

FRAMING IN ADVERTISING MATERIALS IF *FLY ME TO THE MOON* (2024)

Dwi Ainur Riza¹, Muchammad Daffa Firzatullah², Erlis Hersetya Firda³,
Happy Julia Rahmadianti⁴, Rommel Utungga Pasopati⁵

¹²³⁴⁵Universitas Dr. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia
*rommel@unitomo.ac.id*⁵

Received: 8 February 2026, **Revised:** 12 March 2026, **Accepted:** 4 April 2026

Abstract

This study examines how the 2024 film *Fly Me to the Moon* employs framing strategies in its narrative structure and advertising materials. Using a qualitative content analysis approach, this study identifies how specific spoken and visual elements reflect four framing functions as described by Entman (1993): defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies. Goffman's (1974) concept of interpretive frameworks provides additional theoretical grounding by illustrating how characters manage identities and construct social meanings. The findings demonstrate that the film actively uses framing to humanize NASA, advance political goals, influence public opinion, and navigate moral dilemmas involving propaganda, truth, and national image. The film reveals how organizations and individuals strategically control meaning through selective emphasis, concealment, moral narratives, and visual manipulation. In conclusion, this study advances understanding of the framing strategies employed in communication and film promotion within contemporary media narratives.

Keywords: Advertising; *Fly Me to the Moon*; Framing Theory

Abstrak

Studi ini mengkaji bagaimana film *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024) menggunakan strategi pembingkai dalam struktur naratif dan materi iklannya. Melalui pendekatan analisis konten kualitatif, studi ini mengidentifikasi bagaimana elemen lisan dan visual tertentu mencerminkan empat fungsi pembingkai menurut Entman (1993): mendefinisikan masalah, mendiagnosis penyebab, membuat penilaian moral, dan menyarankan solusi. Konsep kerangka interpretatif Goffman (1974) memberikan landasan teoretis tambahan dengan menggambarkan bagaimana karakter mengelola identitas dan membangun makna sosial. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa film tersebut secara aktif menggunakan pembingkai untuk memmanusiakan NASA, memajukan tujuan politik, memengaruhi opini publik, dan menghadapi dilema moral yang melibatkan propaganda, kebenaran, dan citra nasional. Film ini mengungkap bagaimana organisasi dan individu secara strategis mengendalikan makna melalui penekanan selektif, kerahasiaan, narasi moral, dan manipulasi visual. Kesimpulannya, strategi pembingkai dalam komunikasi dan promosi film terbukti efektif dalam narasi media modern.

Kata kunci: *Fly Me to the Moon*; Iklan; Teori Pembingkai

INTRODUCTION

Fly Me to the Moon is a 2024 romantic comedy film directed by Greg Berlanti and produced by Apple Studios and Columbia Pictures. The film follows Kelly Jones, a marketing specialist assigned to rehabilitate NASA's public image amid mounting political pressure surrounding the Apollo 11 mission. Alongside launch director Cole Davis, who remains steadfast in his commitment to scientific integrity, Kelly must navigate government demands to repackage the moon landing in a manner more palatable to the general public (Berlanti, 2024; D'Alessandro, 2024; Sharf, 2024). The film foregrounds how media persuasion, visual narratives, and strategic communication shape public perception of historical events. In this respect, *Fly Me to the Moon* offers a compelling illustration of how framing operates within the context of film promotion.

This study examines the application of framing theory in the promotional materials of *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024), specifically its official trailer and poster. Drawing on Goffman's (1974) concept of interpretive frameworks and Entman's (1993) four framing functions—defining problems, diagnosing causes, making moral judgments, and suggesting remedies—this study investigates how specific messages are selected, emphasized, and organized to shape audience expectations. The central research questions are as follows: How are framing techniques deployed in this film's promotional materials, and why are these frames significant in influencing audience expectations regarding the film's narrative and genre?

The research problem centers on the mechanisms through which visual and narrative elements in film advertising shape how audiences perceive *Fly Me to the Moon*.

The film's promotional materials present not only romance and comedy but also reframe the history of the Apollo 11 landing as a spectacle charged with intrigue, humor, and discursive play (Entman, 1993; Scheufele, 1999; Matthes, 2012). This framing operates not merely through the introduction of new information but through the deliberate selection of aspects most likely to captivate contemporary audiences. This study argues that framing is a key mechanism in the success of film advertising, as it cultivates curiosity and emotional engagement from the outset.

Several prior studies have examined framing in advertising and media, although none have focused specifically on *Fly Me to the Moon*. Bryant and Oliver (2020) explore how entertainment media shapes public perceptions of historical content through framing. Vigar-Ellis and Pitt (2019) analyze how film trailers present characters and conflicts in ways that maximize emotional appeal. Widyaningrum (2023) demonstrates how Indonesian film posters deploy visual framing to direct audience interpretation. While these works differ in their objects of study and theoretical emphases, they share with the present paper a common focus on framing in visual media.

This study thus contributes a novel analysis of framing in the promotional materials of *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024), a topic that remains largely unexplored in academic literature. This approach is expected to enrich scholarly understanding of how framing practices in film advertising function, as well as how these communication strategies shape audience perceptions, expectations, and interpretations prior to viewing the film.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach to analyze the framing strategies used in the advertising materials of the 2024 film *Fly Me to the Moon*. The analysis focuses on how the official trailer and poster construct meaning through selective emphasis, visual cues, and narrative highlights. The study draws on Goffman's (1974) interpretive framework and Entman's (1993) four framing functions to examine how promotional media shape audience perception prior to viewing the film. Data were analyzed through content analysis, which involved collecting primary promotional materials, reviewing relevant scholarly literature, closely examining visual and narrative elements in the advertisements, comparing findings with prior studies on media framing, and accurately citing all referenced sources in the final documentation.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Advertisements in *Fly Me to the Moon*

A framing analysis of *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024) reveals how the film constructs audience perceptions of truth, morality, and national identity through selective information presentation and narrative construction. The film demonstrates that framing—rather than factual accuracy alone—determines how characters interpret events and justify their conduct. Informed by the theoretical frameworks of Entman (1993) and Goffman (1974), the narrative shows how individuals and institutions deliberately emphasize, suppress, or reframe aspects of reality in order to manage meaning. This section examines significant scenes in which characters explicitly employ framing to contest morality, control public perception, and influence decision-making. The following data were drawn from the film:

Data 1

Kelly Jones : “We are working for NASA to sell the moon.” (00:20:24)

This line literalizes Kelly's mission: to “sell the moon”—that is, to package the moon landing as a media product for public consumption. In Entman's framework, this exemplifies *frame building*, which prioritizes the commercial dimensions of a space mission over its scientific significance. The dialogue implies that NASA employed marketing strategies to shape public perception of the lunar landings, constructing Kelly as both an agent and instrument of institutional image-making.

Data 2

Cole Davis: “If you fake this mission, every single thing that we have sacrificed will have been for nothing.” (00:29:16)

Cole frames potential falsification as a moral threat capable of erasing all of NASA's institutional sacrifices. This reflects Entman's (1993) concept of *causal interpretation*: Cole links deception to the collapse of institutional integrity, legitimacy, and trust. The framing also implies a *treatment recommendation*—restoring public trust in NASA requires strict adherence to its procedures and scientific principles. From Goffman's (1974) perspective, Cole's professional identity frame—grounded in honesty and scientific devotion—prevents him from accepting narrative manipulation, which Goffman would describe as an attempt to alter the social meaning of the mission.

Data 3

Cole Davis: “NASA's not something that you sell with a jingle and a slogan.” (00:32:08)

Cole rejects the idea that NASA can be promoted like an ordinary commercial product. This statement constitutes a *moral evaluation* within Entman's (1993) framing theory: Cole argues that reducing NASA to catchy slogans risks undermining its scientific legitimacy and symbolic cultural value. NASA's framing of scientific missions should not be conflated with entertainment-driven marketing strategies. The statement also carries an implicit *treatment recommendation*: preserve NASA's identity as a scientific institution rather than allow it to be reshaped by advertising logic. Cole's resistance aligns with Goffman's (1974) concept of institutional identity frames, illustrating how individuals defend the cultural meaning of an organization when external forces attempt to redefine it.

Data 4

Kelly Jones: "NASA's not just a logo, it's people. People who wake up every morning and commit to accomplishing the impossible." (00:32:35)

Kelly constructs a moral and emotional frame that humanizes the institution, aligning with Entman's (1993) framing functions. She redefines the problem by shifting public focus away from NASA as a distant symbol and toward the individuals whose dedication drives every mission. This functions simultaneously as a *moral evaluation*—encouraging audiences to value the human effort and sacrifice behind space exploration—and as a *treatment recommendation*: public support for NASA should be grounded not in brand recognition but in genuine appreciation for the people behind the work. This framing echoes Goffman's (1974) notion of collective identity framing, as Kelly attempts to construct a shared perception of NASA as a community of committed individuals rather

than a bureaucratic institution, thereby strengthening its emotional legitimacy and public standing.

Data 5

Moe Berkus: "The whole world will be watching. We can't afford to lose." (00:59:29)

Moe's statement constructs a high-stakes geopolitical frame, elevating the mission from a technical operation to a matter of global visibility and national prestige. In Entman's (1993) framework, this represents a *problem definition*: failure would damage not only NASA's credibility but also the nation's ideological standing on the world stage (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). The risks associated with mission failure must be minimized at all costs. Moe's *causal interpretation* links potential failure to political rather than merely scientific consequences, while his *moral evaluation* frames success as a national obligation under global scrutiny. His *treatment recommendation* is clear: the mission's image must be carefully managed to secure both public support and international credibility, given that what is at stake is a historical event witnessed by millions worldwide. This framing resonates with Goffman's (1974) notion of public frames, as Moe constructs the event as a global spectacle where politics, media, and national identity converge.

Data 6

Kelly Jones: "You mean to fake it?" (01:00:04)

This dialogue marks a pivotal moment in which Kelly begins to evaluate the proposed plan through her own ethical lens. According to Entman's (1993) framing theory, Kelly's immediate shock reflects the process of

problem definition: she perceives the plan not as a strategic necessity but as a morally questionable act. Her reaction signals early resistance to the dominant institutional frame, indicating that she views the situation as an act of dishonesty rather than national duty (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). At this point, a contestation of frames emerges between NASA's version—"falsification for the sake of the state"—and Kelly's counter-frame—"falsification as a manipulative act that deceives the public." This tension illustrates how framing can generate both internal and institutional conflict, consistent with Entman's view that frames shape moral judgments about actions. Manipulating a scientific achievement destined to become a permanent historical record is, by any measure, an ethically unjustifiable act.

Data 7

Kelly Jones: "No one can ever know what we're doing." (01:02:40)

This line represents a key moment in which Kelly fully internalizes her role as a frame-forming agent, consistent with Entman's (1993) concept of framing through information selection and omission. Kelly is no longer merely reacting to NASA's institutional frame; she is now actively constructing it. Her insistence on secrecy reflects the practice of *information suppression*—one of Entman's core framing strategies—whereby concealing information directs public interpretation by limiting what becomes visible or salient (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). The deliberate selection of what information is "safe" to present to the public transforms Kelly into a frame gatekeeper who controls the narrative's boundaries. From Goffman's (1974) perspective, her conduct exemplifies

backstage behavior—actions performed behind the scenes that must be concealed from the audience because their exposure would undermine the frame being constructed.

Data 8

Lance Vespertine: "My Armstrong is a whiny little bitch." (01:07:00)

This dialogue reveals Lance's engagement in *character framing*, aligning with Entman's (1993) notion of selecting certain attributes to construct a preferred version of reality. Armstrong's recorded persona is treated not as a person but as a commodity—one that must be molded to satisfy ideological and national expectations. By emphasizing negative traits, Lance justifies the need to modify or "recast" Armstrong's image to better conform to the heroic, stoic figure demanded by public imagination. This process reflects Entman's framing strategy of rendering specific aspects more salient—here, highlighting perceived flaws to rationalize institutional manipulation (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). The exchange underscores that framing is not merely a cognitive process but also an aesthetic and visual act of propaganda—a construction of reality achieved through the selection of characteristics to be presented to the public.

Data 9

Kelly Jones: "You really sold the hell out of that." (01:17:07)

This line marks the moment when Kelly acknowledges the effectiveness of the visual framing produced in the "backup moon landing" filming project. Cole—despite his earlier moral objections—succeeded in creating a scene sufficiently convincing to function as a *dominant frame*, one that presents the fabricated moon landing as a

believable reality. According to Entman's (1993) framing theory, this reflects the process of selecting and emphasizing visual elements to shape audience interpretation. Cole's convincing composition demonstrates the power of visual cues to anchor a preferred reading, guiding audiences to perceive the staged scene as genuine (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). Kelly's acknowledgment thus signals the success of persuasive framing, in which visual representations are arranged to direct public interpretation and foreclose the possibility of alternative readings.

Data 10

Kelly Jones : "I lied to so many people. The worst lies were the ones I told myself." (01:43:27)

This confession exemplifies what may be termed a *self-framing collapse*—a moment in which a character recognizes that the frames she has constructed to justify her actions no longer align with her personal moral beliefs. Throughout the narrative, Kelly had framed deception as "duty," manipulation as "patriotism," and her own role as that of "NASA's image keeper." Her admission shatters these self-sustaining frames and precipitates a moral crisis. From Goffman's (1974) perspective, Kelly experiences a dissonance between her *frontstage identity* and her *backstage reality*, forcing her to confront the collapse of the identity she had painstakingly constructed through framing. This constitutes a moral hazard: had the "backup plan" been made public with the selectively curated data they had prepared, it would have produced interpretations rather than history, imposing an enduring moral burden on all involved in the mission.

Framing Theory in Advertising and Its Continuance

Framing Theory, introduced by communication scholar Robert M. Entman in 1993, illuminates how media, institutions, and individuals shape the presentation of reality to the public. Rather than reflecting events as they occur, communication typically highlights certain details while downplaying or omitting others. According to Entman (1993), framing involves selecting specific aspects of reality and rendering them more salient in a message so that they become more meaningful and memorable to audiences (De Lenne et al., 2021; Pasopati et al., 2025; Stadlthanner et al., 2022). Through this selective process, audiences are guided toward particular interpretations of events, issues, and people.

Entman identifies four key framing functions. First, frames *define problems* by determining which aspect of an event warrants attention through the strategic use of particular angles and language. Second, frames *diagnose causes* by identifying who or what is responsible for the problem—whether an individual, institution, or broader social condition (De Lenne et al., 2021; Pasopati et al., 2025; Stadlthanner et al., 2022). Third, frames *make moral judgments* by evaluating the actions and intentions of those involved, often implying who is right, who is wrong, and why. Fourth, frames *suggest remedies* by proposing solutions, actions, or policies to address the identified problem.

Together, these four functions demonstrate that framing does more than present facts—it organizes meaning and directs how audiences think about an issue, thereby enabling them to become more critically aware of framing as a communicative practice. As Entman (1993) emphasizes, framing operates through both inclusion and exclusion: what information is emphasized, repeated, or made visible

shapes understanding just as profoundly as what is omitted or withheld. Consequently, framing influences how audiences assign responsibility, experience emotion, and form opinions (Bin et al., 2024; Gómez-Carmona et al., 2021; Saputro et al., 2025).

This theory is particularly applicable to the analysis of *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024), which illustrates how government agencies, NASA officials, and key characters actively construct narratives surrounding the moon landing to manage public perception. Through carefully selected dialogue, controlled messaging, and the deliberate withholding of information, the film demonstrates how framing can function as a strategic communication tool. At the heart of the story lies a moral conflict between truth and propaganda (Bin et al., 2024; Gómez-Carmona et al., 2021; Saputro et al., 2025). Characters must navigate the tension between presenting an idealized version of events and remaining faithful to reality—a struggle that directly reflects Entman's framing functions, particularly the embedding of moral judgments and treatment recommendations within communication.

Framing Analysis in *Fly Me to the Moon*

In Data 1, Kelly Jones's statement—"We are working for NASA to sell the moon"—illustrates how the film constructs a strategic media frame consistent with Entman's (1993) framing theory, which explains how messages highlight certain aspects of reality to shape interpretation. Kelly's words function as a deliberate *problem definition*: the moon landing is reframed not as a scientific breakthrough but as a product requiring marketing. The dialogue also performs a *causal interpretation*, suggesting that public disengagement or political pressure has necessitated the transformation of space exploration into a commercial spectacle (Bin et al., 2024;

Gómez-Carmona et al., 2021; Saputro et al., 2025). Additionally, it constitutes an implicit *moral evaluation* that critiques NASA's shift from scientific integrity to public relations, while proposing a *treatment recommendation*: media management becomes the solution for securing public support.

In Data 2, Cole Davis's statement—"If you fake this mission, every single thing that we have sacrificed will have been for nothing"—functions as a moral warning that foregrounds the ethical stakes of the narrative, aligning closely with Entman's (1993) framing functions. Cole *defines the problem* as the potential falsification of the mission, framing it not merely as a procedural issue but as a threat to the very meaning of NASA's work. His words offer a *causal interpretation*, asserting that deception will directly nullify years of sacrifice by eroding institutional integrity and trust. Cole also provides a *moral evaluation*, positioning authenticity and scientific truth as non-negotiable values, while implying a *treatment recommendation*: the mission must remain genuine to preserve NASA's legitimacy and restore public confidence. This framing resonates with Goffman's (1974) concept of identity-linked frames, as Cole's professional identity as a principled launch director compels him to reject any narrative manipulation that would alter the social meaning of the mission.

In Data 3, Cole Davis's statement—"NASA's not something that you sell with a jingle and a slogan"—reflects a clear moral and cultural *evaluation* within Entman's (1993) framing theory. By drawing a boundary between NASA and ordinary commercial products, Cole *defines the problem* as the encroachment of marketing logic into a domain that, for him, must remain grounded in scientific purpose and national aspiration. His statement implies a *treatment recommendation*: NASA's

identity as a scientific institution should be preserved rather than reshaped by advertising strategies. Notably, the framing of NASA's scientific missions should not be equated with entertainment-driven marketing such as jingles or promotional content. Cole's resistance aligns with Goffman's (1974) concept of institutional identity frames, demonstrating how individuals defend the cultural meaning of an organization when external forces attempt to redefine it.

In Data 4, Kelly's statement—"NASA's not just a logo, it's people. People who wake up every morning and commit to accomplishing the impossible"—constructs a moral and emotional frame that humanizes the institution, consistent with Entman's (1993) framing functions. Kelly *redefines the problem* by redirecting public attention from NASA as a distant symbol toward the individuals whose dedication drives every mission. This constitutes a *moral evaluation*, encouraging audiences to value the human effort and sacrifice underlying space exploration. It also implies a *treatment recommendation*: public support for NASA should be grounded not in brand identity but in recognition of the real people whose work embodies perseverance and national aspiration. This framing echoes Goffman's (1974) concept of collective identity framing, as Kelly constructs a shared perception of NASA as a community of committed individuals rather than a bureaucratic institution, thereby strengthening its emotional legitimacy and public respect.

In Data 5, Moe Berkus's statement—"The whole world will be watching. We can't afford to lose"—constructs a high-stakes geopolitical frame consistent with Entman's (1993) framing functions, elevating the mission from a technical operation to a matter of global perception and national prestige. Moe *defines*

the problem as one of international visibility: failure would damage not only NASA but the country's ideological standing on the world stage (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). His *causal interpretation* links the consequences of mission failure to political rather than merely scientific outcomes, while embedding a *moral evaluation* that frames success as a national obligation under global scrutiny. His *treatment recommendation* is explicit: the mission's "image-selling" aspects must be carefully managed to maintain public support and international credibility, given that what is at stake is a historical event witnessed by millions worldwide. This framing resonates with Goffman's (1974) notion of public frames, as Moe constructs the event as a global spectacle where politics, media, and national identity converge.

In Data 6, Kelly Jones's response—"You mean to fake it?"—marks a pivotal moment in which she begins to process the proposed plan through her own ethical framework. In Entman's (1993) framing theory, her immediate shock reflects *problem definition*: Kelly recognizes the plan not as a strategic necessity but as a morally questionable act. Her reaction signals early resistance to NASA's dominant institutional frame, indicating that she perceives the situation as an act of dishonesty rather than national duty (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). At this moment, a frame contestation emerges between NASA's framing—"falsification for the sake of the state"—and Kelly's counter-frame—"falsification as a manipulative act that deceives the public." This divergence illustrates how competing frames can generate both internal and institutional conflict, consistent with Entman's view that frames shape moral judgments about actions.

In Data 7, Kelly's statement—"No one can ever know what we're doing"—marks the moment when she fully assumes her role as a frame-forming agent, consistent with Entman's (1993) concept of framing through information selection and omission. At this stage, Kelly is no longer merely reacting to NASA's frame but actively constructing it. Her insistence on secrecy reflects the practice of *information suppression*—one of Entman's central framing strategies, whereby concealing information guides public interpretation by limiting what becomes visible or salient (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). The deliberate selection of what information is "safe" to disclose transforms Kelly into a frame gatekeeper who controls the boundaries of the narrative. From Goffman's (1974) perspective, Kelly's conduct exemplifies *backstage behavior*—actions performed behind the scenes that must be kept from the audience, as their exposure would undermine the frame being constructed.

In Data 8, Lance Vespertine's remark—"My Armstrong is a whiny little bitch"—reveals his engagement in *character framing*, consistent with Entman's (1993) strategy of selecting certain attributes to construct a preferred version of reality. Armstrong's recorded persona is treated not as a person but as a commodity that must be shaped to satisfy ideological and national expectations. By foregrounding negative traits, Lance justifies the need to modify or "recast" Armstrong's image to conform to the heroic, stoic figure demanded by public imagination. This process reflects Entman's framing strategy of rendering certain aspects more salient—here, highlighting perceived flaws to rationalize institutional manipulation (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). The exchange

underscores that framing is not merely cognitive but also an aesthetic and visual act of propaganda: a construction of reality achieved through the deliberate selection of characteristics to be presented to the public.

In Data 9, Kelly's remark—"You really sold the hell out of that"—signifies the moment she recognizes the effectiveness of the visual framing achieved in the "backup moon landing" production. Despite his earlier moral objections, Cole produced a scene sufficiently convincing to function as a *dominant frame*—one that presents the fabricated moon landing as a believable reality. According to Entman's (1993) framing theory, this reflects the process of selecting and emphasizing visual elements to shape how an event is understood. Cole's persuasive composition demonstrates how visual cues can anchor a preferred interpretation, guiding audiences to perceive the staged scene as genuine (Hasana et al., 2025; Kurniawati et al., 2025; Saputro et al., 2025; Syaif et al., 2024). Kelly's acknowledgment thus signals the success of *persuasive framing*, in which visual representations are strategically composed to direct public interpretation and foreclose alternative readings.

In Data 10, Kelly's confession—"I lied to so many people. The worst lies were the ones I told myself"—exemplifies what may be termed a *self-framing collapse*: the moment a character recognizes that the frames she has constructed to justify her actions no longer sustain her personal moral beliefs. Kelly had framed deception as "duty," manipulation as "patriotism," and her role as that of "NASA's image keeper." Her admission dismantles these self-sustaining frames and precipitates a moral crisis. Drawing on Entman's (1993) concept of *causal interpretation*, Cole's parallel moral reckoning underscores that deception erodes NASA's core values, compromises its

integrity, and invalidates decades of effort. From Goffman's (1974) perspective, Kelly experiences a dissonance between her *frontstage identity* and her *backstage reality*, forcing her to confront the collapse of the identity she has constructed through framing. This constitutes a moral hazard: had the "backup plan" been disclosed publicly, the selectively curated data would have produced mere interpretation rather than authentic history, imposing an enduring moral burden on all those involved in the mission.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of *Fly Me to the Moon* (2024) reveals that the film extensively employs framing techniques to shape how audiences perceive both the mission and its characters. Drawing on Entman's (1993) four essential framing functions—problem definition, causal interpretation, moral judgment, and treatment prescription—the film constructs coherent narratives surrounding national identity, scientific integrity, and political pressure. These functions operate in concert to guide viewers toward specific interpretations of events and character motivations. Characters such as Kelly Jones, Cole Davis, and Moe Berkus strategically engage in framing to humanize NASA, resist commercialization, justify secrecy, and manage public understanding of the Apollo 11 mission.

The analyzed dialogues demonstrate how framing operates not only within institutional settings but also through interpersonal interaction, emotional appeal, and selective disclosure of information. Broadly, the film portrays framing as a communication technique capable of governing public legitimacy, regulating meaning, and shaping audience interpretation. This study underscores the importance of critically

examining framing in political narratives and film advertising, given its significant influence on public opinion prior to audiences engaging with the complete story.

REFERENCES

- Berlanti, G. (2024). *Fly Me to the Moon*. Apple Studios.
- Bin, L., Jiaqi, L., & Aimei, L. (2024). The Effect of Annuity Advertising Type and Goal Framing on Commercial Pension Annuity Insurance: Based on the Double-Entry Mental Accounting Theory. *Journal of Psychological Science*, 47(6), 1400-1409. <https://doi.org/10.16719/j.cnki.1671-6981.20240612>
- Bryant, J., & Oliver, M. B. (2020). *Media Effects: Advances in Theory and Research*. Routledge.
- D'Alessandro, A. (2024). *Fly Me to the Moon Trailer Analysis*. Deadline.
- De Lenne, O., Vandenbosch, L., Smits, T., & Eggermont, S. (2021). Framing Real Beauty: A Framing Approach to the Effects of Beauty Advertisements on Body Image and Advertising Effectiveness. *Body Image*, 37(1), 255-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bodyim.2021.03.003>
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51-58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Gómez-Carmona, D., Muñoz-Leiva, F., Liébana-Cabanillas, F., Nieto-Ruiz, A., Martínez-Fiestas, M., & Campoy, C. (2021). The Effect of Consumer Concern for the Environment, Self-Regulatory Focus and

- Message Framing on Green Advertising Effectiveness: An Eye Tracking Study. *Environmental Communication*, 15(6), 813–841. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17524032.2021.1914701>
- Hasana, F. A., Oktavia, D., Pasopati, R. U., Wijaya, K., & Hariyono, H. (2025). Ideologies and Its Resistances in Martin McDonagh's Film *Three Billboards Outside Ebbing, Missouri*. *Educalitra: English Education, Linguistics, and Literature Journal*, 4(2), 115–124. <https://journal.unupurwokerto.ac.id/index.php/educalitra>
- Kurniawati, W. A., Siadari, Y. V. H. P., Pasopati, R. U., Andharu, D., & Fadillah, M. R. I. (2025). The Vitality of Reality Distortion in Tim Burton's *The Nightmare Before Christmas*. *Salience: English Language, Literature, and Education*, 5(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.60155/salience.v5i1.527>
- Matthes, J. (2012). Framing Politics: An Integrative Approach. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 56(3), 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764211426324>
- Pasopati, R. U., Zhafirah, M. Q., Wirnoto, Y. A. A., Fadillah, M. R. I., & Andharu, D. (2025). The Psychoanalytical Roles of Imaginary Friends in Emotional Development in *If Movie*. *Alphabet*, 8(1), 57–66.
- Saputro, D. E., Pasopati, R. U., Napitupulu, J. C. P., & Wijaya, K. (2025). Examining Quality and Quantity of Literary Works Based on Indonesian Government's Literary Development Policy. *Inspirasi: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*, 2(1), 58–69. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.alphabet.2025.08.01.06>
- Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103–122. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x>
- Sharf, Z. (2024). Behind the Scenes of *Fly Me to the Moon*. *Variety*.
- Stadlthanner, K. A., Andreu, L., Ribeiro, M. A., Font, X., & Mattila, A. S. (2022). The Effects of Message Framing in CSR Advertising on Consumers' Emotions, Attitudes, and Behavioral Intentions. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 31(7), 777–796. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19368623.2022.2065399>
- Syaif, S. M., Siadari, Y. V. H. P., Firzatullah, M. D., & Pasopati, R. U. (2024). The Preservations of Failures in Business in Ambrose Bierce's *The Failure of Hope and Wandel*. *Foremost Journal*, 5(2), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.33592/foremost.v5i2.4631>
- Vigar-Ellis, D., & Pitt, L. (2019). Emotional Framing in Film Trailers: A Strategic Promotional Tool. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 25(6), 567–584.
- Widyaningrum, G. (2023). Visual Framing in Indonesian Movie Posters. *Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi*, 15(1), 45–57.
- Wijayanto, B. P., Oktavia, D., Ayu, E. R., Putri, A. S. L., & Pasopati, R. U. (2025). The Expositions of Expressionism in Elliot Flower's *Winner's Loss*. *Educalitra: English Education, Linguistics, and Literature Journal*, 4(1), 1–12. <https://journal.unupurwokerto.ac.id/index.php/educalitra>