



Analysis of Arab media discourse after the Gaza ceasefire: A comparative analysis of post-conflict and reconstruction narratives

Mohammad N. Shatnawi / PHd*

Press and Media Officer, Médecins Sans
Frontières (MSF)
Med.shatnawi@gmail.com

Mohammed Senouci

PhD Candidate, Faculty of International
Relations, University of Algiers
mohammed.senouci2000@gmail.com

Received: 16/02 /2026

Accepted: 02/03 /2026

Published: 31/03 /2026

Abstract:

This research aims to analyze how the language of media coverage has been reframed in four major media outlets - Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya, Al Araby, TRT Arabi - following the Gaza ceasefire declared in October 2025.

The study relied on a purposive sample of 60 news stories (15 from each outlet) published between the 8th and 12th of October. It employed qualitative analysis of the stories and examined the frequency of key indicative terms.

The findings indicate a linguistic shift from the use of war terms (e.g., “bombing”, “massacres”, “siege”) to post-conflict terminology (e.g., “guarantees”, “humanitarian corridors”, “reconstructions”), while the overall editorial ideology remained largely unchanged.

The study found that all four media outlets maintained their distinct narrative and political identities: Al Jazeera emphasized on the narrative of justice and accountability; Al Arabiya highlighted the themes of stability and security; Al Araby focused on political criticism; and TRT centered on the humanitarian-diplomatic dimension.

Keywords: Arab media, discourse analysis, Gaza ceasefire, post-conflict, communication.

* Corresponding author



1. Introduction

Media coverage of wars and conflicts is one of the most influential aspects of communication, shaping public opinion and collective awareness of the conflicts themselves and the actors involved. With the end of military operations – often heralded as the beginning of a new political and humanitarian phase - the media discourse in the post-ceasefire era becomes no less significant than the discourse employed during the war. It outlines the historical narrative, frames accountability, and redistributes renegotiates symbolic roles between the “victim,” the “perpetrator,” and the “rescuer.”¹

Gaza is a singular instance in the history of Arabic media coverage in the Palestinian context, acting as a constant testing ground for both ideological and professional aspects. The recurrent military operations against the Gaza Strip, along with the ensuing and prolonged humanitarian crises, have transformed the Arab media from a mere reporter of events into an active actor in framing the collective memory and shaping the Arab and global public opinion around the question of “who has the right to tell the tragedy?” As El Damanhoury, Saleh, and Lebovic (2025)² show in their critical discourse analysis of Arabic- and Western-language outlets, media coverage not only reports events but actively constructs narratives of victimhood, blame and agency.

With the announcement of a ceasefire in Gaza in October 2025, the media landscape shifted abruptly from talking about “bombing and destruction” to talking about “guarantees, aid, corridors, and reconstruction”. However, this linguistic shift does not necessarily entail structural change in the intellectual structure or editorial line of the examined media outlets.

From this perspective, the research raises its central question about the extent to which Arab channels are capable of reframing the media coverage to reflect a genuine shift from a rhetoric of conflict to one centered on peace and reconstruction, or whether such coverage has merely reproduced the same ideological frameworks in a new humanitarian form.

This question takes on greater significance in light of the increasing shift in functions of the Arabic Transnational Media, which is no longer limited to news reporting, but has also become a tool for shaping political positions and public perceptions within the region and beyond.

The comparison among the four media outlets - Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya, Al Araby, TRT Arabia -reveals the diversity of the political, economic, and cultural



frameworks that govern the editorial landscape. While Al Jazeera adopts a rights-based discourse that focuses on justice and accountability, Al Arabiya focuses on security, stability, and realistic politics. Meanwhile, Al Araby reintroduces the conflict as an open political conflict that demands collective accountability, whereas TRT Arabia combines the humanitarian and diplomatic dimensions, in line with Türkiye's foreign policy that combines "human victimhood" and "political mediation."

On this basis, the study proceeds from the assumption that the linguistic shift in news after the ceasefire in Gaza was largely symbolic rather than structural. The continuity of each outlet's distinctive discursive patterns associated with their political and economic structures remained the dominant feature across the coverage of all four media outlets.

This research aims to analyze these shifts by applying the framing theory and the critical discourse analysis on a purposive sample of news in the first five days following the implementation of a ceasefire in Gaza.

Research questions:

1. How did the four Arabic media outlets shift their media discourse after the implementation of a ceasefire in Gaza?
2. What are the dominant narrative frameworks in each outlet (at the humanitarian, political, security, diplomatic, justice, and reconstruction levels)?
3. To what extent do the linguistic shifts reflect a transformation in the media's ideological structure and political orientation?
4. To what extent do these narratives influence the formation of an Arab collective consciousness regarding justice, accountability, and reconstruction in Gaza?

Significance of the Study

The importance of this study lies in its quest to link between the linguistic analysis and the political, regional, and media context

The importance of this study lies in its efforts to link linguistic analysis to the regional political and media context, highlighting how the language used in the media influences the reconstruction of meaning after the war.



While most previous studies have focused on analyzing the discourse in times of armed conflicts, this research offers a new contribution by analyzing the post-conflict phase - a stage that is often overlooked by scholars despite its importance in defining the path of human justice and building a sustainable peace.

The study also contributes to enriching the academic discussion around the concept of “transitional media” and its role in the transition from the narrative of war to the narrative of reconstruction. This is a central issue in contexts where there are recurring conflicts, such as in the Middle East.

2. Theoretical Framework and Literature Review

2.1 Framing Theory

One of the most important ideas for analyzing journalistic speech is the Media Framing Theory. According to the notion, these sources actively reshape news reporting by focusing on a "narrative angle" that emphasizes some elements while hiding others³.

Framing, according to Entman (1993)⁴, is "picking specific elements of a perceived reality and emphasizing them in a communicative text to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation".

According to Hoskins and O'Loughlin (2010)⁵, the frameworks used to cover conflicts differ in terms of humanitarian, political, diplomatic, security, and justice elements. These frameworks reflect the biases of the media outlets and the ideological environments in which they operate.

Framing frequently takes on a mobilizing role during military operations during times of conflict, but after the truce, it may change to administrative or developmental framing. Therefore, it is crucial to look at this change after the truce was announced. Reconstruction, accountability, and a return to civilian life are among the priorities that are expected to be reflected in the new phase (Wolfsfeld 1997)⁶.

But according to other research, "a shift in language does not necessarily imply a shift in ideology" (Wolfsfeld, 2021)⁷. Without altering their political stance or their institutional relationships with the authorities, media outlets can substitute language associated with reconstruction for terms relating to war.



2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

The critical discourse analysis is based on the premise that the language is not a neutral tool but an active force that shapes power and knowledge (Fairclough 1995⁸; van Dijk 2008⁹).

This approach is concerned with revealing the mechanisms through which the media discourses contribute to the entrenchment or resistance of power structures through the choice of terminology, the order of events, and the distribution of actors between “blameworthy,” “savior,” and “victim.”

In the Arab world, this approach gains additional significance because media does not operate in an isolated environment, but rather in a sphere where the political, the economic, and the ideological intersect.

From a discourse analysis perspective, media texts produced after the ceasefire can be analyzed on three levels:

1. The linguistic level: Vocabulary, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, the chronology of events.
2. The structural level: Order of paragraphs, sequence of events, wording of titles.
3. The ideological level: The implicit goals and political references of the media institution.

This analysis helps explain how these media outlets maintain the consistent narrative identity despite the recent political changes, and how concepts such as “truce”, “guarantees”, and “reconstruction” are reproduced within a semantic network bearing the traces of war itself.

2.3 Peace Journalism

Seow Ting Lee (2010)¹⁰ introduced the concept of peace journalism as an alternative to “violence-centric journalism,” advocating for coverage that considers solutions and focuses on the root causes of conflict, not just its symptoms.



Lynch and McGoldrick (2005)¹¹ argue that the media can be a "constructive actor" in the transition from war to peace if it provides coverage that amplifies civilian voices and avoids the usual binary simplification of "victory" and "defeat."

In the Arab context, applying this model presents structural challenges, as major media institutions find it difficult to detach themselves from official political discourse or regional polarization.

While some channels rely on narratives of "humanitarian victimhood," others focus on "stability and sovereignty," making the concept of "peace journalism" in the Arab context more akin to a transitional model that balances political positions with humanitarian demands. Recent studies (Hanitzsch 2023)¹² indicate that Arab journalism in conflict zones remains trapped in the "event-reaction" dichotomy, lacking the necessary distance for self-criticism or for holding local and international actors accountable for their post-war commitments.

Hence the importance of analyzing media discourse after a ceasefire, as a practical test of the Arab media's ability to shift from immediate coverage to transformative narratives that contribute to justice and the construction of collective memory.

3. Methodology

3.1. Study Design

This study adopted a descriptive analytical comparative design that combines qualitative and quantitative descriptive approaches, with the aim of analyzing media discourse in four major Arab channels — Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya, Al Araby, and TRT Arabic — during the first days following the ceasefire in Gaza in October 2025.

This design allows for the examination of shifts in media language and news narratives within a specific time frame October 8–12, 2025, the first five days after the ceasefire capture the discursive reframing period, which is considered the most indicative of the reshaping of discourse immediately after the end of military operations.



The analysis was based on the premise that the post-war period is not one of linguistic neutrality, but rather one of redistribution of symbols and meanings, and that each media outlet reproduces its own narrative in line with its editorial policy and geopolitical positioning.

3.2 Study population and sample

The study population consisted of news coverage published on the digital platforms (websites and official social media accounts) of the four channels between October 8 and 12, 2025.

From this community, a purposive sample of 60 media items was selected, with 15 items from each medium, based on the following criteria:

- The item must directly address the post-ceasefire period.
- It must include references to issues of humanitarian aid, reconstruction, guarantees, the return of displaced people, or accountability.
- The material must be original and produced by the channel itself (no external agencies or reports).

The materials were reviewed manually and selected to ensure diversity in media type (news bulletins, reports, analyses, and videos).

3.3 Analysis tools and coding procedures

The study used a combination of two complementary tools:

1. Qualitative Discourse Analysis:

The texts were analyzed in terms of vocabulary choice, sentence structure, type of verbs used, and the nature of the actors in the text (actor–object–victim).



The narrative style, headline structure, and the way the general framework of the news story was constructed were also taken into account.

2. Lexical Frequency Analysis:

This was used to identify the most frequently used words in the texts and their distribution across the four channels.

The words were analyzed semantically within six categories representing framing categories, namely:

- (F1) Humanitarian framework
- (F2) Political/Negotiation Frame
- (F3) Diplomatic/Mediation Frame
- (F4) Security/Stability Frame
- (F5) Justice and Accountability Frame
- (F6) Reconstruction and Recovery Frame

Text analysis software such as MAXQDA 2022 was used to support manual coding and generate tables of vocabulary frequency within the sample.

3.4 Unit of analysis and its levels

- The unit of analysis was defined to include:
- The main title of the article.
- The opening paragraph (introduction).
- The first 300 to 400 words of the text (or the equivalent in transcribed visual texts).

Three levels of analysis were adopted:

1. Linguistic: vocabulary, grammatical and semantic links.
2. Structural: narrative sequence and distribution of roles.
3. Ideological: implicit intentions and discourse references.

5.1 Methodological Table



Analysis of Arab media discourse after the Gaza ceasefire: A comparative analysis of post-conflict and reconstruction narratives

Media outlet	Number of articles	Type of content	Time period	Most prominent frameworks
AL Jazeera	15	Reports, live blogs, analysis	October 8–12, 2025	Justice, accountability, and reconstruction
Al-Arabiya	15	Featured reports, news videos	October 8–12, 2025	Security and stability
Al Araby	15	In-depth news and analysis	October 8–12, 2025	Political criticism
TRT Arabic	15	Reports, human interest stories, diplomatic coverage	October 8–12, 2025	Humanitarian-diplomatic framework

3.6 Reliability and consistency of the analysis

The coding process was reviewed by two analysts to ensure internal consistency, and a high degree of agreement was achieved in the first pilot coding (equivalent to $\alpha = 0.80$ according to the Cronbach's alpha index).

A cross-sectional analysis of the most frequently occurring vocabulary was also conducted to verify the consistency of the results with the three levels (linguistic, structural, and ideological).

4. Findings and comparative analysis

4.1. General introduction to the results

Analysis of the entire sample (60 articles) showed that the shift in media discourse after the ceasefire in Gaza was more linguistic than conceptual.

The four channels moved from vocabulary describing scenes of violence (“bombing,” “destruction,” “victims”) to vocabulary reflecting post-war management (“guarantees,” “corridors,” “return,” “reconstruction”), without



any radical change in the ideological structure or political frame of reference of each media outlet.

The degree of focus on justice, stability, humanity, and mediation varied according to editorial policies and geopolitical positions.

The following is a detailed presentation of the results for each media outlet:

4.2 Al Jazeera: Discourse of Justice and Accountability

Al Jazeera's coverage after the ceasefire continued to focus on the framework of justice and accountability.

While the channel used new vocabulary expressing “calm” and “the start of the implementation of the agreement,” its editorial line remained linked to concepts of violation, responsibility, and the need for international accountability.

Among the most prominent terms repeated in its coverage were: violations, international law, justice, accountability, reconstruction, and aid.

Textual analysis showed that Al Jazeera continued to emphasize that “the ceasefire does not mean the end of suffering,” reflecting a narrative that keeps the war present in the political memory by transforming it into an ongoing legal-moral issue.

The following textual examples are taken from the channel's website on October 10, 2025: "Gaza after the agreement: the truce holds, and thousands of displaced people begin to return to their homes amid calls to hold those responsible for violations accountable."

Phrases like "international accountability" and "pressure on the international community" are frequently used in this discourse, which is a continuation of the channel's rights-based model and reinforces the narrative of transitional justice rather than the conventional narrative of peace.



4.3 Al Arabiya: Security and Stability Discourse

Al Arabiya prioritized technical and institutional terminology over human rights or humanitarian language, concentrating on the security-stability framework.

The majority of headlines, including "US and international efforts to ensure compliance with the truce" and "Implementation of the first phase of the ceasefire is proceeding in an orderly manner," were written in a procedural language.

These headlines demonstrate a shift toward focusing on security guarantees and the US diplomatic role in monitoring the ceasefire.

A vocabulary analysis revealed a high prevalence of words such as stability, coordination, de-escalation, guarantees, security, and control.

The channel also employed ostensibly neutral language, but tended to legitimize the international guarantors more than to emphasize the humanitarian or human rights dimensions of the conflict.

It could be argued that Al Arabiya reproduced the administrative logic of the crisis, treating the ceasefire as a “negotiated” event subject to on-the-ground management, rather than as a political or moral shift.

This pattern aligns with its previous narratives during the conflict, which focused on “restoring calm” and “controlling the borders.”

4.4 Al Araby: Political Criticism Discourse

The analysis revealed that Al-Araby TV maintained a clear critical discourse characterized by a political-critical framework.

Most of its reports addressed the ceasefire from the perspective of questioning international commitments and expressing distrust in the continuation of the truce or the intentions of the guarantor parties.



Headlines were phrased analytically, such as: “Do the parties have the ability to solidify the truce?” and “Reconstruction is hostage to political will, not humanitarian aid.”

Responsibility, commitments, pressures, guarantees, reconstruction, and negotiations were among the most frequently used terms.

This discourse tends to hold international and regional actors responsible for the continuation of the crisis, while highlighting the humanitarian dimension from a critical, rather than emotional, perspective.

It is evident that Al-Araby sought to politicize the debate surrounding reconstruction, attempting to transform it into an international accountability issue concerning “who controls the funding” and “who holds the decision-making power.”

This reflects an analytical approach closer to independent media that links the political and economic structures in interpreting the course of events.

4.5 TRT Arabic: Humanitarian-diplomatic mediation discourse

TRT Arabic's coverage blended humanitarian and diplomatic approaches, with a particular focus on Turkey's role in international mediation.

The coverage was characterized by its emotional language, highlighting the suffering of civilians and the importance of "transforming the truce into a lasting peace," while also emphasizing Turkish and regional efforts to "open humanitarian corridors."

The most frequently used words were: opportunity, peace, mediation, aid, hope, and reconstruction.

One report published on October 10, 2025, was titled:

“Details of the first phase of the ceasefire agreement in Gaza... Humanitarian corridors and hopes for reconstruction.”



Analysis of Arab media discourse after the Gaza ceasefire: A comparative analysis of post-conflict and reconstruction narratives

This discourse shows the channel's keenness to combine humanitarian symbolism with diplomatic legitimacy, presenting Turkey as a “constructive actor” seeking to link politics with humanitarianism.

This model reflects what is known in the literature as the mediative frame, which combines empathy with political effectiveness.

4.6 General comparison between the four channels

The general trends can be summarized as follows:

Media outlet	The prevailing framework	Language used	General perspective	Key vocabulary
AL Jazeera	Justice and accountability	Legal and incitement to accountability	Post-war as a legal issue	Justice Violations International Law Reconstruction
Al-Arabiya	Security and stability	Technical and institutional	Post-war as field management	Security Stability Coordination Guarantees
Al Araby	Political criticism	Analytical and skeptical	Post-war as a forum for political accountability	Commitments Pressures Negotiations Reconstruction
TRT Arabic	Humanitarian-diplomatic mediation	Emotional and conciliatory	Post-war as an opportunity for peace	Mediation Peace Hope Aid

The comparison shows that each medium reproduced its previous rhetorical identity in the post-conflict phase, such that the truce did not bring about a break but rather a formal reshaping of the language and vocabulary of the narrative.

The “transformation” was limited to a shift in vocabulary from military to civilian, without any real change in meaning or ideological framework.



5. Discussion and theoretical implications

5.1 Between linguistic change and ideological continuity

The results show that the shift in Arab media discourse after the ceasefire in Gaza was linguistic rather than structural, i.e., it was limited to replacing military vocabulary with humanitarian or diplomatic terms without accompanying change in the ideological framework underlying the narrative.

The four channels adopted the language of “reconstruction,” “aid,” and “humanitarian corridors,” but they reused it within the same old discourse structures, which is consistent with Entman's (1993)¹³ hypothesis that media frames function as stable interpretive templates that reproduce reality in a way that is consistent with the interests of the media institution. (1993)¹⁴ that media frameworks function as stable interpretive templates that reproduce reality in a manner consistent with the interests of the media institution.

This conclusion confirms that the post-conflict phase is not necessarily a transitional phase in media discourse, but may rather represent an extension of previous meanings in a new language.

Al Jazeera, for example, maintained its human rights discourse focused on accountability, while Al Arabiya maintained an institutional security approach that legitimizes the international role, and TRT Arabic continued to represent Turkey as a diplomatic-humanitarian actor.

Al-Arabiya, meanwhile, remained the most critical of official narratives, making it the closest to what Van Dijk (2008)¹⁵ calls “resistant discourse,” which seeks to deconstruct the authoritarian structure of meaning.

5.2 The media as an actor in the post-war phase

The results show that the Arab media in the Gaza context played a role in changing the ideas of "stability," "reconstruction," and "peace" in addition to serving as a conduit for the truce.



The terminology used to discuss the ceasefire helps determine the topics of public discussion, such as "who is accountable," "who finances," and "who owns the narrative."

This is in line with Bourdieu's (1991)¹⁶ concept of symbolic power, which holds that the media has the authority to decide what constitutes an event, what constitutes a "violation," and what is left out of the discourse as a minor detail.

From this perspective, it can be said that the Arab media contributed to managing the post-war narrative rather than seeking to deconstruct it.

While the channels presented an image of Gaza gradually recovering, they rarely exercised long-term accountability towards those responsible for destroying infrastructure or disrupting reconstruction.

Thus, the discourse shifted from criticism of the occupation to limited, circumstantial criticism that did not touch on the political structure that produces the violence itself.

5.3 Journalism for Peace: An Absent or Postponed Model?

From the perspective of Galtung (2002)¹⁷ and Lynch and McGoldrick (2005)¹⁸, the post-ceasefire phase is supposed to represent a starting point for the transition from violence-centered journalism to solutions-centered journalism (Peace Journalism).

However, analysis has shown that this transition has not actually taken place in the Arab context.

The humanitarian language used by some channels, although seemingly close to the "peace" model, remained governed by the same political frameworks, making it more 'relief' journalism than "transformative" journalism.

This suggests that adopting a peace discourse is not only linked to linguistic transformation, but also to an institutional will to change the angle of coverage, from focusing on the actors in the conflict to focusing on the victims, the needs of civil society, and rebuilding trust.



Because Arab media is often linked to government funding or political agendas, the editorial independence required to transition to a peace discourse remains limited.

Nevertheless, partial attempts can be observed—particularly at TRT Arabi and Al Arabi—to include civil voices and analytical approaches, but these remain governed by diplomatic or critical perspectives that do not go beyond the regional framework.

5.4 Towards a Concept of Transitional Media

Based on the above, this study proposes a conceptual approach that can be called “transitional media,” which is media that does not merely cover the transition from war to peace, but seeks to rebuild collective memory and public awareness in a cumulative manner.

In this model, the media becomes an agent of transitional justice by following up on reconstruction promises, holding donors accountable, and representing victims as partners in the narrative rather than mere recipients of aid.

Arab media discourse in Gaza can be seen as an example of a partial failure in transformative change, as coverage remained hostage to the political moment, unable to move beyond the “event” to “meaning.”

In this sense, it can be said that the required change is not in the linguistic dictionary, but in the cognitive structure of media narrative.

5.5 Implications of the findings for the future of Arab coverage of conflicts

First: The centrality of memory – The continued use of war vocabulary in the truce discourse shows that the Arab media is participating in recycling memory rather than transforming it into a narrative of recovery.



Second: The challenge of editorial independence – Links to regional political structures make neutrality difficult and affect the quality of the frames used.

Third: Reform Potential: By broadening the breadth of humanitarian coverage and accountability, a distinctive Arab model of journalism for peace that adapts to the local situation without copying the Western model exactly could emerge.

Fourth: Reconstruction as political discourse: Reconstruction is more of an ideological framing exercise than a merely humanitarian issue since coverage of it is not impartial; it establishes who should receive aid and who has the authority to make decisions.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

The findings of this study reveal that Arab media discourse after the 2025 Gaza ceasefire did not undergo a fundamental shift in its ideological structure, despite an apparent linguistic shift towards the vocabulary of reconstruction and peace.

The media outlets involved—Al Jazeera, Al Arabiya, Al-Araby, and TRT Arabic—replaced the language of “destruction and battles” with that of “relief and aid,” but the core of the discourse remained tied to each channel’s position within the regional political landscape. The comparison showed that Al Jazeera maintained its human rights discourse focused on accountability and justice, while Al Arabiya focused on stability and security guarantees, and Al Arabi continued to employ political criticism of regional and international actors, while TRT Arabi combined the humanitarian and diplomatic dimensions by highlighting Turkey's role in mediation.

These patterns confirm that the post-war period did not produce a new discourse, but rather recycled old narratives in new linguistic forms, reflecting the continuing political division within the cross-border Arab media.

Theoretically, the results support the hypothesis that a shift in language does not necessarily mean a shift in meaning, and that media framing acts as a



mechanism for reproducing reality in images that are consistent with the interests of media institutions and their sources of funding.

It is also clear that the “journalism for peace” model has not yet found a supportive Arab institutional environment, and that there is still a need to develop an alternative local model that could be called “transformative journalism,” which seeks to address the roots of conflict and document justice rather than merely recounting suffering.

6.2 Recommendations

First: At the level of media practice

1. Adopt a continuous accountability approach: Coverage after the ceasefire must extend to monitoring the implementation of reconstruction promises and following up on donor commitments, rather than merely reporting official statements.

2. Strengthening civil and grassroots voices: Expanding the range of sources to include local organizations and those directly affected by the war, thus contributing to building an informal community narrative.

3. Avoiding excessive politicization of reconstruction issues: The need to separate geopolitical competition from the right of the population to recover, and to adopt a media approach that balances political criticism with humanitarian considerations.

4. Training journalists in peace journalism: Integrating this concept into media training programs, while adapting it to the Arab context.

Second: At the academic research level

1. Expand the scope of comparative studies: It is advisable to conduct studies that include both Western and Arab media to measure differences in narrative and linguistic frameworks regarding Gaza.



2. Integrate audience analysis: To understand how the Arab public receives these discourses and their impact on shaping political and social attitudes.

3. Analyze the chronological evolution of discourse: Conduct longitudinal studies to track how media discourse changes from war to reconstruction across multiple time periods.

4. Employ artificial intelligence tools in media text analysis: To increase the accuracy of analyzing vocabulary frequency and framing patterns in large samples.

Third: At the regional media policy level

1. Establish independent Arab platforms to monitor media discourse in conflicts, operating as non-governmental research bodies to evaluate media performance based on professional and humanitarian standards.

2. Encourage cooperation between media institutions and humanitarian organizations to exchange data and field information, and to avoid duplication or misrepresentation in crisis coverage.

3. Rethink the media's function in rebuilding as an agent of societal trust-building as opposed to just a reporting or commercial medium.

6.3 Concluding Remarks

The study confirms that Arab media must decide whether to stick with the war narrative or switch to one that emphasizes peace and reconstruction.

The symbolic struggle over discourse was not resolved by the truce; rather, it was framed in gentler terms without altering its fundamental nature.

Therefore, there is still a pressing need for a new Arab media that goes beyond the dichotomy of humanitarian sympathy and political emotion in favor of a critical-constructive discourse that connects justice, transparency, and human



rights as the foundation for any future media narrative concerning Gaza and beyond.

References

1. Pierre Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991).
2. Kareem El Damanhoury, Fatma Saleh, and Mark Lebovic, "Covering the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A Critical Discourse Analysis of Al Jazeera English and BBC's Online Reporting on the 2023 Gaza War," *Journalism and Media* 6, no. 1 (2025): 9, <https://doi.org/10.3390/journalmedia6010009>.
3. Paul D'Angelo, "Framing Theory and Journalism," in *The International Encyclopedia of Journalism Studies*, ed. Tim P. Vos and Folker Hanusch (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2019), 1–10, <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118841570.iejs0021>.
4. Robert M. Entman, "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm," *Journal of Communication* 43, no. 4 (1993): 52.
5. Andrew Hoskins and Ben O'Loughlin, *War and Media: The Emergence of Diffused War* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2010).
6. Gadi Wolfsfeld, *Media and Political Conflict: News from the Middle East* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997).
7. Gadi Wolfsfeld, *Making Sense of Media and Politics: Five Principles in Political Communication* (New York: Routledge, 2021).
8. Norman Fairclough, *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London: Longman, 1995).
9. Teun A. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008).
10. Seow Ting Lee, "Peace Journalism: Principles and Structural Limitations in the News Coverage of Three Conflicts," *Mass Communication and Society* 13, no. 4 (2010): 361–84, <https://doi.org/10.1080/15205430903348829>.
11. Jake Lynch and Annabel McGoldrick, *Peace Journalism* (Stroud: Hawthorn Press, 2005).



12. Thomas Hanitzsch, *Journalism, War, and Peace: Global Comparative Perspectives* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2023).
13. Entman, "Framing," 52.
14. Entman, "Framing," 53.
15. van Dijk, *Discourse and Power*.
16. Bourdieu, *Language and Symbolic Power*.
17. Johan Galtung, "Peace Journalism – A Challenge," in *Media, War and Peace in the Middle East*, ed. Kai Hafez (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2002).
18. Lynch and McGoldrick, *Peace Journalism*.