CNN US And CNN Indonesia's Textual Practice in Framing Humanitarian Narratives: A Critical Discourse Analysis

Dyah Ayu Ratna Jelita[1], Suhartawan Budianto[2]

[12]English Department, Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia
[1]dyahayuratnajelita@gmail.com, [2]suhartawanbudianto@unitomo.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the role of textual practice (micro-structure) in shaping humanitarian narratives in news coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict by CNN US and CNN Indonesia. Employing Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), the research identifies key linguistic features, including lexical choices, sentence structure, modality, rhetorical devices, and pronoun usage, that contribute to the ideological framing of news articles. The findings indicate that CNN US employs neutral and euphemistic language, passive constructions, and hedging devices to maintain journalistic objectivity, whereas CNN Indonesia utilizes emotionally charged language, active voice, and definitive claims to frame the conflict with a strong pro-Palestinian stance. These textual differences underscore the influence of language in constructing public perceptions of humanitarian crises.

Keywords: CNN; Critical Discourse Analysis; Humanitarian Narratives; Israel-Palestine Conflict; Textual Practice

INTRODUCTION

News media plays a crucial role in shaping public perceptions of global conflicts through linguistic choices that frame narratives. Media outlets, intentionally or unintentionally, contribute to constructing ideological perspectives through the way they present news (Van Dijk, 1993). Language is a powerful tool that not only informs but also influences readers' emotions and attitudes toward particular issues (Fairclough, 1995). This study investigates how textual practices, particularly micro-structural elements, shape humanitarian narratives in CNN US and CNN Indonesia's coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Textual practice, also referred to as micro-structure in Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) framework, involves linguistic features such as lexical choices, sentence structure, modality, rhetorical devices, and pronoun usage (Fairclough, 2003). These linguistic elements are crucial in determining how news is framed and interpreted by audiences. Lexical choices, for example, can indicate whether a media outlet presents an event neutrally or in a way that aligns with a particular ideological stance (Richardson, 2007). Sentence structures, such as the use of active or passive voice, can either emphasize or obscure agency in reporting acts of violence (Machin & Mayr, 2012).

The ideological positioning of media organizations can be reflected in their reporting style and linguistic preferences. While CNN US is known for its adherence to Western journalistic standards that prioritize neutrality and factual reporting, CNN Indonesia operates within a different socio-political context, which can lead to variations in how humanitarian narratives are framed (Wodak, 2009). The political and cultural backdrop of a country often influences how media outlets frame conflicts, leading to differing portrayals of similar events (Baker et al., 2008).

This study employs Fairclough's CDA framework to examine how CNN US and CNN Indonesia linguistically construct narratives surrounding humanitarian crises in the Israel-Palestine conflict. By analyzing lexical choices, sentence structures, modality, rhetorical strategies, and pronoun usage, the study aims to uncover how textual practices shape public perception. Understanding these differences is essential in recognizing how language functions as an instrument of power in media discourse (Van Dijk, 2006). By examining the linguistic elements in news texts, this study contributes to the broader discourse on media representation, ideology, and public perception of global conflicts. The findings will provide insights into how textual choices reflect broader socio-political influences and contribute to constructing ideological perspectives in international news coverage.

Numerous studies have examined media coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict, exploring aspects such as bias, framing, propaganda, and the role of media ownership (Mhanna, 2018; Panayotova & Rizova, 2021; Sirhan & Sirhan, 2021; Barari & Yacoub, 2024). Research has highlighted notable differences in how media outlets portray the conflict, often aligning with the political and ideological perspectives of their audiences and stakeholders. However, there remains a gap in comparative research on humanitarian narratives across regional branches of the same news organization. Most existing studies either analyze the coverage of a single media outlet or compare different outlets within a specific country.

Therefore, this study examines several news articles that focus on humanitarian issues, particularly those involving victims, perpetrators, human aid, and tolls. These articles serve as the primary data source for analysis using Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis framework. Fairclough's approach consists of three dimensions: textual, discursive, and sociocultural practice. However, this research focuses solely on the textual practice. The objective is to identify the textual practices used by CNN US and CNN Indonesia when covering news on the Israel-Palestine conflict.

METHODS

This study adopted a qualitative research design using Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to examine the textual practice (micro-structure) in CNN US and CNN Indonesia's news coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict. Qualitative research, as defined by Creswell (2013), allows for an in-depth understanding of social phenomena by exploring meaning-making processes rather than quantifiable relationships. This approach is appropriate for uncovering ideological influences in news discourse.

The analysis focused on linguistic elements such as lexical choices, sentence structures, modality, rhetorical devices, and pronoun usage. By investigating these features, the study aims to uncover how language constructs humanitarian narratives and embeds ideological perspectives within the news discourse. For data collection, the thesis employed purposive sampling, also known as judgmental sampling, following Palys & Atchison (2008). This method involves selecting data based on relevance to research objectives rather than randomness.

The data was collected from four news articles, two from CNN US and two from CNN Indonesia, selected based on their relevance to humanitarian issues. The textual elements were systematically analyzed to identify patterns that shape public perception and media framing of the conflict. The research process included systematically identifying, classifying, and interpreting linguistic patterns within the selected articles.

Moreover, since there are 4 news articles, the first news from CNN US entitled *Around 70% of deaths in Gaza are women and children, says UN* is referred as news 1 and the second news from CNN US entitled *A year into the war, Israeli military operations in Gaza continue to ramp up and Hamas is yet to be defeated* is referred as news 2. Then, the first news from CNN Indonesia entitled *UNRWA: Rata-rata 67 Anak di Gaza Dibunuh Israel Setiap Hari* is referred as news 3 and the second news from CNN Indonesia entitled *Satu Tahun Agresi Brutal Israel di Palestina, 41.870 Orang Tewas* is referred as news 4.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

A. Findings

The micro-structure of a text focuses on its linguistic features to uncover how meaning is constructed, and ideologies are embedded. To analyze the micro-structure of a text using Fairclough's CDA, the following indicators are commonly used: 1) lexical choices (vocabulary), 2) sentence structure (syntax), 3) modality, 4) rhetorical devices, 5) Pronoun use (Fairclough, 1995). The textual practice analysis revealed significant differences in how both news outlets use language to frame the humanitarian crisis. The following table shows the comparison of the textual practice of CNN US and CNN Indonesia:

Tabel 1. Textual Practice Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Features	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Lexical Choices	Neutral	Emotionally Charged
Sentence Structure	Passive Voice	Active Voice
Modality	Hedging	High Modality
Rhetorical Devices	Authority Reference	Emotional Appeal
Pronoun Use	Neutral	Solidarity

Based on the research, the researcher found that CNN US employs neutral and euphemistic language, passive constructions, and hedging devices to maintain journalistic objectivity, whereas CNN Indonesia uses emotionally charged language, active voice, and definitive claims to directly attribute blame to Israel and advocate for the Palestinian cause.

B. Discussions

1. Lexical Choices (Vocabulary)

Lexical choices in news discourse play a crucial role in shaping public perception, as language is never neutral but embedded with ideological and socio-political meanings (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Through vocabulary, media outlets frame events, construct narratives, and influence audience interpretations (Bell, 1991). Neutral or euphemistic language can downplay controversial actions, while emotionally charged terms can evoke outrage or

sympathy (Fowler, 1991). The selection of words such as "conflict" versus "aggression" or "casualties" versus "victims" reflects underlying ideological stances, subtly guiding readers toward specific perspectives (Richardson, 2007). By examining lexical choices within Fairclough's (2003) framework of textual practice, critical discourse analysis reveals how power and ideology operate in media texts, influencing not only how events are reported but also how they are understood by the public (van Dijk, 2006).

Tabel 2. Lexical Choices Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Aspects	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Neutral Terms	"Civilian toll," "displaced Palestinians," "military operations," "evacuation orders"	None
Emotionally Charged	"Systematic violation," "humanitarian zone," "brink of collapse"	"Agresi brutal" (brutal aggression), "genosida" (genocide), "militer Zionis" (Zionist military)
Euphemisms	"Eliminating future threats," "evacuation orders issued"	None
Descriptive Terms	"Multiple bodies lying in the street covered in blood," "mounting casualties"	"Rata-rata 67 anak dibunuh setiap hari" (67 children killed daily), "41.870 orang tewas" (41,870 people killed)

The lexical choices in CNN US and CNN Indonesia's articles reflect contrasting approaches to reporting on the Israel-Palestine conflict, shaped by their ideological orientations, socio-political contexts, and audience expectations. Neutral vocabulary often serves to present information in a way that minimizes bias and maintains journalistic objectivity (Thorsen, 2008). In CNN US article *Around 70% of deaths in Gaza are women and children, says UN* also referred as news 1, phrases such as *"*civilian toll," "displaced Palestinians," and "military operations*"* highlight the humanitarian aspect of the conflict without directly assigning blame. For instance, the phrase: "The toll on civilians has been catastrophic, with 70% of the dead being women and children," emphasizes the devastating impact of the conflict on non-combatants but avoids identifying the actors responsible for these casualties. In contrast, CNN Indonesia avoids neutral terms entirely. The headline of *Satu Tahun Agresi Brutal Israel di Palestina, 41.870 Orang Tewas* in news 4 uses *"agresi brutal"* (brutal aggression), a phrase laden with condemnation, to characterize Israeli military actions. This choice reflects an explicitly critical stance, aligning with the cultural and political solidarity of Indonesia with Palestine. By avoiding neutral terms, CNN Indonesia positions itself as an advocate rather than an impartial observer.

Emotionally charged language, then is employed to evoke specific reactions from readers. CNN US, while generally restrained, includes phrases like "systematic violation" and "brink of collapse." In *A year into the war, Israeli military operations in Gaza continue to ramp up and Hamas is yet to be defeated*, also referred as news 2, the article describes the situation as: "Mounting casualties and overcrowding have pushed humanitarian systems to the brink of collapse." This language evokes concern and urgency without overtly blaming any party (Edelman, 2013). Such vocabulary reflects CNN US's intent to maintain a balanced tone, appealing to a diverse global audience (Bell, 1991). Conversely, CNN Indonesia relies heavily on emotionally charged terms. In *UNRWA: Rata-rata 67 Anak di Gaza Dibunuh Israel Setiap Hari* also referred as news 3, the article uses terms like *"genosida"* (genocide) and *"pasukan Zionis"* (Zionist forces) to frame the conflict as a moral and humanitarian crisis caused by deliberate Israeli actions. For instance, the statement: *"Genosida yang dilakukan oleh pasukan Zionis telah menewaskan rata-rata 67 anak setiap hari" "*(Genocide carried out by Zionist forces has killed an average of 67 children daily)" explicitly condemns Israel's actions, leaving no room for ambiguity. The use of *"genosida"* invokes historical atrocities, intensifying the moral weight of the narrative (Meretoja, 2018).

Euphemisms soften the impact of harsh realities and often reflect institutional or ideological biases (Aytan, et. al., 2021). CNN US employs euphemistic terms such as "eliminating future threats" to describe Israeli military objectives. In news 2, the phrase: "The Israeli military continues to ramp up operations in Gaza, focusing on eliminating future threats," frames the military actions as preventive and strategic rather than aggressive. Similarly, terms like "evacuation orders issued" downplay the forced displacement of civilians, aligning the narrative with Israel's official justification. In contrast, CNN Indonesia foregone euphemisms entirely. In news 4, the article uses direct language like "*menewaskan lebih dari 41.870 orang*" "(killing over 41,870 people)", which starkly conveys the severity of the conflict. The absence of euphemisms aligns with CNN Indonesia's goal of amplifying the Palestinian perspective and critiquing Israeli actions.

Both outlets use descriptive terms, but their focus and tone differ significantly. CNN US opts for descriptions that highlight the consequences of the conflict, as seen in news 1, The article notes: "Casualties in the north have also mounted, forcing thousands to flee south under evacuation orders." While descriptive, this statement avoids graphic or emotionally charged details, maintaining a tone of factual reporting. CNN Indonesia, by contrast, uses vivid and graphic descriptions to emphasize the human suffering caused by the conflict. In news 3, the article states: "*Situasi di Gaza telah menjadi salah satu tragedi paling mematikan dalam sejarah.*" "(The situation in Gaza has become one of the deadliest tragedies in history.)" This statement not only highlights the scale of destruction but also frames it as an unprecedented humanitarian catastrophe, evoking a sense of urgency and outrage among readers (Fairclough, 2003).

The connotations embedded in CNN US's vocabulary emphasize the humanitarian consequences of the conflict without overtly assigning blame (Kennedy, 2004). Terms like "health crisis," "displacement," and "casualties" focus on the outcomes rather than the actors. This approach reflects CNN US's attempt to appeal to a broad audience by maintaining neutrality while highlighting the severity of the situation. CNN Indonesia's vocabulary, on the other hand, carries strongly negative connotations toward Israel. Terms like "*agresi brutal*" (brutal aggression) and "*genosida*" (genocide) frame Israeli actions as deliberate violations of human rights, resonating with Indonesia's political and cultural solidarity with Palestine. These connotations are aimed at fostering empathy for Palestinian victims and mobilizing public opinion against Israel.

Moreover, the lexical choices in CNN US and CNN Indonesia articles reflect fundamentally different approaches to reporting on the Israel-Palestine conflict. CNN US employs neutral, euphemistic, and restrained vocabulary to maintain an appearance of balance and objectivity, aligning with its global audience and socio-political context. In contrast, CNN Indonesia uses emotionally charged, graphic, and ideologically explicit language to align with Indonesia's pro-Palestinian stance and to evoke moral outrage. These differences illustrate how media discourse is shaped by cultural, political, and ideological factors, influencing public understanding of global conflicts.

2. Sentence Structure (Syntax)

Sentence structure plays a crucial role in shaping meaning, influencing how information is presented and interpreted in media discourse. Syntactic choices, such as active and passive voice, sentence complexity, and nominalization, contribute to how events and actions are framed (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Passive constructions can obscure agency, while active voice explicitly assigns responsibility, affecting audience perceptions (Fowler, 1991). Sentence complexity also impacts readability and emphasis, with longer structures providing nuance and shorter ones creating immediacy (Bell, 1991). Additionally, nominalization, where verbs are transformed into abstract nouns, can depersonalize actions and contribute to a neutral or detached tone (Fairclough, 2003). These syntactic features are not merely grammatical choices but serve as strategic tools in discourse, reflecting ideological positions and shaping public understanding (Richardson, 2007; van Dijk, 2006).

Tabel 3. Sentence Structure Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Aspects	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Use of Passive Voice	Frequently uses passive constructions, e.g., "70% of deaths were women and children."	Active voice to emphasize agency, e.g., "Israel membunuh 67 anak setiap hari." (Israel killed 67 children daily).
Use of Active Voice	Limited use of active voice, primarily for neutral descriptions, e.g., "The Israeli military continues to ramp up operations."	Predominantly uses active voice, explicitly attributing blame, e.g., "Pasukan Zionis menyerang warga sipil." (Zionist forces attacked civilians).
Focus of Sentences	Focuses on the outcomes or consequences of actions rather than the agents, e.g., "Evacuation orders were issued."	Focuses on agency and assigns responsibility, e.g., "Israel telah menyebabkan bencana kemanusiaan terbesar." (Israel has caused the greatest humanitarian disaster).
Nominalization	Frequently uses nominalizations, e.g., "civilian toll," "displacement," "systematic violations."	Minimal use of nominalizations; prefers more direct expressions, "pembunuhan massal" (mass killing).

CNN US employs a variety of sentence structures, often using passive constructions to present actions without directly attributing blame. This allows for a more neutral and balanced tone, focusing on the outcomes rather than the agents responsible (Macdonald & Birdi, 2020). For example, in "Evacuation orders were issued," the use of passive

voice removes direct responsibility, presenting the situation in a factual manner (Truksasová, 2012). Similarly, terms like "civilian toll" and "systematic violations" are frequently used, which generalize the actions without specifying who is responsible. This approach is evident in the following excerpt: "Systematic violations have increased the civilian toll" from news 1. In contrast, CNN Indonesia rarely uses passive constructions and instead employs active voice to explicitly assign responsibility. For instance, in "*Pasukan Zionis menyerang warga sipil*" (Zionist forces attacked civilians), the active voice directly attributes blame to Israel, leaving no ambiguity about who is accountable. This direct approach is intended to evoke emotional responses and express a clear ideological stance (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005).

The focus of CNN US sentences often revolves around the consequences of actions rather than the agents involved. Terms such as "evacuation orders," "displacement," and "casualties" serve to frame the humanitarian outcomes without overtly blaming any specific party (Kennedy, 2004). For instance, in "Casualties in the north have also mounted, forcing thousands to flee south under evacuation orders", the emphasis is placed on the effects of the conflict rather than identifying responsible actors. This reflects CNN US's attempt to maintain a neutral stance. On the other hand, CNN Indonesia emphasizes agency by focusing on who is responsible for the actions. This is evident in sentences like "*Israel telah menyebabkan bencana kemanusiaan terbesar*" (Israel has caused the greatest humanitarian disaster). By directly assigning blame, CNN Indonesia frames the conflict as a moral crisis, as illustrated in the excerpt: "*Israel telah menyebabkan bencana kemanusiaan terbesar dalam sejarah.*"

Additionally, CNN US frequently employs nominalizations, which help abstract complex concepts and soften direct responsibility (Tarasova & Fajardo, 2022). Phrases such as "systematic violations" or "civilian toll" are used to generalize actions and outcomes, reducing emotional impact and maintaining a more factual tone (Van Kleef, et. al., 2015). For example, "Systematic violations have increased the civilian toll" demonstrates how abstract terms are preferred to avoid direct blame. In contrast, CNN Indonesia uses fewer nominalizations and leans towards more direct expressions. This preference for straightforward language is evident in phrases like *"pembunuhan massal"* (mass killing), which are emotionally charged and lack abstraction. In the case of "*Pasukan Zionis melakukan pembunuhan massal terhadap warga Palestina*," the focus is on the explicit actions of Israel, underscoring the severity of the conflict.

The complexity of sentences also differs between the two outlets. CNN US maintains moderate sentence complexity with compound and complex constructions that provide detailed descriptions without overwhelming readers emotionally (Spiro, et. al., 2017). In contrast, CNN Indonesia often uses straightforward and simple sentence structures to convey urgency and clarity. For example, in news 4, the excerpt *"41.870 orang tewas dalam setahun"* (41,870 people have died in one year) effectively communicates the scale of destruction without unnecessary complexity.

Overall, the differences in sentence structure between CNN US and CNN Indonesia reflect their distinct approaches to framing the Israel-Palestine conflict. While CNN US adopts a more neutral and balanced tone with moderate sentence complexity and nominalization, CNN Indonesia uses active voice, direct responsibility, and emotionally charged language to align with its pro-Palestinian stance and evoke public outrage.

3. Modality

Modality in discourse refers to linguistic devices that express levels of certainty, obligation, or possibility, influencing how information is perceived (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Modal verbs and adverbs help convey confidence or doubt, shaping the framing of issues in media (Fowler, 1991). Strong modals like "must" express certainty, while weaker ones like "might" suggest uncertainty (Bell, 1991). In media, these choices reflect ideological positions and cultural contexts, offering insight into how language constructs meaning and influences public perception (Richardson, 2007; van Dijk, 2006).

Tabel 4. Modality Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Aspects	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Certainty	Often uses modal verbs to express certainty, e.g., "will," "must," "is," to assert factual information.	Utilizes modal verbs like "harus" (must), "mesti" (should), and "akan" (would), emphasizing moral and ethical responsibility.
Uncertainty	Uses modal verbs to convey uncertainty, e.g., "might," "could," "may," indicating possible outcomes	Shows higher levels of uncertainty through expressions like "kemungkinan" (possible), "mungkin" (maybe), "diyakini" (believed), "menurut perkiraan" (according to estimates), "setidaknya" (at least) suggesting doubt or speculation.
Obligation	Employs strong modal verbs to indicate obligation, e.g., "must," "should," to reflect the need for action.	Focuses on collective responsibility, e.g., "should be held accountable," reflecting moral duty.

In examining modality, CNN US and CNN Indonesia adopt distinct approaches to convey certainty, uncertainty, and obligation within their narratives. CNN US frequently utilizes modal verbs to express certainty, asserting factual information and maintaining a relatively balanced tone (Deng & Zhang, 2022). For instance, in news 1, "The Israeli military must take responsibility for its actions, and international bodies will continue to hold them accountable," the use of "must" and "will" reflects a sense of inevitability and factual assertion. This use of modal verbs reinforces CNN US's journalistic approach to presenting information in a restrained manner, avoiding overstatements and appealing to a global audience that values neutrality. Conversely, CNN Indonesia employs modal verbs to emphasize moral obligation and accountability. For instance, in news 3, the article states: "*Dunia harus mengakui penderitaan rakyat Palestina, dan Israel perlu bertanggung jawab atas kejahatan yang dilakukannya.*" (The world must recognize the suffering of the Palestinian people, and Israel needs to be held accountable for its crimes.) The use of *"harus"* (must) and *"perlu"* (needs) underscores a strong ethical stance, urging action and accountability from the international community. These modal verbs convey CNN Indonesia's ideological positioning, advocating for justice and solidarity with Palestinians. Unlike CNN US, which uses modality sparingly to maintain impartiality, CNN Indonesia leverages it as a tool to heighten moral urgency and demand responsibility for the humanitarian crisis. Through this contrast, the outlets' differing ideological and cultural orientations become evident, reflecting how modality contributes to framing global conflicts. This highlights CNN Indonesia's ideological stance, emphasizing moral duty and advocating for Palestinian rights through a more urgent and empathetic tone.

Additionally, CNN US balances uncertainty through expressions like "might" and "could," allowing for a degree of speculation while maintaining journalistic neutrality. In contrast, CNN Indonesia tends to highlight higher levels of uncertainty through modal expressions that suggest doubt or speculation, as seen in the phrase from news 3: "*Beberapa kematian mungkin juga merupakan akibat dari proyektil yang meleset dari kelompok bersenjata Palestina yang jatuh tepat di bawah sasaran.*" (Some deaths may also have been the result of stray projectiles from Palestinian armed groups that fell just below their targets.)

To sum up, CNN US uses modal verbs to frame obligations in terms of the need for impartial observation and ethical reporting, while CNN Indonesia places greater emphasis on collective responsibility and moral duty, shaping a discourse that seeks to galvanize public opinion against perceived injustices.

4. Rhetorical Devices

Rhetorical devices are key tools in shaping meaning and influencing audience emotions, and they play a significant role in framing narratives in media discourse (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Devices like metaphors, hyperbole, and imagery can evoke specific emotional responses, emphasizing certain aspects of a story while downplaying others (Fowler, 1991). By analyzing rhetorical strategies, one can uncover underlying ideological biases and explore how language is used to persuade and engage audiences (Bell, 1991; Richardson, 2007).

Tabel 5. Rhetorical Devices Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Aspects	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Metaphors	Subtle metaphors, e.g., "brink of collapse" to describe humanitarian crises.	Strong metaphors, e.g., "agresi brutal" (brutal aggression), portraying Israeli actions as extreme.
Hyperbole	Minimal use, e.g., "mounting casualties."	Frequent use, e.g., "genosida paling mematikan" (the deadliest genocide), intensifying the narrative.
Imagery	Descriptive imagery, e.g., "bodies lying in the street covered in blood."	Graphic imagery, e.g., "anak-anak tewas setiap hari akibat serangan" (children killed daily by attacks).
Emotional Appeals	Subtle, e.g., "70% of deaths are women and children," evoking sympathy indirectly.	Strong, e.g., "41.870 orang tewas dalam setahun" (41,870 people have died in one year), emphasizing human loss.
Symbolism	Limited use, e.g., "humanitarian zone" as a symbolic reference to safety.	Strong use, e.g., "pasukan Zionis" (Zionist forces), symbolizing aggression and oppression.
Repetition	Minimal, used for emphasis, e.g., "women and children" mentioned repeatedly.	Frequent, e.g., "tewas" (died) repeated to highlight the death toll and suffering

Rhetorical devices play a critical role in framing narratives and engaging audiences (Mansukhani, 2023). In CNN US articles, rhetorical devices are used sparingly and with subtlety, reflecting the outlet's objective tone. For instance,

in news 1, the metaphor "brink of collapse" is used to describe the state of humanitarian systems. This phrase creates an image of urgency but avoids sensationalism (Sachsman, 2017). Similarly, descriptive imagery, such as "bodies lying in the street covered in blood," evokes sympathy for the victims while maintaining a factual tone (Bandes & Salerno, 2014). Emotional appeals in CNN US articles are understated, as seen in the repeated reference to "women and children" to emphasize the vulnerability of civilian casualties. These restrained rhetorical choices align with CNN US's goal of informing a diverse global audience while avoiding overt bias.

On the other hand, CNN Indonesia articles heavily rely on rhetorical devices to amplify the emotional and moral weight of their narratives (Phelan, 1996). Metaphors like "*agresi brutal*" (brutal aggression) in news 4 frame Israeli actions as extreme and unjust. Hyperbole is frequently used, as seen in "*genosida paling mematikan*" (the deadliest genocide), which magnifies the severity of the conflict. Graphic imagery is prevalent, with phrases such as "*anak-anak tewas setiap hari akibat serangan*" (children killed daily by attacks) evoking shock and outrage. Emotional appeals are direct and potent, as evidenced by "*41.870 orang tewas dalam setahun*" (41,870 people have died in one year), which starkly emphasizes human suffering. Symbolism, such as referring to Israeli forces as "*pasukan Zionis*" (Zionist forces), reinforces the narrative of aggression and oppression. Repetition, such as the frequent use of "*tewas*" (died), serves to underscore the high death toll and keep the reader's focus on the human cost of the conflict.

5. Pronoun Use and Representation

Pronoun use and representation in discourse are critical for understanding how groups are portrayed and how solidarity or division is constructed (Fairclough, 1995; van Dijk, 1998). Through the strategic use of pronouns like "we," "they," and "us," media outlets can shape identities, influence perceptions of in-groups and out-groups, and construct moral or ideological boundaries (Paterson, 2023). Analyzing pronoun choices reveals how language reflects and reinforces social and political perspectives, highlighting the subtle ways in which power relations are embedded in discourse (Richardson, 2007).

Tabel 6. Pronoun Use and Representation Comparison of CNN US and CNN Indonesia

Aspects	CNN US	CNN Indonesia
Inclusive Pronouns	Rarely uses inclusive pronouns like "we" or "us"; maintains journalistic objectivity.	Occasionally uses "we" to signal solidarity with Palestine, e.g., "kita harus mendukung" ("we must support").
Exclusive Pronouns	Often uses third-person pronouns like "they" and "their" to describe parties in the conflict.	Frequently uses "they" to refer to Israeli forces, emphasizing opposition, e.g., "mereka membunuh anak-anak" ("they killed children").
Representation of Victims	Uses neutral language and pronouns to describe victims, e.g., "women and children were killed."	Frequently employs "our" when discussing Palestinian victims, e.g., "anak-anak kita" ("our children").
Framing Through Pronouns	Avoids pronouns that imply alignment with any side; uses descriptive phrases instead.	Uses pronouns to create a sense of in-group solidarity and out-group opposition.

The pronoun choices in CNN US and CNN Indonesia's reporting on the Israel-Palestine conflict highlight distinct framing strategies influenced by their respective editorial priorities and sociopolitical contexts. CNN US employs third-person pronouns and neutral descriptive phrases to maintain an objective and detached tone (Wales, 1996). For instance, in news 1, the victims are described as "women and children" without any possessive pronouns that might suggest alignment with one side. This neutral language reflects CNN US's intent to present itself as an impartial observer catering to a diverse, global audience. The absence of inclusive pronouns like "we" or "us" ensures that the article does not convey solidarity with any party in the conflict. Contrarily, CNN Indonesia uses pronouns to establish emotional connections and align with the Palestinian cause. In news 4, the phrase *"anak-anak kita"* ("our children") is employed to emphasize shared humanity and solidarity with the victims. This usage resonates deeply with an Indonesian audience, reflecting the nation's cultural and political alignment with Palestine. Similarly, the frequent use of "mereka" ("they") to describe Israeli forces, as seen in the statement *Mereka membunuh anak-anak setiap hari* ("They kill children every day"), reinforces a narrative of moral opposition to Israel's actions.

CNN US avoids pronouns that could suggest alignment, instead opting for descriptive phrases like "the victims" or "the displaced population" to maintain a degree of journalistic neutrality. This approach contrasts sharply with CNN Indonesia's use of pronouns to delineate in-groups (Palestinians as "us" or "our") and out-groups (Israeli forces as "they"). The latter's pronoun choices not only foster empathy for Palestinian victims but also encourage readers to view the conflict through a moral and ideological lens aligned with the Indonesian perspective. These differences in pronoun use and representation underscore the broader editorial strategies of the two outlets. While CNN US aims to present

balanced coverage for a global readership, CNN Indonesia leverages pronouns to evoke solidarity and emphasize moral responsibility, aligning its narrative with the cultural and political sentiments of its audience.

CONCLUSION

The comparative analysis of CNN US and CNN Indonesia's reporting on the Israel-Palestine conflict reveals how lexical choices, sentence structure, modality, rhetorical devices, and pronoun use shape ideological positioning and audience perception. CNN US employs neutral and euphemistic vocabulary, moderate sentence complexity, and restrained rhetorical strategies to maintain an appearance of balance and journalistic objectivity. In contrast, CNN Indonesia utilizes emotionally charged language, active sentence structures, strong modality, and vivid rhetorical devices to advocate for the Palestinian perspective and evoke moral urgency. These differences reflect broader socio-political contexts, with CNN US appealing to a global audience through impartial reporting, while CNN Indonesia aligns with national sentiment and political solidarity with Palestine. Ultimately, the findings highlight the power of language in media discourse, demonstrating how linguistic strategies not only report events but also construct reality, influence public understanding, and shape ideological narratives.

REFERENCES

Aytan, A., Aynur, B., Hilal, P., Aytac, E., & Malahat, A. (2021). Euphemisms and dysphemisms as language means implementing rhetorical strategies in political discourse. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, *17*(2), 741-754.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., & McEnery, T. (2008). *Discourse analysis and media attitudes: The representation of Islam in the British press.* Cambridge University Press.

Bandes, S. A., & Salerno, J. M. (2014). Emotion, proof and prejudice: The cognitive science of gruesome photos and victim impact statements. *Ariz. St. LJ*, *46*, 1003.

Barari, H. A., & Yacoub, R. (2024). Unmasking Media Bias and Religious Zionism's Impeding Political Influence on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. *American Journal of Arts and Human Science*, 3(3), 1-11.

Bell, A. (1991). *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: a sociofunctional threat-based approach to" prejudice". *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *88*(5), 770.

Deng, R., & Zhang, Y. (2022). An Analysis of Modal Adverbs of Certainty in Linguistic Academic Discourse. *International Journal of Languages, Literature and Linguistics*, *8*(2), 100-104.

Edelman, M. (2013). *Political language: Words that succeed and policies that fail*. Elsevier.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing discourse: Textual analysis for social research.* New York: Routledge.

Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. New York: Routledge.

Kennedy, D. (2004). *The dark sides of virtue: Reassessing international humanitarianism*. Princeton University Press.

Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology.* California: SAGE Publications.

Macdonald, S., & Birdi, B. (2020). The concept of neutrality: a new approach. *Journal of Documentation*, *76*(1), 333-353.

Machin, D., & Mayr, A. (2012). *How to do critical discourse analysis: A multimodal introduction.* California: SAGE Publications.

Mansukhani, S. (2023). Chapter-15 Rhetorical Analysis: Deconstructing Language and Persuasion. *The Art of Critical Thinking: Exploring Ideas in Liberal Arts*, 125.

Meretoja, H. (2018). *The ethics of storytelling: Narrative hermeneutics, history, and the possible*. Oxford University Press.

Mhanna, M. (2018). *Caught in the frame: A critical analysis of Australian media representations of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict 2014–2015.* Edith Cowan University.

Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analyzing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Panayotova, M., & Rizova, H. (2021). Online news media framing of the 2021 Israeli-Palestinian conflict by Al Jazeera, BBC and CNN. *Communication Studies Media Studies*.

Paterson, L. L. (Ed.). (2023). *The Routledge handbook of pronouns*. Taylor & Francis.

Phelan, J. (1996). *Narrative as rhetoric: Technique, audiences, ethics, ideology*. Ohio State University Press.

Sachsman, D. B. (Ed.). (2017). *Sensationalism: murder, mayhem, mudslinging, scandals, and disasters in 19th-century reporting*. Routledge.

Sirhan, N. R., & Sirhan, N. R. (2021). Media Framing and Sourcing Techniques Used in the Reporting of the 'Conflict'. *Reporting Palestine-Israel in British Newspapers: An Analysis of British Newspapers*, 165-200.

Spiro, R. J., Bruce, B. C., & Brewer, W. F. (Eds.). (2017). *Theoretical issues in reading comprehension: Perspectives from cognitive psychology, linguistics, artificial intelligence and education* (Vol. 11). Routledge.

Tarasova, E., & Fajardo, J. A. S. (2022). 3 Adj+ie/y Nominalizations in Contemporary English. *The Grammar of Hate: Morphosyntactic Features of Hateful, Aggressive, and Dehumanizing Discourse*, 59.

Thorsen, E. (2008). Journalistic objectivity redefined? Wikinews and the neutral point of view. *New Media & Society*, *10*(6), 935-954.

Truksasová, K. (2012). Active and Passive Voice in Reporting Clauses in Newspaper Reports.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. California: SAGE Publications.

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society, 17*(3), 359-383.

Van Kleef, G. A., Van den Berg, H., & Heerdink, M. W. (2015). The persuasive power of emotions: Effects of emotional expressions on attitude formation and change. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *100*(4), 1124.

Wales, K. (1996). *Personal pronouns in present-day English*. Cambridge University Press.

Wodak, R. (2009). *The discourse of politics in action: Politics as usual.* Palgrave Macmillan.