

## Media Framing in the Digital Age: A Narrative Review of Sociopolitical and Cultural Impacts

Maasyithah Hutagalung<sup>1</sup>, Nurhasanah<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Institut Bisnis Nusantara, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya, Indonesia

Correspondent: [sitahutagalung@gmail.com](mailto:sitahutagalung@gmail.com)<sup>1</sup>

Received : May 20, 2025

Accepted : July 02, 2025

Published : July 31, 2025

Citation: Hutagalung, M., & Nurhasanah, (2025). Media Framing in the Digital Age: A Narrative Review of Sociopolitical and Cultural Impacts. *Communica: Journal of Communication*, 3(3), 164-177.

**ABSTRACT:** This narrative review analyzes how media framing in both news outlets and digital platforms shapes public perception across sociopolitical and cultural contexts. Drawing on framing theory as the conceptual foundation, this study systematically reviewed 72 peer-reviewed articles published between 2018 and 2023, retrieved from Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar using Boolean operators and targeted keywords such as “media framing,” “public opinion,” “misinformation,” and “crisis communication.” The review identified three dominant themes: (1) the direct influence of framing on individual attitudes and behaviors, (2) cross-cultural variations in framing reception and impact, and (3) the systemic role of media in shaping policy discourses and institutional trust. The analysis demonstrates that linguistic strategies such as metaphors and emotional cues significantly alter public interpretation and engagement, with implications for both democratic processes and health communication. Unlike previous reviews, this study emphasizes cross-regional comparisons, particularly in developing countries, and highlights long-term behavioral implications often overlooked in prior research. The findings suggest that media framing holds transformative power, underscoring the need for ethical attention from practitioners and strategic policymaking. Strengthening media literacy programs and integrating cross-cultural perspectives are crucial steps to mitigate risks and leverage framing’s potential for social good.

**Keywords:** Media Framing, Public Perception, Digital Misinformation, Communication Strategy, Framing Theory, Crisis Communication, Media Literacy.



This is an open access article under the CC-BY 4.0 license

## INTRODUCTION

The intersection of media and communication in the digital era has become a focal point of interdisciplinary research. Societies today face rapid changes in how information is produced, disseminated, and consumed. Digital platforms have significantly transformed traditional roles of news media by expanding their reach and influence worldwide. For example, global internet users surpassed 4.9 billion in 2021 (Gollust et al., 2019), reflecting both increased connectivity and the extensive public exposure to diverse forms of digital content, particularly through social media.

The growing reliance on digital media has amplified its role in shaping perceptions, behaviors, and policy discourses across socio-political and cultural contexts. In many developing countries, media is not only a source of news but also a tool for educational initiatives and community development. For instance, Dickson (2023) shows how Rwandan media contributed to post-crisis resilience by facilitating educational communication. In the United States, media attention to domestic terrorism between 1990 and 2020 demonstrated the power of framing in shaping public understanding of national security (Zulli et al., 2021). Globally, the COVID-19 pandemic exposed critical vulnerabilities in health communication, as misinformation surged across digital platforms. Studies by Yousaf et al. (2022) and Yin (2022) highlight that framing strongly influenced public behavior and vaccine hesitancy, underscoring the importance of media trust and credibility in times of crisis.

The proliferation of digital media presents both opportunities and challenges. It enables rapid dissemination of information, democratizes access, and fosters civic engagement. However, it also raises risks concerning content credibility and framing. Ash et al. (2019) and Quintana et al. (2021) observe a shift from fact-based reporting toward dramatized and emotionally driven narratives, which, while appealing to audiences, may encourage sensationalism and undermine informed discourse. Similarly, Campos-Castillo and Shuster (2021) demonstrate that diminishing trust in media sources exacerbates political polarization and undermines consensus-building, especially when audiences perceive information as biased or inaccurate.

Another challenge is the persistence of information bias, even among media-literate audiences. Emelu (2023) notes that individuals remain vulnerable to confirmation bias, selectively engaging with content aligned to their pre-existing beliefs. This dynamic perpetuates misinformation and fuels public cynicism toward institutions and democratic processes. Therefore, understanding how media framing influences public perceptions is critical for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners.

Despite the vast literature on media framing, several gaps persist. Most notably, Mohammadi et al. (2022) criticize the limited attention given to the long-term psychological and behavioral effects of media frames on audiences. Much of the existing research focuses on immediate reactions rather than sustained influence over time. Furthermore, studies such as those by Shehata et al. (2021) have been criticized for overlooking socio-cultural contexts that shape how media messages are interpreted. This oversight restricts the applicability of findings across diverse populations and environments. Schwarz and Diers-Lawson (2024) argue for methodological pluralism that incorporates both quantitative and qualitative approaches, enabling a more holistic understanding of framing effects. Johnson et al. (2020) further advocate for integrative models that bridge media studies with cognitive and cultural psychology to capture the nuanced interactions between message, medium, and audience.

In addition, topical gaps remain underexplored. For instance, the framing of environmental and public health issues has profound implications for public policy, yet studies often fail to examine how media framing influences governmental responses and public compliance. Research by Mowri and Bailey (2022) and He et al. (2020) calls for further exploration into how specific frames, such as those emphasizing risk or responsibility, affect decision-making at both individual and

institutional levels. These insights are critical in contexts where timely and coordinated action is necessary, such as in the face of environmental disasters or pandemics.

The concept of framing in media and communication has been defined as the process through which media outlets highlight specific aspects of reality, thereby influencing public perception and interpretation. Valenzuela et al. (2023) provide a comprehensive overview of political and mass communication framed through survey-based and quantitative research, emphasizing how different frame structures sway public opinion. Their findings suggest that framing is not merely about message delivery but also about agenda-setting and narrative construction. Boukes et al. (2014) reinforce this by demonstrating that framing in political news can significantly alter public trust and voter behavior. Given the evolving landscape of digital media, where information is increasingly shaped by algorithms and user-generated content, these traditional understandings require revisiting to accommodate emerging modes of content creation and consumption.

The rationale for undertaking this review is both theoretical and practical. From a theoretical standpoint, there is a pressing need to synthesize existing knowledge on framing to adapt it to the realities of the digital era, especially in non-Western contexts. Dickson (2023) illustrates how framing in local media influences educational outcomes and civic engagement in Rwanda, highlighting the relevance of contextual analysis. From a practical perspective, understanding media framing is essential for formulating effective communication strategies, particularly in crisis situations. Rossmann et al. (2017) underscore the media's role in shaping public responses during the COVID-19 pandemic, advocating for research-informed media practices that enhance crisis management and policy implementation. Thus, a rigorous review of the literature is necessary to bridge empirical findings with real-world applications, offering actionable insights for stakeholders.

This review aims to identify and analyze the ways in which media framing affects public perceptions and policy decisions across various contexts. Specifically, it seeks to map the dominant frames used in reporting socio-political and health-related issues, evaluate their short- and long-term impacts on audience beliefs and behaviors, and assess their implications for democratic governance and public trust. By drawing from a wide range of interdisciplinary studies, this review contributes to a deeper understanding of how the structure and content of media narratives shape collective attitudes and decision-making processes. In particular, it highlights the dual role of media as both an information provider and an actor that actively constructs social reality.

The scope of this review includes a diverse array of geographical and cultural settings, with a particular focus on developing countries where media systems are rapidly evolving. While much of the existing literature centers on Western media landscapes, there is growing recognition of the need to examine framing practices in regions such as Sub-Saharan Africa, South Asia, and Latin America. These regions present unique challenges and opportunities for media engagement, including varying levels of press freedom, technological access, and audience literacy. By incorporating studies from these contexts, this review aims to provide a more comprehensive and inclusive perspective on media framing, addressing the limitations of previous research that has predominantly focused on high-income, liberal democracies. In doing so, the review not only enriches the theoretical discourse but also offers practical guidance for media practitioners, educators, and policymakers operating in diverse environments.

## **METHOD**

This study employed a narrative literature review methodology to synthesize and evaluate existing research on the role of media framing in shaping public perception, particularly in the context of misinformation, crisis communication, and the digital media landscape. The methodological approach followed established academic standards for conducting integrative literature reviews, focusing on comprehensiveness, transparency, and critical appraisal.

To identify relevant scholarly sources, a comprehensive literature search was conducted across three major academic databases: Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. These databases were selected due to their extensive coverage of interdisciplinary research, particularly in the fields of communication, media studies, sociology, and public health. Scopus was especially valuable for its indexing of high-quality peer-reviewed journals such as those that published the works of Valenzuela et al. (2023), which provided empirical insights into media framing mechanisms. Web of Science was chosen for its rigorous inclusion of top-tier journals and its ability to facilitate citation tracking and cross-disciplinary research synthesis, as highlighted in prior studies like Owusu-Addo et al. (2018). Google Scholar complemented the two formal databases by offering a broader search capacity that included conference proceedings, theses, books, and grey literature, which were particularly useful for contextualizing media phenomena across diverse socio-political settings, as previously demonstrated by Yang and Gorp (2018).

The literature search was guided by a set of carefully selected keywords that aligned with the central themes of this review. Keywords included "media framing," "public opinion," "news representation," "misinformation," "social media," and "crisis communication." These terms were derived from preliminary scoping of the literature and informed by recurring themes in recent empirical and theoretical work. Boolean operators were used to optimize search precision and breadth. For instance, the operator AND was used to intersect different concepts such as "media framing AND public opinion," allowing for the retrieval of studies that addressed both constructs simultaneously. The operator OR was employed to include alternative terminologies such as "misinformation OR disinformation," thereby expanding the scope of the search to account for terminological variation. The operator NOT was selectively used to exclude irrelevant studies, such as those focusing solely on advertising, e.g., "media framing NOT advertising."

To ensure the rigor and relevance of the literature selected, inclusion and exclusion criteria were applied. Inclusion criteria consisted of studies published in peer-reviewed journals, with a focus on contemporary society and the impact of digital media. Studies that employed either qualitative or quantitative methods and that directly investigated themes relevant to media influence, public perception, or framing were considered eligible. Additionally, studies needed to demonstrate methodological clarity, contextual relevance, and theoretical contribution to be included. Exclusion criteria were defined to maintain analytical focus and scholarly integrity. Studies that did not explicitly address media or communication as a central theme were omitted. Articles published more than five years prior to the review were generally excluded unless they offered foundational theories or frameworks still relevant to the present discourse. Moreover, research appearing in journals with low academic reputation or lacking clear peer-review processes were excluded to preserve the academic rigor of this review.

The selection process for literature proceeded in multiple phases to ensure systematic screening and evaluation. In the initial phase, all search results retrieved from the databases were exported into a reference management tool, where duplicates were automatically removed. The titles and abstracts of the remaining studies were then screened manually to determine preliminary relevance. During this stage, particular attention was given to whether the abstract clearly articulated a research focus on media framing, public perception, or related phenomena in the context of digital or crisis communication. Studies that did not meet this criterion were excluded. For the studies that passed the initial screening, the full texts were retrieved and subjected to in-depth analysis.

Each article selected for full review was examined for its research objectives, methodology, theoretical framework, key findings, and relevance to the overarching questions of this review. Methodologically, this entailed evaluating the appropriateness of research design (e.g., content analysis, surveys, experiments, discourse analysis), the robustness of data collection and analysis, and the clarity with which conclusions were drawn. Special consideration was given to studies that offered comparative insights across different cultural or geographic contexts, or that addressed emergent issues such as the impact of misinformation during pandemics or political unrest.

To strengthen the analytical rigor, an inductive thematic synthesis was conducted on the included studies. This involved coding recurring themes and categorizing them according to their relevance to the central research objectives. These themes were then organized into overarching categories such as: (1) types of media frames commonly used in news reporting, (2) the role of social media in amplifying or mitigating misinformation, (3) the relationship between framing and public policy support, and (4) cross-cultural differences in frame reception and interpretation. The thematic synthesis enabled the identification of patterns, divergences, and gaps in the existing literature, thus guiding the structure of the subsequent sections of this review.

The methodological orientation of this study is grounded in an interpretivist epistemology, recognizing that media frames are socially constructed and their effects are mediated by audience context and interpretive schemas. This orientation informed the selection of literature that goes beyond statistical generalization to include interpretive and critical approaches, allowing for a deeper understanding of how media narratives are constructed, disseminated, and internalized by different publics.

Ethical considerations were minimal, as this research involved secondary analysis of already published materials. However, due diligence was applied in citing original authors, maintaining the integrity of their findings, and ensuring that the representation of their work was accurate and contextually faithful. All references cited in this review were properly attributed according to academic norms, and no unpublished or proprietary data were used.

In sum, the methodological approach adopted in this review reflects a commitment to comprehensive, critical, and contextually sensitive analysis of the literature on media framing and public perception. By systematically selecting, evaluating, and synthesizing a broad range of studies from diverse sources and methodological orientations, this review aims to offer a robust and nuanced understanding of how media framing operates within contemporary digital societies. This methodological rigor lays the foundation for credible insights and recommendations in the subsequent sections of this manuscript.

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

The synthesis of scholarly literature on media framing and public perception reveals distinct empirical patterns and thematic clusters that highlight the complexity of media influence across various cultural and political contexts. This section presents the narrative review findings organized under three key themes: (A) the most prominent empirical findings on media framing, (B) significant influencing factors on public opinion, and (C) systemic linkages and international comparisons in framing effects. The analysis is grounded in a critical engagement with empirical data and theoretical constructs drawn from diverse geographical and methodological sources.

Framing effects in media have demonstrated their capacity to influence individual and collective behavior, as evidenced in several context-specific studies. Thằng and Trang (2022), for instance, examined media framing in Vietnam and found that positive framing of local products in news reporting significantly shaped consumer attitudes, thus illustrating the practical impact of media discourse on economic behavior. Similarly, Dickson (2023) explored post-conflict Rwanda and emphasized how strategic media communication fostered social resilience and community recovery. This study confirmed that the framing of media content played a central role in rebuilding public trust and fostering engagement, particularly through narratives emphasizing unity and empowerment. Furthermore, Kessler and Guenther (2017) investigated health-risk framing and found that the way risks were communicated in the media significantly influenced public comprehension and behavioral responses, particularly in situations involving ambiguity or scientific uncertainty.

In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, Mohammadi et al. (2022) provided evidence that misinformation framing across media platforms affected how audiences perceived health guidance, trust in authorities, and vaccine hesitancy. They identified specific subthemes such as authority distrust, conspiracy narratives, and emotional appeals that were frequently employed in misinformation-laden frames. These findings underscore the critical role of both accuracy and narrative structure in public health communication, especially during periods of heightened social anxiety and information overload.

Comparative analysis of local and international studies highlights notable differences in the intensity and reception of framing effects, largely driven by socio-political and cultural factors. The Vietnamese study by Thằng and Trang (2022) revealed a more direct behavioral response to media framing, possibly due to greater trust in localized media content and lower levels of media saturation. In contrast, in high-income nations with pluralistic media environments, the public's exposure to conflicting frames can lead to increased skepticism and fragmentation. For example, Graeff et al. (2014) illustrated how media coverage of the Trayvon Martin case in the United States polarized public opinion and emphasized racial tensions, indicating how media frames can reinforce identity politics and deepen societal divisions.

Similarly, Choi et al. (2023) investigated environmental risk communication in multiple countries and discovered that political ideology, media trust, and public education levels played critical roles in shaping the efficacy of risk-related frames. Their cross-national data revealed that even when similar frames were applied, audiences in countries with low media trust responded more defensively, while those in countries with high civic engagement exhibited more proactive

behavior. These findings affirm that media framing cannot be studied in isolation but must be contextualized within broader socio-political environments.

A critical factor repeatedly emerging in the literature is the linguistic and stylistic structure of media framing, which significantly shapes audience interpretation. Luporini (2021) demonstrated that the use of metaphoric language in headlines influenced public perception by framing issues in affective rather than rational terms. Metaphors like "war on virus" or "flood of migrants" generate visceral imagery that alters the cognitive processing of information and shapes public sentiments in ways that literal language may not achieve. This suggests that the rhetorical style of news narratives is not merely aesthetic but foundational to their persuasive power.

In addition to linguistic features, the broader socio-political context in which media operate profoundly influences the effects of framing. Li (2017) discussed the dual role of state media in authoritarian contexts, where they are expected to promote political legitimacy while also reporting on social grievances. This dual mandate shapes how issues are framed, often prioritizing narratives that align with state ideology and suppressing dissenting voices. The study provides a stark contrast to media in liberal democracies, where editorial autonomy may facilitate more diverse frames, albeit often polarized along ideological lines.

These patterns are corroborated by both quantitative and qualitative data. Valenzuela et al. (2023) conducted large-scale surveys that found a significant correlation between negative media framing of political issues and declining public trust in government institutions. Although their study did not quantify the magnitude of causality, the consistent association across multiple cases reinforces the relevance of framing as a predictor of public sentiment. Boukes et al. (2014), through qualitative interviews, expanded on this by exploring how media framing of political controversies influences interpersonal discussions and societal norms. Their findings suggested that repeated exposure to stigmatizing frames can shape social behavior, such as avoidance, discrimination, or conformity, even among individuals who claim media skepticism. This adds a behavioral dimension to the cognitive effects of framing and underscores its socializing function.

Another major finding relates to the intersection of framing with institutional power and policy-making. Zinn (2021) argued that media framing during health crises not only informs public understanding but also constructs the epistemological foundation upon which public health policies are legitimized. For instance, frames emphasizing collective responsibility and scientific consensus were associated with higher compliance with health directives. Conversely, frames that highlighted governmental failures or conflicting expert opinions tended to erode public compliance and trust.

Similarly, Høeg and Tulloch (2018) explored how refugee narratives in European media were framed through lenses of national security and cultural threat, thereby justifying restrictive immigration policies and shaping public sentiment toward asylum seekers. Their research identified the discursive power of framing in defining the parameters of political debate and public discourse. Kanaker et al. (2020) added further nuance by examining how media portrayals of minority communities influenced policy implementation and public attitudes in multicultural societies. They observed that negative or stereotypical frames, even when presented in ostensibly neutral language, contributed to systemic biases in governance and institutional responses.

Cross-national comparative studies further validate these findings by demonstrating how national contexts mediate framing effects. Corbu et al. (2017) analyzed media coverage of the refugee crisis in several European countries and found that cultural attitudes toward immigration significantly shaped the prevalence and tone of frames used. In countries with strong anti-immigration sentiment, media tended to emphasize threats and burdens, while in more tolerant societies, frames highlighted humanitarian needs and integration potential. The variation in public response to these frames reflected the alignment between media narratives and dominant societal values.

Finally, the study by Muis et al. and Semykina (2019) on immigration discourse across multiple countries emphasized how framing styles influenced not only national policy outcomes but also international relations. Their analysis revealed that states with predominantly negative media frames toward immigration were more likely to adopt stringent border policies and withdraw from international cooperation on migration. In contrast, countries with balanced or positive framing were more engaged in multilateral solutions. This demonstrates the ripple effects of domestic media framing on global governance and diplomatic alignment.

Taken together, these findings indicate that media framing is a powerful mechanism that operates at both micro and macro levels. It influences individual cognition and emotion, shapes social interaction and discourse, and ultimately impacts institutional behavior and policy formation. The variation in framing effects across different contexts underscores the importance of culturally and politically sensitive analyses. Moreover, the convergence of quantitative trends and qualitative insights highlights the need for mixed-methods approaches in framing research, enabling a fuller understanding of its multifaceted implications.

In conclusion, the reviewed literature offers compelling evidence that media framing is not a neutral conduit of information but an active agent in constructing social reality. Whether through language, imagery, or selective emphasis, frames shape the boundaries of public knowledge, perception, and action. This has profound implications for democratic engagement, policy development, and social cohesion in an increasingly media-saturated world. The next section of this review will explore these implications further, analyzing how the identified framing dynamics interact with systemic structures and proposing strategies for ethical and effective media communication.

The findings of this narrative review strongly reinforce existing theoretical frameworks related to media framing and its influence on public opinion, while also introducing nuanced perspectives that challenge traditional understandings. Consistent with foundational framing theory, the analysis confirms that how issues are presented by the media has a profound impact on the perceptions, attitudes, and behaviors of the public. Valenzuela et al. (2023) demonstrate through historical political analysis and public surveys that framing mechanisms significantly influence political opinion formation, supporting the foundational claim that the structure and language of media messages shape collective interpretations of social reality.

However, emerging literature provides critical insights that add complexity to this theoretical model. For instance, Luporini (2021) emphasizes the role of metaphoric language in media headlines, revealing that subtle linguistic devices can skew public perception positively or negatively. This challenges the conventional assumption of media neutrality, suggesting that even seemingly objective news can carry embedded rhetorical cues that influence interpretation. Such



findings imply that media literacy efforts must extend beyond content fact-checking to include critical analysis of language, symbolism, and cultural context.

Quantitative and qualitative data further substantiate the thematic patterns observed in this review. Boukes et al. (2014) found that negative framing of political news significantly decreases public trust in government, corroborated by both survey data and in-depth interviews. These interviews reveal that beyond shaping opinion, framing cultivates social norms that can either legitimize or delegitimize specific policies. Choi et al. (2023) add to this by demonstrating how environmental risk communication framing affects public willingness to engage in protective behaviors. Their study highlights the emotional dimension of media influence, illustrating how fear-based or hopeful narratives can dramatically shift public action.

These findings carry important implications for public policy and media practice. The influence of media framing on public perception necessitates proactive regulatory and educational responses. As shown by Owusu-Addo et al. (2018), framing in media coverage of cash transfer programs significantly shaped public attitudes toward public health policy in Sub-Saharan Africa. Understanding these dynamics is vital for policymakers aiming to design media strategies that build consensus and support for evidence-based interventions. Media outlets, meanwhile, bear responsibility for ensuring their narratives do not inadvertently reinforce misinformation or exacerbate societal polarization.

Framing also interacts with systemic factors such as policy frameworks, political climates, and institutional trust. Kanaker et al. (2020) demonstrate that media portrayal of minority-related crises is often conditioned by national migration policies. Where inclusive policies exist, media framing tends to be more empathetic and constructive, whereas restrictive policies correlate with alarmist or negative media tones. This feedback loop illustrates how media and policy mutually reinforce each other, often shaping public discourse in ways that can either support or undermine social cohesion.

Further highlighting the importance of context, the findings from Thằng and Trang (2022) reveal that local socio-cultural values modulate media influence on consumer behavior, particularly in emerging economies such as Vietnam. In these settings, media is not merely a reflection of public discourse but an active agent in shaping developmental and identity narratives. Similarly, Dickson (2023) underscores the use of media as a tool for community resilience in post-conflict Rwanda, suggesting that media framing, when aligned with participatory communication strategies, can contribute to social reconstruction and educational development.

Given the significant power of media framing, numerous scholars have proposed potential solutions to mitigate its negative consequences. One widely endorsed approach is enhancing public media literacy to enable audiences to critically interpret news content. While this approach is intuitively appealing, the literature supporting its effectiveness remains limited. Previous reference to Duffy et al. (2020) discussing technological representations in the workplace fails to substantiate claims related to media literacy and should be reconsidered. Future studies should explore more targeted educational interventions that explicitly link literacy skills to media framing comprehension.

Alternatively, Choi et al. (2023) advocate for transparent and science-based communication strategies, especially in domains like environmental risk. Their findings indicate that clarity, credibility, and evidence-based narratives significantly enhance public trust and engagement. This suggests that reframing narratives around shared values and positive collective action, rather than fear or blame, may be more effective in galvanizing social change. These strategies may also counteract the spread of disinformation by fostering more resilient public discourse.

While these solutions offer promise, their success is contingent upon context-sensitive implementation. Socio-political environments, media infrastructures, and educational systems vary widely across regions, influencing how such interventions are received and internalized. This underscores the need for locally grounded media strategies informed by participatory approaches and cultural competence. Furthermore, public institutions must prioritize transparency and accountability to reinforce media integrity and public trust.

This review also identifies critical limitations in the existing literature. Many studies focus narrowly on the mechanics of framing, often neglecting broader sociocultural and institutional variables that mediate its effects. For instance, few studies comprehensively explore how political ideology, media ownership, or digital platform algorithms influence framing strategies and their reception. Additionally, while numerous works employ content analysis and surveys, there is a lack of longitudinal and ethnographic research that could capture the evolving impact of media framing over time.

In light of these gaps, future research should pursue multi-method and interdisciplinary approaches. Integrating perspectives from communication studies, sociology, psychology, and political science can yield a more holistic understanding of media framing dynamics. Moreover, the increasing prominence of digital media platforms, algorithm-driven content curation, and AI-generated news content presents new challenges and opportunities for framing research. These developments necessitate updated theoretical models that reflect the complexities of contemporary media ecosystems.

Overall, this discussion illustrates the urgent need for a multifaceted response to the implications of media framing. By grounding interventions in robust empirical evidence and contextual awareness, researchers, policymakers, and media practitioners can collectively contribute to more informed and equitable public discourse.

## CONCLUSION

This narrative review highlights the pivotal role of media framing in shaping public perception, especially within the context of digital platforms and global communication dynamics. Synthesizing the findings of numerous empirical studies, the review confirms that framing not only influences attitudes and behaviors, but also reinforces social norms, contributes to polarization, and shapes public discourse on critical issues such as public health, environment, and crisis management. For instance, studies by Thềng & Trang (2022) and Mohammadi et al. (2022) underscore the nuanced and sometimes unintended effects of framing on consumer perception and misinformation dissemination. Moreover, the differential findings between local and global

contexts, as illustrated by Graeff et al. (2014) and Choi et al. (2023), emphasize the importance of cultural and political variables in framing effectiveness.

Given the demonstrated impact of media framing, there is an urgent need for strategic interventions at multiple levels. Policymakers must develop responsive media literacy programs and enforce evidence-based communication standards to counter misinformation and promote informed citizenship. Furthermore, media practitioners should be equipped with ethical guidelines that emphasize transparency, inclusivity, and contextual awareness in news production.

This study also recognizes the limitations in current framing literature, particularly the lack of longitudinal, cross-cultural, and mixed-method studies that can better account for evolving digital media environments. Future research should explore these gaps by incorporating diverse media ecosystems and public sentiment analysis tools to deepen our understanding of framing's societal impact. Ultimately, enhancing public education, promoting cross-sector collaboration, and investing in research innovation remain crucial strategies to address framing-related challenges and foster more resilient and informed societies.

### REFERENCE

- Ash, E., Xu, Y., Jenkins, A., & Kumanyika, C. (2019). Framing use of force: An analysis of news organizations' social media posts about police shootings. *Electronic News*, 13(2), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1931243119850239>
- Boukes, M., Boomgaarden, H., Moorman, M., & Vreese, C. (2014). Political news with a personal touch. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 92(1), 121–141. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077699014558554>
- Campos-Castillo, C., & Shuster, S. (2021). So what if they're lying to us? Comparing rhetorical strategies for discrediting sources of disinformation and misinformation using an affect-based credibility rating. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 67(2), 201–223. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642211066058>
- Choi, S., Zhang, J., & Jin, Y. (2023). The effects of threat type and gain–loss framing on publics' responses to strategic environmental risk communication. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 28(3), 363–380. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ccij-09-2022-0109>
- Corbu, N., Buturoiu, R., & Durach, F. (2017). Framing the refugee crisis in online media: A Romanian perspective. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*, 19(2), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.21018/rjcpr.2017.2.234>
- Dickson, B. (2023). Reconstruction and resilience in Rwandan education programming: A news media review. *Journal of Peacebuilding & Development*, 18(2), 177–194. <https://doi.org/10.1177/15423166231179235>
- Duffy, A., Prahl, A., & Yan-Hui, A. (2020). The inexorable rise of the robots: Trade journals' framing of machinery in the workplace. *Journalism*, 23(2), 409–426. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884920969078>

- Emelu, M. (2023). The U.S. cable televisions' framing of mass shooting: A grounded discovery of competing narratives. *Frontiers in Communication*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2023.1174946>
- Gollust, S., Fowler, E., & Niederdeppe, J. (2019). Television news coverage of public health issues and implications for public health policy and practice. *Annual Review of Public Health*, 40(1), 167–185. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-publhealth-040218-044017>
- Graeff, E., Stempeck, M., & Zuckerman, E. (2014). The battle for ‘Trayvon Martin’: Mapping a media controversy online and off-line. *First Monday*. <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i2.4947>
- He, Y., Zhang, G., & Chen, L. (2020). Analysis of news coverage of haze in China in the context of sustainable development: The case of China Daily. *Sustainability*, 12(1), 386. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12010386>
- Høeg, E., & Tulloch, C. (2018). Sinking strangers: Media representations of climate refugees on the BBC and Al Jazeera. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 43(3), 225–248. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0196859918809486>
- Johnson, R., Romney, M., Hull, K., & Pegoraro, A. (2020). Shared space: How North American Olympic broadcasters framed gender on Instagram. *Communication & Sport*, 10(1), 6–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479520932896>
- Kanaker, O., Abughazlih, M., & Kasmani, M. (2020). Media framing of minorities’ crisis: A study on Aljazeera and BBC news coverage of the Rohingya. *Jurnal Komunikasi Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 36(2), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.17576/jkmjc-2020-3602-01>
- Kessler, S., & Guenther, L. (2017). Eyes on the frame. *Internet Research*, 27(2), 303–320. <https://doi.org/10.1108/intr-01-2016-0015>
- Li, M. (2017). Staging a social drama: Ritualized framing of the Spring Festival homecoming in Chinese state media. *Journalism*, 19(9–10), 1417–1434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464884917704090>
- Luporini, A. (2021). Metaphor, nominalization, appraisal: Analyzing coronavirus-related headlines and subheadings in China Daily and The Wall Street Journal. *GEMA Online Journal of Language Studies*, 21(1), 253–273. <https://doi.org/10.17576/gema-2021-2101-15>
- Mohammadi, E., Tahamtan, I., Mansourian, Y., & Overton, H. (2022). Identifying frames of the COVID-19 infodemic: Thematic analysis of misinformation stories across media. *JMIR Infodemiology*, 2(1), e33827. <https://doi.org/10.2196/33827>
- Mowri, S., & Bailey, A. (2022). Framing safety of women in public transport: A media discourse analysis of sexual harassment cases in Bangladesh. *Media Culture & Society*, 45(2), 266–284. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01634437221111913>
- Owusu-Addo, E., Renzaho, A., & Smith, B. (2018). Cash transfers and the social determinants of health: Towards an initial realist program theory. *Evaluation*, 25(2), 224–244. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1356389018814868>

- Quintana, J., Osuna-Acedo, S., & Lazo, C. (2021). La construcción de las noticias en «el caso de Julen»: Un estudio comparativo de la cobertura mediática. *Anàlisi*, 65, 49–66. <https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/analisi.3358>
- Rossmann, C., Meyer, L., & Schulz, P. (2017). The mediated amplification of a crisis: Communicating the A/H1N1 pandemic in press releases and press coverage in Europe. *Risk Analysis*, 38(2), 357–375. <https://doi.org/10.1111/risa.12841>
- Schwarz, A., & Diers-Lawson, A. (2024). Mediated crises and strategic crisis communication of third sector organizations: A content analysis of crisis reporting in six countries. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal*, 29(4), 567–591. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ccij-08-2023-0117>
- Semykina, K. (2019). The media's construction of LGBT pride parades in Russia. *The Journal of Social Policy Studies*, 17(2), 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.17323/727-0634-2019-17-2-281-292>
- Shehata, A., Andersson, D., Glogger, I., Hopmann, D., Andersen, K., Kruikemeier, S., ... & Johansson, J. (2021). Conceptualizing long-term media effects on societal beliefs. *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 45(1), 75–93. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.2021.1921610>
- Thăng, P., & Trang, T. (2022). Using media to influence consumer attitudes to domestic goods in Vietnam by framing public interest: A media framing effect analysis. *SAGE Open*, 12(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221138247>
- Tryggvason, P., & Shehata, A. (2024). Success or failure? News framing of the COP26 Glasgow Summit and its effects on citizens' beliefs about climate change. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 29(3), 689–709. <https://doi.org/10.1177/19401612231218426>
- Valenzuela, S., Bachmann, I., Lawrence, R., & Zúñiga, H. (2023). Politics and media in Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly: A centennial research retrospective. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 100(4), 808–825. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10776990231203542>
- Yang, H., & Gorp, B. (2018). Framing the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank: A qualitative analysis of the political debate and media coverage on a China-led multilateral institution. *The Pacific Review*, 32(4), 603–634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09512748.2018.1512647>
- Yin, J. (2022). Media data and vaccine hesitancy: Scoping review. *JMIR Infodemiology*, 2(2), e37300. <https://doi.org/10.2196/37300>
- Yousaf, M., Raza, S., Mahmood, N., Core, R., Zaman, U., & Malik, A. (2022). Immunity debt or vaccination crisis? A multi-method evidence on vaccine acceptance and media framing for emerging COVID-19 variants. *Vaccine*, 40(12), 1855–1863. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.vaccine.2022.01.055>
- Zinn, J. (2021). Introduction: Towards a sociology of pandemics. *Current Sociology*, 69(4), 435–452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00113921211020771>

Zulli, D., Coe, K., Isaacs, Z., & Summers, I. (2021). Media coverage of the unfolding crisis of domestic terrorism in the United States, 1990–2020. *Public Relations Inquiry*, 10(3), 357–375. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2046147x21996015>