

MAREK PALCZEWSKI

The concept of framing and its use
in Wiadomości TVP and Fakty TVN news broadcasts research

KEY WORDS

framing theory, types of frames, analysis of TV news broadcasts

ABSTRACT

The article presents the framing theory application in order to analyze news broadcasts by *Fakty TVN* and *Wiadomości TVP*. The author examines news broadcasts basic frames: “conflict”, “human interest”, “responsibility”, “economics” and “morality”. Each of these frames is an “interpretative package”, attributing meaning to the presented issues and events. From research carried out by the author, it appears that the most frequently used frames by news broadcasts are the “conflict” and “human interest” frames. It shows that dominant in news services are the so called personal points of view and presentation of the world as a place full of conflict, arguments and controversies.

The term *framing*¹ was first used by Goffman² in his work, *Frame analysis*. However, it was not until 1980s and 1990s that the term was applied to describe a media phenomenon in the shape of the so called frames³. Some are of the opinion that *framing* is the second level of *agenda-setting* theory⁴. On the first level, *agenda-setting* delineates what we are to think about (what subjects), then *frames* indicate how we are to think about events and issues

¹ Translation of framing after: M. Kunczik, A. Zipfel A., *Wprowadzenie do nauki o dziennikarstwie i komunikowaniu*, Warszawa 2000; M. McCombs, *Ustanawianie agendy. Media masowe i opinia publiczna* [*Setting the agenda. The mass media and public opinion*], Kraków 2008; E. Nowak, R. Riedel, *Agenda setting, priming, news framing. Analiza porównawcza telewizyjnych audycji informacyjnych TVN I TVP1 w okresie kampanii przedwyborczych w Polsce 2005 i 2007*, “Zeszyty Prasoznawcze” 2008, No. 1/2, p. 67–83.

² E. Goffman, *Frame analysis. An essay on the organization of experience*, New York 1974.

³ W.A. Gamson, A. Modigliani, *Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach*, “American Journal of Sociology” 95 (1989), 1, p. 1–37; T. Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and the Unmaking of the New Left*, Berkeley 1980; W.R. Neuman, M. Just, A.N. Crigler, *Common knowledge. News and the construction of political meaning*, Chicago 1992; P. Reese, D. Buckalew, *The Militarism of Local Television: The Routine Framing of the Persian Gulf War*, “Critical Studies in Mass Communication” Vol. 12 (1995), No. 1, p. 40–59; *Media frames: Approaches to conceptualization and measurement*. Paper presented in Boston, MA. by J.W. Tankard et al., 1991; Polish translation [in:] M. McCombs, *Ustanawianie agendy...*, p.101.

⁴ See M. McCombs, *Ustanawianie agendy...*; D.A. Scheufele, D. Tewksbury, *Framing, Agenda Setting, and Priming: The Evolution of Three Media Effects Models*, “Journal of Communication” Vol. 57 (2007), p. 9–20, www.scienzepolitiche.unimi.it/files/_ITA_/COM/3-Framing-AgendaSetting.pdf [accessed: 24.08.2009].

shown in media broadcasts. The goal of this article is to present the general concept of *framing* and to research *newsframes*⁵ in news broadcasts of the select channels – TVP and TVN.

Definition of framing

The first popular definition of frames in media was put forward by Gitlin who stated that, “Frames are [...] persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation, and presentation, selection, emphasis and exclusion by which symbol-handlers routinely organize discourse”⁶. Nelson, Clawson and Oxley define *framing* “as the process by which a communication source, such as news organization (or political reader, public relations officer, political advertising consultant or news consumer) defines and constructs a political issue or public controversy”⁷.

Gamson and Modigliani are of the opinion the frames are *interpretative packages* which give meaning to the presented issues. In other words, a frame is a basic idea which allows us to understand the meaning of events, suggesting what the issue is about⁸. Similarly, Tankard and others define a frame as, “central organizing idea for news content that supplies a context and suggest what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion and elaboration”⁹. Neuman describes frames as, “conceptual tools which media and individuals rely on to convey, interpret and evaluate information”¹⁰. Entman, on the other hand, sees the issue from a much wider perspective. According to him, “frames define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments and suggest remedies”¹¹. Frames are part of political disputes and journalist norms.

⁵ In this article interchangeably used are terms such as „news”, „news report”, „news coverage”. For the purposes of this article they are treated synonymously even though the author is aware of differences in their meaning and even though not all of them meet the criteria of information news according to Polish media studies rules.

⁶ T. Gitlin, *The Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and the Unmaking of the New Left*, Berkeley 1980, p. 7.

⁷ T.E. Nelson, R.A. Clawson R.A., Z.M. Oxley, *Media framing of a civil liberties conflict and its effect on tolerance*, “American Political Science Review” Vol. 91 (1997), p. 567 (quoted from K.P. Johnson-Cartee, *News Narratives and News Framing. Constructing Political Reality*, Lanham 2005, p. 24).

⁸ W.A. Gamson, A. Modigliani, *Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power. A constructionist approach*, “American Journal of Sociology” Vol. 95 (1989), No. 1, p. 3.

⁹ *Media frames...*, p. 3.

¹⁰ W.R. Neuman, M.R. Just, A.N. Crigler, *Common Knowledge...*, p. 60.

¹¹ R. Entman, *Framing toward Classification of a Fractured Paradigm*, “Journal of Communication” Vol. 43 (1993), No. 4, p. 52. Polish translation by M. McCombs, *Ustanawianie agendy...*, p. 101. McCombs does not provide his own definition of a frame.

Pan and Kosicki define a frame as, “a cognitive device used in information encoding, interpreting and retrieving”¹²; while news framing is about drawing attention to particular aspects of a given event, more imperative than others¹³. The process of framing is about, as Capella and Jamieson put it, activity delineating what should be part of a report and what should be excluded, what is important and what is not¹⁴.

The definition provided by Price and Tewkesbury combines the “framing” process with news selection, “Framing focuses not on which topics or issues are selected for coverage by the news media but instead on the particular ways those issues are presented”¹⁵. The process of attributing frames, then, is also a process of selection but not of events or issues but of what type of frame will be used to present the news.

In the end, it is worth noting that definitions of frames which have appeared in books translated into Polish regarding the discussed here issue as well as those present in Polish media studies publications are a repetition of already functioning definitions in literature on the subject and they do not present anything new¹⁶.

News frames and their division

Capella and Jamieson provide useful criteria which can be utilized in order to define a general frame model for the news. Firstly, a news frame must possess easy to identify characteristic conceptual and language traits. Secondly, it should be generally identifiable in journalist practice. Thirdly, it must be clearly distinguished from other forms. Fourthly, it must be commonly acknowledged, in order not to be just a fabrication in a researcher’s mind¹⁷.

Other indicators are presented by Entman who lists the presence or lack of certain words – key ones, typical phrases, stereotypical views, sources of information and sentences which “thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments”¹⁸.

¹² Z. Pan, G. Kosicki, *Framing Analysis. An Approach to News Discourse*, “Political Communication” Vol. 10 (1993), p. 57-

¹³ Z. Pan, G. Kosicki, *Framing as a strategic action in public deliberation*, [in:] *Framing public life: Perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world*, ed. P.D. Reese, O.H., Gandy Jr., A.E. Grant, Mahwah, N.J. 2001, p. 39.

¹⁴ J.N. Cappella, K.H. Jamieson, *Spiral of cynicism. The press and the public good*, New York 1997, p. 38.

¹⁵ V. Price, D. Tewkesbury, *News values and public opinion: A theoretical account of media priming and framing*, [in:] *Progress in communication sciences: Advances in persuasion*. Vol. 13, ed. G.A. Barnett, F.J. Boster, Greenwich, CT 1997, p. 184.

¹⁶ For example M. Kunczik, A. Zipfel, *Wprowadzenie...*, p. 125, view a frame as, “a field for possible interpretation, as a cognitive structure in a journalist’s consciousness which facilitates information selection and processing”. Such a definition, in view of others presented above, does not seem very precise.

¹⁷ J.N. Cappella, K.H. Jamieson, *Spiral of cynicism...*, p. 47, 89.

¹⁸ R. Entman, *Framing...*, p. 52.

According to Gamson and Modigliani, frames can be recognized based on: 1) metaphors, 2) exemplars, 3) catch phrases, 4) depictions, 5) visual images¹⁹.

Tankard lists eleven ‘mechanisms’ allowing the identification and measurement of a news frame. Among there are: headlines, subheads, photos, photo captions, leads, source selection, quotes selection, pull quotes, statistics and charts, concluding statements and paragraphs²⁰.

It should be noted that few researchers see media frames as *content free*²¹. Most often, as also believed by the author of this article, frames are *content-bound*.

The presented above frame characteristics have resulted in researchers distinguishing numerous kinds of media frames, in an inductive and deductive way. The deductive method is based on earlier, a priori frame definition which is then confronted with the analysed news. The research is based on a comparison of frame definition characteristics and those actually appearing in the news. The inductive method is more free and bases on a comparison of particular news attributes, based on which their common characteristic are delineated.

Additionally, there is a division into *issue-specific frames* and *generic frames*. The first regard specific events, issues or topics, while the second are tied to journalist information conventions, norms and values. The author of this article will focus on the deductive approach and generic frames. Examples of these types of frames are provided by Neuman and they are: “human impact”, “powerlessness”, “economics”, “moral values” and “conflict”. These are used both by media and by recipients²². Semetko and Valkenburg also identify five frames: “conflict”, “human interest”, “attribution of responsibility”, “morality” and “economic consequences”²³. We are dealing here with 80% unanimity since “economic” and “economic consequences” as well as “human impact” and “human interest” can be considered the same. Hence, the only difference regards the “responsibility” and “powerlessness” frames.

Besides the above mentioned frames, there are also numerous other frame classifications, among them there are: “risk & danger”, “violence”, “victims”, “powerful and wicked”²⁴; “control and consensus”²⁵; “horse race”, “strategic”, “game”, “personality”,

¹⁹ W.A. Gamson, A. Modigliani, *Media discourse...*, p. 1–37.

²⁰ J.W. Tankard, *The empirical approach to the study of media framing*, [in:] *Framing public...*, p. 95–106.

²¹ G. Tuchman, *Making news: A study in the construction of reality*, New York 1978.

²² See W.R. Neuman, M.R. Just, A. Crigler, *Common Knowledge...*, p. 60 i n.

²³ H.A. Semetko, P.M. Valkenburg, *Framing European politics: a content analysis of press and television news*, “Journal of Communication” Vol. 50 (2000), No. 2, p. 93–109.

²⁴ C. Kellow, H. Steeves, L., *The Role of Radio in the Rwandan Genocide*, “Journal of Communication” Vol. 48 (1998), No. 3, p. 107–128.

²⁵ P. Reese, D. Buckalew, *The Militarism...*, p. 40–59.

“issue”, “episodic”²⁶ or “cold war”²⁷. As a result of the fact that the first frame classifications are popular in research and there is the possibility to compare own research results to those of predecessors, the five frames by Neuman as well as Semetko and Valkenburg were used in the research.

“Conflict” frame

Many researchers pay particular attention to the “conflict frame”²⁸. The conflict frame should not be confused with the way conflict as is, is presented²⁹. Instead, it is a pattern via which presented are events not always explicitly associated with conflict. Events or issues are shown through disputes, arguments, deep controversy or through unsolvable differences of opinion. The conflict frame is sometimes characterized via components such as polarization of power, political competition, media interpretation of politics as a battle scene where there are winners and losers³⁰. According to Vreese, “the conflict frame focuses on conflict between individuals, groups, institutions or countries”³¹. Reese and Buckalew define this frame as the result of routine which accompanies the creation of news, the focus on conflict, dramatic images, action and balanced reporting³². The last characteristic shows conflict frame similarity to journalist tradition of presenting two sides of any event which, according to Tuchman, is one of the four rules of the so called strategic objectivity ritual³³.

“Human interest” or “human impact” frame

This frame can also be described as the “personalization” frame, or the presentation of an event or issue from the perspective of individual people or how it would influence the fate of individuals or groups. According to Semetko and Valkenburg, this frame individualizes the story, it gives it a human face or an emotional take on the presented events, issues or

²⁶ J.N. Cappella, K.H. Jamieson, *Spiral of cynicism...*

²⁷ W.A. Gamson, *Talking politics*, New York 1992.

²⁸ W.R. Neuman, M.R. Just, A.N. Crigler, *Common Knowledge...*; V. Price, D. Tewksbury, *News values...*; H.A. Semetko, P.M. Valkenburg, *Framing European politics...*; C.H. de Vreese, *News framing: Theory and typology*, “Information Design Journal + Document Design” 13 (2005), No. 1, p. 51–62, www.claesdevreese.com/documents/News_framing_Doc_design_2005.pdf [accessed: 24.08.2009]; M.J. Canel, Ch. Holtz-Bacha, P. Mancini, *Conflict as a frame in television coverage of politics: A comparative study in Italy, Spain and Germany*, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, TBA, San Francisco, CA, May 23, 2007, www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/7/0/7/7/pages170775/p170775-1.php [accessed 24.08.2009].

²⁹ Perhaps a better term would be “conflict as a news frame” but for simplicity purposes chosen was the term “conflict” frame.

³⁰ W.R. Neuman, M.R. Just, A. Crigler, *Common knowledge...*, p. 64–65.

³¹ C.H. de Vreese, *News framing...*, p. 56.

³² P. Reese, D. Buckalew, *The Militarism...*, p. 47.

³³ See G. Tuchman, *Objectivity as strategic ritual: An examination of newsmen’s notion of objectivity*, “American Journal of Sociology” Vol. 77 (1972), p. 660–679.

problems. The human interest frame describes the issues in terms of care, worry and compassion to others.

“Attribution of responsibility” or “responsibility” frame

This frame focuses on who is responsible for a given issue. It analyses whether accusations were presented against individuals or a group and whether the author presents a solution in the conclusion. The responsibility frame report asks a question as to who is responsible for the creation and solution of key social problems such as, for example, poverty.

“Moral values” or “morality” frame

This frame places events in the context of moral and religious judgments or obligations. It discusses issues and events in terms of values. It points to religious principles such as the 10 Commandments, equality, freedom, peace, etc. As times, the included in the news moral judgment instructs people how they should behave in their lives.

“Economics” or “economic consequences” frame

This frame looks at issues and events from the aspect of their economic consequences. It sees matters in the market and trade context, or that of profits and losses, taxes, economic costs, budget and its consequences, the stock market, economic crisis, etc. According to Semetko and Valkenburg, the economic consequences frame presents the event or problem in terms of economic effects for the individual, group, institution, region or country. This frame shows whether a given issue can be explained through economic interests of a given country and whether it includes information on the costs and profits resulting from particular activity.

News frame research in Poland and around the world

Research on the concept of *framing* in culture and in media has been performed for over thirty years. In Poland, there have so far been few researchers who focused on *framing* in their work. In 1992, Neuman, Just and Crigler analysed 150 news reports from the “Boston Globe”, “Newsweek”, “US News & World Report” and CBS. The “conflict frame” was present in 29% of the analysed news, the “human interest” – in 18%, “economics” – in 16%, and “morality” – in 0.4%. Interestingly, dominant was the “powerlessness” frame, present in 35% of news.

In research by Semetko and Valkenburg from 2000, focusing on four Dutch newspapers and select news broadcasts from three TV stations³⁴, the most common was the “responsibility” frame, followed by “conflict”, then “economics”, “human interest” and “morality”.

Estelle Marie Ladrido analysed 213 news reports from two newspapers in 2005 (from mid June to mid July)³⁵, discussing the political crisis in the Philippines. The analysis shows that the “conflict frame” was the most popular frame in both newspapers. In second place was the “responsibility” frame, in third – “human interest”, then “horse racing” and finally – “morality”.

The “conflict” frame was also dominant in TV news reports on politics in news services on three European stations (in Germany, Spain, and Italy)³⁶. Such was the result of research performed in 2004 by Canel, Holtz-Bacha and Mancini. The research, encompassing a two week period in January, showed that the “conflict” frame was chosen in 37% of reports on ARD, 51% on TVE1 and 40% on TG1 Rai.

In similar research, carried out in Poland by Ewa Nowak and Rafał Riedel, the researchers analysed news broadcasts on TVP1 and TVN during election campaigns in 2005 and 2007. In 2005, on TVP *Wiadomości*, dominant was “focus on the individual” (or “human interest”) frame, followed by “conflict” and “morality” frames. On TVN’s *Fakty*, most common was the “conflict” frame. Two years later, in 2007, on *Wiadomości* most popular was the “morality” frame, then “conflict” and “focus on the individual”, or order opposite from two years earlier. On *Fakty*, the “morality” frame was dominant as well. We might wonder why this particular frame was most popular. This was for two reasons; firstly, it was because of the character of events, the campaign was very negative, often described as “black”. Secondly, it was the result of combining two frames “morality” and “responsibility”, which tied assessment into the categories of good and evil with political “subjects responsibility for the consequences of their decisions and activity”³⁷.

³⁴ “Telegraf”, “Algemeen Dagblad”, “Volkskrant”, “NRC Handelsblad” and *NOS Journaal*, *RTL Nieuws*, *Hart van Nederland*.

³⁵ “Philippine Star” and “Philippine Daily Inquirer” (E.M. Ladrido, “Hello, Garci”; *Framing Gloriagate: The Prevalence of the Conflict Frame in the News Coverage of the “Hello, Garci” Presidential Crisis* – “Loyola Schools Review” Vol. 6 (2007), p. 1–26, www.philjol.info/philjol/index/LSR/article/view/201/187 [accessed: 24.08.2009].

³⁶ ARD – Tagesschau, TVE1, Tg1 Rai. M.J. Canel, Ch. Holtz-Bacha, P. Mancini, *Conflict as a frame...*

³⁷ E. Nowak, R. Riedel, *Agenda setting...*, footnote 25.

Analysis of news broadcasts on TVP1 and TVN

In the presented research, analysed were 129 news reports broadcasted over fourteen news services on TVP and TVN during a randomly chosen week in 2009 (September 7–13)³⁸.

Methodological assumptions

In order to identify various frames, a theoretical model was constructed for each one of the frames. A series of questions was drawn up so as to verify whether a particular news report meets the characteristics of a given frame. An affirmative answer to at least two questions shows, according to the author, that the news bit includes the characteristics of a particular frame, while one affirmative answer is not enough³⁹. The frame model, as mentioned earlier, was based on earlier research carried out by Semetko and Valkenburg, de Vreese and Ladrio. Each frame includes four basic attributes/characteristics, considered by the author most imperative to that frame. The following are questions drawn up per each frame:

■ “conflict” frame

- 1) does the news report show discord between parties/individuals/groups/countries?
- 2) are the parties/individuals/groups/countries accusing or fighting with each other, are there winners and losers?
- 3) does the report present both or more side’s arguments in the discussed issue/problem?
- 4) does it include offensive or provoking images, language, terms or phrases directed at the ‘other’ sides involved the issue/problem/event?

■ “human interest” frame

- 1) is the event presented in the context of its influence on the individual/group?
- 2) is the report personalized, is the issue presented from an individual/human perspective?
- 3) are adjectives used or individual descriptions which entice feelings of indignation, care, sympathy or compassion?
- 4) does the report regard private matters of people or treats their reactions as a point of reference?

■ “responsibility” frame

- 1) does the report suggest who is responsible (or guilty) in the events (government/group/party/ individual/others)?

³⁸ The author’s hypothesis, which requires verification in empirical research, is that Polish TV stations format their news services just like their Western counterparts (CNN, BBC, NBC). Such an assumption allowed him to use the same research tools as in international literature for news coverage research.

³⁹ One affirmative answer was considered insufficient and could result in random results.

2) does it indicate what consequences should be faced by people /groups /parties /government for the resulting situation or lack of action taken, or perhaps show what rewards should be awarded for a positive solution?

3) does it suggest a solution to the issue/problem?

4) does it include suggestions as to who should resolve the issue/problem?

■ “morality” frame

1) does the report deal with morality?

2) does it refer to morality, God, religious dogmas or ethical rules?

3) does it include a moral judgment?

4) does it include moral ideals which should be followed?

■ “economics” frame

1) does the report present an event or problem in terms of economic consequences for an individual, group, institution, region, or state?

2) does it include information on profits or losses resulting from particular activity now or in the future?

3) does it discuss the issue/problem from the perspective of market values as well as state, group or individual economic interests?

4) does it mention the influence of economics on daily life?

Each news report was checked as to whether it answered the questions listed above. In case there was an affirmative answer to at least two questions in a particular frame, then the report was automatically viewed as having this frame. It turned out, however, that often it was difficult to explicitly state that a report belonged to one frame as there was an affirmative answer to only one of the questions, or to none of them (then the news was not classified). On the other hand, there were also reports which could fall into more than one frame. In such cases, the dominant frame was chosen (with most affirmative answers). If this was not possible (i.e. equal amount of answers per frame), then a mixed frame option was chosen.

Research results

Let us examine to what extent the analysed reports meet the set criteria. In total, affirmative answers to the above questions were found 371 times (in 129 TV news reports) – 189 times in 62 news reports on TVN and 182 times in 67 news broadcasts on TVP. The news frame ‘saturation’ factor was in total 71.8%, while separately 76% for TVN and 68% for TVP, in

other words on average 3 affirmative answers for each report⁴⁰. As far as the ‘saturation’ factor for the different frames, the results are as follows:

Table 1. News frame ‘saturation’ factor (in %) describing how often the reports affirmatively answered the questions

Frame	TVN	TVP
Conflict	29.8	22.3
Human interest	17.3	16.8
Economics	10.5	11.9
Responsibility	10.5	10.8
Morality	8.8	6.0

Table 1 shows that the ‘saturation’ level for different frames was similar on both stations. Most common was the “conflict” frame, followed by “human interest”, then “economics”, “responsibility” and “morality”. The difference in saturation between frames used by both stations was less than 3% in most cases. Only in case of the “conflict” frame it was more significant, at 7.5%. It shows that perhaps TVN puts more emphasis on presenting such a view of the world; with controversy, disputes and differences of opinion.

Analysis of news reports with at least two affirmative answers shows the same exact order of frame frequency (Table 2).

Table 2. Frequency of at least two affirmative answers per frame in a news report

Frame	Station	TVN	TVP
Conflict		35.4	23.9
Human interest		21.0	22.4
Economics		12.9	16.4
Responsibility		12.9	11.9
Morality		11.3	6.0
Others		6.5	19.4

Table 2 shows that, once again, the “conflict” frame was most common. Additionally, the other frames appear in the same order as in Table 1. Moreover, there is a similar larger

⁴⁰ It was assumed that a report fully (100%) meets the criteria for a given frame if it affirmatively answers all four questions. Hence, all 129 news reports would have a frame saturation factor equal to 100% if they affirmatively answered the four questions, 516 times (4 x 129). Similarly, for TVN – 248 (62 x 4), for TVP – 268 (67 x 4). Ratio of affirmative answers to potential (i.e. 371:516) affirmative answers is the “saturation” factor.

difference between the frequency of the “conflict” frame between the two stations, of 11.5% greater on TVN than on TVP. There is also a noticeable but not large difference between the channels regarding the “economics” frame (by 3.5%).

Aside from the above mentioned “pure” frames, there were also “mixed” frames, roughly about 25% of all frames. Most often, it was a combination of the “conflict” frame with the “economics” or “responsibility” frame or “conflict” and “human interest” frames (at TVN) or “conflict”, “human interest”, “economics” and “responsibility” frames (at TVP). The one combination that never occurred was the “economics” and “morality” mix.

Table 3. “Conflict” frame (in brackets percentage of affirmative answers to questions, N = total number of news reports)

	TVN + TVP (N=129)	TVN (N=62)	TVP (N=69)
Question 1	56 (43.4)	28 (45.1)	28 (40.5)
Question 2	24 (18.6)	14 (22.6)	10 (14.5)
Question 3	37 (28.6)	22 (35.5)	15 (21.7)
Question 4	17 (13.2)	10 (16.1)	7 (10.1)
Total affirmative answers	134 (25.9)	74 (29.8)	60 (22.4)
Number of possible affirmative answers	516	248	268

As noted above, the “conflict” frame is the most popular way of presenting TV news. What is presented are disputes between parties, individuals, groups, countries, etc. Generally, the reports take into consideration and present arguments of both or all sides. About 45% of TVN and 40% of TVP news reports answered the first question affirmatively, on whether the report shows discord between parties/individuals/groups/countries. Question number 4, on the presence of offensive or provoking images or language, obtained the least number of affirmative answers (between 10–16% of reports).

What kind of reports were described by the “conflict” frame – mostly on politics and matters related to different kinds of disputes between individuals or between individuals and organizations or the state. In the analysed news services it was, among other things, on the controversy regarding the content of a Sejm resolution passed on the 70th anniversary of the Soviet invasion in 1939 (was the Katyń crime genocide or a war crime? – TVP and TVN), on the draft of the media act (TVP and TVN) and on the conflict regarding the Wrocław bypass (TVP). An excellent example of the use of the “conflict” frame was the dispute on the content

of the Sejm resolution regarding Soviet aggression and the Katyń crime, described using fight terminology, at times even including political war phrases.

Table 4. “Human interest” frame (in brackets percentage of affirmative answers, N = total number of news reports)

	TVN + TVP (N=129)	TVN (N=62)	TVP (N=69)
Question 1	25 (19.3)	12 (19.3)	13 (18.8)
Question 2	31 (24.0)	15 (24.2)	16 (23.8)
Question 3	18 (13.9)	9 (14.5)	9 (13.0)
Question 4	14 (10.8)	7 (11.3)	7 (10.1)
Total affirmative answers	88 (17.0)	43 (17.3)	45 (16.8)
Number of possible affirmative answers	516	248	268

The human interest frame allows for ‘humanisation’ of a given report. Affirmative answers to question 2 (whether the report was personalized, meaning whether the issue was presented from an individual/human perspective) can be found in one out of four TVN and TVP reports. This frame also presents the issue or matter in the context of influence on the individual or group. The least amount of affirmative answers were given to question number 4, does the report regard private matters of people or treats their reactions as a point of reference?

Via this frame portrayed was information on the death of a 65 year old man left in front of a hospital (TVN), on parishioners from Radnica demanding the dismissal of their parish priest (TVN), on the flood in Istanbul from the perspective of its inhabitants (TVN and TVP), on a wave of suicides at French Telecom (TVP) and on people suing their town authorities for paying too much rent for council flats (TVP).

Table 5. “Responsibility” frame (in brackets percentage of affirmative answers, N = total number of news reports)

	TVN + TVP (N=129)	TVN (N=62)	TVP (N=69)
Question 1	34 (26.3)	15 (24.2)	19 (28.3)
Question 2	8 (6.2)	5 (8.0)	3 (4.3)
Question 3	9 (6.9)	4 (6.4)	5 (7.2)
Question 4	3 (2.3)	1 (1.6)	2 (2.9)
Total affirmative answers	54 (10.5)	25 (10.1)	29 (10.8)
Number of possible affirmative answers	516	248	268

The “responsibility” frame focuses on who is responsible or guilty regarding a given matter. This takes place in one out of four news reports. However, there are very few reports (2–3%) which indicate how or by who the given issue should be solved (question No. 4). Reports containing this frame regarded ZUS employees accusations of corruption (TVN and TVP), daughter not adhering to instructions on how to aid her sick mother (as a result, the mother died), and vaccines for the AH1N1 virus (TVP).

Table 6. “Morality” frame (in brackets percentage of affirmative answers, N = total number of news reports)

	TVN + TVP (N=129)	TVN (N=62)	TVP (N=69)
Question 1	14 (10.8)	8 (12.9)	6 (8.9)
Question 2	5 (3.8)	3 (4.8)	2 (2.9)
Question 3	13 (10.01)	8 (12.9)	5 (7.2)
Question 4	6 (4.6)	3 (4.8)	3 (4.3)
Total affirmative answers	38 (7.4)	22 (8.9)	16 (6.0)
Number of possible affirmative answers	516	248	268

It is easiest to determine whether a news report meets the first criterion, that is if it deals with morality. Generally, either journalists or other sources provide a moral judgment of events or issues presented. On the other hand, it is rare that news reports directly focus on religious dogmas, ethical values or show moral ideals to be followed. “Morality” frame reports included news on joint prayers of representatives of different religions at Auschwitz (TVP), disputes and apologies among politicians (TVN), discussion on the Sejm act on in-vitro fertilization and politicians advertising newspapers (TVN).

Table 7. “Economics” frame (in brackets percentage of affirmative answers, N = total number of news reports)

	TVN + TVP (N=129)	TVN (N=62)	TVP (N=69)
	19 (14.7)	8 (12.9)	11 (15.9)
Question 1	21 (16.2)	10 (16.1)	11 (15.9)
Question 3	15 (11.6)	7 (11.3)	8 (11.9)
Question 4	2 (1.5)	0 (0.0)	2 (3.0)
Total affirmative answers	57 (11.0)	25 (10.1)	32 (11.9)
Number of possible affirmative answers	516	248	268

As far as the “economics” frame, most affirmative answers were given to the first question – does the report present an event or problem in terms of economic consequences for an individual, group, institution, region, or state? The least, surprisingly, to question 4, on the influence of economy on daily life (1.5%). Reports with the “economics” frame regarded a record budget deficit (TVP), Putin’s statements on gas trade with Poland (TVN) and the sale of Opel company (TVN and TVP).

Conclusion

The carried out analysis shows that news reports presented in key news services on two major TV networks (with 3 to 5 mln viewers) can be described using the framing theory. Some news reports (less than 20%) could not be categorized into any of the above described frames. Most, however, met the set criteria. The majority of news reports were presented using the “conflict” frame; one out of three TVN reports and over 20% of TVP reports. The “morality” frame was applied least often, in about 7.5% of cases. Second most popular was the “human interest” frame. It shows that dominant on TV news broadcasts are the so called personal points of view and presentation of the world as a place full of conflict, arguments and controversies. Is it a permanent tendency and would viewer opinions confirm this observation? In order to answer this question, required would be further research and analysis.