POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POLISI POL

JOURNAL OF MEDIA AND INFORMATION WARFARE
Centre for Media and Information Warfare Studies

Media Framing of Peace and War News: A Comparative Study between Malaysian TV Stations and the Global Media

Faridah Ibrahim
School of Media and Communication Studies
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

ABSTRACT

In the 1990s we witnessed wars via the mass media; death of thousands in several warring states and millions in others. We also witnessed numerous acts of terrorism for instance 9/11 in America, the 7/7 bomb blast in the British capital and several bomb blast in Malaysian neighboring country, Indonesia. In the midst of these happenings, are the media, both local and global, doing their best to cover the news for the benefits of their audiences locally or worldwide. As for the local media, and in this case the news broadcast, one may ask how does a country such as Malaysia, that does not experience war, report other peoples' war? With Malaysia's over dependence of war news from the international news agencies and global media, will the news by Malaysian broadcast media differ from those that are covered by the global media, due to news slant and editors' preferences? Moreover with the potential of the mass media to provide neutral and objective reporting of war and peace, one may ask, how do these local and global media propagate peace? For that matter, is peace journalism an option for these media. This study engages in a comparative study on the coverage of war and peace news between two Malaysian television stations, TV3 and RTM with two global television networks, CNN and Al-Jazeera. Using a quantitative content analysis study with Smetko and Valkenburg's framing theory as the theoretical platform, the study hopes to identify to what extent these four selected media are involved in propagating world peace.

Keywords: *War, Peace Journalism, Global Media, Terrorism, International News.*

37

Introduction

The mass media especially television and new media are our windows to the world. Without them we are unaware of what is going on around us. We watch news about wars in many countries – Angola, Sudan, Rwanda, Guatemala, Liberia, Burundi, Algeria , border conflicts between Ethiopia and Eritrea, fighting in Colombia, the never-ending Israeli-Palestinian conflict, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Chechnya, Sri Lanka, southeastern Turkey, Kosovo, Afghanistan, and the latest Iraq. We also witness numerous acts of terrorism via the media – 9/11 in the United States, 7/7 in London, Bali, Jakarta and Mumbai bombings and many others.

All of these wars become important events recorded by the media. The global media with their experienced war correspondents and sophisticated tools are always ready to be flown to war zones and become embedded journalists. Some TV stations producers like the idea of embedded journalists but many don't because journalists found that they are not free to report whatever they see. They are not free to report from the other side. Hence, embedded journalists only benefit one party at war.

Once a war break out, it will take months and years to put it to a halt. No one could stop the war. Even with military prowess, the Superpowers such as the United States, Great Britain and Russia could not stop the war. Many other countries, and Malaysia is without exception, are also involved in sending troops to other people's war under the United Nations peace keeping mission with the hope to control widespread violence in the war zones and negotiate peace.

Definition of War

What is war? Carl von Clausewitz (cited in Tang Siew Mun, 2008: 179) defined war as "an act of force to compel our enemy to do our will… It is the contest of will between two parties with the ultimate aim to defeat the enemy". Why do nations and their people go to war? War usually involves human dignity, right and pride and more often than not war sometimes is a justifying cause for nation to protect their territorial rights and enduring values. War is a conflict of human justification, indignation and ego. Because of this excessive feeling, man uses his strength and weapons to undermine the enemy (Mohd Rajib and Faridah, 2008).

38

According to Tang Siew Mun (2008) although wars in contemporary times are less frequent than a few centuries ago, modern wars are lethal and destructive. Wars have been waged in various intensities, degrees and by diverse actors. But today's wars are fought on many fronts and may not necessarily involve the use of armed violence. The technological innovation that comes with globalization has changed the various faces of war. Today's war is asymmetrical in nature. We talk about war in different terms. Trade wars and the spread of a pandemic diseases do not fall under the conventional "wars" category but are no less lethal and destructive. They are modern wars just like war against drugs, war against terrorism, war against crime and so on.

War is no longer a show of one's superiority and supremacy where those with military prowess can easily win the war. And it is no longer a struggle for territorial conquest. It is about image and dignity.

Hence, this calls for a broader definition of war. Mohd Rajib (2008) stressed that the conduct of warfare has always changed over time. Wars of the future will be fought by individuals or groups or non-state actors and not just armies representing the nation-states. He said it is the dawning of the 5th Generation Warfare where the advancement of information technology has revolutionised the mass media causing a shift from conventional war to the non-conventional or asymmetrical such as information war.

And in the midst of these modern war, is the media, which help to transmit news on war to millions of world population via the technologically savvy Internet and the traditional media in the form of television and the newspapers. Media coverage is integral to shaping the course of events in war and peace. With technology that allows transborder flow of information and visuals within seconds, war news has become routine news of the day.

Without media images, nobody will know what is going on around the world. Who is at war and how many people are suffering. It is the media which provide minute details about the warring states and without which, everybody will be in a state of ignorance (Mohd Rajib & Faridah, 2008). But the coverage of war news comes in multi dimension. There are various angles the camera lens would want to portray and the mighty computer would want to narrate. What kind of directions would war correspondents and producers follow? Would peace news be sidelined to make way for war news that fulfill the criteria for news value? These are questions raised in this paper.

39

Peace Journalism: Some Background

In recent years, some journalism scholars have suggested that journalist put aside the notion of war reporting in favour of peace journalism to promote a culture of peace (Maslog et al., 2006). The idea of peace journalism is considered timely in a situation where wars are happening in many countries. Well-known Malaysian journalist, Bunn Nagara (2003) emphasized that the elements of peace journalism are not new. It is an alternative to the conventional war journalism. It encompasses several reporting traits from political analysis, investigative journalism, socially responsible reporting, and advocacy journalism in the interests of peace.

Although ideas about peace journalism has been forwarded by Johan Galtung in the 60's, the adoption process is very slow. Some of reasons cited are, the nature of peace journalism is not well comprehended by journalists, not only at the local level but also abroad. It comes with its pros and cons, strengths and weaknesses, and advocates and detractors. Many journalists view peace journalism as insidious and disruptive for the standard practice. Like most other news genre covered by the media it is based on certain core principles. Journalists will only become acquainted to peace journalism through long term practice and experience.

There are several reasons why there are difficulties to inculcate peace journalism values. First, journalists tend to develop their respective comfort levels at their work place. Second, majority are protective of their own comfort level. Third, many journalists feel that they are not suitable to be peacemakers and have no training in that direction. Fourth, it is more associated to academic pronouncements, theoretical expositions rather than their professional needs. And fifth, lack of understanding due to poor explanation (Bunn Nagara, 2003: 7-9).

Galtung (2002) observed that the traditional war reporting is modeled after sports journalism which place a great emphasis on the winners. Galtung equates peace journalism with health journalism where emphasis is given to multidimensional perspectives which cover the plight of the patient battling the disease he/she is suffering, background information pertaining to the disease, the full range of cures and preventive measures. One can see that peace journalism writing is a holistic approach to news writing that covers elements of subjectivity and objectivity.

Why is peace journalism so crucial? In general, it helps to raise the standard of journalism by giving a broader, fairer and more balanced perspectives to the coverage of war. It also helps to clarify matters, particularly where differences and contentions exist, by providing more

40

rounded and comprehensive coverage of issues. And finally, it might actually help the cause of peace, which would help all parties by making peace journalism both positive and non-partisan.

Hence, peace journalism recommends that journalists carry out the role as educators who could inform and educate the public on the background, contexts and origins of issues that have led nations to be at war. These, of course need training, media literacy and sensitization programs, conducted among journalists and the public (Faridah Ibrahim, 2008).

Empirical Findings

Various researchers have undertaken studies on war and peace news coverage over the years, but not many have focused on a comparative context (Abu Daud et al., 2008, Aday et al., 2005, Faridah & Mohd Rajib, 2005, Lewis, 2004, Pfau et al., 2004, Faridah & Mohd Rajib, 2002, Faridah & Rahmah Hashim, 1996). This study compares between Malaysian TV stations with two global TV networks, CNN and Qatar – based Al-Jazeera.

Abu Daud et al. (2008) conduct a survey of the perceptions of war against terrorism (WAT) from a Malaysian perspective. The objectives of the study were to determine respondent's perceptions regarding the reasons for increased terrorism acts, beliefs about WAT, relationship with religion and future of terrorism. In their findings, two reasons were cited for increased terrorism acts. First, aggressive US foreign policy and second, deepening misunderstanding and tension between the West and Islam. To another objective, they found WAT is about US invasion in foreign lands (68.2%), about oil control (67.7%), a fight between West and Islam (56%). On the future of terrorism, majority of the respondents identified that terrorism will increase.

Maslog et al. (2008) found in their studies of newspapers and a news agency of five Asian countries that there is a slight presence of peace journalism frames in the news samples due to two factors, religion and sourcing. They studied coverage of Iraq war in 2003 by newspapers in India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, Philippines and a news agency in Pakistan. Newspapers from the non-Muslim countries, except the Philippines have a stronger war journalism frames and are more supportive of the war and of the Americans/British. On the other hand newspapers from the Muslim countries are more supportive of the Iraqis. They also found that

41

stories produced by foreign wire services have a stronger war journalism framing, and show more support for the war and the Americans/British than stories written by the newspapers' own staff.

Studies on foreign news (see Faridah, 1984; Mohd Rajib, 1984; Faridah & Rahmah, 1996; Mohd Rajib & Faridah, 1996) by the international news agencies such as the Associate Press (AP), United Press International (UPI), Reuters, Agence-France Presse (AFP) and satellite television, Cable News Network (CNN) have indicate that international news are reported with a Western slant. These agencies tend to give a negative slant to news about foreign countries that are not their countries of origin.

According to Chang et al. (1987), what concerns the Third World nations is the global flow of news and information based on quantitative and qualitative interpretations. In terms of quantity, there is a minimal coverage of the Third World by the Western media even though the Third World nations form nearly three-quarters of the world's population. Of the scanty coverage, news about the Third World is usually portrayed in a negative light, hence reinforcing stereotypes against those countries.

A brief glimpse of news covered by western media on the Third World, may revealed that the news contained items that are negative in nature such as war, poverty, illiteracy, riots, revolutions, antics of national leaders, social disruption, natural calamity and the like (Chang et al., 1987).

A study on human rights covered by five Malaysian dailies namely *Utusan Malaysia, New Straits Times, Sun, Berita Harian* and *The Star* (Faridah Ibrahim and Mohd Rajib, 1996) from the perspective of source bias and journalistic bias showed that the international news agencies such as AP, AFP and Reuters gave a dual orientation of unfavorable and neutral directions in the coverage of human rights' issues in the Third world while the newspapers' own correspondents focus more on favourable and neutral directions. The journalists from the western news agencies are also fond to take sides on certain issues they cover.

Along similar line, a study conducted by Faridah and Mohd Safar (2005) on the usage of news sources and news agencies in 12 Malaysian newspapers found that foreign news supplied by international news agencies, particularly Reuters, AFP and AP are slanted more towards negative and neutral directions as compared to positive and balanced directions. The study found that there are lesser news of negative orientations if the news are covered by the local journalists or news

agency. The findings in this study supported earlier study by Faridah and Mohd Rajib conducted in 1996. The study also found that local gatekeepers in both print and broadcast media tend to use more foreign news supplied by international news agencies because of extensive and up-to-date coverage supported by superior footage and visuals.

All the above findings, both local and foreign, reaffirm main comments made during the New World Information Order debate in the 80's where distorted, negative treatment of the Third World in the Western media is transferred to the Third World itself because of the latter's dependence on the Western news agencies (Faridah Ibrahim, 2008). However, there is a current practice in Malaysia by local gatekeepers to combine several news supplied by various international agencies and labeled it as news from the "Agencies" to give a more holistic and balanced coverage.

Media Framing

In recent years, the concept of framing and frame building have become an important focus in many research, both qualitative and quantitative, especially in media and communication studies and related fields of sociology, political science, health, economy and many others. Framing has been associated with the works of sociologist, Erving Goffman (1974).

More recently, the concept of framing has been explicated as second-level agenda setting (McCombs et al., 1997). These scholars contended that the concepts of agenda setting and framing represent a convergence, in that framing is an extension of agenda-setting. In the first level of agenda-setting process, object salience is the main focus which is transmitted via the media. In the second level agenda-setting, popularly known as framing, viewed as indicator salience, illustrates 'how the media tell us *how* to think about something', which is a retribution of Bernard Cohen's statement that 'the media tell us *what* to think about'.

To frame is to select, says Entman (1993: 51-52) and "it describes the power of a communication text". In other words, the act of framing involves the selection of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text. Entman subscribed to four stages of framing namely problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation and treatment recommendation.

Reese and Buckalew (1995) looked at framing as the way events and issues are organized and made sense of, especially by media, media practitioners and their audiences. Gamson (1992) considers framing as

an important field of analysis that looks at how issues are constructed, discourse structured and meanings developed. These are seen from the qualitative aspect. In fact the qualitative tradition allows one to capture the meanings embedded within the texts and avoid the reductionistic urge to sort media texts and discourse into categories and frequencies.

On the other hand, the positivist, behavioral measures of frames based on manifest content allows precision in measurement of issues that makes it preferred by many scholars (Reese & Buckalew, 1995).

Tankard et al. (1991: 11) proposes that a frame is a central organizing idea for news content and need to be analysed through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration.

Gamson and Modigliani (1989: 3) reiterate that a frame can be further viewed as a "central organizing idea or story line that provides meaning" to the events related to a story or issue. Their analysis of media text and communication meanings are guided by five common devices: catchphrases, depictions, metaphors, exemplars and visual images).

Central to the process of framing is the role of the mass media. Framing has been useful in understanding the media's role in their news construction. The way issues are framed by the media could also trigger different perceptions among the audience. People respond differently when information is framed either positively or negatively (Ferguson and Gallagher, 2007). Hence, the mass media are important carriers of information that have the potential to shape people's opinion towards certain issues (Faridah Ibrahim et al., 2010).

According to Maslog et al. (2008: 24) peace journalism is supported by framing theory although one can see that there is no one definition of framing. However, a common understanding of framing is that it is a process of "organizing a news story thematically, stylistically and factually, to convey a specific story line".

Based on these observations and reviews, it can be seen that framing analysis is a useful theoretical framework to study the coverage of war and peace by the media. Furthermore, the content of the media is deliberately or unintentionally being organized in a form of media frames by editors that allow systematic analysis from various structures in the news namely syntactic, thematic, rhetorical and script (Pan and Kosicki, 1993).

From the quantitative perspective, Smetko and Valkenburg (2000) look at framing through five generic frames namely responsibility, human interest, conflict, morality and economic consequences frames. Responsibility means high degree of attributions to the government for

44

certain issues such as humanitarian aid in times of war or in a natural catastrophe. Human interest frame looks at demonstration of high degree of human interest or emotional angle to the presentation of an event, issue, or problem. Conflict frame looks at high degree of conflict between individuals, groups, or institutions as a means of capturing audience interest. The morality frame include putting a high degree of preferences for moral prescriptions. And the economic consequences framing looks at a high degree of reporting event, problem, or issue in terms of the consequences and its economic aspect on an individual, group, institution, region, or country. This study uses analysis of all types of frames based on Smetko and Valkenburg (2000).

The literature reviewed above, showed evidences of some differences in war and peace news coverage by different media in various countries. Nevertheless, the usage of several framing theories have helped to shed some lights in terms of war and peace news framing. Taking a few steps further this study hopes to see the different media framing of war and peace based on a comparative study.

The objectives of the study is to identify how does a country such as Malaysia, that does not experience war, report about war in other countries. With Malaysia's over dependence of war news from the international news agencies and global media, it is interesting to find out whether the news by Malaysian broadcast media differ from those that are covered by the global media, due to news slant and editors' and producers' preferences. Moreover with the potential of the mass media to provide neutral and objective reporting of war and peace, the study hopes to identify to what extent these local and global media propagate peace. For that matter, the study also hopes to answer this research question: Is peace journalism an option for these media? This study engages in a comparative study on the coverage of war and peace news between two Malaysian television stations, TV3 and RTM1 with two satellite global television networks, CNN and Al-Jazeera. The study used Smetko and Valkenburg framing theory as the basis to compare the different frames on war and peace news constructed by the four selected media.

Methodology

The study focused on war and peace news broadcast by two Malaysian television stations namely the government owned station, Radio

Televisyen Malaysia (RTM1) and private TV station, TV3 as well as news broadcast by the global media, CNN and Al-Jazeera in the month of August 2009. The goal of the study is to compare war and peace news coverage by Malaysian TV stations and the global media. A quantitative content analysis was used to analyse war and peace news coverage by these four stations. To answer the above objectives and research question, several factors will be focused including the analysis of news sources and directions of news as well as the application of Smetko and Valkenburg framing theory to understand to what extent these four selected media are involved in propagating world peace.

Findings and Discussion

The content analysis of the four selected local television and global media yielded a total of 138 news covering war and peace. However, war news coverage is more prominent with a total of 78.3 percent (108) compared to 21.7 percent (30) of peace news coverage.

In terms of frequencies, the findings showed that CNN had more war and peace news coverage, 37 percent (51), followed by Al-Jazeera, 30.0 percent (42), TV3, 25.4 percent (35). RTM1 recorded the least coverage on war and peace, 7.2 percent (10) (See Table 1). The findings also indicate that between the two Malaysian TV stations, the private station TV3 aired more war news compared to its counterpart, RTM1. Between the global media, CNN aired more war news compared to Al Jazeera. On the overall, all selected media tend to focus more on war news. However, Table 2 also demonstrates that Al Jazeera and Malaysian government owned TV station covered more percentages of peace news.

Table 1: Frequency of Coverage by the Four Media

Media (television and satellite TV)	Frequency	Percent
RTM1	10	7.2
TV3	35	25.4
CNN	51	37.0
AL JAZEERA	42	30.4
Total	138	100.0

Table 2: Frequency of Coverage on War and Peace News in all Selected Media

Media	War News		Peace News		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
RTM1	6	60.0	4	40.0	10	100.0
TV3	30	85.7	3	14.3	35	100.0
CNN	42	82.4	9	11.1	51	100.0
Al Jazeera	30	71.4	12	28.6	42	100.0

News Sources

Findings in Table 3 show that RTM1, CNN and Al Jazeera used a bigger percentage of war and peace news written by the stations' own staff with the exception of TV3. However, it can be seen that the two Malaysian TV stations tend to make full use of news footage from other international agencies including Al Jazeera, CNN and BBC (see Table 3). In terms of sources of news in the news text, it can be seen that the stations used a bigger portions of news from other media (30.4 percent), followed by the public or the civilians (15.9 percent) and government sources (13.0 percent). Army sources recorded only 5.1 percent (see Table 4).

Table 3: News Providers

Media/ news providers	Bernama	Own staff	Others
RTM1	1 (10.0%)	7 (70.0%)	2 (20.0%)
TV3	-	13 (37.1%)	22 (62.9%)
CNN	-	48 (94.1%)	3 (5.9%)
AL JAZEERA	-	42 (100.0%)	-

Dominant Issues

The media have their own way in framing war and peace news. Several dominant issues (see Table 5) framed by the media under the war news category include instability (43.5 percent), confusion in leadership (19.4 percent), economic turmoil (16.7 percent). Such negativities do not help warring states to negotiate peace. On the other hand, it will intensify animosities that will make the winning party to take advantage of these vulnerabilities. On the other hand, peace news that were highlighted by

47

Table 4: Sources of News

Sources	Frequency	Percent
Government leaders	18	13.0
Opposition	1	0.7
Leaders of Association/ NGO	8	5.8
Members of Association/ NGO	6	4.3
News Agency	11	8.0
Scholars/experts	11	8.0
Public	22	15.9
Army	7	5.1
Media	42	30.4
Others	12	8.7
Total	138	100.0

Table 5: Dominant Issues in War News

Issues	Frequency	Percent
Aid sanction	6	5.5
Economic turmoil	18	16.7
Leadership confusion	21	19.4
Instability	47	43.5
Non-compromising	3	2.7
Non related	13	12.0
Total	108	100.0

the selected media formed only 21.7 percent of the total news recorded during the one-month duration of August 2009. From the coverage, dominant issues highlighted were the usage of diplomacy and the possibilities of negotiations for peace (40.0 percent). These are considered noble effort on the part of the media to try to concentrate on peace options. Other issues highlighted that could demonstrate some positive effort to promote peace are issues on security (23.3 percent) and issues on economic building (16.7 percent). Issues on leadership and humanitarian aids recorded equal percentages of 10.0 percent respectively (see Table 6). These factors are important issues that indicate some peace initiatives on the part of the media for the warring states. However, peace news form a small percentage of the total news when compared to war news.

Table 6: Dominant Issues in Peace News

Issues	Frequency	Percent
Humanitarian Aids	3	10.0
Economic Building	5	16.7
Leadership	3	10.0
Security	7	23.3
Diplomacy and Negotiation	12	40.0
Total	30	100.0

Media Framing

Smetko and Valkenburg (2001) identified five generic frames in their frame theory. They are conflict, human interest, economics consequences, morality and responsibility. Table 7 showed a heavy emphasis on the conflict frames by the television stations and global networks. This is followed by the economics (14.5%) and responsibility frames (13.8%). For peace journalism to be operative, news should be educational in nature perhaps comprising of morality and responsibility frames.

Table 7: Dominant Frames (based on Smetko and Valkenburg Framing Theory)

Dominant frames	Frequency	Percent
Conflict	74	53.6
Human interest	12	8.7
Economic Consequences	20	14.5
Morality	13	9.4
Responsibility	19	13.8
Total	138	100.0

News Directions

The focus of news stories in all the selected television and networks is in the negative category. This is true since the bulk of news stories are war rather than peace. The Malaysian private TV station, TV3 carried more negative news (77.1%) compared to RTM1, CNN and Al Jazeera. RTM1 has more positive news (30.0%) compared to the rest. Among the

49

television stations and news networks, CNN has more neutral news. The findings in Table 9 showed that the local televisions and global networks do not have strong preferences for the balance news category, which is considered the ideal in journalism.

Table 8: Dominant Frames Based on the Different TV Stations

TV/ Frames	Conflict	Human Interest	Economic Consequences	Morality	Responsibility
RTM1	2(20.0%)	1(10.0%)	5(50.0%)	0(0%)	2(20.0%)
TV3	14 (40.0%)	6(17.1%)	8(22.9%)	2(5.7%)	5(14.3%)
CNN	35 (68.6%)	4(7.8%)	0(0%)	1(2.0%)	11(21.6%)
AL JAZEERA	23 (54.8%)	1(2.4%)	7(16.7%)	10 (23.8%)	1((2.4%)

Table 9: News Direction and Selected TV Stations/Networks

TV and networks/ Directions	Positive	Negative	Neutral	Balance	Total
RTM1	3 (30.0%)	5 (50.0%)	1 (10.0%)	1 (10.0%)	10
TV3	3 (8.6%)	27 (77.1%)	5 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	35
CNN	4 (7.8%)	32 (62.7%)	15 (29.4%)	0 (0%)	51
AL JAZEERA	7 (16.7%)	28 (66.7%)	7 (16.7%)	0 (0%)	42

Conclusion

This analysis has focused primarily on coverage of war and peace news in four selected television stations (2 local stations and 2 global satellite televisions). This study echoed other earlier studies on peace journalism. Peace news coverage stands at a minimal frequency of 21.7 percent as compared to war news coverage of 78.3 percent.

Following universal news evaluation criteria as suggested by many previous scholars, for instance Galtung and Ruge (1965), this study found that the conflict frame is the dominant frame. This is followed by the responsibility and economic consequences frames. These two frames clearly weigh heavily in nations that are experiencing war. At the onset, responsibility frame should be the dominant frame because where war and peace news are concerned, there should be heavy focus on the elements of responsibility in the coverage by news journalists or producers, if they would want to propagate peace. Instead, conflict news is the

50

focus of the day. Hence, it can be seen that the four selected stations continue to face the questions of how that responsibility is to be defined in a global scenario where peace should be the option.

At the local level, war and peace news, like other genres, is coloured and framed with a local flavor. It can be seen that although the stories are officially from foreign countries, they are often edited and rephrased to suit to local preferences. Looking at the direction of news, the findings showed negative direction is the dominant frame. Again this follows the universal criteria that negativities sell news. News producers, both local and global, tend to search for their own definition of war and peace news and in the process of news preparation, they are also guided by their news preferences and biases in the societies where they operate. This is so in Malaysia where the mass media operate closely along societal and governmental lines (Faridah Ibrahim, 1995). The same goes to the global media, CNN and Al-Jazeera, where the universal criteria and media ownership dictate.

Is Peace Journalism an option that is propagated by the two global media, CNN and Al-Jazeera and the two local TV stations, RTM1 and TV3? The findings showed that although all the media covered peace news, the amount and frequency is still very minimal when compared to war news coverage. To go for peace journalism options, both local and global media need to strike a good balance between war and peace news. More highlights should be given to peace news to educate people about war, conflict, negotiations, WMDs, terrorism and the superpowers as well as their foreign policies. This will need journalists to upgrade their knowledge and be at par with current affairs with regards to war and peace mission. At the local level, journalists need to be trained for combat since they might be embedded in war zones.

References

Abu Daud Silong, Zaharah Hassan & Steven Eric Krauss (2008). Perceptions of the war against terrorism (WAT): A Malaysian case study. *Alternatives*, 7(2&3): 1-14.

Aday, S., Livingstone, S. & Hebert, M. (2005). Embedding the truth; A cross cultural analysis of objectivity and television coverage of the Iraq War. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 10(1): 3-21.

51

Bunn Nagara (2003). Peace journalism and Malaysia. Possibilities and prospects. Paper presented at Seminar/ Workshop on Peace Journalism, Taiping, Malaysia, 4-7 August 2003.

Dimitrova, D.V. & Connolly-Ahern, C. (2007). A tale of two wars: Framing analysis of online news sites in coalition countries and the Arab world during the Iraq war. *The Howard Journal of Communications*, 18: 155-168.

Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 34(4): 51-58.

Faridah Ibrahim (2004). Images of Superpowers as reflected in two Malaysian national dailies. *MA thesis*. University of Missouri Columbia, USA.

Faridah Ibrahim (2008). Global media versus peace journalism. *Journal of Media and Information Warfare*, 1(1): 81-104.

Faridah Ibrahim & Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani (2005). Peace or annihilation: A study of war news coverage from the General Semantics perspectives. In Lee Su Kim et al. (eds). *Language and nationhood: New contexts, new realities.* Bangi: PPBL, UKM, 129-148.

Faridah Ibrahim & Mohd Safar Hashim (2005). *Sumber berita dalam media cetak dan elektronik*/trans: News sources in print and broadcast media. Bangi: Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia.

Faridah Ibrahim, Normah Mustaffa & Chang Peng Kee (2010). Framing a pandemic: An analysis of Malaysian mainstream newspapers in the H1N1 coverage. Paper presented at International Communication 2010 Preconference – Health Communication Campaigns: Issues and Strategies in Asia, Australia and Southeast Asia, 22 June 2010 at Singapore Health Promotion Board, Singapore. Organised by ICA and NTU.

Faridah Ibrahim & Rahmah Hashim (1996). *Images of women and human rights: A conent analysis of Malaysian media during the Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing.* Paper presented at the IAMCR Conference, Sydney, Australia. August 19-22, 1996.

Ferguson, E. & Gallagher, L. (2007). Message framing with respect to decisions about vaccination: the roles of frame valence, frame method and perceived risk. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98(4): 667-680.

Galtung, J. (2002). *Media: Peace journalism*. http://www.nicr.ca/programs/PeaceJouanlism.htm.

Gamson, W. & Modigliani, A. (1987). The changing culture of affirmative action. In R. D. Braungart (ed.). *Research in political sociology*, pp. 137-177. Greenwich, CT: JAI.

Gamson, W. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1): 1-37.

Lewis, J. (2004). Television, public opinion and the war in Iraq. The case of Britain. *International of Public Opinion Research, 16*, 295-310.

Maslog, C.C., Lee, S.T. & Kim, H.S. (2008). Framing analysis of a conflict: How newspapers in five Asian countries covered the Iraq war. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16(1): 19-39.

McCombs, M., Shaw, D. L. & Weaver, D. (1997). *Communication and democracy: Exploring the intellectual frontiers in agenda-setting theory*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani (1984). The study of semantic objectivity in two Malaysian national dailies. *MA thesis*. University of Missouri Columbia, USA.

Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani (2008). Media warfare: A global challenge in the 21st Century. *Journal of Media and Information Warfare*, 1(1): 1-8.

Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani & Faridah Ibrahim (1996). Analysis of semantic objectivity of human rights coverage in four Malaysian mainstream newspapers. *Monograph Series School of Mass Communication*, UiTM.

53

Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani & Faridah Ibrahim (1996). *The use and misuse of language in the media: Semantic analysis of human rights coverage in Malaysian national dailies*. Paper presented at the IAMCR Conference, Sydney, Australia. August 19-22 1996.

Mohd Rajib Ab Ghani & Faridah Ibrahim (2008). Media stereotyping: Reporting war and terrorism. In Nirmala Rao Khadpekar (ed). *Media ethics: Global dimension*. New Delhi: Icfai University Press, 139-156.

Pfau, M., Haigh, M., Gettle, M., Donnelly, M., Scott, G., Warr, D. & Wittenberg, E. (2004). Embedded journalistsin military combat units: Impact on newspaper story frames and tone. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1): 74-88.

Reese, S.D. & Buckalew, B. (1995). The militarization of local television: The routine framing of the Persian Gulf. *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(1): 41-56.

Semetko, H. A. & Valkenburg, P. M. (2000). Framing European politics: A content analysis of press and television news. *Journal of Communication*, 50(2): 93-109.

Tang Siew Mun (2008). The many faces and facets of war: Redrawing the boundaries and focus of warfare in contemporary and focus of warfare in contemporary international affairs. *Journal of Media and Information Warfare*, 1(1): 177-192.

Tankard, J., Hendrickson, L. Silberman, J., Bliss, K. & Ghanem, S. (1991). Media frames: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement. Annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (AEJMC), Boston, MA, August.