

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

In this final chapter, the researcher presented the conclusions of all the findings that were found in the previous chapter and provided suggestions for future researchers who would like to conduct this study.

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the findings of this research, both the *New York Times* and *Al-Jazeera* had their own style in presenting the Hamas attack to the readers. This research aims to analyze Richardson's three analytical tools to uncover bias in reporting Hamas attack. First, in lexicalization analysis, these news articles used some lexical choices to frame the actors. The second, in referential strategy analysis to categorize framing to the actors. The third, is predication strategy analysis to describe the representation of the event.

The result of this research revealed that in lexicalization analysis, the lexical choices employed by the *New York Times* and *Al Jazeera* reveal distinct ideological narratives in their framing of the actors involved in the conflict. Which is classified into three roles, the first role is military actor, the *New York Times* image as a counter-terrorism perspective, using terms such as '*terrorists*', '*militants*', and '*attackers*' to describe Palestinian groups, thereby reinforcing a negative portrayal and delegitimizing their resistance. In contrast, Israeli military actors are framed as '*Israel military*' and '*reservists*' which emphasize institutional authority rather than aggression. *Al Jazeera*, on the other hand, employs terms such as '*resistance*

fighters’ and *‘Palestinian resistance group’* to frame Palestinian groups as engaged in a legitimate struggle, while referring to Israeli military forces as *‘Israel’s military’* and *‘Israeli troops’* highlighting their institutionalized power rather than their actions. Continuously, the second role in the political leadership of each side is also framed differently. The *New York Times* marginalizes Palestinian political actors by associating them with external forces such as *‘Iran-backed militants’* and *‘Israel’s enemies’* while largely omitting direct references to Palestinian governance structures. Conversely, Israeli political actors are individualized and legitimized through names and official titles, reinforcing their credibility and authority. Meanwhile, *Al Jazeera* presents Palestinian political actors within a broader geopolitical context, recognizing their positions within the regional power structure of Hamas’s group. Israeli political actors in *Al Jazeera’s* coverage are often neutral being referred to the dominant force as *‘the government’*, *‘Israel’s Ministry of Health’*, *‘Israel’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs’*, and *‘Israel’s intelligence community’* and also *‘Prime Minister Netanyahu’* are named as the personal figure. The third role, the portrayal of civilians further reflects these contrasting editorial stances. The *New York Times* employs general lexical choices such as *‘Palestinians’* and *‘Gaza’s suffering’* often conflating *‘civilians with militants’*, which obscures Palestinian victimhood. In contrast, Israeli civilians are humanized through detailed quantifiers such as *‘hundreds of thousands of Israelis’* and emotionally charged terms such as *‘women’*, *‘children’*, and *‘captives’* reinforcing their vulnerability. *Al Jazeera*, while maintaining numerical balance in reporting casualties on both sides, places greater emphasis on Palestinian suffering through

specific figures such as '*1.2 million displaced*' and lexical choices as '*victims*' and '*the people of Gaza*'. This framing underscores the humanitarian impact of the conflict while still acknowledging Israeli casualties in a more neutral manner as '*Israelis*', '*residents*', and '*700 people*', creating a sense of collective identity similar to that of Palestinian civilians and providing specific and general data of Israelis casualties. The results indicate that the *New York Times* portrayed Hamas in a negative framing, did not provide political leadership of Palestinian actors, and in civilian Palestinian actors marginalizing lexical choices in reporting, while *Al Jazeera* was just representing Hamas as their ideological stance as a resistance group and the actors of political leadership and civilian from both sides portrayed neutral without adding any negative lexical choices to label the actors in the event.

Further, the results in the analysis of the referential strategy that the *New York Times* and *Al Jazeera* used in referring to the actors. It was found that in the *New York Times*, there are 9 types of referential strategies with 16 linguistic means while in *Al Jazeera* there are 8 strategies with 13 linguistic means. Both websites utilize 8 strategies such as collectivisation, spatialisation, actionalisation, somatisation, politicisation, militarisation, victimisation, and sociativation to refer to the actors involved in the conflict. However, the *New York Times* differently found (religionisation — religionyms) such as '*Jewish*', '*Ultra-Orthodox members*', and two linguistic means of criminalisation such as '*Militants*', '*the attackers*', '*Iran-backed militant group*', and negative ideologization such as '*Terrorist*', '*Antisemitism*', '*Ultranationalist*', '*terorrism*') under the social problematisation strategy, which is not present in *Al Jazeera's* reporting. Instead, *Al Jazeera*

emphasizes (politicisation — professionalisation) of Hamas perspective, while there is no appeared in the *New York Times*. and (politicisation — organization) such as ‘*United Nations*’, ‘*Israel’s intelligence community*’, ‘*Gaza’s Health Ministry*’, ‘*The UN humanitarian office (OCHA)*’, ‘*International community*’, ‘*International Court of Justice (ICJ)*’, ‘*Lebanon’s Health Ministry*’ thereby expanding in *Al Jazeera* framing of the conflict, however, these organizations do not appear in the *New York Times*.

Finally, the results of the analysis of predication strategy, the *New York Times* is positively qualified to frame the event divided into two themes. Firstly, framing emphasizes the strength of the U.S.-Israel alliance through linguistic devices (noun phrases — function of responsibility and prepositional phrases — modifiers of role). Secondly, the theme is framed positively in showing Israel's power and unity that using linguistic devices (verb phrases — express actions and achievements and prepositional phrases — modifiers of context). Moreover, in negative qualified divided into two themes. The first theme, claiming the Hamas attack through linguistic devices (noun phrases — function of perception, prepositional phrases — modifiers of context, and metaphors), also second theme is justifying Israel’s efforts that used linguistic devices (verb phrases aligned passive voice, prepositional phrases — modifiers of purpose, metaphors, and conjunctive clause — showing cause-effect). Meanwhile, *Al Jazeera* is positively qualified divided into two themes. Firstly, framing the Hamas attack as an effort of resistance through linguistic devices (noun phrases — function of objectives and prepositional phrases — modifiers of time and place). The second is eyewitnesses' justifications

through eight sentences (relative clause and prepositional phrases — modifiers of time and place). Moreover, in negative qualified, the first theme is the toll of war on civilians through linguistic devices (prepositional phrases — modifiers of time and place, comparative phrases, and relative clauses). The second theme of Israel's violation of law is through linguistic devices (prepositional phrases — modifiers of time and place and adverbial phrase). Both news media are significantly different in linguistic devices the use of comparative phrases, adverbial phrase, and relative clauses, which are only found in *Al Jazeera*'s reporting focuses on grassroots resistance mostly genericized by numeric aggregation to present readers with actual data about the number of casualties to challenge power dynamics. Additionally, provides specific time and place in prepositional phrases. Meanwhile, the *New York Times* is different in linguistic devices the use of noun phrases, and verb phrases that reflect the narratives of its institutional allies while employing abstraction and emotional appeals to validate government actions. Significantly the use of metaphors and conjunctive clauses provide the readers with historical analogies of the Hamas attack to highlight Israel's suffering, thus justifying Israel's genocide as a self-defence strategy. This contrast highlights how linguistic devices influence narratives, either masking agency or calling for responsibility.

This research enhances the understanding of how critical discourse analysis is utilized in news articles, particularly in biased framing of the event. The findings also support Fairclough's (1995) theory that the power of language in shaping public understanding and legitimizing state actions, shaping social realities while also being shaped by them illustrating how discourse can perpetuate unequal power

relations. Thus, this study contributes valuable insights into the application analysis tools of lexicalization, referential strategy, predication strategy in news articles, offering a new perspective in analyzing different news media. The *New York Times* media outlet used those three strategies to justify Israel's deeds and legitimate their aggression. Similarly, *Al Jazeera's* media outlet used to create Palestinian resistance and to condemn Israeli aggression.

Overall, the present study highlights several remarks. First, CDA has proven to be a useful approach to compare the framing of the Hamas attack in two news outlets and analyze the lexical choices, referential, and predication strategy in the selected articles. CDA helps reveal the ideological use of language to represent the parties involved in the conflict and their actions. Second, analysis of these linguistic devices helps reflect bias in news coverage, more importantly, it reveals how media institutions can manipulate their readers and lead them unconsciously to adopt certain political stances. Moreover, CDA helps prove that although media institutions and news producers claim to have the authority to inform people of the truth. However, their word choices reveal that their truth would vary as regards which party of the conflict they side with.

5.2 Suggestions

This study was conducted on the Hamas attack on October 7 by using the Critical Discourse Analysis framework to analyze how the framing of actors and the event in the news coverage. This study did not cover all the dimensions of Fairclough's CDA framework. The analysis was only on the textual analysis dimension which focused on Richardson's analytical tools of textual analysis.

Future studies are recommended to investigate other media outlets, another sequence Israel-Palestinian conflict, or use different experts of Critical Discourse Analysis.

Additional suggestions, for the readers should be critical when consuming news to assess the objectivity of the information presented. This critical lens is essential because news articles are often shaped by journalist perspectives, the agendas of their outlet, or prevailing cultural narratives, which can lead to selective reporting and potential manipulation of facts. Thus, by studying these discourses being a critical lifelong learner not only learns to recognize biases but also develops the skills to understand different viewpoints. So that, this can lead to a better understanding of social issues, and becoming more thoughtful and filtering the information that can contribute positively to society, especially for future teachers who should be lifelong learners means constantly seeking to understand and question the world around them.