

Framing Philanthropy in Time of War

SHANI HOROWITZ-ROZEN
EYTAN GILBOA
Bar-Ilan University, Israel

This study examines media framing of philanthropy. It presents a new theoretical and methodological framework that combines and integrates theories and models from the fields of communication and philanthropy. The framework includes three communication components (media outlets, functions, and roles) and three philanthropy components (donors, donations, and recipients). The integration of these components yielded six frames: government substitution, individual, high-net-worth, consumer, corporate, and media driven, as well as a new framework for analysis. Content analysis of media coverage of philanthropy during two cases of warfare in Israel demonstrates examples of these frames. The findings and the framework for analysis have significant implications for the study of media-philanthropy relations.

Keywords: media, philanthropy, NPOs, conflict, war, framing, mobilization, social responsibility

Philanthropy plays a vital role during civil catastrophes, such as wars or natural disasters. Philanthropic actors and nonprofit organizations (NPOs) employ vast infrastructures to rapidly recruit volunteers and mobilize resources needed to meet pressing public needs (Katz et al., 2007). The blurring boundaries between the postwelfare state, the free market, and the philanthropic sector has reinforced the role of philanthropy as a key instrument for dealing with social problems that governments often fail to solve (Eikenberry, 2007). The media provide large audiences with vital information and updates and shape the public discourse on philanthropic giving and contribution to society. Positive coverage can encourage philanthropic giving and enhance NPOs' public legitimacy (Simon, 1997). During warfare, the mass media, philanthropists, and NPOs form a mutually beneficial special relationship. The media helps NPOs to accomplish their mission, while NPOs and philanthropists provide a plethora of interesting and emotional human interest stories. Despite the media's significant contributions to the promotion of philanthropic activity and to public discourse on philanthropy during war, existing research on these issues is scarce and very limited (Seo et al., 2012).

Shani Horowitz-Rozen: shanihz@gmail.com

Eytan Gilboa: Eytan.Gilboa@biu.ac.il

Date submitted: 2015-10-29

Copyright © 2018 (Shani Horowitz-Rozen and Eytan Gilboa). Licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives (by-nc-nd). Available at <http://ijoc.org>.

Scholars have investigated media coverage of philanthropy in emergencies and natural disasters (Brown & Minty, 2006; Einolf, Philbrick, & Slay, 2013; Seo et al., 2012; Simon, 1997; Waters & Tindall, 2011;). They have mostly used quantitative methodology to measure possible correlations, primarily in the U.S., between the scope of media coverage of natural disasters and levels of fundraising. Others have explored the scope of attention the public gives to news about international disasters (Bennett & Kottasz, 2000; Martin, 2013). Very few have examined the media's social functions and roles in time of war and none have viewed the media as an independent philanthropic dynamic actor.

This study attempts to fill the theoretical and methodological void in this interdisciplinary field. It offers an innovative analytical framework based on the integration of major theories and concepts from the fields of both communication and philanthropy. The framework presents a typology of frames and creates an innovative platform for comparative analysis of philanthropy coverage in Western liberal democracies. The framework (see Figure 1) includes three main communication components: type of media (elite, popular, financial, and new), media role and function (social responsibility or mobilization), and framing concepts; and three philanthropy components: donors (NPOs, corporations, and individuals), donations (money, goods and volunteers) and recipients (individuals and organizations). The integration of these components yielded six frames of philanthropy: *government substitution*, *individual*, *high-net worth*, *consumer*, *corporate*, and *media driven*. The framework resulted from research on the coverage of philanthropy in the Israeli media during two types of warfare: the large-scale Second Lebanon War between Israel and Hezbollah (July–August 2006), and a limited military operation in Gaza between Israel and Hamas (December 2008–January 2009).

Our qualitative content analysis has yielded interesting and useful observations about media framing of philanthropic activity during warfare. The amount of philanthropy coverage was extensive; the media served both as an instrument in the hands of philanthropic actors as well as an independent actor pursuing its own philanthropic agenda. The various media outlets created frames in line with their ideological or professional orientations. The framing was primarily episodic and favorable, although certain newspapers criticized the government for failing to provide the basic necessary supplies and services and philanthropists for seeking publicity. The framework for analysis demonstrates media frames, roles, and functions aligned with types of media and philanthropic actors. It has significant implications for the study of media-philanthropy relations.

Literature Survey

Philanthropy

A large body of knowledge is available on philanthropy, yet scholars haven't been able to agree on one clear definition (Bekkers & Wiepking, 2011; Sulek, 2010). Several definitions are based on the literal translation of the word *philanthropy* from Greek, "love of mankind," while others focus on goals and principles motivating charitable giving. Philanthropy is often equated with terms such as charity, generosity, giving, and donating.

In this study, philanthropy means voluntary giving of time or valuables, designed to meet urgent social needs (Payton, 1988; Salamon, 1992) and motivated by moral obligation (Schervish, 1998), without receiving material benefits in return (Anheier & List, 2005). By definition, statutory and governmental agencies are excluded.

Philanthropy represents a sequence of actors and acts: donor to donation to recipient (Mauss, 1990; Silber, 1998). The donor is the active actor giving or volunteering, and may be an ordinary individual, a high-net-worth philanthropist, or a corporate firm. NPOs are considered "donors" if they are framed as the active actors, responding to urgent social needs of recipients. Donations may include money, time, goods, and skills. The recipient is the actor who is in need, such as an ordinary individual, a group, or an NPO. Thus, in philanthropy analysis, NPOs have a unique place because they could be both donors and recipients. The giving process satisfies the two sides: The needy receive valuable assistance and the giver becomes a donor. This work investigates how different media outlets define and frame philanthropic actors, including elite philanthropists, NPOs, beneficiaries, and corporate firms, as well as the third sector, and giving process more generally.

Media

This study employs theories and models of media-government and media-society relations, as well as media effects. Siebert et al. (1956) suggested four normative theories of media-government relations: authoritarianism, communist, libertarian, and social responsibility. McQuail (2010) added two: development media (as in developing countries) and democratic participant (e.g., alternative media). Hallin and Mancini (2004) suggested three models of media and politics systems in Western liberal democracies: polarized pluralist, (as in France and Spain); democratic or corporatist (as in Germany and Sweden); and liberal (as in the UK and the U.S.). Of all these theories and models, the most relevant and useful for this study is the social responsibility theory, because it focuses on the media's own social roles and coverage of social issues. The theory considers the media as bounded by an ethical obligation to serve the public as a common carrier for public aspirations and societal goals and values (Coates-Nee, 2014; Siebert et al., 1956). The media should be truthful, accurate, fair, objective, and relevant (McQuail, 2010). The social responsibility model prescribes agenda-setting (McCombs & Shaw, 1993), reducing tensions, and rallying the nation (Baum, 2002).

Relations between the media and society have been defined in terms of five functions. (Laswell, 1948) described three functions: surveillance (news reporting), correlation (commentary), and cultural transmission. Wright (1960) added entertainment and McQuail (2010, p. 99) added mobilization. Mobilization is the most relevant function to this study. It entails media campaigns for societal objectives in the spheres of politics, peace, war, economic development, work, and religion.

While mobilization may be government- or self-initiated, the behavioral consequences are almost the same. The media suspends its normative watchdog role, supports the government, and reinforces national consensus. Mobilization demonstrates how communication channels could be used to promote wide political or social participation during peacetime or wartime (Gamson & Wolsfeld, 1993; Thorson, 2005). The media convey information and interpretation, ensure stability, relieve anxieties, and

strengthen social unity (Ball-Rokeach & DeFleur, 1976; Peled & Katz, 1974). Mobilization is also responsible for the “rally-around-the-flag” phenomenon—short-term increased popular support for leaders during crises (Baum, 2002).

In a few cases, the media self-mobilized to promote negotiations and peace agreements. For example, the Israeli media self-mobilized to support the Oslo peace process (Gur, 2010). During war, the media tends to self-mobilize, promote national consensus, and act within the framework of the social responsibility model. It strengthens social solidarity by highlighting positive activity and the nation’s common goals (Baum, 2002; Waisbord, 2002). In philanthropy, mobilization can be extended to Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs) and social movements that use the media to criticize governments and policies.

The media framing theory is one of several theories of media effects. Entman defined framing as “the selection of certain aspects of reality to make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation” (1993, p. 52). Framing explains how the media provides audiences with schemas for interpretation (Bora, 2011; Entman, 1993; McQuail, 2010) and how an issue can be viewed from various perspectives and construed as having implications for multiple values (Chong & Druckman, 2007).

The media can not only highlight issues but also define them as thematic or episodic. Thematic frames portray issues in general or in abstract context, while episodic frames focus on specific people, events, and processes (Iyengar, 1991). Thematic coverage would frame philanthropy within the context of social problems and governmental solutions or inaction, while episodic framing would focus on random individual acts of giving and receiving. Framing analysis reveals whether coverage is predominantly positive or negative toward philanthropy.

This study seeks to compare coverage of philanthropy across various types of media outlets. The basic distinction is between traditional media outlets—the elite and the popular press vs. the new digital media. The elite press appeals to elites, uses high language, and offers in-depth analysis and extensive commentary on both domestic and foreign affairs. The popular press appeals to the masses, uses simple language, focuses mostly on domestic affairs, and is often sensational and superficial (Lehman-Wilzig & Seletzky, 2010; Paletz, 2002). The economic and financial media belongs to the elite press.

Methodology

The empirical work reported in this paper resulted from content analysis of textual and photographic media representation of philanthropy and charitable behavior during two different types of warfare in Israel: a large-scale war in the north, the Second Lebanon War between Israel and Hezbollah (July–August 2006), and a limited military operation in the South, (Gaza) between Israel and Hamas (December 2008–January 2009). The data include philanthropy coverage during each war followed by two weeks’ additional coverage: The Second Lebanon War data extends from July 12–August 28, 2006; the

Gaza operation¹ data extends from December 28, 2008–February 1, 2009. This procedure was adapted in order to thoroughly cover each case study and its aftermath philanthropic efforts.

A comparative analysis of philanthropy coverage was performed on four different types of media (Gilboa, 2008, 2012): *Ha'aretz*, a daily elite newspaper, liberal and dovish, frequently covers social issues, and is similar to *The New York Times*; *The Marker*, a prominent daily economic and financial newspaper that extensively deals with issues of wealth, philanthropy, and governmental accountability, is similar to the British *Financial Times*; *Yediot Aharonot*, Israel's most popular newspaper combining both hard and soft news, is similar to the American *USA Today*; and *Ynet*, Israel's main news website (www.ynet.co.il). The latter represents new media's unique role in emergencies: providing instant access to news, allowing unprecedented interactivity, and serving as an essential tool to augment volunteering and sharing (Brown & Minty, 2006; Lev-On, 2010). These outlets were selected because they were the leading newspapers in each category.

Research design for this study required an integration of components from theories, approaches, models, and concepts from both the philanthropy and communication fields. Philanthropy includes process and types of philanthropy and philanthropists. The process consists of the donor-to-donation-to-recipient sequence. In this study, stories are the unit of analysis. The data corpus included all textual and visual items concerning philanthropy, NPOs, and charitable behavior or other types of giving related to the warfare and its implications for the government, the homefront citizens, and the public published in every section of each media outlet during the two cases. The sections included news reports, editorials, op-ed articles, and gossip. Content analysis of *Ynet* was performed by searching the keywords *philanthropy*, *charity*, *donation*, *volunteering*, *the Second Lebanon War*, *Gaza*, and *Northern or Southern home front* in the website's own search engine. Articles on philanthropy that weren't relevant for the case studies were eliminated from the data base.

Systematic qualitative content analysis of media output was selected to analyze framing of philanthropy during the warfare. Frames were generated and analyzed via content (e.g., key words, narratives, and compositions) and types (thematic and episodic); tone of coverage (positive or negative); type of media outlet; type of philanthropy; and media roles. Role refers here to media coverage, but also to media's proactive participation where the media initiates and conducts campaigns for various ways of giving. This role is defined here as "media intervention" or "media-driven philanthropy processes." New media framing analysis considered its unique functions and capabilities in mobilizing readers.

Framing philanthropy during warfare was examined through two case studies of Israeli media framing of two different types of warfare. Both, Hezbollah and Hamas targeted the civilian population living in cities and towns, causing casualties and substantial damage. In each case, about one million citizens spent long periods of time in inadequate and neglected public shelters.

During the war in Lebanon, Hezbollah fired over 4,000 Katyusha rockets and long-range missiles mostly at civilian targets, killing 44 citizens, wounding 1,489, and sending 2,733 into treatment for shock

¹ Israel called this military action "Cast Lead." In this work, it will be referred to as "the Gaza Operation."

and anxiety. The attacks led to a massive flight of Israeli civilians to the south and caused serious damage to buildings and property and severe economic hardship (Elran, 2009). Since 2001, Hamas and other extreme Palestinian organizations conducted missile attacks from Gaza on Israeli towns and villages. In December 2008, Israel launched a massive offensive on Gaza to stop these attacks. Hamas attacked the Israeli Southern population with about 1,000 missiles and mortar shells (Gilboa, 2012). After three weeks of fighting, an Egyptian initiative to end the hostilities was accepted (Ben-Meir, 2009).

A report by Israel's State Comptroller (2007) provided information about philanthropy during the war in Lebanon. The scope of civil philanthropic activity, both in money and volunteering, was unusually high and unprecedented in recent Israeli history. The overall value of donations in money or monetary equivalents was approximately one billion NIS (about US\$250 million). During the war, national and local government agencies failed to provide rapid assistance to the besieged population. As a result, thousands volunteered to help the northern residents, and NPOs effectively filled the gap (Katz et al., 2007) and demonstrated strong societal cohesion and empathy.

Learning the lesson of the war in Lebanon, governmental and local authorities provided more help to the Southern bombarded population, but it was still short of meeting urgent civilian needs (Elran, 2009). The two cases demonstrated Israel's third-sector activity, considered one of the largest in the world in terms of relative contribution to GDP, and the number of employees (Limor, Aisenberg, & Gidron, 2004). Although Israel is a major "importer of philanthropy," bringing in numerous large donations from abroad, the domestic philanthropy constitutes only 0.74% of its GDP. It is similar to the British percentage (0.73%) but lower than the U.S. ratio (2.1%) (Schmid, 2011).

The two warfare cases were selected for several reasons. First, they represent a combination of severe civil emergencies during protracted military conflicts. Second, in both, the Israeli philanthropic actors played a critical part, providing aid to the two home fronts. During the Lebanon War, philanthropic activities were similar to other NPOs' emergency activities worldwide (Katz et al., 2007). The cases also present different types of wars, a large-scale war and a limited military operation, and respectively different types of activities of philanthropists and NPOs, ranging from substantial help in the Lebanon War to a more limited assistance during the Gaza operation.

The theoretical and methodological foundations of this study suggest one research question and three hypotheses. The question is: *How did different media outlets in Israel frame philanthropic giving during warfare, and why and how did they construct these frames?*

The three hypotheses are:

H1: The media will become active actors, and framing of philanthropy will follow the social responsibility theory and the mobilization function.

Considering the significant roles and functions of both media and philanthropy during the warfare, we anticipate that the media will demonstrate their social responsibility, functioning as a social

actor while highlighting the philanthropy's essential contributions to the home front, and actively mobilize the public to donate and volunteer.

H2: Media coverage of philanthropy will be mostly favorable and positive toward philanthropic actors.

Following the media's social involvement and mobilization during the warfare, we anticipate that the media will frame philanthropy as a highly valuable and constructive social mechanism.

H3: Each media outlet will select philanthropy frames according to its professional or ideological orientation.

Due to the differences in professional and ideological orientations and readership, framing of philanthropy will differ accordingly. We anticipate the elite framing to be thematic and related to governmental responsibility; the popular framing to be episodic and focused on human interest stories; and the financial framing to concentrate on economic aspects of philanthropy and elite philanthropists.

Findings

Systematic content analysis of philanthropy coverage in the four media outlets, during the two cases of warfare, yielded a total of 200 news items (Table 1). The distribution among the media outlets was as follows: 28 were published in *Ha'aretz*; 79 in *Yediot Aharonot*; 43 in *The Marker*; and 50 on the *Ynet* website. The location column designates the position of the story within the paper or the website. The total number of items published during the Second Lebanon war was 134, representing an overwhelming average of four news items per day. During the Gaza Operation, 66 items were published, with a similar large average of three news items per day. This amount of coverage is unusual in comparison with routine news reports about philanthropy in all the four types of media outlets. Routine coverage yields an average of five items per week, and the items seldom appear simultaneously in several news outlets.

Table 1. Coverage of Philanthropy During Warfare in Israel.

Newspapers		The Second Lebanon War		Gaza Operation	
Outlet	Type	No. of Items	Location	No. of Items	Location
<i>Yediot Aharonot</i>	Popular	36	News	43	Economy
<i>Ha'aretz</i>	Elite	24	News	4	News
<i>The Marker</i>	Financial	34	News	9	Gossip
<i>Ynet</i>	News	40	Involvement	10	Involvement
	Website		Mobilization		Economy
			Special		Consumerism
			Sections		
Total		134		66	

The results demonstrate a vivid intensive coverage of philanthropy in the Israeli media during the two cases of warfare. Coverage of the Second Lebanon War was more intensive than the coverage of the

Gaza Operation because the humanitarian crisis during this war was longer and more acute than that of the operation. Also, while during the war in Lebanon NPOs replaced the government in helping the population in distress, during the Gaza Operation both the government and NPOs provided help and relief (Katz et al., 2007).

Frames

This study presents an analytical framework for framing analysis of philanthropy in time of war. It includes three main communication components: type of media, media roles, and functions and framing; and three philanthropy components: donors, donations, and recipients. The integration of these components yielded six frames of philanthropy: *government substitution*, *individual*, *high-net worth*, *consumer*, *corporate*, and *media-driven*. This section defines, explains, and demonstrates these frames.

Government Substitution Philanthropy

This frame, seen mostly in *Ha'aretz*, combines the suffering of the Northern home front, the extensive civil philanthropic activity and the government failures to provide adequate assistance to citizens during the Second Lebanon war. The frame dominated the coverage in the elite and the financial newspapers, and demonstrated the attributes of the elite press—macrosocial issues and “hard news.” The frame featured a thematic description of the two key social actors in the war—NPOs and state institutions—and depicted normative division of responsibility between them by contrasting the active role of the third sector with the inactivity of the government. NPOs received more frequent and more detailed coverage than the government. The frame presented the state’s heavy reliance on the third-sector and philanthropic efforts as a government failure.

Examples:

At the end of one week of fighting in the North, it turns out that the government is relying heavily on volunteering activities to fulfil the needs of the residents, in a period in which the state should be taking care of its citizens for the most basic thing—food—it is relying on...philanthropy and non-governmental bodies... This is moral bankruptcy. (*Ha'aretz*, July 20, 2006, p. 6)

“What started as a vacation from war, funded by philanthropists is turning into a real distress. One can see in the refugees’ difficulties a useful example for a welfare system that relies on philanthropy instead on regular governmental funding. (*Ha'aretz*, August 8, 2006, p. 6)

Ha'aretz's criticism of the government for relinquishing responsibility to the third sector combined episodic and thematic motifs of philanthropic activity. The thematic approach appeared in a special series of investigative articles on the national roles played by philanthropy during the war. The thematic frame presented individual cases of philanthropy recipients and consolidated the episodic human interest stories into one theme—the civil distress of the home front coupled with the government responsibility for the

suffering. The thematic coverage in *Ha'aretz* also provided much meticulously gathered quantitative data about the scope of the social distress and the philanthropic giving. This evaluative and critical frame shed negative light on NPOs, because they were presented as a marginal actor rushing to fill the government gap.

Individual Philanthropy

This frame, common in *Yediot Aharonot* and *Ynet*, praised the individual donors and recipients as people engaged in direct interpersonal giving. It was characterized by an episodic attribute that described giving as a series of concrete, random stories of individual philanthropy cases. The frame was widespread in coverage of the popular newspaper and the new media during the Second Lebanon war, and well fitted the attributes of the popular press and the "soft" emotional human interest stories. It also personified the giving process in a highly melodramatic and poetic style. The individual philanthropy frame presented two actors mutually benefiting from the giving process: the donor, who fulfilled worthy civic and moral duties, and the specific recipients, who suffered from the violence. Coverage of the giving process focused on the great tragedy the recipients were undergoing, the help provided by the donation and the compassion of the individual donor. The coverage presented recipients experiencing situations of distress and pressure due to a rocket hit, sudden food shortage and small-business closure as *force majeure*, and glorified efforts of individual donors to help. Explanations and commentary on the giving process and praise for the donors for their patriotic and solidarity actions resembled attributes of the social responsibility model.

Examples:

Police chief superintendent Shabtai... recently became Mother Teresa of Tiberias volunteering to give each day thousands of food packages to the elderly, disabled and handicapped who were confined to shelters for three weeks . . . "we searched in every shelter to find the old lady that didn't eat a warm meal for weeks, the handicapped that ran out of medicine ... we found hungry people . . ." (*Yediot Aharonot*, August 8, 2006, p. 16)

[W]hen I saw on TV that Shaul is trying to play the piano that was hit by a rocket, it touched my heart[,] said Einav . . . "I saw a man's lifetime disappearing: house, contents, memories. Immediately I thought how I as a citizen can help, even a little . . . I thought he should have my piano." According to Einav, the wish to give is one the core values she teaches her kindergarten children "you have to give from your heart and soul and this is how I gave my piano." (*Yediot Aharonot*, July 28, 2006, p. 6)

Ynet demonstrated this frame by stressing the individual donor's personal perspective and experiences, rather than the recipient. Unlike the printed media, however, the news website promoted symbolic collective actions of empathy such as organizing a solidarity flotilla and sending paintings and letters to children in shelters, rather than specific charitable actions.

Example:

Gadi and Amichai have never participated in a food distribution operation, but the distress of the people in shelters touched their hearts . . . it turns out that behind the fatigue and worry rests a handful of decisiveness . . . “we felt no danger” they say, “we came to donate wherever we can.” (*Ynet*, August 1, 2006)

High-Net-Worth Philanthropy

High-net-worth philanthropists appeared mostly in the financial newspaper *The Marker*, particularly during the Second Lebanon War. This finding is compatible with the attributes of a financial paper, most of whose readers belong to the financial elite. Furthermore, during the two wars, this paper focused on the philanthropists and almost completely ignored the recipients, who were only vaguely identified as “the town’s children” or “Northern residents.” The donation itself was mentioned in a brief and vague manner. This pattern created asymmetrical framing of the philanthropic giving, focusing on the donor’s personality and paying only little attention to the value and effectiveness of the donation or to the recipients’ urgent needs. Contrary to the individual philanthropy frame, the high-net-worth philanthropy frame rarely brought the donors’ own expressions or their personal feelings and empathy. The focus was entirely on their public image.

The financial newspaper presented three different frames of high-net-worth philanthropists: mostly negative, mostly flattering, and neutral. The negative frame was thematic, appeared in the news section, and combined attributes of criticism and cynicism about the philanthropists’ motivation and interests in giving and their expected benefits, as well as the government helplessness.

Critical frame:

As it glorifies the strength of the home front residents, the government actually says—you are on your own. Many of those that migrated to the center . . . find themselves dependent on philanthropists and nonprofit organizations. The welfare state’s safety network was replaced by bank accounts of Arkadi Gaydamak, Itzhak Tshuva, Nohi Dankner (prominent high-Net-Worth Philanthropists) and fundamental Christians from America. (*The Marker*, August 1, 2006, p. 11)

The state of Israel that has already deposited the care for the needy in private companies privatises its shelters to charities of high-net-worth—why worry for air-conditioning in shelters if Shari Arison (the most affluent individual in Israel) sends trucks with air-conditioners, DVDs and toys? (*Ha’aretz*, July 24, 2006, p. 6)

The positive and neutral frames were episodic and appeared in the social and the gossip pages of the financial paper. They mentioned prominent philanthropists, who made donations directly to the needy or via the companies they own.

Flattering or neutral frame:

Mr. Gaydamak will host about 150 families from the North in Novotel hotels chain . . . In addition he donated 500,000 NIS . . . for aiding the Northern residents. (*The Marker*, July 19, 2006, p.10).

Lev Leviev's (a prominent high-Net-Worth Philanthropist) hotel company provides free accommodation for the northern residents whose houses were damaged by the missile attacks. (*The Marker*, July 31, 2006, p. 12)

Placing these stories within the gossip section shows how the paper viewed the social attributes of high-net-worth philanthropy, as well as its low news values. The financial paper's positive frame demonstrated a proactive role: mobilizing the elite to donate by strengthening the donors' social reputation among their elite milieu. This framing was compatible with the paper's perception of its readers' interests. Unlike in the negative frame, here the paper actively maintained the elite's charitable lifestyle and presented their donations as legitimate and patriotic actions.

Consumer Philanthropy

The popular *Yediot Aharonot* played a very proactive role during both cases of warfare by advocating and pushing for "consumer philanthropy." This framing presents as a philanthropic and altruistic act the purchase of certain goods and services from the companies located at the affected areas. By purchasing goods, consumers make a philanthropic statement, showing their generosity and solidarity with those hurt most by the wars (Krishna, 2011). The patriotic context of consumer buying is a known phenomenon (Dickinson, 2005), and during crises often appears in advertising (Zeevi, 2009). During the operation in Gaza, the popular newspaper encouraged readers to prefer and purchase goods and services from factories and small businesses in violence-damaged areas in order to increase sales and maintain jobs. This frame presented philanthropic giving as a civil initiative to rebuild local businesses. It linked philanthropy to economic prosperity, based on personal entrepreneurship and capitalistic success. This framing is similar to the American media discourse in the aftermath of the 9/11 terror attacks, linking patriotism to active consumption (Dickinson, 2005).

The consumer philanthropy frame viewed readers as potential donors who fulfil civil moral duties, and potential recipients who fulfil capitalistic values of the free market. This type of philanthropy was also framed as an essential aid to national recovery and reconstruction efforts after the warfare. Interestingly, although the lists of factories and companies in the affected areas were devoid of any journalistic value, they appeared in the news pages but looked like public service advertising.

Examples:

What can us, the small consumers do to repair the war damages?

Mainly shop for products from the North; you don't have to go up there to shop, you can do it . . . from home . . . every purchase of product or service will help the Northern residents to recover. (*Yediot Aharonot*, August 16, 2006, p. 10)

The popular newspaper pushed the consumer philanthropy frame because the editors assumed that both readers and the government would appreciate the effort.

Corporate Philanthropy

The corporate philanthropy frame emerged during the Gaza Operation in the popular paper's financial supplements and in the financial paper. It mostly appeared in the news sections and occasionally in the social columns. It refers to ad-hoc giving by local and national corporate firms to residents of the Southern home front. Coverage of corporate philanthropy was episodic, focusing on random acts of corporate donations of money, equipment, services, and discounts for citizens under siege. The corporate firm was placed at the center of the frame along with detailed information about the nature of the donation. The recipient was only mentioned in passing.

Placing this type of philanthropy even within just the social or the gossip pages demonstrated public relations efforts designed to cultivate positive image for the donor. Although this pattern exists also during routine coverage of philanthropy, it was clearly amplified during the war. The newspapers assembled lists of donating companies, and the episodic framing portrayed them in a very positive light.

Examples:

The Manpower Care senior citizen home at the center invited elderly 65 and up from the home front near Gaza to stay with them until the war ends. (*The Marker*, December 30, 2008, p. 12)

Fattal Hotels & Resorts donates the rooms at the Golden Tulip hotel in Beer-Sheba for the Northern residents for a whole week. (*The Marker*, July 27, 2006, p. 14)

Media Driven Philanthropy

During both cases of warfare, the media played an active role in encouraging and promoting wide spread philanthropic behavior. Three types of media interventions were identified, all compatible with the social responsibility model and the mobilization function: "hosts' lists," "consumer philanthropy," and "instrumental activism."

The popular *Yediot Aharonot* created a process of media intervention by directly and actively encouraging readers to make donations. The paper published in the news pages "hosts' lists," which included names and contact information for citizens from areas unaffected by the wars who volunteered to host evacuated residents from the bombarded regions. The lists occupied about one third of the paper's stories about philanthropy. The paper's intervention was expressed in this unique frame, which included phrases such as "greater good," "mutual responsibility," and "opening heart and home."

The "hosts' lists" frame demonstrated a direct, emotional, and civil interpersonal giving process initiated by the newspaper, creating a "national peer group" (Einolf, Philbrick, & Slay, 2013). Within this process, *Yediot Aharonot* praised itself and the hosts—"if we do not host our brothers from the North, who

will?" (July 21, 2006, p. 10) —and framed the giving by using patriotic and solidarity attributes that enhanced its reputation among its audience.

Example:

Yediot Aharonot initiated and the public responded: Hundreds called yesterday, offering to host families or children from the home front. (Yediot Aharonot, July, 7, 2006, p. 10)

During the Second Lebanon War, *Ynet* demonstrated instrumental activism and disseminated daily information about the fighting and the home front, including survival guidelines and measures to cope with damage, psychological stress, and other major problems (Lev-On, 2010). Steering the philanthropic discourse, the all-news website also directly called on readers and audiences to assist NPOs by volunteering and donating whatever they could. *Ynet* published lists of NPOs and *ad hoc* philanthropic ventures that helped the home front, mostly in the civil involvement section. This activism created direct connection between the needy people and the relevant audiences.

Example:

Since last Thursday, hundreds of good people and NPOs activists report our editorial about various aiding activities they organize for the Northern residents . . . We had no idea how many emails will overwhelm Ynet. We are excited to find out that thousands of good people share activities such as collecting food for people in shelters, taking care of refugees etc. (Ynet, August 15, 2006).

Discussion

During the two wars, the media widely presented, discussed, and framed philanthropic needs and activities, and consequently shaped the public sense of emergency, tragedy, and cohesion (Ben-Meir, 2009; Elran, 2009). The following analysis demonstrates the complex media framing of philanthropy during warfare, and discusses its meaning in light of this work's research question and framework. The relatively high volume of media items resulted from a combination of acute security crisis, civil distress, government failure to supply the population's basic needs, and the stepping in of philanthropists and NPOs.

The social responsibility theory and the mobilization function appeared in the media's promotion of philanthropic discourse and activities. The application of this theory to philanthropy framing suggests that the media's self-declared mission was to aid society by advancing philanthropic discourse and charitable giving for the besieged home front citizens. In accordance with H1, this work argues that this role reflected both media-government and media-society relations. The media played a proactive role trying to solve social problems and not merely report on them. It functioned as a horizontal mediator between audiences, social groups, home front residents and philanthropic actors. Although the media demonstrated various types of philanthropic worldviews and active roles; all the various outlets framed philanthropy as an essential social resource during warfare; actively strengthened the public's sense of

solidarity (Ben-Meir, 2009; Elran, 2009); and assisted the home front residents to survive the damages and the distress.

Following the social importance the media attributed to the philanthropic efforts, we expected the coverage to be mostly positive, stressing the public's benefits from these actions (H2). This hypothesis however, was only partially validated. The tone of coverage toward philanthropy was mostly positive, except in the elite newspaper and in certain sections of the financial newspaper. These outlets criticized several aspects of the philanthropic giving, such as the nature of donations, the solicitation process, and the image and interests of high-net-worth philanthropists.

Different types of media outlets shaped frames according to their ideological and professional orientations, thus validating H3. The popular paper emphasized individual philanthropy and framed it as a touching individual act of giving; the elite newspaper focused on the government substitution frame and referred to the role of philanthropy in the wider context of government responsibility; the financial paper highlighted high-net-worth philanthropy; and the new media facilitated direct links to *ad hoc* philanthropic networks, and used the individual philanthropy frame to encourage the public to donate. All the frames, except the elite's government substitution frame, were episodic. These attributes are consistent with the elite paper's emphasis on the presentation of social issues in a broad perspective. The elite paper was the only outlet that severely criticized the government's failure to support the besieged population and presented the philanthropic efforts as a necessary compromise.

The application of philanthropic and communication theories, models, and concepts to the two warfare cases has yielded an analytical framework for analysis (Figure 1). The framework allows comparative framing analysis of philanthropy during war and other emergencies according to various media types and roles. It is a novel theoretical and methodological integrated tool to systematically analyze media coverage of philanthropy. It includes frames, media outlets, media roles, and philanthropic actors. It is a flexible tool, which allows partial or selective applications, such as different aspects of media functions and philanthropic processes.

The framework demonstrates three facets of philanthropy coverage by dividing the frame concepts and mobilization roles and aligning them to types of media. The vertical facet presents the three components of the philanthropic process: donors (high-net-worth, ordinary individuals, commercial companies, NPOs), donation (money, volunteering), and recipients (individual citizens; NPOs; commercial companies). The horizontal facet presents six types of media frames: *government substitution philanthropy*, *corporate*, *consumer*, *individual*, *media-driven*, and *high-net-worth philanthropists*. The upper facet presents four types of media (popular, elite, financial, and new) and two types of media roles (proactive, coverage). The dashed line presents the common areas of these attributes.

Media	Elite	Popular and Financial		Popular and New		Financial
Role	Coverage		Proactive			Coverage & Proactive
Frames	Government Substitution Philanthropy	Corporate Philanthropy	Consumer Philanthropy	Individual Philanthropy	Media Driven Philanthropy Host Lists	High Net Worth Individuals
Process						
Donors	NPOs Third Sector	Commercial Companies	Individual Citizens	Individual Citizens	Individual Citizens	Affluent Philanthropists
Donations	Money Volunteering	Money Products	Money	Money Volunteering	Volunteering	Money
Recipients	Citizens Social Organizations	Individuals Bodies	Commercial Companies	Individual Citizens	Individual Citizens	Amorphous Bodies

Figure 1. Media coverage of philanthropy during warfare: A framework for analysis.

The framework shows that in general, the media covered the entire philanthropic process, but certain outlets focused only on one component. Each cell in Figure 1 presents the three main components of the philanthropic process: type of frame, media outlet, and media role. The framework demonstrates donors’ framing attributes by the various frame concepts, which characterize each type of media outlet.

For example, the *government substitution philanthropy* frame in the elite paper showed NPOs as donors and the paper’s role as coverage. The *corporate philanthropy* frame in the popular and the financial newspapers described commercial companies as donors. The *consumer* and *individual philanthropy* frame of the popular, financial, and new media, along with the popular *media-driven* frame, identified individual citizens as donors. The financial paper presented high-net-worth philanthropists as donors. These findings demonstrate a strong linkage between types of frames, types of media outlets, and types of donors. Each media outlet concentrated on donors deemed most relevant to its audience. The popular paper and the news website emphasized individual citizens as donors; the financial paper emphasized high-net-worth individuals; and the elite paper emphasized NPOs and civil society organizations as donors.

The framework highlights the media’s intervention role in line with the type of media outlet, the philanthropic frame and actors. The proactive mobilization and the social responsibility roles are demonstrated mainly in the *consumer*, *individual*, and *hosts’ list* frames. The media-driven *hosts’ lists* frame, which appeared in the popular newspaper, is a unique phenomenon of media intervention because it replaced potential paid advertising space with promotion of non-profitable volunteering by individual citizens. This frame resembles the social function of a local or community newspaper, but since *Yediot Aharonot* is distributed nationally, during the war this media outlet created a sense of community at the nation level. The *individual philanthropy* frame of the popular paper and the news website embedded an instrumental role. After publishing moving stories of individual philanthropists’ experiences, they directly called on individuals to donate and support the besieged population.

The *consumer philanthropy* frame demonstrated how the popular newspaper called upon individual citizens to purchase products of commercial companies located at the war zones as a way to convey patriotic and solidarity feelings, and highlighted the benefits national commercial companies offered to the home front citizens. The frame promoted patriotic and solidarity feelings, bestowed legitimacy on selective purchasing, and defined the value of giving in economic and financial terms. These frames show how the media acted not just as a traditional news organization, but also as an independent actor allocating substantial space to social or commercial ventures, fulfilling wartime social responsibility through philanthropic actions.

The proactive frames presented the individual donor, i.e., the ordinary reader, as the target audience for the media driven philanthropic mobilization efforts. The proactive role of the financial newspaper was found in calls on readers to encourage high-net-worth philanthropists to make donations. This call was more subtle than the popular media's mobilization of wealthy philanthropists. By publishing positive stories about elite giving, the paper implied that donating would strengthen wealthy philanthropists' social status and reputation as patriotic and benevolent citizens.

Ynet, the news website, used positive instrumental frames loaded with popular socially and patriotic values, such as the obligation to assist a brother in trouble in order to directly encourage readers to volunteer and donate. It promoted the *individual philanthropy* frame and placed it in the civil involvement section, which focused on stories about social issues and volunteering. The website's mobilization role was reinforced by frames that played on emotional short personal stories and by assigned more responsibility to individual action rather than to structural forces, such as charity or governmental organizations. Thus, *Ynet* functioned not only as a source of news, but also as an agent of civil society. The revolutionary potential of the Internet demonstrated the ability of the new media to initiate *ad hoc* individual philanthropic activity. In that sense, the website served as a philanthropic actor, pursuing the roles and commitments of an auxiliary organization while still functioning as a news provider. This particular role increased the visibility and the favorability of philanthropic activity in the public eye.

Conclusion

This study combined and integrated theories, models, and concepts from both communication and philanthropy in order to investigate philanthropy framing during warfare. This research design was applied to two cases of warfare in Israel and yielded a new typology of frames and a framework for analysis. The six frames include government substitution, individual, high-net-worth, consumer, corporate, and media-driven philanthropy. Significant linkages were found among types of frames, types and characteristics of media outlets, and types of audiences.

This study shows that the media framed philanthropy as a legitimate and useful social and economic activity needed to effectively deal with acute social crises, often created by modern warfare and other emergencies. Both the news website and the popular newspaper functioned as active social actors by creating a unique platform for direct mobilization of the public to donate and contribute. The popular press emphasized exciting human-interest stories about philanthropy and presented a unique frame—the focus on the consumer attributes of philanthropy. The news website encouraged direct civil participation

by focusing on the experiences of individual donors. The elite press concentrated on the civil status of philanthropy and, pursued a dichotomous attitude: It encouraged private philanthropy while strongly demanding from the government to fulfil its duties. The financial press focused on high-net-worth philanthropists using both cynical and flattering frames.

This study also shows that the media serve both as an instrument in the hands of NPOs and philanthropists, and as an independent actor initiating and implementing ideas and programs. It is difficult to imagine successful philanthropy without sufficient media attention, coverage, and inspiration, especially during wartime, because the media inspires philanthropy and rewards philanthropists. Sharing the sense of emergency and civil solidarity during warfare, media and philanthropy have much in common, and both can benefit from the critical analysis presented in this article. While philanthropy is usually considered a pure and exalted act, sometimes the media frames it in a cynical and negative way. This tendency may have implications for evaluation of news values and mediation roles, which his work could advance.

The Israeli case study presented in this research is only an example demonstrating the theoretical and methodological challenges and possibilities in promoting research on media coverage of philanthropy. This case study yielded a general framework for analysis, which could be especially useful for analysis of philanthropy discourse during different cases of emergency, warfare, natural disasters, or even routine periods. It also allows comparative analysis across various countries and cultures of giving.

The work can also advance the qualitative research of cultural framing and especially framing of social change, as well as further comparison between national and local newspapers' social responsibility and mobilization roles during emergencies.

Research about elite philanthropy could also benefit from this work's methodology, analytical framework, and findings. Future research should compare elite philanthropists' framing during routine periods and emergencies, and investigate its effects on the elite's scope and nature of giving. Since philanthropy's social effectiveness depends on public legitimacy, lessons from this research may have practical implications as well, especially for third-sector organizations and philanthropists. Research is needed on the framing of the roles of NPO in public discourse during both routine periods and emergency, and comparing them with NPOs actions and media strategies.

The linkages between types of frames and types of outlets characterized by ideological or professional orientations, as well as the media's active calls for philanthropic action, could expand the theoretical discourse on framing theory and the media's unique social and economic roles and functions during war. The work also demonstrates the value of interdisciplinary research that in this particular case is the only way to advance research and understanding on a significant media and society issue. Future research could expand the media driven concept to other areas of public life, such as politics, religion, and consumerism.

The lessons also reveal the barriers philanthropy needs to cross in order to gain supportive media coverage and favorable public opinion. As this study shows, the media-philanthropy relationship yields interesting collaboration patterns, especially in time of war. The results expand the existing literature on

media and war to unexpected new territory. Applications of this work could advance comparative analysis, both theoretical and practical, on linkages between media and philanthropy in Western liberal democracies. The frames typology and the framework for analysis, suggested in this study, may provide tools necessary to promote systematic research on media-philanthropy relations.

References

- Anheier, H.K., & List, R. (2005). *A dictionary of civil society, philanthropy, and the non-profit sector* (1st ed.). London, UK: Routledge.
- Ball-Rokeach, S.J., & DeFleur, M. (1976). A dependency model of mass media effects. *Communication Research*, 3, 3–21. doi:10.1177/009365027600300101
- Baum, M.A. (2002). The constituent foundations of the rally-round-the-flag phenomenon. *International Studies Quarterly*, 46, 263–298. doi:10.1111/1468-2478.00232
- Bekkers, R., & Wiepking, P. (2011). A literature review of empirical studies of philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 40, 924–973. doi:10.1177/0899764010380927
- Ben-Meir, I. (2009). Mivtza "Oferet Yetzuka": Heybetim politiyim veda'at hakahal [Operation "Cast Lead": Political and public opinion aspects]. *Strategic Update*, 11(4), 25–29.
- Bennett, R., & Kottasz, R. (2000). Emergency fundraising for disaster relief. *Disaster Prevention & Management*, 9(5), 352–360. doi:10.1108/09653560010361393
- Bora, P. (2011). Conceptual issues in framing theory: A systematic examination of a decade's literature. *Journal of Communication*, 61, 246–263. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01539.x
- Brown, P., & Minty, J. (2006). *Media coverage and charitable giving after the 2004 tsunami*. William Davidson Institute, Working Paper 855, Ann-Arbour, MI: University of Michigan.
- Chong, D., & Druckman, J.N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103–126. doi:10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.103054
- Coates-Nee, R. (2014). Social responsibility theory and the digital non-profits: Should the government aid online news startups? *Journalism*, 15(3), 326–343. doi:10.1177/1464884913482553
- Dickinson, G. (2005). Selling democracy: Consumer culture and citizenship in the wake of September 11. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 70, 271–285. doi:10.1207/s15326926clp0902_3
- Eikenberry, A.M. (2007). Philanthropy, voluntary association, and governance beyond the state. *Administration & Society*, 39, 857–882. doi:10.1177/0095399707306189

- Einolf, C.J., Philbrick, D.M., & Slay, K. (2013). National giving campaigns in the United States: Entertainment, empathy and the national peer group. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 42, 241–261. doi:10.1177/0899764012467230
- Elran, M. (2009). Hachazit Haezrachit bemivtza "Oferet Yetzuka": Tifkud naot muhl etgar mugbal [The civil home-front during operation "Cast-Lead": Proper functioning with a limited challenge]. *Strategic Update*, 11, 17–20.
- Entman, R. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43, 51–58. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x
- Gamson, W.A., & Wolsfeld, G. (1993). Movements and media as interacting systems. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 528(1), 114–125. doi:10.1177/0002716293528001009
- Gilboa, E. (2008). The evolution of Israeli media. *Middle-East Review of International Affairs*, 12(3), 88–101.
- Gilboa, E. (2012). Covering Gaza, 2008–2009: An Israeli view. In P. Seib (Ed.), *Al-Jazeera English* (pp. 143–163). New York, NY: Palgrave.
- Gur, A. (2010). Hatikshoret vetahalich Oslo [The media and the Oslo Process]. Tel Aviv, Israel: Ofir.
- Hallin, D.C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Israel's State Comptroller (2007). Hearchut haoref vetifkudu bemilhemet levanon hashniya [The Homefront's preparation and functioning during the Second Lebanon War]. Jerusalem, Israel: Keter.
- Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Katz, H., Elon, Y., Raviv, E., Levinson, E., Yogev, H., Yaakobi, M., & Gidron, B. (2007). *Civil society during the Second Lebanon War*. Be'er-Sheva: Israeli Center for Third Sector Research, Ben Gurion University of the Negev.
- Krishna, A. (2011). Can supporting a cause decrease donations and happiness? The cause marketing paradox. *Journal of Consumer Psychology*, 21(3), 338–345. doi:10.1016/j.jcps.2011.02.001
- Laswell, H (1948). *The structure and function of communication and society: The communication of ideas*. New York: NY: Institute for Religious and Social Studies.

- Lehman-Wilzig, S., & Seletzky, M. (2010). Hard news, soft news, 'general news': The necessity and utility of an intermediate classification. *Journalism*, 11(10), 37–56. doi:10.1177/1464884909350642
- Lev-On, A. (2010). Tifkudey media hadashim bishat herum: Hamikre shel milhemet levanon hashniya [New media functioning during emergency: The case of the Second Lebanon War]. Tel-Aviv, Israel: Haim Herzog Institute for Communication, Society and Politics, Tel-Aviv University.
- Limor, N., Aisenberg, S., & Gidron, B. (2004). *Israel's third-sector*. Jerusalem, Israel: Kahanoff Foundation & Yad Hanadiv.
- Martin, J.A. (2013). Disasters and donations: The conditional effects of news attention on charitable giving. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*, 25(4), 547–560. doi:10.1093/ijpor/eds044
- Mauss, M. (1990). *The gift: Forms and functions of exchange in archaic societies*. London, UK: Routledge.
- McCombs, M.E., & Shaw, D.L. (1993). The evolution of agenda-setting research: Twenty-five years in the marketplace of ideas. *Journal of Communication*, 43(2), 58–67. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01262.x
- McQuail, D. (2010). *McQuail's mass communication theory* (6th Ed.). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Paletz, D. (2002). *The media in American politics*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Payton, R.L. (1988). *Philanthropy: Voluntary action for the public good*. New York, NY: American Council on Education/Macmillan.
- Peled, T., & Katz, E. (1974). Media functions in wartime: The Israel home front in October 1973. In J.G. Blumler & E. Katz (Eds.), *The uses of mass communication: Current perspectives on gratifications research* (pp. 49–70). London, UK: SAGE Publications.
- Salamon, L. (1992). *America's nonprofit sector: A primer*. New York, NY: Foundation Center.
- Schervish, P. (1998). Philanthropy. In R. Wuthnow (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of politics and religions* (pp. 600–603). Washington, DC: Congressional Quarterly.
- Schmid, H. (2011). *Characteristics of the Israeli philanthropy in the 21st century*. Jerusalem, Israel: The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, The Center for the Study of Philanthropy in Israel.
- Seo, M., Sun, S., Merolla, A.J., & Zhang, S. (2012). Willingness to help following the Sichuan earthquake: Modelling the effects of media involvement, stress, trust, and relational resources. *Communication Research*, 39(1), 3–25. doi:10.1177/0093650210388407

- Siebert, F., Peterson, T., & Schramm, W. (1956). *Four theories of the press*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Silber, I. (1998). Modern philanthropy: Reassessing the viability of a Maussian perspective. In W. James & N.J. Allen (Eds.), *Marcel Mauss: A centenary tribute* (pp. 134–150). New York, NY: Berghahn Books.
- Simon, A.F. (1997). Television news and international earthquake relief. *Journal of Communication*, 47(3), 82–93. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.1997.tb02718.x
- Sulek, M. (2010). On the modern meaning of philanthropy. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 39(2), 193–212. doi:10.1177/0899764009333052
- Thorson, E. (2005). Mobilizing citizen participation. In G. Overholser & K. Hall-Jamieson (Eds.), *The institutions of American democracy: The press* (pp. 203–220). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Waisbord, S. (2002). Journalism, risk and patriotism. In B. Zelizer & S. Allan (Eds.), *Journalism after September 11* (pp. 201–209). London, UK: Routledge.
- Waters, D.W., & Tindall, N.T.J. (2011). Exploring the impact of American news coverage on crisis fundraising: Using media theory to explicate a new model of fundraising communication. *Journal of Nonprofit & Public Sector Marketing*, 23, 20–40. doi:10.1080/10495142.2010.494875
- Wright, W. R. (1960). Functional analysis and mass communication. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 24, 605–620. doi:10.1086/266976
- Zeevi, I. (2009). Northern residents: Cellcom is with you: The rhetoric of Israeli advertising during the Second Lebanon War. *Media, War & Conflict*, 2, 191–211. doi:10.1177/1750635209104654