

## Uluslararası Krizlerin Medyada Temsili: Farklı Ülkelerde Haber Söylemlerinin Karşılaştırmalı Analizi

### Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries

Tabriz Gurshad Samadbayli<sup>1</sup>, Agharza Hasanguliyev<sup>2</sup>

Atıf/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142.  
<https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

#### Özet

Bu çalışma, uluslararası krizlerin küresel medya tarafından nasıl temsil edildiğini ve farklı ülkelere ait haber kuruluşlarının aynı olayı hangi söylemsel çerçeveler aracılığıyla anlamlandırıldığını incelemektedir. Uluslararası ilişkiler literatüründe giderek önem kazanan inşacı (constructivist) yaklaşım doğrultusunda, medya yalnızca bilgi aktaran bir araç olarak değil, uluslararası gerçekliğin kurulmasına aktif olarak katılan bir söylem üreticisi olarak ele alınmaktadır. Çalışmada, farklı siyasal ve kültürel bağlamlara sahip uluslararası haber kuruluşlarının belirli bir kriz olayına ilişkin haber metinleri karşılaştırmalı olarak analiz edilmiştir. Yöntem olarak Norman Fairclough'un eleştirel söylem analizi modeli benimsenmiş, metinsel yapı, söylemsel pratikler ve toplumsal bağlam düzeylerinde inceleme gerçekleştirilmiştir. Analiz sonucunda, medya söylemlerinin krizleri tarafsız biçimde yansıtmaktan ziyade belirli aktörleri meşrulaştıran, tehdit algıları üreten ve uluslararası güç ilişkilerini yeniden kuran anlatılar oluşturduğu görülmüştür. Böylece medya kurumlarının uluslararası ilişkilerde pasif gözlemciler değil, anlam, meşruiyet ve gerçeklik inşasında etkili söylemsel aktörler olduğu ortaya konmuştur. Bu çalışma, uluslararası ilişkiler teorisi ile medya çalışmalarını birleştirerek kriz temsillerinin politik doğasına dair eleştirel bir perspektif sunmayı amaçlamaktadır.

**Anahtar kelimeler:** Medya Söylemi, Uluslararası Kriz, Eleştirel Söylem Analizi, İnşacılık, Kriz Temsili.

#### Abstract

This study examines how international crises are represented by global media and how news organizations from different countries interpret the same event through distinct discursive frameworks. In line with the constructivist approach, which has gained increasing prominence in the field of international relations, the media is treated not merely as a channel of information transmission but as an active producer of discourse that participates in the construction of international reality. The study comparatively analyzes news texts covering a specific crisis event published by international media outlets operating within diverse political and cultural contexts. Methodologically, Norman Fairclough's Critical Discourse Analysis model is employed, enabling examination at the levels of textual structure, discursive practices, and broader social context. The findings indicate that media discourses do not simply reflect crises in a neutral manner, rather, they construct narratives that legitimize certain actors, generate perceptions of threat, and reproduce existing power relations in international politics. Accordingly, media institutions emerge not as passive observers but as influential discursive actors shaping meaning, legitimacy, and reality in international affairs. By bridging international relations theory and media studies, this study aims to provide a critical perspective on the political nature of crisis representation.

**Keywords:** Media Discourse, International Crisis, Critical Discourse Analysis, Constructivism, Crisis Representation

Article Type

Research Article

Application Date

March 1 2026

Admission Date

May 4 2026

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

## 1. Introduction

In the field of international relations, crises have long been explained primarily through material factors such as state behavior, military capacity, diplomatic strategies, and the balance of power. However, with the development of communication technologies and the expansion of global media networks, it has become increasingly evident that crises are not limited to events occurring on the ground; rather, they gain meaning through the ways in which these events are narrated, framed, and circulated. Today, international crises are presented to global public opinion not only through diplomatic documents or official statements, but also through global news flows, visual representations, and interpretative discourses. This situation necessitates evaluating the media not as a passive instrument that merely reflects crises, but as an actor that reconstructs them within specific systems of meaning. Indeed, media content produces symbolic frames that determine which actors are perceived as “legitimate,” which actions as “defense” or “aggression,” and which developments as “threats” (Entman, 1993).

In the international relations literature, especially in the post-Cold War period, theoretical transformations have increased interest in such discursive processes. While realist and neorealist approaches explain the international system through material power elements, the constructivist paradigm emphasizes that international reality is socially constructed and that meaning is produced through discourse (Wendt, 1992). In this context, identities, threat perceptions, and definitions of interest are treated not as given in advance, but as phenomena shaped within communicative and discursive interactions. Similarly, critical security studies have demonstrated that security is not an objective condition, but a process that is “securitized” through specific discursive practices (Buzan, Wæver, & de Wilde, 1998). In the field of media studies, agenda-setting and framing approaches have shown that the ways in which news texts select, prioritize, and interpret events directly influence public perception (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). Cultural theorists have likewise argued that processes of representation do not merely reflect reality but reproduce it, drawing attention to the media’s role as a constructor of meaning (Hall, 1997). Thus, an increasingly strong interdisciplinary intersection has emerged between international relations and media studies. This intersection has deepened further with mediatization debates, which argue that global communication networks not only transmit international politics but also structure it (Couldry & Hepp, 2017).

Despite this theoretical background, comparative studies examining how international crises are represented within different national media contexts remain limited. Existing research often focuses on

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

the media discourse of a single country or evaluates crisis communication from a normative perspective. Yet within globalized news circulation, the same event can be presented through markedly different narratives shaped by distinct political cultures, foreign policy priorities, and ideological positions (Pinar, 2018). This situation raises several questions: Why is the same international crisis interpreted differently across media systems? Through which linguistic and conceptual tools do news discourses legitimize certain actors while marginalizing others? What role do media texts play in reproducing international power relations? How do the discursive strategies used in representing crises shape the way international public opinion perceives events? These questions demonstrate that international crises are not only strategic arenas but also arenas of discursive struggle. Indeed, the strategic narratives approach suggests that international actors attempt to produce legitimacy by circulating their visions of global order through the media (Miskimmon, O'Loughlin, & Roselle, 2013).

This study aims to contribute to both the international relations and media studies literature by examining media representations of international crises within a comparative discourse analysis framework. The significance of the study is concentrated on three main points. First, the research moves international relations analysis beyond material factors and makes visible the dimensions of meaning, representation, and discourse. This approach demonstrates that foreign policy is shaped not only by decision-makers but also within communicative processes (Campbell, 1998). Second, the study positions media institutions not as passive intermediary organizations within the international system, but as discursive actors that produce norms, identities, and threat perceptions. With the expansion of global news networks, media organizations have acquired the capacity to shape international public opinion, thereby becoming key components of the symbolic power field (Thussu, 2006). Third, the study offers an interdisciplinary methodological contribution by applying critical discourse analysis to the field of international relations. The approach developed by Fairclough (1995), by examining the relationship between text, discursive practice, and social context, enables the analysis of the ideological and political functions of media texts. In this way, it can be demonstrated that crisis news does not merely transmit information, but also normalizes particular worldviews, renders certain policy options visible while excluding others.

## **2. Theoretical Framework: The Constructivist Approach and the Reality-Constructing Function of Discourse**

In the discipline of international relations, the constructivist approach argues that the international system cannot be explained solely through the distribution of material power; rather, this system is socially constructed through shared meanings, norms, and discourses among actors. According

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

to this perspective, international politics is not an objectively “out there” reality, but a field of meaning that is continuously reproduced through the ways actors interpret the world. Therefore, crises, threats, or claims of legitimacy do not directly derive from material events; they become political realities through the meanings attributed to these events (Orujov, 2024). By emphasizing the constitutive role of language, communication, and processes of representation in international relations, constructivism has expanded the level of analysis from material elements to discursive structures (Adler, 1997; Onuf, 1989).

One of the core assumptions of constructivism is that the interests of international actors are not fixed in advance, but are shaped through processes of social interaction. In this context, the concept of interest is not taken as given, as in the realist tradition, but emerges through identities and normative expectations. According to Kratochwil (1989), rules and norms in international relations are not merely elements that constrain behavior; they are also frameworks of meaning that determine what actors perceive as possible and legitimate. From this perspective, media discourses indirectly contribute to the formation of interests and policy preferences by influencing how states and societies define crises (Zeynalov, 2025). For example, labeling a development as a “humanitarian crisis” rather than presenting it as a “security threat” creates distinct constructions of reality that enable different international responses. This demonstrates how strong the relationship is between linguistic choices and political outcomes. Acts of naming carried out through discourse possess not only an explanatory function but also a productive function in generating action.

In the constructivist literature, the concept of identity is also closely linked to discourse. How actors construct the distinction between “us” and “the other” is an important factor shaping the direction of international relations. According to Hopf (2002), identities gain stability through repeatedly articulated discourses and narratives. The media is one of the primary instruments of this repetition, because a news language that consistently describes certain actors with specific attributes gradually produces categories that appear natural and unquestionable. Thus, media discourse does not merely explain events; it also reproduces the identity positions of parties in international politics. This process becomes more visible during times of crisis, as uncertainty increases the need for interpretation and strengthens the impact of discursive frames. By consistently presenting certain actors within categories such as “stabilizer,” “revisionist,” “threatening,” or “victim,” the media produces symbolic boundaries that shape the cognitive maps of international public opinion.

Studies focusing on the role of norms in the international system also support the constitutive function of discourse. Finnemore (1996) argues that international norms shape state behavior not only

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

through external pressure but also by creating shared understandings of appropriate behavior. Finnemore and Sikkink (1998) demonstrate that the emergence, diffusion, and internalization of norms largely occur through communicative practices. In this process, the media functions as a platform that circulates the discourses of norm entrepreneurs. For example, the widespread use of concepts such as “international responsibility,” “humanitarian intervention,” or “global stability” becomes possible not only through diplomatic documents but also through media narratives. Thus, the media becomes a discursive arena that mediates the global legitimation of norms (Baylarov, 2025). This situation reveals the decisive role of communicative circulation in the formation of normative assumptions in international politics.

The contributions of social theory are also important for understanding the reality-constructing role of discourse. The social construction of reality approach put forward by Berger and Luckmann (1966) argues that knowledge is produced within everyday interactions and, over time, becomes institutionalized, acquiring the appearance of objective reality. This perspective can be used to explain how crisis narratives in international relations come to be perceived as “natural” and “inevitable” realities. Similarly, Foucault (1972) defines discourse not merely as a linguistic form of expression, but as a practice that regulates the relationship between knowledge and power. By determining which knowledge is considered valid and which interpretations are excluded, discourses reproduce power relations. International crisis news can likewise establish particular regimes of knowledge, centralizing certain actors’ perspectives while marginalizing others. In this way, discourse not only produces meaning but also constructs an epistemological framework that legitimizes the distribution of power.

When combined with the constructivist perspective, approaches developed in media studies also indicate that news is not an objective process of reflection (Orujov & Gulmammadov, 2025). Tuchman (1978) argues that news should not be regarded as a practice of “capturing reality,” but rather as a form of narrative constructed within institutional routines and professional norms. Hansen (2006), by incorporating discourse analysis into foreign policy analysis, contends that the meaning of international events is fixed through texts and practices of representation. Within this framework, the media can be seen not merely as a channel transmitting information in international relations, but as an epistemic actor that determines which events are defined as crises and which moral and political meanings are attached to these crises. By making certain interpretations of international politics visible while limiting the circulation of alternative interpretations, media texts structure the field of meaning.

When these theoretical approaches are evaluated together, it becomes clear that international crises do not possess objective and singular meanings; rather, they are defined within discursive

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

struggles. Constructivist theory, norm research, identity analyses, and discourse theory provide a complementary foundation for explaining the role of the media in international politics. This foundation demonstrates that crises are produced not only strategically but also meaningfully, and therefore that media texts perform a constitutive function in the construction of international reality. For this reason, the analysis of international crises should not be limited to the examination of diplomatic and military developments alone; it should also include questions of how these developments are represented, within which conceptual frameworks they are interpreted, and through which discursive strategies they are legitimized. Such an approach makes it possible to evaluate international relations not merely as a material power struggle, but as a multilayered social practice encompassing processes of meaning production and discursive dominance.

### **3. Method: Critical Discourse Analysis and Research Design**

This study was designed within the framework of a qualitative research approach in order to examine how international crises are interpreted within different national media contexts. Critical discourse analysis was chosen as the research method. Critical discourse analysis assumes that linguistic structures are not merely communicative tools, but practices that reflect and reproduce social power relations, ideological orientations, and processes of legitimacy production (Fairclough, 1995). In this respect, the method provides an appropriate analytical framework for analyzing how crises are represented through the media in the context of international relations and what political meanings these representations produce. By addressing the textual features of discourse together with the institutional context in which it is produced and its relationship with broader social structures, critical discourse analysis enables a multi-layered form of analysis (Wodak & Meyer, 2009).

In the research design, Norman Fairclough's three-dimensional model of analysis was adopted. This model consists of three analytical levels: (1) textual analysis, (2) analysis of discursive practices, and (3) interpretation at the level of social practice. In the textual analysis stage, the concepts, metaphors, actor definitions, the use of passive or active voice, and recurring themes in news texts were examined. In the discursive practice stage, it was evaluated which sources the news relied upon, which actors' views were included, and which perspectives were excluded. At the level of social practice, these discourses were interpreted in relation to international power relations, normative assumptions, and the production of political legitimacy (Fairclough, 2003). This multi-layered approach aims to demonstrate that media texts do not merely provide information, but also construct systems of meaning that structure international reality.

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

A comparative analysis method was adopted in the study, and news organizations broadcasting internationally from five countries were selected as the sample to represent different media systems. In line with purposive sampling, the selected organizations are: BBC World News (United Kingdom), CNN International (United States), Al Jazeera English (Qatar), Deutsche Welle (Germany), and TRT World (Turkey). These organizations provide suitable diversity for comparative discourse analysis due to their representation of different political traditions, broadcasting cultures, and foreign policy perspectives. Their influence in international news production and their global reach also make it possible to consider the capacity of the analyzed discourses to reach international public opinion. This approach is consistent with the literature, which assumes that media discourses are not independent of national contexts, but are produced within specific political and cultural frameworks (Thompson, 1995).

Within the scope of the research, the dataset subjected to discourse analysis consists of news texts related to two global crisis cases that have generated significant international attention in recent years. Case selection was carried out by considering criteria such as geographical diversity, level of international impact, and the reflection of different types of crisis dynamics. Accordingly, the cases analyzed are:

1. The Russia-Ukraine war
2. The Gaza Crisis and conflicts in the Middle East

For each case, news texts selected from the digital archives of the respective news organizations were examined, thereby enabling a comparison of the discursive frameworks through which different media systems presented the same event. Such comparative discourse analyses are frequently used in qualitative research, as they demonstrate how international events are reinterpreted within different contexts (Dijk, 1998). During the analysis process, the texts were evaluated through thematic coding, and recurring discursive patterns were identified. In the coding process, particular focus was placed on the following categories: the naming of actors, attribution of responsibility, language of moral legitimacy, discourses of threat and security, forms of crisis definition, and the framing of proposed solutions. These categories are consistent with the core assumptions of critical discourse analysis, which aims to make visible the ideological dimension of discourse (Dijk, 2001). During the analysis, attention was paid not only to the explicit statements contained in the texts, but also to which meanings were presented as natural and inevitable, and which alternative interpretations were rendered invisible.

This research design seeks to explain media representations of international crises not through quantitative frequency measurements, but through an in-depth examination of processes of meaning production. Through the approach of critical discourse analysis, media texts are treated not as passive

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

documents reflecting reality in international relations, but as discursive practices that produce political meanings, identities, and frameworks of legitimacy. Thus, the study methodologically grounds the assumption that international crises can be understood not only through the events themselves, but also through how these events are narrated within the global media sphere.

This methodological approach enables a systematic comparison of how media discourses construct meaning across different national contexts, thereby revealing the ideological and political dimensions embedded in crisis representations.

#### **4. Comparative Findings: The Construction of Crisis Narratives in Different National Media**

This section comparatively analyzes how the selected international news organizations represent the identified global crisis cases. The examination conducted within the framework of critical discourse analysis aims to demonstrate that although each media outlet reports the same event based on similar factual data, they produce different conceptualizations, actor definitions, and frameworks of meaning. The analysis focuses on linguistic choices used in news texts, attributions of responsibility, strategies of legitimacy construction, and the normative contexts within which crises are presented. In this way, national media systems are evaluated not merely as channels that transmit international crises, but as discursive arenas that reconstruct them in line with particular political and ideological perspectives.

##### **4.1. The Discursive Construction of the Russia-Ukraine War in the Media: Legitimacy, Naming, and Power Relations**

Following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, Russia sought to fill the power vacuum that emerged in the Eurasian geography by activating its “Near Abroad” doctrine, resorting at times to soft power and at times to hard power. Moreover, this war has been shaped within the framework of Ukraine’s efforts to integrate with Western institutions (particularly NATO and the European Union) (Asker, 2021). The 2004 Orange Revolution and the 2013-2014 Euromaidan protests accelerated Ukraine’s Western-oriented transformation in foreign policy. In response, Russia annexed Crimea in 2014 and implemented a hybrid warfare strategy by supporting separatist movements in the Donbas region. With Russia’s large-scale military intervention on February 24, 2022, the conflict evolved into a high-intensity conventional war from the perspective of the international system. In the initial phase, a rapid advance toward Kyiv was targeted; however, due to Ukraine’s resistance and the military-economic support of Western states, the fighting concentrated on the eastern and southern fronts (Sezer,

2024). In the 2023–2025 period, the war turned into a war of attrition in which front lines relatively stabilized, and unmanned aerial vehicles, long-range missile systems, and attacks on energy infrastructure became decisive. At present, the conflict represents a multilayered geopolitical crisis, encompassing not only military balance but also economic sanctions, energy security, and global power competition. The course of the war continues to profoundly affect both the regional security architecture and debates on international law and the balance of power.

The “full-scale” phase of the Russia-Ukraine War that began on February 24, 2022, constitutes a typical example demonstrating that crises in international relations gain political reality not only through military movements on the ground, but also through how these movements are narrated, justified, and framed within normative codes. Al Jazeera’s news text defines Russia’s action against Ukraine as a “full-scale invasion” carried out through “land, air, and sea” forces, positioning it as “the biggest attack by one state against another in Europe since World War II,” thereby framing the event not merely as a conflict, but as a historical threshold and a rupture shaking the international order (Al Jazeera, 2022). Such historical scaling strengthens the perception in the reader’s mind that the crisis is not “ordinary” but “exceptional,” and thus creates a legitimate ground for stronger international responses (sanctions, isolation, security mobilization). Within the same text, the reference to Putin’s televised speech and the use of the phrase “special military operation” demonstrate that the crisis is constructed at the discursive level between two competing acts of naming: “invasion” (violation of norms) versus “operation” (technical and purposeful intervention). This juxtaposition makes visible what discourse analysis terms a “war of naming,” indicating that even if the material reality of the event remains constant, its meaning (crime, defense, preventive action, humanitarian protection, etc.) transforms according to the regime of words employed.

A second prominent element in the Al Jazeera text is the construction of legitimization and securitization language through direct quotations. It is stated that Putin justified the attack by claiming the need to “protect people” and alleging “genocide” in Ukraine, completing this justification with the goal of “demilitarization and denazification” (Al Jazeera, 2022). Here, the discourse attempts to move the action out of the category of “attack” and into a framework of “protection” or “preventive security.” The emphasis in the same paragraph that “Russia cannot feel safe while there is a constant threat” demonstrates that by perpetuating the perception of threat, the war is presented as a “necessary” security measure (Al Jazeera, 2022). Such securitizing narratives provide the international public with a justificatory framework that rationalizes the crossing of the boundaries of ordinary politics: if the threat is continuous and existential, then stepping outside the limits of law and diplomacy can be portrayed as inevitable. However, Al Jazeera does not leave this claim unchallenged; by including the phrase that the

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

West has long described it as “nonsense propaganda,” it incorporates a counter-legitimacy element into the text (Al Jazeera, 2022). Thus, within the same news report, both Russia’s repertoire of legitimization and the delegitimization of that repertoire are circulated together, transforming the text from a monophonic narrative into a discursive structure that allows for multiple readings.

The TRT World (2022) text, by contrast, constructs the crisis from the outset with the headline “Russia launches ‘military operation’ in Ukraine” (TRT World). The preference for the term “operation,” instead of a more normatively loaded word such as “invasion,” produces a more technical and military-administrative designation, thereby creating a relatively softened moral and legal judgment of the event and generating a more neutral descriptive effect. In the subheading of the same report, the phrase “Putin authorized... and demanded that the Ukrainian army ‘lay down its arms’” does not merely convey information, but also establishes the relationship between the parties on a hierarchical basis. This structure makes visible the distinction between an actor who demands and sets conditions and an actor who is the addressee of that demand. Such linguistic choices reveal who is positioned as the subject in the crisis narrative and where agency is concentrated.

Moreover, the phrase in the image caption stating that it “could be a full-scale Russian invasion” produces a tension that re-hardens at the level of content the softened normative tone created by the headline’s preference for “operation” (TRT World, 2022). Thus, within the same text, a discourse emerges that fluctuates between different acts of naming. This fluctuation can be associated with foreign policy balances and the adjustment of news language according to the target audience: a more cautious and technical framing at the headline level is used alongside a more dramatic and risk-emphasizing narrative in the detailed content.

Reading Al Jazeera and TRT World together demonstrates that the same event is constructed within two different regimes of representation. While Al Jazeera amplifies the crisis within a strong normative and historical framework through expressions such as “full-scale invasion” and “the biggest attack since World War II,” it simultaneously incorporates Russia’s discourse (“special military operation,” “genocide,” “denazification”) into the text, thereby embedding narrative competition within the report itself. TRT World, on the other hand, prefers the phrase “military operation” in the headline, naming the event on a more technical plane; however, through the language of command and demand in the subheading (“lay down their arms”), it makes power asymmetry visible and reconstructs the magnitude of risk through the possibility of a “full-scale invasion” mentioned in the visual caption. This contrast reflects a distinction frequently observed in discourse analysis: one media text may expand the

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

crisis through a framework of “norm violation and moral shock,” while another may produce a more controlled representation through “operational reality and diplomatic caution.” What is important is that these representational choices are not merely editorial language differences, but discursive reflections of the political relationship established with the crisis (whose security, whose legitimacy, and which repertoire of solutions is foregrounded).

CNN’s (2022) report titled “Biden says Russia has ‘begun an invasion’ of Ukraine as he announces sanctions on Moscow” fixes the crisis within a normative and legal category already at the level of the headline. The direct placement of the concept “invasion” in the headline closes the naming of the event to debate, which in discourse analysis can be evaluated as “definitional fixation.” In the opening of the text, Biden’s reference to “the beginning of a Russian invasion” constructs both the temporal and legal framework of the crisis: this is not merely military activity, but the commencement of a norm violation. Thus, the event is positioned not as a potential tension, but as an actual legal breach. This naming strengthens the connotation of a violation of international law and the breach of sovereignty norms, producing a field of meaning that presents U.S. sanctions decisions as a defensible and necessary response.

Throughout the text, the use of expressions such as “sanctions,” “cutting off the Russian government from the Western financial system,” “first package,” and “the sharpest edge of the pain we can impose” frames economic sanctions not merely as a policy instrument, but as a punitive and disciplinary mechanism. In particular, the phrase “the pain we can impose” transforms the use of economic power through sanctions into an explicit display of power. At this point, the discourse constructs the U.S. response as a rational, measured, and controlled counter-move by centering economic pressure rather than military retaliation. At the same time, presenting sanctions as “the beginning of our response” narrates the crisis within a logic of gradual escalation, thereby both sustaining the perception of threat and preemptively preparing the legitimacy of potentially harsher steps in the future.

Another notable discursive element in the report is the strong construction of the moral framework of the crisis. Biden’s statements describing the situation as “a clear violation of international law” and asking, “Who does Putin think gave him the right to declare new so-called states on territory that belongs to his neighbor?” reinforce a technical foreign policy explanation with moral indignation and normative judgment. The characterization of the action as “unprovoked and unjustified” discursively invalidates alternative narratives regarding the causes of the crisis (for example, Russia’s security concerns). At this point, the CNN (2022) text positions the crisis not as “a security tension with

**Atıf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

contested causes,” but as an explicit and undisputed norm violation. Thus, the political complexity of the event is simplified into a moral binary of good versus evil.

The distribution of subjects and actions within the text is also noteworthy. While Russia and Putin are positioned with active verbs such as “launch,” “declare,” and “redraw borders,” the United States and its allies are represented with more defensive and balancing actions such as “respond,” “strengthen allies,” and “remain open to diplomacy.” This distribution of agency linguistically reproduces the aggressor–defender dichotomy. In particular, Biden’s framing of the decision to deploy troops to NATO’s eastern flank with the statement that they “are not going there to fight Russia” presents military mobilization within a deterrent and defense-based logic. Thus, the U.S. military posture is represented not as escalatory, but as a protective reflex.

The inclusion of the possibility of diplomacy in the report (“remaining open to diplomacy”) indicates that the discourse is not constructed in an entirely belligerent tone. However, the option of diplomacy is tied to a condition dependent on Russia’s “actions,” and the statement “we will judge Russia not by its words but by its actions” produces the assumption that Russia’s declarations are unreliable. This approach constitutes a discursive strategy that devalues the opposing side’s discourse and reinforces the crisis of trust. Thus, although diplomacy is mentioned within the discourse, the dominant narrative is shaped along the axis of sanctions and deterrence.

The section of the report addressing energy prices (“there will be a cost to defending freedom”) demonstrates a strategy of producing legitimacy for the domestic public. Here, the crisis is framed not only as a foreign policy issue but also as a matter directly connected to the economic interests of the American people. The expression “there will be a cost to defending freedom” justifies the potential economic consequences of sanctions within the context of defending freedom and norms. In this way, economic sacrifice is linked to a normative value such as freedom, thereby generating domestic public consent.

Deutsche Welle’s report titled “How Ukraine’s war effort against Russia has changed” constructs the Russia-Ukraine War not primarily through the classic framework of “invasion/attack,” but through a narrative of transformation and evolution. The phrase “how it has changed” in the headline positions the war not as a static conflict, but as a process that is continuously evolving technologically and tactically. This approach addresses the crisis from a military-strategic transformation perspective rather than a normative violation narrative. The concept of a “kill zone” used in the opening of the text describes the battlefield as an area almost entirely under surveillance and carrying an inevitable risk of

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

death, thereby emphasizing both the dramatic nature of the war and the increasing lethality of technological transformation (DW, 2026).

In the report, the year 2022 is described with expressions such as “chaos” and “lack of communication,” representing the initial phase of the war through disorder and coordination failure. However, it is immediately followed by the statement that “a real ground war began,” indicating that the war gained stability through infantry, tanks, artillery, and air elements (DW, 2026). This narrative frames the first phase of the war as a temporary period of disorder and the subsequent phase as a conventional war in the classical sense. Thus, the Deutsche Welle text presents the war as a gradually developing process that matures through experience. In the same context, the characterization of HIMARS systems as a “game changer” positions Western military support as a critical factor determining the course of the war. This expression reinforces the narrative that Western technology provides strategic superiority on the battlefield (DW, 2026).

The centralization of the use of unmanned aerial vehicles (drones) in 2023 and beyond is presented in the report as a turning point marking a fundamental transformation in the nature of the war. The statement, “It was a stroke of luck that I had served in the infantry before the dominance of drones,” codes drone superiority as the new norm of warfare (DW, 2026). Here, discourse transforms technology not merely into a tool but into a decisive actor shaping the war. In particular, the emphasis that the “kill zone” has expanded to 20–25 kilometers and that evacuating the wounded can take days indicates that technological advancement has increased the human cost. This representation presents the war as a struggle shaped not by human will or classical military maneuvers, but by technical capacity and digital superiority.

In the sections covering 2024 and 2025, the diversification of unmanned systems (first-person-view kamikaze drones, fiber-optic cable drones, ground robots) and the development of electronic warfare tools convey the message that the war has turned into a “high-tech war of attrition” (DW, 2026). Expressions such as “units were forced to adapt” and the withdrawal of tanks 10–15 kilometers behind the front lines demonstrate that the battlefield has moved away from classical front-line logic. This discourse reveals that the spatial order of war has been redefined by technology. At the same time, statements such as “we are strategically on the defensive” and “this war is the enemy’s strategic offensive” position Ukraine along a defensive axis while representing Russia as the actor holding the initiative and conducting offensive actions (DW, 2026). Thus, the text frames the conflict not primarily within a normative good-versus-evil dichotomy, but within the context of military initiative and strategic superiority.

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

In the section of the text concerning 2026, the phrase “cutting Russian troops off from Starlink terminals” explicitly draws attention to the digital infrastructure dimension of the war. This framework presents the conflict not merely as a conventional war conducted through land and air forces, but also as a struggle shaped through satellite systems and communication technologies. The statement in the same section that “the course of the war now depends on which side runs out of soldiers able to fight first” indicates that technological superiority alone is not decisive, and that human resources, endurance, and sustainable military capacity play a critical role (DW, 2026). Thus, the report opens the discussion of the war’s future not only through technical innovations and digital capacity, but also through manpower and societal resilience.

The BBC’s live broadcast titled “Ukraine marks four years since Russia’s full-scale invasion as Moscow says goals not yet achieved” frames the crisis by juxtaposing two opposing discourses already at the headline level. On the one hand, the phrase “full-scale invasion” fixes the event within a legal and normative violation category; on the other hand, Moscow’s statement that “the goals have not yet been achieved” gives the impression that the war remains an unfinished strategic project from Russia’s perspective. The explicit use of the term “full-scale invasion” in the headline clarifies the legal status of the event, while the emphasis on “goals” positions the conflict not merely as a military process but also as a political struggle conducted through strategic objectives and claims of legitimacy (BBC, 2026). This contrast demonstrates that the war is represented on two different levels: as both a normative violation and a pursuit of strategic goals.

In the opening sections of the text, the anniversary narrative is placed within a framework of solidarity and collective support through the expression “a day of solidarity from European allies.” This discourse positions the crisis not simply as a war between two countries, but as a matter concerning Europe’s shared norms. The G7 leaders’ references to “unwavering support” and “defending territorial integrity and the right to exist” transform Ukraine’s existence and sovereignty into objects of normative defense (BBC, 2026). This framework constructs the meaning of the war through sovereignty and international law: the emphasis on Ukraine’s “right to exist” represents the crisis not merely as a territorial struggle, but as an ontological question of existence.

In the BBC text, the section concerning Russia’s objectives produces a noteworthy ideological contrast in discourse analysis. Immediately after conveying Putin’s goals of “demilitarization and denazification,” the narrative is described as “a crude distortion of history,” positioning Russian discourse through delegitimization (BBC, 2026). Moreover, the inclusion of RIA’s statement that

“denazification is inevitably also de-Ukrainisation” creates the implication that Russia’s objectives are associated with the erasure of Ukrainian identity. In response, the BBC adds the sentence that “Ukrainian culture and identity have in fact existed independently of Russia for centuries,” making a normative correction through a claim of historical truth. This discursive intervention does not present the parties’ claims at equal distance; rather, it positions one side’s narrative as historically inaccurate and ideologically problematic.

In the section concerning peace negotiations, the phrase “there is little hope of a breakthrough” presents the diplomatic process within a framework of low expectations. Verb constructions such as “Russia rejected proposals” and “demands the withdrawal of Ukrainian forces” explicitly attribute agency to Russia and assign responsibility for the deadlock in negotiations to that actor (BBC, 2026). At the same time, the statement that “rhetoric from the Kremlin suggests Russia’s ambitions extend far beyond controlling the Donbas” reinforces the perception that Russia’s objectives are broad and potentially maximalist. Thus, the war is represented not as a limited regional conflict, but as a project that threatens Ukraine’s sovereignty in its entirety.

The inclusion of Zelensky’s call to Trump to “come and see” foregrounds the emotional and experiential dimension in the representation of the war. The statement that “only by coming to Ukraine... can we understand what this war is really about” produces the idea that knowledge can be acquired through on-the-ground experience. This discourse implies that the war should be understood not through abstract diplomatic debates, but through human suffering and societal struggle. Similarly, the testimonies of Kyiv residents (“Everything depends on one person... He started this war and he must end it”) shift the crisis into a framework of individualized responsibility (BBC, 2026). This structure simplifies the cause of the war through a leader-centered narrative rather than a systemic explanation.

In the final section of the text, the expressions referring to a “net protecting the road against attacks by explosive-laden unmanned aerial vehicles” in Donetsk and that “unmanned aerial vehicles have completely changed the way the war is conducted” emphasize the technological transformation of the war. The sentence “armies around the world are closely monitoring the situation” positions the crisis not merely as a regional conflict, but as a laboratory transforming global military doctrines (BBC, 2026). Thus, the BBC narrative frames both the normative and strategic global impact of the war: on the one hand, a struggle over sovereignty and existence; on the other, the transformation of modern warfare.

When evaluated within the framework of Norman Fairclough’s three-dimensional model of critical discourse analysis, it becomes evident that the examined media texts do not merely describe the Russia–Ukraine War, but also reproduce it within specific regimes of meaning (Fairclough, 1995;

**Atıf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

Fairclough, 2003). At the textual level, conceptual choices such as “invasion,” “military operation,” “full-scale attack,” “unwavering support,” “game changer,” and “kill zone” linguistically fix the normative status of the crisis, the distribution of agency, and the framework of legitimacy. At the level of discursive practices, the ways in which media organizations select, quote, and frame the statements of particular actors (for example, whether the discourse of “demilitarization and denazification” is conveyed directly or characterized as a “distortion of history”) make visible the ideological dimension of the meaning-production process. At the level of social practice, these discourses articulate with broader power relations and hegemonic structures such as the liberal international order, the norm of sovereignty, the logic of securitization, and the paradigm of technological warfare. As Fairclough emphasizes, discourse is not merely a practice that reflects reality, but one that constructs it and reproduces specific social relations. In this context, the representational strategies of BBC, CNN, Al Jazeera, TRT World, and Deutsche Welle construct the meaning of the war in line with different normative and geopolitical positions, and thus the crisis is reproduced within the field of discursive struggle independently of material military developments (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, 2003).

These findings indicate that media discourse constructs the Russia–Ukraine war through different regimes of legitimacy, ranging from normative condemnation to strategic and technological framing. Thus, the crisis is not represented as a fixed reality but as a contested discursive field shaped by political and ideological perspectives.

#### **4.2. Discourse in the Gaza Crisis: The Struggle over Meaning between Terror, Legitimate Self-Defense, and Humanitarian Law**

In order to understand the contemporary dimension of the Gaza Crisis, it is necessary to address the issue within a long-term historical-political continuity. The Palestinian question has been shaped since the early 20th century by colonialism, settler-colonial politics, and dynamics of displacement. Particularly after the mass displacement following 1948 and the occupation regime beginning in 1967, Gaza has been transformed into a fragile area both demographically and administratively (Khalidi, 2020). Within this background, Gaza points to an experience in which occupation and restrictive governance practices are linked not only to security-oriented policies but also to a process that “structurally weakens” the economic and social fabric, explained through chronic dependency and “de-development” (Roy, 2016). The cycles of violence and comprehensive military operations repeated throughout the 2000s have placed Gaza at the center of debates on humanitarian catastrophe, civilian protection, and proportionality under international humanitarian law. The wave of intensified conflict

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

after October 7, 2023, has simultaneously sharpened discussions on “jus ad bellum” (the law on the use of force) through discourses of “terror” and “legitimate self-defense,” and on “jus in bello” (the law of armed conflict) through questions concerning methods of warfare and the protection of civilians (Steenberghe, 2024).

The BBC’s report titled “Israeli air strike destroys part of last fully functioning hospital in Gaza City” frames the crisis, already at the headline level, through the destruction of humanitarian infrastructure (BBC, 2025). The emphasis on the “last fully functioning hospital” creates the impression that the event is not an ordinary military targeting, but a critical threshold indicating the collapse of Gaza’s healthcare capacity. Thus, the report presents the attack not merely as a tactical military move, but as a structural rupture directly affecting the sustainability of civilian life.

In the opening sections of the text, details such as the “destruction of intensive care and surgical departments,” the “evacuation of patients together with their beds,” and “evacuation images in the dark” foreground the dramatic and humanitarian dimension (BBC, 2025). This narrative directs the reader to perceive the event not through a technical-military lens, but through human vulnerability. In particular, the inclusion of statements from injured children and patients who have undergone amputations produces a strong discourse of victimhood. The expression “only two minutes separated us from death” transforms the crisis from an abstract conflict into an existential experience of danger. Such testimonies centralize the human cost of war and create a form of representation that mobilizes normative sensitivity.

At the same time, the BBC text does not construct a one-sided narrative; it also includes the Israel Defense Forces’ claim that the hospital “contained a command and control center used by Hamas” (BBC, 2025). This statement reflects an attempt to rationalize the attack on the grounds of legitimate self-defense and security. Moreover, the Israeli army’s statements that “measures were taken to avoid harm to civilians,” that “warnings were given in advance,” and that “precision munitions were used” aim to strengthen the claim that the operation was lawful and limited. Thus, the news text circulates, on the one hand, dramatic depictions implying a violation of humanitarian law, and on the other hand, a discourse of legitimization grounded in security justifications.

The inclusion in the report of the World Health Organization Director-General’s statement that “Hospitals are protected under international humanitarian law. Attacks on healthcare must stop” shifts the normative framework to the axis of international law (BBC, 2025). This statement positions the crisis not merely as a military conflict between two parties, but as an issue concerning the international legal order. In particular, the use of categorical language such as “are protected” and “must stop”

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

strengthens the implication that legal norms have been violated. Thus, the report connects the debate over legitimacy to a global normative field through reference to humanitarian law.

The distribution of agency within the text is also noteworthy. Israel is positioned with active verbs such as “targeted,” “carried out an attack,” and “launched a campaign,” while patients, civilians, and healthcare personnel are predominantly placed in passive positions. This linguistic structure attributes agency to the actor carrying out the attack while concentrating the position of victimhood on civilians. However, references to Hamas are presented through expressions such as “the Hamas-run health ministry” or “a center allegedly used by Hamas,” thereby creating an implicit distance suggesting that information sources may be partisan (BBC, 2025). This discursive strategy both conveys information originating from Gaza and produces editorial caution.

In the section addressing historical context, reference to the explosion that occurred at the same hospital in 2023 and to the parties’ mutual accusations situates the crisis within continuity (BBC, 2025). This narrative recalls that the hospital had previously been at the center of a controversial incident, thereby articulating the current attack within a broader conflict narrative. Additionally, references to total casualty figures and to the October 7, 2023 attacks make visible the background that frames Israel’s military operation within the context of “retaliation” and “counterterrorism.” Thus, the text produces a layered discourse that presents the humanitarian crisis narrative together with a security narrative.

CNN’s report titled “UN calls for ‘accountability’ over Gaza hospital strike as Israel releases initial probe findings” frames the crisis, already at the headline level, along two parallel axes: the demand for accountability under international law and the axis of military investigation and security justification (CNN, 2025). The prominence of the concepts of “accountability” and “justice” in the headline indicates that the event is presented not merely as a military mistake or operational decision, but as a matter with legal and normative consequences. This framework situates the crisis within the context of the international order and humanitarian law.

The inclusion of the UN Human Rights spokesperson’s statement that “The killing of journalists in Gaza should shock the world and lead not to silence but to calls for accountability and justice” produces a strong normative appeal (CNN, 2025). This discourse elevates the attack from an isolated military incident to the sphere of universal values. In particular, the targeting of journalists and healthcare workers creates moral intensity through the harm inflicted upon groups that enjoy special protection under international humanitarian law. Thus, the report makes visible in a pronounced manner the narratives of victimhood and violation of law.

At the same time, the text devotes considerable space to the Israel Defense Forces' initial investigative findings, conveying the claim that the attack was based on the assertion that "a camera positioned near the hospital by Hamas was being used to direct military activities" (CNN, 2025). This discourse produces legitimization through the claim that the target was not directly a medical facility, but "an element serving terrorist activities." However, the report's emphasis that Israel did not present evidence for this claim and did not explain why a second strike was carried out opens space for questioning the security narrative. At this point, the text not only conveys the official statement but also makes visible its incomplete and contested aspects.

The inclusion in the report of testimonies stating that the second strike targeted emergency response teams and journalists who had arrived at the scene after the first explosion deepens the humanitarian dimension of the event (CNN, 2025). The phrase "we were directly targeted" carries a strong implication of intentionality. Such narratives create sharp tension between the discourse of an operation justified on security grounds and the allegation of a violation of humanitarian law. Thus, the report produces a field of meaning in which the boundary between legitimate self-defense and excessive use of force is opened to debate.

The Israeli Prime Minister's characterization of the strike as a "tragic mishap" and the army's statement that it "regrets any harm caused to civilians" can be read as a discursive strategy that mitigates responsibility at the level of intent (CNN, 2025). Expressions such as "mishap" and "regret" push aside claims of deliberate intent and create the impression that the event was an unintended outcome. In contrast, the report's mention that the Israeli military would review its authorization and decision-making processes brings the issue of institutional accountability, albeit in a limited way, onto the agenda.

Another notable dimension of the text is the treatment of the attack within the context of protests and ceasefire calls in Israeli domestic politics. The reference to demonstrations attended by hundreds of thousands of people in Tel Aviv and criticisms directed at the government indicates that the crisis is not merely a foreign policy issue, but has also generated serious debates over legitimacy within the domestic public sphere (CNN, 2025). Statements such as "This government must end the war and bring back the hostages" reveal the presence of an alternative political discourse opposing the continuation of the war. Thus, the report situates the conflict not only along the Israel–Hamas axis, but also within the framework of political debates within Israeli society.

Another striking element in the text is the extensive listing of different states and international actors condemning the attack. The reactions of actors such as Canada, the United Kingdom, Germany, France, and the European Union contribute to constructing the crisis as a global diplomatic issue (CNN,

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

2025). This strengthens the framework suggesting that the event is not merely a local conflict, but a crisis concerning the normative order of the international community.

Al Jazeera's report titled "Patients face death in Gaza as Israel continues to block medical supplies" constructs the crisis, already at the headline level, within the framework of humanitarian catastrophe and structural responsibility (Al Jazeera, 2025). The phrase "face death" represents the situation not as a potential risk, but as an ongoing condition directly threatening the right to life. The emphasis in the headline that Israel "continues to block medical supplies" positions the cause of the crisis not primarily within the conditions of military conflict, but as a deliberate policy choice. Thus, the report constructs the humanitarian crisis not as a natural consequence of war, but as the direct result of blockade policies and restrictions on access.

In the opening of the text, the Gaza Health Ministry Director-General's description of the situation in hospitals as "tragic and horrific" produces a strong dramatic discourse (Al Jazeera, 2025). Expressions such as "unprecedented collapse" and "on the brink of the collapse of the health system" elevate the crisis to an extraordinary level of humanitarian devastation. This narrative points not only to physical damage, but to a systematic and comprehensive collapse of healthcare infrastructure. The inclusion of details such as shortages of medicine and surgical supplies, lack of anesthetics, depletion of dialysis materials, and electricity outages makes visible the technical dimension of the humanitarian crisis. These details transform the narrative of victimhood from an abstract discourse of suffering into a concrete and measurable narrative of collapse.

A significant discursive choice in the report is the characterization of the conflict as a "war of a genocidal nature" (Al Jazeera, 2025). This expression refers not merely to a military operation, but to the gravest category of crime within the framework of international criminal law. The concept of "genocide" carries extremely high normative intensity and directs the reader to evaluate the crisis not simply within a debate over legal violations, but within the framework of an existential and systematic destruction claim. Thus, the text positions the crisis not only as a humanitarian emergency, but within the context of an accusation of a serious international crime.

Throughout the text, agency is clearly attributed to Israel. Expressions such as "continues to block," "does not open border crossings," and "violates the flow of aid" imply that the collapse of the healthcare system is directly linked to the actions of a specific actor (Al Jazeera, 2025). This discourse represents the crisis not as a neutral humanitarian disaster, but as a structural problem attributed to a

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

particular state policy. In particular, the allegation that a ceasefire agreement has been violated places Israel not only in a military context but also within the framework of diplomatic obligations.

The special emphasis placed on vulnerable groups such as children, pregnant women, and chronically ill patients deepens the discourse of victimhood. Statistical data indicating that 320,000 children under the age of five are at risk of malnutrition, that 4,000 glaucoma patients face the danger of permanent blindness, and that thousands of patients awaiting treatment abroad have died elevate the humanitarian crisis narrative to a quantitative level of catastrophe (Al Jazeera, 2025). Such statistics create in the reader not only an emotional response but also a perception of a structural and systematic crisis.

Another important dimension of the text is the statement that while the World Health Organization is involved in the patient referral mechanism, final security approval remains dependent on Israeli authorities. This framework links access to healthcare with a security procedure and creates a field of tension between “security” and “humanitarian need” (Al Jazeera, 2025). This tension makes visible the fundamental normative conflict between the discourse of legitimate self-defense and security on the one hand, and humanitarian law and the right to life on the other.

Deutsche Welle’s live broadcast titled “Middle East: Ministers speak of ‘unimaginable suffering’ in Gaza” frames the crisis along the axes of international diplomatic response and humanitarian catastrophe (DW, 2025). The phrase “unimaginable suffering” in the headline positions the situation not as an ordinary consequence of war, but as a humanitarian devastation exceeding normative limits. This discourse removes developments in Gaza from the sphere of military strategy debate and relocates them within the context of universal human values.

The extensive coverage of the World Health Organization’s call to restock hospitals in Gaza with medical supplies makes the crisis visible through the lens of the healthcare system (DW, 2025). Expressions such as “catastrophic health emergency” and “stocks falling to zero” reinforce the emphasis on systemic collapse. In particular, data indicating that bed occupancy rates have reached 240 percent and 300 percent support the dramatic discourse with quantitative evidence. Thus, the text grounds the humanitarian crisis not only in emotional testimonies but also in statistical indicators.

Another notable element in the Deutsche Welle text is the indirect construction of responsibility through references to Israel’s “complex procedures” and the “slowness of aid entry” (DW, 2025). Rather than employing direct accusatory language, the discourse emphasizes bureaucratic obstacles and restrictions. This narrative presents the crisis less as an intentional attack and more as a structural and administrative obstruction practice. Nevertheless, the resulting situation is still represented through

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

severe humanitarian concepts such as “hunger,” “malnutrition,” and “collapse.” Thus, despite its more cautious language, the text produces normative criticism.

The inclusion of the Council of Europe’s call for member states to “halt arms shipments where there is a risk of human rights violations” links the crisis to debates over arms trade and international responsibility (DW, 2025). This framework allows the conflict to be read not only along the Israel–Palestine axis, but also through the policy choices of European states. The call for an arms embargo implicitly contains the assumption that military operations may lead to human rights violations (Pinar, 2018). Thus, the text situates the crisis within a framework of global ethical responsibility.

In the same report, reference is made to the Israeli Prime Minister’s defense of the planned operation in Gaza City as “the best way to end the war” (DW, 2025). This statement reflects a legitimization strategy centered on security and military objectives. However, it is immediately followed by mention that world leaders have condemned the plan due to the risk of “further displacement, destruction, and death.” Thus, the text produces a contrast between the discourse of military expansion and humanitarian concerns.

Statements by doctors and civil society representatives add a strong dimension of humanitarian testimony to the report. Phrases such as “Everyone is hungry... and yet they keep working” ensure that healthcare personnel are represented both as victims and as resilient actors (DW, 2025). Such expressions strengthen the humanitarian crisis narrative through individual experience and emotional intensity. At the same time, criticisms that the international community has been “insufficient” frame the crisis not merely as a regional issue, but as a matter of global responsibility. In the final sections of the text, the call by 26 foreign ministers for an “urgent ceasefire,” the “release of hostages,” and the “unhindered entry of aid” foregrounds the discourse of diplomatic resolution (DW, 2025). The expression “starvation is happening before our eyes” places the crisis within a dimension of temporal urgency. Thus, the Deutsche Welle narrative produces a representation centered on humanitarian law, hunger, and calls for international intervention, while leaving discussions of security and military strategy in the background.

TRT World’s report titled “‘Another war crime’: Global outrage over Israel’s killing of civilians and journalists” fixes the crisis, already at the headline level, within a clear and strong normative category (TRT World, 2025). The direct use of the term “war crime” in the headline frames the legal and moral nature of the event in a manner closed to debate. Such naming can be evaluated in discourse

Atif/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

analysis as “normative fixation,” because it codes the event as an unlawful act before a debate over legitimacy even begins.

In the opening of the text, it is stated that the attack on Nasser Hospital in Gaza resulted in the deaths of at least 20 people, including journalists and firefighters (TRT World, 2025). In particular, listing individually the names of journalists working for international agencies creates the perception that the attack poses a threat not only locally but also to global media freedom. This discourse positions journalists as “witnesses conveying the truth,” thereby placing their targeting within a broader framework of an “attack on press freedom.”

Although the report conveys technical information indicating that Israel targeted a specific floor of the hospital, it emphasizes that the second strike occurred immediately after rescue teams arrived at the scene (TRT World, 2025). This narrative creates the impression that the attack was not accidental, but a continuous action encompassing even those providing assistance. Thus, the report produces a representation that strengthens both the humanitarian dimension of the event and the possibility of intent.

The most striking discursive feature of the TRT World text is the inclusion of condemnation statements from numerous states and international organizations. The Turkish President’s characterization of the attack as a “merciless assault aimed at destroying everything related to humanity” frames the crisis along the axis of human values (TRT World, 2025). Spain’s description of the attack as a “clear and unacceptable violation of humanitarian law,” Germany’s call for an investigation, and France’s emphasis on respect for international law demonstrate that the attack is debated globally not only as a political issue but as a legal one. This structure builds the report upon a discourse of multilateral condemnation.

The inclusion of Iran’s description of the attack as “part of a genocide plan” and its accusation that Israel committed a “barbaric war crime” represent some of the highest normative intensity expressions in the report (TRT World, 2025). Such statements position the attack not as an ordinary violation, but as an element of a systematic strategy of destruction. Thus, the text situates the legal accusation within a broader historical and ideological context.

Statements by United Nations officials and press freedom organizations are also given extensive coverage in the report. Expressions that the killing of journalists “should shake the world” and lead to demands for justice strengthen the discourse of accountability (TRT World, 2025). The inclusion of claims that journalists were “deliberately targeted” supports the perception that the attack was intentional rather than accidental. This representation frames the crisis as a systematic assault against press freedom.

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

The limited inclusion of Israel's official security justifications and the relatively restricted presentation of counter-arguments shift the normative weight of the text toward a predominantly one-sided axis of criticism. This discursive choice pushes the narrative of security and legitimate self-defense into the background while centralizing the framework of humanitarian law violation and war crime. Thus, the crisis is represented not through the technical justifications of a military operation, but within the context of international law and human rights violations.

When evaluated within the framework of Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis, news texts by different media organizations regarding hospital attacks in Gaza should be read not merely as the transmission of events, but as the discursive reproduction of social reality (Fairclough, 1995; Fairclough, 2003). At the textual level, word choices such as "war crime," "unimaginable suffering," "genocide," "tragic mishap," and "legitimate target" determine the normative positioning of the crisis. At the level of discursive practice, the actors granted the right to speak (United Nations officials, state leaders, health authorities, military spokespersons) shape how meaning enters circulation. At the level of social practice, these discourses are situated within broader ideological frameworks such as humanitarian law, security, counterterrorism, and legitimacy. In particular, the distribution of agency (who is represented as the active subject and who as the passive victim) and naming choices demonstrate how power relations are reproduced at the linguistic level. In some texts, the attack is fixed as a "violation of humanitarian law" and a "war crime," while in others a space for legitimization is opened through the discourse of "military target" and "security threat." In line with Fairclough's three-dimensional model, these reports can be evaluated not merely as texts transmitting information, but as discursive arenas in which hegemonic struggles over meaning are conducted and where normative order and political legitimacy are reconstructed. Thus, the hospital attacks in Gaza are represented, beyond being a material event, within a process of meaning production that is articulated to different ideological projects through language and that shapes international public perception (Fairclough, 1995).

Overall, the comparative analysis demonstrates that media representations of the Gaza crisis are structured around competing discursive frameworks of security and humanitarianism. While some media outlets legitimize military actions through the language of counterterrorism and self-defense, others foreground humanitarian suffering and legal violations. This divergence reveals that media discourse actively constructs competing interpretations of legitimacy, responsibility, and victimhood.

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study, by examining how international crises are interpreted through the media within the framework of a comparative discourse analysis, has demonstrated that global news organizations reconstruct the same event within different conceptual and normative frameworks. The analyzed texts show that crises are not merely transmitted through factual developments; rather, they are structured through the positioning of actors, attributions of responsibility, the production of legitimacy, and humanitarian or security-based categories.

In the case of the Russia–Ukraine War, it was observed that some media outlets established a normative framework by explicitly fixing the crisis within the categories of “invasion” and “violation of sovereignty,” while others preferred a more technical and operational language, addressing the conflict along the axis of military strategy and transformation. This difference is not merely a terminological distinction but reflects implicit assumptions regarding the legal status of the war, the agency of the actors, and their positions within the international order. When the concepts used at the textual level, the sources selected at the level of discursive practice, and the normative references articulated at the level of social context are evaluated together, it becomes evident that media narratives possess the capacity to reproduce power relations.

Regarding the Gaza Crisis, it has been identified that the regime of representation was largely constructed around the axes of “terror,” “legitimate self-defense,” “humanitarian catastrophe,” and “international law.” While some media texts rationalized the attacks within the framework of security and military necessity, others produced a representation with high normative intensity by centering humanitarian destruction and the devastation of civilian infrastructure. Narratives built around hospitals, journalists, and civilians in particular framed the conflict as a moral crisis, whereas security discourse functioned to legitimize operations through the perception of threat. Thus, the same event could be coded, on the one hand, as a security practice and, on the other, as a violation of humanitarian law. The comparative analysis demonstrates that media institutions are not passive transmitters, but discursive actors that construct the meaning of crises through selective naming practices, strategies of emphasis, and normative references. In crisis narratives, subject–action distribution, passive/active language choices, and dramatic depictions have emerged as fundamental tools guiding how audiences perceive events. This situation reveals that international crises constitute not only a field of struggle at the military and diplomatic levels, but also at the symbolic and epistemic levels.

This research, while making visible the discursive nature of crisis representations, also demonstrates that the existing academic literature remains limited in comparison to the rapid transformation of the international media sphere. Digitalization, the rise of social media platforms, and

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

algorithmic content circulation reveal that crisis narratives are produced not only by traditional news institutions but within multilayered and fragmented communication networks. This situation indicates that discourse analysis should not remain confined solely to institutional media texts. Moreover, in international crises, information wars, disinformation strategies, and strategic narrative competition are becoming increasingly prominent. However, the effects of these processes on norm production, identity construction, and the formation of international public opinion have not yet been systematically examined to a sufficient extent. In particular, there is a need for more in-depth comparative studies analyzing the structural relationship between different media regimes and foreign policy orientations.

Another significant problem area concerns how the tension between humanitarian law discourse and security discourse becomes institutionalized within media representations. The circulation of concepts with high normative intensity-such as “terror,” “legitimate self-defense,” “genocide,” and “war crime”-directly influences debates in international law. Understanding in which contexts, by which actors, and within which media systems these concepts are fixed is of critical importance for comprehending the normative structure of the international order.

In conclusion, the analysis of international crises should not be limited to material power balances; processes of meaning production, representational practices, and discursive struggles must be systematically examined. Considering the increasing intensity of global crises and the expansion of communication networks, deepening research on the constitutive role of media discourse in international politics through more comprehensive, interdisciplinary, and comparative studies emerges as an unavoidable necessity from both academic and societal perspectives.

This study makes three main contributions to the literature. First, it demonstrates that international crises are not merely material events but discursively constructed realities shaped by media narratives. Second, it provides a comparative perspective by revealing how different national media systems produce distinct frameworks of legitimacy, responsibility, and threat perception. Third, it contributes methodologically by applying critical discourse analysis to international relations, thereby bridging media studies and international relations literature.

**Information About Ethics Committee Approval:** Ethics committee approval was not required.

**Research And Publication Ethics Statement:** The authors declare that the ethical rules are followed in all preparation processes of this study. In the event of a contrary situation, the ASSAM International Refereed Journal has no responsibility and all responsibility belongs to the author of the study.

**Conflict Of Interest Statement:** There is no conflict of interest among the authors and/or any institution.

**Contribution Rate Statement:** The authors contributed equally to the work.

Atıf/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

## REFERENCES

- Adler, E. (1997). Seizing the middle ground: Constructivism in world politics. *European Journal of International Relations*, 3(3), 319–363.
- Asker, A. (2021). “Rusya’nın Yakın Çevre Siyaseti: Karadeniz-Hazar (Güney Kafkasya) Bölgesi”. İçinde: 100. Yılında Türkiye Rusya İlişkileri ve Karadeniz (Moskova Antlaşması’ndan Günümüze), Editörler: Mehmet Okur, Yüksel Küçüker, Ahmet Nafiz Ünalı, Akçağ Yayınları, Ankara 2021 (ss. 97-141).
- Al Jazeera. (2022). Russian forces launch full-scale invasion of Ukraine. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2022/2/24/putin-orders-military-operations-in-eastern-ukraine-as-un-meets>
- Al Jazeera. (2025). Gaza patients facing death as Israel continues to block medical supplies. <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2025/12/23/gaza-patients-facing-death-as-israel-continues-to-block-medical-supplies>
- Allison, R. (2022). Russia and the post-2014 international legal order. *International Affairs*, 98(3), 789–809.
- Associated Press. (2026, February 23). 4 years into Russia’s full-scale invasion of Ukraine, a look at the war by the numbers. <https://apnews.com/article/russia-ukraine-war-numbers-f023cd82917ccb29ad2dda54ea589249>
- Baylarov, D. G. (2025). The Transformation Process of New Communication Models Through Digitalization. *ASSAM Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi, “MASS COMMUNICATION” SPECIAL ISSUE*, 20-30. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1785708>
- BBC. (2025). Israeli air strike destroys part of last fully functional hospital in Gaza City. <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cjr71123zy5o>
- BBC. (2026). Ukraine marks four years since Russia's full invasion as Moscow says its 'goals' not yet achieved. <https://www.bbc.com/news/live/cre08q9dergt>
- Berger, P. L., & Luckmann, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. Anchor Books.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., & de Wilde, J. (1998). *Security: A new framework for analysis*. Lynne Rienner.
- Campbell, D. (1998). *Writing security: United States foreign policy and the politics of identity* (Rev. ed.). University of Minnesota Press.
- CNN. (2025). UN demands ‘accountability’ over Gaza hospital attack as Israel releases initial inquiry findings. <https://edition.cnn.com/2025/08/26/middleeast/idf-nasser-hospital-gaza-war-protest-latam-intl>
- CNN.com. (2022). Biden says Russia is beginning an ‘invasion of Ukraine’ as he unveils sanctions on Moscow. <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/02/22/politics/biden-invasion-sanctions>
- Couldry, N., & Hepp, A. (2017). *The mediated construction of reality*. Polity Press.
- Dijk, V. T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage.
- Dijk, V. T. A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352–371). Blackwell.
- DW. (2025). Middle East: 'Unimaginable' suffering in Gaza, say ministers. <https://www.dw.com/en/middle-east-unimaginable-suffering-in-gaza-say-ministers/live-73614596>
- DW. (2026). How Ukraine’s war effort against Russia has evolved. <https://www.dw.com/en/russia-ukraine-war-drones-starlink-evacuations-front-line-changes-since-2022/a-76096050>

**Atf/Citation:** Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media discourse*. Edward Arnold.
- Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. Routledge.
- Finnemore, M. (1996). *National interests in international society*. Cornell University Press.
- Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. *International Organization*, 52(4), 887–917.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. Pantheon Books.
- Hall, S. (1997). The work of representation. In S. Hall (Ed.), *Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices* (pp. 13–74). Sage.
- Hansen, L. (2006). *Security as practice: Discourse analysis and the Bosnian war*. Routledge.
- Hopf, T. (2002). *Social construction of international politics: Identities and foreign policies, Moscow, 1955 and 1999*. Cornell University Press.
- Khalidi, R. (2020). *The hundred years' war on Palestine: A history of settler colonial conquest and resistance, 1917-2017*. Metropolitan Books.
- Kratochwil, F. (1989). *Rules, norms, and decisions: On the conditions of practical and legal reasoning in international relations and domestic affairs*. Cambridge University Press.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176-187.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2014). Why the Ukraine crisis is the West's fault. *Foreign Affairs*, 93(5), 77-89.
- Miskimmon, A., O'Loughlin, B., & Roselle, L. (2013). *Strategic narratives: Communication power and the new world order*. Routledge.
- Onuf, N. (1989). *World of our making: Rules and rule in social theory and international relations*. University of South Carolina Press.
- Orujov, Umud. 2024. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğu'nda Ermeni Milliyetçiliği: Toplumsal Dönüşüm". *KARE Uluslararası Karşılaştırmalı Edebiyat Dergisi*, 18, 71-81. <https://doi.org/10.38060/kare.1570956>.
- Orujov, U., & Gulmammadov, R. (2025). Dijital Dönemde Haberciliğin Yeniden Yapılandırılması: Sosyal Medya Platformları Üzerine İnceleme. *ASSAM Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi*, 26, 12-28. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1627255>
- Pınar, L. (2018). Dış Politika Yapım Sürecinde Medyanın Rolü. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 7(3), 1904-1916.
- Pınar, L. (2018). Kudüs Tasarısı Oylaması ve Türkiye'nin Ortadoğu'daki İmajı / Voting of Jerusalem Proposal and Turkey's Image in the Middle East. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(3), 683-699. <https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i3.1565>
- Roy, S. (2016). *The Gaza Strip: The political economy of de-development* (3rd ed.). Institute for Palestine Studies.
- Sakwa, R. (2022). *The Ukraine war and the Eurasian world order*. Routledge.
- Sezer, S. (2024). Rusya-Ukrayna Savaşı'nın jeopolitik sonuçları. Ömer Halisdemir Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi, 17(1), 158-180. <https://doi.org/10.25287/ohuiibf.1331462>

Atıf/Citation: Samadbayli, T. G., Hasanguliyev, A. (2026). Representation of International Crises in the Media: A Comparative Analysis of News Discourses Across Different Countries. *ASSAM International Refereed Journal* (29), 114-142. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1900276>

- Steenberghe, R. (2024). The armed conflict in Gaza, and its complexity under international law: Jus ad bellum, jus in bello, and international justice. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 37(4), 983–1017.
- Thompson, J. B. (1995). *The media and modernity: A social theory of the media*. Polity Press.
- Thussu, D. K. (2006). *International communication: Continuity and change* (2nd ed.). Hodder Arnold.
- TRT World. (2022). Russia begins 'military operation' in Ukraine. <https://www.trtworld.com/article/12767780>
- TRT World. (2025). 'Another war crime': Global outrage over Israel's killing of civilians and journalists. <https://www.trtworld.com/article/0bafb9045b72>
- Tuchman, G. (1978). *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*. Free Press.
- Zeynalov, J. (2025). The Future of the Network Society: Reflections of Manuel Castells and van Dijk on the Network Society. *Assam Uluslararası Hakemli Dergi, "Mass Communication" Special Issue*, 57-72. <https://doi.org/10.58724/assam.1796523>
- Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. *International Organization*, 46(2), 391–425.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of critical discourse analysis* (2nd ed.). Sage.