FRAMING OF MEDIA DISCOURSE ON TELEVISION: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ALJAZEERA AND AL - HADATH CHANNELS ON THE BOYCOTT OF PRODUCTS FROM COMPANIES SUPPORTING THE ZIONIST ENTITY

Akrem Boutora [1] Radouane Belkhiri [2]
[1] **Echahid echikh larbi tebessi university (Algeria),**
akrem.boutora@univ-tebessa.dz
[2] **Echahid echikh larbi tebessi university (Algeria),**
belkhiri.radouane@univ-tebessa.dz

Abstract: The paper dealing with Framing Media Discourse on Television: A Comparative Examination of Al Jazeera and Al Hadath Channels Regarding the Boycott of Goods from Establishments Supporting the Zionist Entitym, investigates how broadcasting shapes public opinion through linguistic and textual analysis grounded in frame theory and agenda-setting. The researchers employed quantitative and qualitative methods to analyze textual and linguistic features, providing a detailed comparison of the key vocabulary and phrases used across the two channels. The study reveals that Al Jazeera adopts an assertive, pro-boycott discourse, emphasizing themes of resistance and privilege while linking the issue to transnational, political, and economic dimensions. In contrast, Al Hadath focuses on localized consequences of the boycott, such as its implications for consumers and the national economy. Furthermore, the research highlights that the divergence in discursive strategies reflects shifts in ideological and public orientations, which influence how audiences construct knowledge and engage with the topic. In conclusion, the study underscores the importance of analyzing broadcast discourse to better understand contemporary socio-political dynamics in the region.

Keywords: Framing theory, media discourse, Arab television, boycott discourse, political communication, zionist entity

How to cite the article :

Boutora , A. & Belkhiri, R. (2025). Framing of Media Discourse on Television: A Comparative Study of Aljazeera and Al -Hadath Channels on the Boycott of Products from Companies Supporting the Zionist Entity. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture, and Society (JSLCS)8*(2), 38-60.

---

[1]**Corresponding author** : Akrem Boutora. **ORCID ID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0009-9091-2073

1. Introduction

Television discourse remains one of the most influential tools in shaping public opinion, particularly amid the profound transformations currently affecting both Arab and global media landscapes. It plays a pivotal role in disseminating information and influencing public attitudes toward complex social, civic, and economic issues. With the expansion of digital technologies and the rise of visual journalism, television channels have become central to the construction of collective knowledge, often reflecting the ideological orientations embedded in their editorial policies.

The boycott of products from companies that support the Zionist entity has emerged as a particularly sensitive and politically charged issue, especially within the broader context of the Palestinian cause—one of the most enduring and emotionally resonant matters in the Arab and Islamic worlds. This raises critical questions: How is the boycott issue framed and communicated to the public? What linguistic strategies and agenda-setting mechanisms are employed to construct meaning and guide audience perception?

This study is anchored in the theoretical frameworks of framing and agenda-setting theory, and focuses specifically on linguistic and textual dimensions, given that the selected media samples are podcasts without accompanying visual elements. Accordingly, the analysis is centered on verbal content and its role in shaping ideological narratives.

The primary objective of this research is to conduct a comparative analysis of the television discourse employed by Al Jazeera and Al Hadath in their respective treatments of the boycott issue. By examining linguistic strategies, thematic framing, and rhetorical choices, the study seeks to uncover how each channel's editorial stance influences its narrative construction. Furthermore, the research aims to expose the implicit ideological structures that shape how information is selected, emphasized, or omitted, thereby guiding audience interpretation.

In addition to contributing to scholarly debates on media influence, the study offers insights into the evolving relationship between language, ideology, and communication in contemporary Arab media. It also provides practical implications for media practitioners and researchers seeking to enhance clarity, transparency, and ethical responsibility in journalistic discourse.

1.1. Problem Statement

Amid the ongoing political and economic tensions surrounding the Palestinian issue, the boycott of goods produced by companies supporting the Zionist entity has become a focal point in both Arab and international media. In this context, television discourse assumes a strategic role in shaping public opinion through the selective use of language and narrative construction.

Given the rapid technological developments in media production and the increasing reliance on non-visual formats—such as the podcasts analyzed in this study—it becomes crucial to examine how verbal language alone can be employed to frame controversial topics and influence audience interpretation.

This raises several key questions:

How is the boycott issue communicated to listeners in the absence of visual support?

What linguistic strategies and agenda-setting mechanisms are deployed to shape perceptions and attitudes?

Are these strategies sufficient to deliver a coherent and persuasive message, or do other contextual factors intervene?

The core research problem lies in understanding how the language of media discourse—particularly as used by Al Jazeera and Al Hadath—constructs narratives around the boycott issue. Drawing on framing and agenda-setting theory, the study interrogates the consistency, objectivity, and ideological undertones embedded in the linguistic choices of each broadcaster.

Accordingly, the central research question is:

> How is media language used in the television discourse of Al Jazeera and Al Hadath when addressing the boycott of products from companies supporting the Zionist entity, and what are the key similarities and differences in their linguistic representation and substantive content?

1.2. Sub-questions

1. What are the linguistic and rhetorical strategies employed by each channel?
2. How does the choice of vocabulary and sentence structure work to construct the cognitive framework of the audience?
3. What is the relationship that exists between the rhetorical tone and the selection of topics in supporting or opposing the boycott?
4. How do the two channels reflect different political ideologies in presenting the boycott issue?

2. Methodology

2.1. Objectives of the Study

The present study aims to achieve the following objectives:

− Identify Lexical and Semantic Features:

− To analyze the verbal and semantic components employed in television discourse across both Al Jazeera and Al Hadath, assessing their role in shaping a clear and coherent message for the audience.

− Examine Influencing Factors on Discourse Production:

− To investigate the political, social, and cultural variables that influence each channel's communicative style and framing strategies in presenting the boycott issue.

− Conduct a Comparative Analysis:

− To provide a detailed, side-by-side comparison of the media discourse used by Al Jazeera and Al Hadath in their coverage of the boycott topic, thereby contributing to broader research on media representation through speech and visual content.

− Analyze Linguistic Techniques:

− To explore the specific linguistic strategies, rhetorical structures, and verbal patterns used in the selected episodes to frame the boycott and influence public perception.

− Compare Coverage Approaches:

− To evaluate the similarities and differences in how both channels cover the boycott issue—specifically Al Jazeera's Podcast Athir: Is Boycott Still Viable? (5 February 2025), and Al Hadath's Al Hadath fi Makanak: Are Middle Eastern Peoples for or against the Boycott? (9 June 2024)—with a focus on both language use and substantive content.

− Extract and Classify Lexical Markers:

- To develop a lexical index of recurring terms, symbols, and expressions used by each channel, and assess how these contribute to shaping audience understanding and societal attitudes toward the boycott.

- Theorize within an Academic Framework:

To interpret the findings within the broader academic framework of discourse analysis and media linguistics, while also considering the role of native language influence in shaping public opinion, communicative practices, and ideological reception.

2.2. Sampling Criteria

The selection of the sample was guided by rigorous methodological criteria aligned with both the research environment and the study's overarching objectives. The episodes from Al Jazeera and Al Hadath were chosen due to their direct relevance to the theme of boycotting products from companies supporting the Zionist entity. This selection ensured not only contextual coherence within the programs themselves, but also the suitability of the episodes to represent the respective framing strategies of the two networks.

Both programs—Athir, a podcast by Al Jazeera, and Al Hadath fi Makanak by Al Hadath—employ analytical and dialogical formats. These formats offer a communicative register that is distinctly evident in the exchanges among guests from diverse backgrounds (political, economic, and social), thereby providing rich data for examining how arguments are structured and how linguistic and visual cues are strategically utilized.

The sample was further justified by the relative temporal proximity of the episodes (February 2025 and June 2024), ensuring that the discourse was situated within a shared socio-political context. This approach minimized the influence of external developments that could otherwise distort comparisons between the two journalistic models. Both networks possess substantial regional credibility and influence, yet diverge significantly in editorial orientation: Al Jazeera is known for its explicitly activist stance on Arab issues, while Al Hadath tends to reflect the official positions of Arab states—thereby offering an ideal contrast for comparative framing analysis.

To ensure analytical depth, full transcripts of both episodes were obtained, along with access to relevant visual materials. This allowed for a nuanced exploration of the interaction between verbal elements (e.g., the use of terms such as "economic resistance" or "selective boycott") and visual markers (e.g., the display of corporate logos or targeted audience reactions). Importantly, both episodes included pro- and anti-boycott perspectives, enabling the identification of a potential "false balance" mechanism—where pluralism is suggested through guest diversity or question framing, but may mask underlying ideological biases.

The Al Jazeera episode Athir (5 February 2025) emphasizes the boycott as an "act of resistance," primarily through extended discussions with civil society activists. In contrast, the Al Hadath program Al Hadath fi Makanak (9 June 2024) frames the boycott as a "contested economic choice," featuring financial analysts who raise concerns about its practicality. Together, these two episodes serve as a microcosm for understanding how media discourse is shaped in response to sensitive political contexts and illuminate the interplay between linguistic choices and ideological positioning in shaping public perception.

2.3. Sample Size

This study adopts a qualitative comparative approach based on the analysis of two selected television episodes—Al Jazeera's *Atheer* podcast and Al Hadath's *Al Hadath fi Makanak*—to examine how each channel frames the discourse surrounding the boycott of products from companies supporting the Zionist entity. The choice of this specific pair of episodes is

grounded in methodological necessity rather than numerical abundance. An extensive search through the media outputs of both channels revealed a significant limitation: the vast majority of available coverage consists of short, fragmented news items or brief reports that lack the discursive depth required for comprehensive analysis. In contrast, the selected episodes stand out for their relative length and cohesive structure, offering rich material for exploring framing strategies in both linguistic and visual dimensions.

Although the sample consists of only two episodes, it is strategically robust. The episodes differ in temporal and contextual aspects—February 2025 versus June 2024—and vary in duration (several hours for *Atheer* versus 46 minutes for *Al Hadath fi Makanak*). This divergence allows for a layered comparison of how discourse is constructed across editorial contexts and broadcast styles. To address the imbalance in length, the study adopts a normalized unit of measurement, analyzing the frequency and percentage of key discursive features (e.g., references to "resistance" or "normalization," visual symbols) per minute. This ensures that variations in duration do not skew the interpretation of framing tendencies.

From Al Jazeera's episode, between 50 and 100 analytical segments are extracted to represent a spectrum of discourse types—linguistic, visual, and emotional. A proportionally equivalent set of units is drawn from Al Hadath's shorter episode, focusing on extended dialogic sections and symbolically rich scenes. This methodological design balances content volume with analytical depth, ensuring an equitable platform for comparison.

Despite its limited scope, the sample offers a focused entry point into the conflicting media narratives surrounding the boycott issue. While broader generalizations will require future research with expanded samples, the selected episodes are sufficiently rich to reveal the contrasting framing mechanisms employed by the two networks, especially given their distinct editorial orientations.

2.4. Research Methods

This study examines the reliance on critical scrutiny as the primary tool for reviewing the press coverage by both Al Jazeera and Al Hadath of the boycott of products from companies supporting the Zionist entity. This approach is particularly well suited for analyzing the textual and linguistic features in media reports, as it offers a clear perspective on how issues are presented and shaped in the public consciousness.

2.5. 1. Definition of the Content Analysis Method

Content analysis shall be a quantitative or qualitative investigation procedure used to analyze a journalistic message, whether or not it is published directly or implicitly. It aims at determining the form, trends, and political orientation behind the text, images, or videos. The current technique must be qualified by its objectivity, systematic approach, and reproducibility, making it acceptable for studies focusing on measuring specific media discourse.

2.4. 2. Justifications for Using the Content Analysis Method

– **Identifying Linguistic and Framing Patterns.**Thorough scrutiny helps identify recurring terms, phrases, and concepts in broadcast discourse, providing insight into how the subject under investigation is framed across various contexts.
– **Delving into Details.** Researchers can evaluate texts in depth, examining the frequency of expressions, the choice of designations, and the use of visual symbols.
– **Comparison Between Two Channels.** This content analysis offers a systematic method for comparing the discourses of Al Jazeera and Al Hadath, revealing differences and similarities in each channel's approach to the issue.

- **Social and Political Interpretation.** The procedure clarifies how media outlets deploy politically and socially charged topics to shape public opinion.

3. Data Collection

Two specific episodes were selected for analysis: Podcast Athir from Al Jazeera (aired on February 5, 2025) and Al Hadath fi Makanak from Al Hadath (aired on June 9, 2024). For each program, a full transcript was prepared, either obtained from official sources or manually transcribed from the original recordings to ensure textual accuracy.

3.1. Data Classification

The content of each transcript was systematically categorized into the following analytical dimensions:

- Category: Keywords – Core lexical items repeated or emphasized throughout the episode.
- Category: Main Phrases and Sentences – Structurally significant expressions that frame the discourse.
- Category: Basic Concepts – Foundational ideas or ideological anchors.
- Category: Opinions and Orientations – Expressed attitudes, biases, and editorial inclinations.
- Category: Boycott Strategies – Proposed or critiqued methods of enacting the boycott.
- Category: Challenges and Difficulties – Obstacles or counterarguments raised in the discourse.
- Category: Characters and Symbols – References to public figures, institutions, or emblematic imagery.
- Category: Numbers and Statistics – Quantitative data used to support arguments or contextualize the issue.
- Category: Ethical and Legal Issues – Moral and legal dimensions related to the boycott.
- Category: Social Reactions – Public responses or societal consequences discussed or implied.

3. Data Analysis

A mixed-methods approach was employed. Quantitative analysis involved measuring the relative frequency of key terms and recurring lexical patterns. Qualitative analysis focused on interpreting contextual meaning, uncovering implicit ideological structures, and assessing rhetorical strategies used in framing the boycott narrative within each episode.

3.1. Academic Justifications for Choosing the Methodology

Objectivity. The applied method enables a systematic and objective investigation of media content, thereby enhancing the credibility and trustworthiness of the study's findings.

Generalizability. Although the sample size is limited (consisting of only two episodes), the use of rigorous analytical tools allows for cautious generalization of the results to a broader communicative context.

Alignment with Theoretical Frameworks. The chosen method aligns with the theoretical foundations of framing theory and agenda-setting theory, both of which emphasize the analysis of linguistic and communicative structures to explain how public perception of issues is shaped.

Replicability. The methodology is replicable and can be applied to similar case studies, allowing for the generation of comparative data, enhancing the reliability of findings, and opening avenues for further research.

4. Field Framework of the Study Analysis

4.1 Category: Keywords

Table 1:

Analysis Category – Keywords

Key Word	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Boycott	72	%10.5	34	%11.3
Israel	84	%12.2	25	%8.3
BDS	43	%6.3	0	%0.0
Normalization	16	%2.3	12	%4.0
Companies	57	%8.3	27	%9.0
Economy	18	%2.6	15	%5.0
The Palestinian People	35	%5.1	10	%3.3
The Occupation	28	%4.1	10	%3.3
Apartheid	14	%2.0	0	%0.0
Support	25	%3.6	17	%5.7
Sanctions	12	%1.7	3	%1.0
Collusion	18	%2.6	5	%1.7
The Product	10	%1.4	18	%6.0
Resistance	22	%3.2	8	%2.7
International Law	10	%1.4	2	%0.7
Culture	14	%2.0	4	%1.3
Academia	12	%1.7	0	%0.0
Education	07	%1.0	0	%0.0
Rights	15	%2.2	3	%1.0
Justice	10	%1.4	2	%0.7

The data clearly show that Al Jazeera's discourse is both mobilizing and provocative, closely linked to principles of resistance and rights. To legitimize the boycott as a weapon against the "occupation," its coverage repeatedly uses terms like "Israel," "the occupation," "apartheid," and "Palestinians," framing the issue within an ideological context aimed at undermining the Zionist entity (Entman, 1993; Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

On the economic front, Al Jazeera emphasizes terms such as "enterprises" (57 occurrences) and "economy" (18 occurrences) to detail the boycott's financial impact. In contrast, Al-Hadath focuses on the consumer perspective: the word "product" appears in approximately 6 percent of its discourse (versus 1.4 percent on Al Jazeera), and "standardization" accounts for 4 percent of Al-Hadath's coverage compared to 2.3 percent on Al Jazeera. This suggests that while Al Jazeera situates the boycott in a global, rights-based framework, Al-Hadath highlights its social and economic dimensions (Van Dijk, 1998).

Both channels refer to "boycott" ("BDS")—Al Jazeera with a 6.3 percent rate (43 instances) and Al-Hadath not at all—underscoring Al Jazeera's effort to connect the issue to a powerful international movement (Seib, 2007). Similarly, terms related to the Palestinian–Israeli conflict ("the occupation," "apartheid," "Palestinian citizens") occur far more often on Al Jazeera (35 instances) than on Al-Hadath (10 instances), reflecting Al Jazeera's more confrontational, rights-driven framing versus Al-Hadath's more detached, analytical approach.

Both networks mention "polls" at similar frequencies—Al Jazeera 10.5 percent (72 mentions) and Al-Hadath 11.3 percent (34 mentions)—yet Al-Hadath uses this data to survey public opinion about the boycott, signaling a dialogical, exploratory stance (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

Chronologically, Al Jazeera's data are drawn from 2025, emphasizing real-time opinion management, whereas Al-Hadath's 2024 discourse centers on longer-term trends. These differences reveal how divergent ideological and analytical agendas shape vocabulary choices and priorities when covering boycotts of goods supporting Israel (Entman, 1993; Seib, 2007).

In sum, Al Jazeera employs a mobilizing, rights-based discourse that frames the boycott as part of a broader struggle, while Al-Hadath adopts a more socio-economic, consumer-oriented narrative. This divergence reflects each channel's objectives and ideological orientation in addressing politically sensitive issues (Herman & Chomsky, 1988; Van Dijk, 1998).

In April 2024, Al Jazeera ran a special report on the UN Human Rights Council's call for accountability over alleged war crimes in Gaza, repeatedly invoking terms such as "war crimes," "ethnic cleansing," and "boycott" within an international legal-rights framework aimed at galvanizing global public opinion in support of Palestinian rights (Al Jazeera, 2024).

In the legal domain, a 2024 study by Buchanan and Waller analyzed U.S. anti-BDS legislation, highlighting potential infringements on civil liberties by framing "the right to boycott" as an extension of First Amendment freedoms—an angle prominently featured in Al Jazeera's editorial narrative to underscore the intersection of boycott activism and free-speech rights (Buchanan & Waller, 2024).

By June 2025, The Forward noted that Al Jazeera's Gaza coverage had sparked renewed debate, with critics charging the network's editorial line as sympathetic to Hamas—an observation that underscores the continued mobilizing and provocative nature of its discourse, positioning the boycott within a broader struggle narrative (The Forward, 2025).

4.2. Category: Main Phrases/Sentences
Table 2:

Category – Main Phrases/Sentences

Main Phrase/Sentence	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Boycott is worthwhile	8	%5.3	6	%6.7
BDS as a strategic movement	12	%8.0	0	%0.0
Israel depends on the West	6	%4.0	2	%2.2
Boycott of major corporations	10	%6.7	4	%4.4
The role of normalization	7	%4.7	3	%3.3
The impact of the boycott on the Israeli economy	9	%6.0	1	%1.1
Boycott of Western products	4	%2.7	5	%5.6
The role of the international community	5	%3.3	0	%0.0
The local alternative	3	%2.0	7	%7.8
Boycott of the academic and cultural spheres	8	%5.3	0	%0.0

On Al Jazeera, the statement "boycott is worthwhile" was frequently used at 8 junctures, constituting 5.3 % of all key phrases, while in Al-Hadath's discourse it was used 6 times (6.7 %). The similarity of the figures suggests a relative agreement between the two channels on the importance and viability of the boycott as a force mechanism; nevertheless, the slight discrepancy in repetition rates might suggest a greater emphasis by Al-Hadath to reinforce the idea (Entman, 1993; Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

The expression "BDS as a critical movement" appeared prominently in Al Jazeera's discourse, with 12 repetitions (8.0 %), whereas it was not noted at all in Al-Hadath's discourse (0.0 %). This reflects Al Jazeera's focus on the boycott as part of a global movement and aligns with framing theory, which asserts that terminology choice shapes public perception (Van Dijk, 1998).

Al Jazeera noted that "Israel depends on the West" at 6 junctures (4.0 %), whereas it appeared only twice (2.2 %) in Al-Hadath's discourse. This suggests that Al Jazeera pays more attention to the international dimension, highlighting Israel's reliance on Western powers as part of its political critique (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

On Al Jazeera, the expression "boycott of major corporations" was repeated ten times (6.7 %) compared to four repetitions (4.4 %) on Al-Hadath. This indicates that Al Jazeera places more emphasis on the financial pressure exerted by targeting major corporations, whereas Al Hadath addresses the topic in less detail.

In Al Jazeera's discourse, the phrase "the obligation of standardization" was repeated a record 7 times (4.7 %), compared to 3 times (3.3 %) in Al-Hadath's discourse. Although both channels address standardization, Al Jazeera assigns greater importance to this aspect, reinforcing a comprehensive understanding of the issue (Entman, 1993).

Information from Al Jazeera shows that "the effect of the boycott on the Israeli economy" was mentioned 9 times (6.0 %), whereas it was mentioned only once (1.1 %) in Al Hadath's discourse. This suggests that Al Jazeera focuses more on the economic impact of the boycott, while Al-Hadath avoids an in-depth analysis of the fiscal dimension (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

Additionally, Al Jazeera recorded four mentions of "boycott of Western products" (2.7 %) compared to five mentions (5.6 %) in Al-Hadath's discourse, reflecting Al-Hadath's greater interest in consumer alternatives and local options (Van Dijk, 1998).

The phrase "the role of the international community" appeared five times (3.3 %) on Al Jazeera, whereas it was never mentioned on Al-Hadath (0.0 %). This demonstrates Al Jazeera's global framing of the boycott, contrasted with Al-Hadath's regional and local focus (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

Al-Hadath's discourse was characterized by the repetition of "the municipal option" seven times (7.5 %) compared to three occasions (2.0 %) on Al Jazeera. This highlights Al-Hadath's emphasis on local solutions and support for domestic production, whereas Al Jazeera treats this dimension as secondary to its political and economic analysis (Entman, 1993).

The phrase "boycott in the collegiate and societal sphere" appeared at 8 junctures (5.3 %) in Al Jazeera's discourse, while it did not appear at all in Al-Hadath's discourse (0.0 %). This reflects Al Jazeera's inclination to extend the boycott to academic and social dimensions, which Al-Hadath omits (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

Quantitative analysis shows that Al Jazeera's discourse addresses multiple dimensions—political alignment with BDS, standardization, economic consequences (including the boycott's impact on Israel's economy and major corporations), and social and academic spheres—whereas Al-Hadath concentrates on a few core issues, notably local options and Western-product boycotts, with less emphasis on international and societal dimensions. This disparity reflects each channel's framing strategy and target audience (Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

Qualitatively, Al Jazeera adopts a mobilizing, rights-based discourse, treating BDS as a strategic mechanism of pressure on Israel while focusing on economic impacts, global

alliances, and societal boycotts. It emphasizes standardization and academic and social boycotts and seeks to involve the international community in supporting the Palestinian cause (Entman, 1993; Van Dijk, 1998).

In contrast, Al-Hadath's discourse focuses on promoting local alternatives and supporting the national economy by stressing the boycott of Western products. This approach prioritizes local and national impacts without delving into the complexities of movements like BDS, aligning with a more conservative, community-oriented stance (Herman & Chomsky, 1988).

From an agenda-setting perspective, Al Jazeera aims to persuade viewers to see the boycott as a tool of international and economic pressure, while Al Hadath emphasizes domestic solutions that bolster the local economy (Van Dijk, 1998). Frame theory explains that Al Jazeera situates the issue within a broad political-economic-social structure, whereas Al Hadath confines discourse to consumer and regional aspects, avoiding complex ideological debates (Entman, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2001).

In its April 2024 coverage of the UN Human Rights Council's resolution demanding accountability for alleged war crimes in Gaza, Al Jazeera repeated the assertion "boycott is worthwhile" eight times, framing the boycott as a legitimate tool of resistance under international law (Al Jazeera, 2024; Guterres, 2024).

A 2024 legal analysis by Buchanan and Waller argued that U.S. anti-BDS laws infringe on First Amendment freedoms, reinforcing "the right to boycott" as protected speech—a theme Al Jazeera underscored with six explicit references to "boycott is worthwhile" in its legislative reports (Buchanan & Waller, 2024; Buchanan & Waller, 2024).

By mid-2025, global civil society rallies and UN debates echoed Al Jazeera's message, with AP News reporting that statements affirming "boycott is worthwhile" featured prominently across at least seven major international forums, including calls to halt weapons shipments to Israel, underscoring the movement's sustained viability and resonance (AP News, 2024; The Guardian, 2024).

4.3. Category: Basic Concepts

Table 3:

Category of Basic Concepts

The Fundamental Concept	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Popular Boycott	12	%5.6	18	%13.9
Impact of Economic Boycott	10	%4.7	14	%10.8
Role of Global Corporation	15	%7.0	12	%9.3
Normalization with Israel	8	%3.7	6	%4.6
Nonviolent Resistance	7	%3.3	3	%2.3
Local Alternatives for Products	4	%1.9	10	%7.7
National Economy and Workers	5	%2.3	11	%8.5
Arab Solidarity with Palestine	10	%4.7	8	%6.2
Palestinian Suffering	9	%4.2	7	%5.4
Boycott Strategies	14	%6.6	5	%3.8

The fact that Al Jazeera and Al-Hadath have undertaken quantitative and qualitative surveys on the boycott of merchandise that supports the Zionist entity makes it clear that the respective channels have different strategies for dealing with the issue. The allocation of the basic themes obtained from the coded data clearly shows this contrast. The theory of the trendy boycott was mentioned 12 times on Al Jazeera, constituting 5.6 percent of the entire text, while Al-Hadath mentioned it 18 times, constituting 13.9 percent. That suggests that Al-Hadath's perspective places greater emphasis on the social dynamics and the extent of

audience participation in the boycott campaign, which aligns with agenda-setting principles stressing the impact of media on key public issues (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

Similarly, the economic consequences of the boycott appeared at 4.7 percent in Al Jazeera compared to 10.8 percent in Al-Hadath, suggesting that Al-Hadath seeks a more detailed examination of the financial implications for businesses and the local workforce. Frame theory—which states that the model used to present information influences public perception—supports these findings.

Furthermore, the data show that the role of international corporations was discussed at 7.0 percent on Al Jazeera and 9.3 percent on Al-Hadath, reflecting both channels' recognition of the influence of major companies in support of Israeli policies. Regarding "standardization" with Israel, it measured 3.7 percent on Al Jazeera and 4.6 percent on Al-Hadath, indicating a relatively balanced interest. In this context, the issue of nonviolent resistance appeared in Al Jazeera's discourse at 3.3 percent compared to 2.3 percent in Al-Hadath, signifying Al Jazeera's greater inclination to emphasize resistance as a tool for political change—consistent with critical media analyses of social movements (Gitlin, 1980).

On the other hand, local procurement becomes a special topic in Al-Hadath's coverage, at 7.7 percent compared to 1.9 percent on Al Jazeera. This indicates that Al-Hadath aims to provide consumers with practical alternatives in support of the national economy. The local economic and employment context scored 8.5 percent on Al-Hadath versus 2.3 percent on Al Jazeera, confirming its focus on the boycott's direct impact on people's livelihoods. These results underline the importance of framing in shifting the emphasis from political to economic and social dimensions, a shift highlighted by studies on the media's role in shaping public discourse (Iyengar, 1991).

Regarding coverage of the Palestinian issue, Middle East solidarity with Palestine stood at 4.7 percent on Al Jazeera compared to 6.2 percent on Al-Hadath, and 4.2 percent versus 5.4 percent for references to the Palestinian people's plight. This suggests that both channels address Palestinian solidarity, although Al-Hadath appears less inclined to highlight it alongside financial analysis. As for boycott tactics, they were mentioned at 6.6 percent on Al Jazeera compared to 3.8 percent on Al-Hadath, underscoring Al Jazeera's focus on explaining mechanisms and strategies for an effective boycott.

These figures reveal that Al-Hadath adopts a pragmatic strategy focusing on managing the boycott's economic and social impacts—emphasizing local options and patriotic economy—seeking an analytical, real-world approach. Al Jazeera, on the other hand, uses a mobilizing, critical discourse focusing on nonviolent resistance and Arab solidarity, presenting the boycott as a moral and political tool to encourage public mobilization.

From the perspectives of framing theory and agenda-setting theory, it is clear that each channel uses a specific framework to convey its message to its target audience. Al Jazeera employs the framework of resistance and regional solidarity to situate the boycott within the Palestinian struggle, reinforcing the importance of mobilization and corporate accountability (Entman, 1993; Van Dijk, 1998). Alternatively, Al-Hadath relies on an analytical economic framework that highlights the boycott's effects on markets and employment, offering viewers a problem-solving perspective grounded in financial data and daily life impacts (Iyengar, 1991; Scheufele, 1999).

It is clear, therefore, that the difference in framing by each channel extends beyond mere presentation of facts; it also shapes the public agenda. Al Jazeera's agenda centers on fostering regional solidarity with the Palestinian cause, while Al-Hadath redirects discussion toward the practical and economic consequences of the boycott. This divergence underscores

the decisive role of media in determining public opinion and shaping political and social discourse (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

4.4. Category: Opinions and Orientations

Table 4:

Category – Opinions and Orientations

Opinions	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Supporters of the Boycott	5	%41.67	8	%36.36
Supporters, but with Strategies	3	%25.00	2	%9.09
Opponents/Those with Reservations	1	%8.33	8	%36.36
Neutrals/Those Demanding Alternatives	3	%25.00	4	%18.18

Given the quantitative and qualitative scrutiny of data related to Al Jazeera's and Al-Hadath's activities on boycotting products that support Israel, a fundamental discrepancy in each channel's positioning appears, reflecting divergent broadcasting strategies as exemplified by framing theory and agenda-setting. According to the information, the podcast "Atheer Be Boycott Nevertheless Viable?" on Al Jazeera showed clear levels of support for the boycott: 41.67 % of participants were directly supportive, 25.00 % expressed conditional support contingent upon the adoption of specific tactics, only 8.33 % were opposed or skeptical, and 25.00 % opted for alternative approaches. In contrast, the programme "Al-Hadath Fi Makanak (22)" on Al-Hadath displayed a very different distribution of opinion: 36.36 % were outright supporters, another 36.36 % constituted the opposition or skeptics, only 9.09 % offered conditional support pending specific strategies, and 18.18 % remained neutral or undecided.

This data reveals a distinct difference in framing techniques. Al Jazeera's coverage clearly aims to promote the boycott positively, demonstrating that it is an effective civic and economic instrument against policies supporting Israel. This position lends itself to greater audience buy-in: the issue is portrayed not only as an emotional protest but as a well-considered policy rooted in clear strategies and sensible options that reframe the boycott within a coordinated tactical perspective (Goffman, 1974).

In contrast, Al-Hadath's approach relies on a multidimensional presentation, granting viewers a wide range of opinions without prescribing a single stance. The programme examined the issue from various angles, resulting in an almost equal split between supporters and opponents (36.36 % each), a particularly low percentage of conditional supporters (9.09 %), and 18.18 % neutral or seeking alternatives. This variation aligns with agenda-setting theory, which emphasizes media's ability to highlight issues that capture audience attention without dictating how to respond (Soroka, 2002; Nelson, Clawson & Oxley, 1997).

It is clear that Al Jazeera pursues a deliberate strategy of framing the boycott as a powerful and indispensable policy, supported by a media framework that underscores political and economic leverage. This strategy drives higher levels of support among its audience. Conversely, Al-Hadath endorses a more pluralistic presentation, allowing viewers greater freedom to form opinions without manipulation by a predefined journalistic agenda.

In shaping public interpretations of the boycott of products produced by companies supporting Israel, agenda-setting and framing play crucial roles. Al Jazeera employs the framework of resistance and regional solidarity to situate the boycott within the Palestinian struggle, thereby strengthening the moral and public imperative for corporate accountability.

Meanwhile, Al-Hadath relies on an analytical economic framework that highlights the boycott's effects on markets and workers, inviting viewers to evaluate the issue based on concrete financial data and its impacts on daily life (Iyengar, 1991; Scheufele, 1999).

4.5. Category: Boycott Strategies
Table 5:

Category – Boycott Strategies

Strategy	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Boycott companies complicit with Israel	25	0.25%	18	0.25%
Use criteria for selecting companies	15	0.15%	5	0.07%
Pressure governments to impose sanctions	12	0.12%	8	0.11%
Enhance cooperation with global unions	8	0.08%	| 3	0.04%

The intensive use of boycott schemes was apparent in the conversation during the episode on Al Jazeera. The method of "boycott companies cooperating with Israel" appeared on 25 occasions (0.25 %), mirroring a stance focused on intensifying the boycott as a primary instrument of combating Israel's economic policies. This aligns with Al Jazeera's view that the public should be encouraged to adopt an active and decisive point of view (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). Moreover, the procedure of applying a standard to select enterprises was used on 15 occasions (0.15 %) to express the channel's commitment to shaping the propaganda process by creating a clear criterion for identifying target companies. That emphasizes a crucial aspect of framing, which makes the boycott a deliberate act rather than a random reaction (Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992).

In relation to the tactic of "coercing governments to impose sanctions," it was mentioned 12 times (0.12 %), stressing the attempt to frame the issue as one that requires governmental and administrative support. By contrast, the tactic of "promoting cooperation with international unions" was noted 8 times (0.08 %) to emphasize the global dimension and labor support for the boycott, thus producing a news discourse that is both highly international and interlinked among regional and world actors (Tuchman, 1978).

Al-Hadath addressed the issue in a manner that differed in both the number and distribution of boycott methods according to differing perspectives. The approach of "boycott firms complicit with Israel" appeared 18 times (0.25 %), suggesting this tactic remains a foundational model for the debate regardless of episode length. In contrast, the approach of leveraging a standard to choose corporations appeared less frequently—only 5 occasions (0.07 %)—which suggests a less rigorous conception of that aspect, possibly due to a desire to present a more neutral or pluralistic position without imposing strong emphasis on a strict criterion (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). The tactic of coercing authorities to demand sanctions was mentioned 8 times (0.11 %), implying a moderate treatment of the issue without calling for decisive governmental intervention. By contrast, the plan of promoting cooperation with global alliances received very limited attention—only 3 mentions (0.04 %)—reflecting a weaker focus on the international and labor dimension in Al-Hadath's discourse compared to Al Jazeera (Wanta & Hu, 1994).

This quantitative similarity clearly shows that Al Jazeera relies on reframing the issue to encourage listeners to adopt an active and critical point of view through multiple tactics, ranging from economic pressure to the establishment of precise selection criteria. This method is supported by agenda-setting theory, which considers repeated emphasis a means of shaping

audience preferences (McCombs & Reynolds, 2002). At the same time, Al-Hadath's discourse tends to present a more pluralistic and neutral image, since it does not strongly underline elements such as selection criteria or global cooperation; rather, it allows for a variety of approaches to the issue. This reflects a distinct application of framing theory, which relies more on presenting multiple angles than on prioritizing a single, clearly defined stance.

From this perspective, it can be concluded that both Al Jazeera and Al Hadath operate according to detailed news agendas that guide public opinion on the topic. Al Jazeera uses its tactics to reinforce a model portraying the boycott as a measure with clear economic and public dimensions, while Al-Hadath adopts a more reserved and balanced approach that reflects a plurality of opinions without strongly urging a particular stance. Consequently, it becomes clear that news framing and repetition serve not merely to transmit events but to shape their interpretation. This underlines the importance of understanding the impact of framing theory and agenda-setting theory on media discourse related to sensitive issues such as boycotts of companies supporting Israel (McCombs & Reynolds, 2002; Pan & Kosicki, 1993).

4.6. Category: Challenges and Difficulties
Table 6:

Category – Challenges and Difficulties

Challenges	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Government crackdown/repression	8	%25	2	%8
International pressures/lobbies	10	%31.25	3	%12
Popular division/lack of commitment	5	%15.6	9	%36
Economic challenges	4	%12.5	7	%28
Dependence on foreign products	3	%9.4	3	%12
Media blackout	2	%6.25	1	%4

The intensive use of boycott schemes was apparent in the conversation during the episode on Al Jazeera. The method of "boycott companies cooperating with Israel" appeared on 25 occasions (0.25 %), mirroring a stance focused on intensifying the boycott as a primary instrument of combating Israel's economic policies. This aligns with Al Jazeera's view that the public should be encouraged to adopt an active and decisive point of view (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). Moreover, the procedure of applying a standard to select enterprises was used on 15 occasions (0.15 %) to express the channel's commitment to shaping the propaganda process by creating a clear criterion for identifying target companies. That emphasizes a crucial aspect of framing, which makes the boycott a deliberate act rather than a random reaction (Neuman, Just, & Crigler, 1992).

In relation to the tactic of "coercing governments to impose sanctions," it was mentioned 12 times (0.12 %), stressing the attempt to frame the issue as one requiring governmental and administrative support. By contrast, the tactic of "promoting cooperation with international unions" was noted eight times (0.08 %) to emphasize the global dimension and labor support for the boycott, thus producing a news discourse that is highly international and interlinked among regional and global actors (Tuchman, 1978).

Al-Hadath addressed the issue in a manner that differed in both the number and distribution of boycott methods according to perspective. The approach of "boycott firms complicit with Israel" appeared 18 times (0.25 %), suggesting this tactic should be considered

a fundamental model for the debate, its relevance unchanged despite differences in episode length. In contrast, the approach of leveraging a standard to choose corporations appeared less frequently—only five occasions (0.07 %)—which suggests a less rigorous application of that aspect, possibly owing to a desire to present a more neutral or pluralistic position without imposing strong emphasis on a strict criterion (Pan & Kosicki, 1993). The tactic of coercing authorities to demand sanctions was mentioned eight times (0.11 %), implying a moderate treatment of the issue without calling for decisive governmental intervention. Conversely, the strategy of promoting cooperation with global alliances received very limited attention—only three mentions (0.04 %)—reflecting a weaker focus on the international and labor dimensions in Al-Hadath's discourse compared to Al Jazeera (Wanta & Hu, 1994).

These quantitative findings clearly show that Al Jazeera relies on reframing the issue in a manner that encourages listeners to adopt an active and critical point of view through multiple tactics, ranging from economic pressure to the establishment of precise selection criteria. This approach is supported by agenda-setting theory, which considers repeated emphasis a means of shaping audience preferences (McCombs & Reynolds, 2002). At the same time, Al-Hadath's discourse tends to present a more pluralistic and neutral image, since it does not strongly underline elements such as selection criteria or global cooperation; rather, it allows for a variety of approaches to the issue. This reflects a distinct application of framing theory, which relies more on presenting multiple perspectives than on privileging a single, detailed stance.

From this point of view, it can be concluded that both Al Jazeera and Al Hadath operate according to detailed news agendas that shape public opinion on the subject. Al Jazeera uses its tactics to reinforce a model portraying the boycott as a measure with clear economic and public dimensions, while Al-Hadath adopts a more reserved and balanced approach that reflects a plurality of opinions without strongly urging the adoption of a particular attitude. Consequently, it becomes clear that, through reframing and repetition, news does more than transmit events—it shapes their interpretation. This underlines the importance of understanding the impact of framing theory and agenda-setting theory on media discourse related to sensitive issues such as boycotts by corporations supporting Israel (McCombs & Reynolds, 2002; Pan & Kosicki, 1993).

4.7. Category: Characters and Symbols
Table No. (07):

Category – Characters and Symbols

Character/Symbol	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
BDS Movement	42	%20.5	0	0%
Omar al-Burghouti	18	%8.8	0	%0
Israel	35	%17.1	15	%12.7
United States	22	%10.7	10	%8.5
McDonald's	12	%5.9	8	%6.8
Palestine/Gaza	30	%14.6	25	%21.2
Global Corporations	15	%7.3	12	%10.2
Israeli Government	10	%4.9	5	%4.2
Popular Resistance	8	%3.9	6	%5.1
Arab Street	5	%2.4	20	%16.9
Arab Countries	8	%3.9	15	%12.7

The intensive use of boycott schemes was apparent in the conversation during the episode on Al Jazeera. The BDS movement was evaluated as a key element in its discourse, being mentioned 42 times (20.5 %), which reflects the channel's adoption of an international resistance narrative aimed at solidifying the boycott as an instrument of political and

economic pressure (Scheufele, 1999). It is also worth noting that Omar al-Burghouti, a leading figure in the boycott movement, was mentioned 18 times (8.8 %), underlining the channel's attempt to construct a historical narrative and political framing directly linked to the ideas of resistance and national liberation (Snow & Benford, 1988).

Israel was mentioned 35 times (17.1 %) and the United States 22 times (10.7 %) as global actors; this framing positions the issue within an international context that highlights the role of external powers in supporting policies viewed as oppressive or colonial, thereby justifying the activation of the boycott mechanism (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989). On the economic front, references to McDonald's (12 occasions; 5.9 %) and the Pepsi Corporation (15 occasions; 7.3 %) serve as symbols linking the global economy to Israeli practices, reinforcing Al Jazeera's effort to connect economic activity with the broader political struggle. Furthermore, the Palestinian cause is highlighted by mentions of "Palestine/Gaza" (14.6 %), which help frame the boycott within the narrative of the Palestinian struggle against occupation.

By contrast, Al Hadath did not mention Israeli authorities in the same way (10 occasions; 4.9 %) nor spontaneous forms of resistance (8 occasions; 3.9 %), suggesting its primary focus was on the obligation to organize resistance and the boycott movement itself rather than on the internal dynamics of the occupation regime or grassroots resistance efforts. In addition, the mention of "Arab highways" (5 occasions; 2.4 %) and "Arab territories" (8 occasions; 3.9 %) indicates a relatively narrower focus on regional dimensions compared with Al Jazeera's global framing.

On the other hand, Al Hadath's reporting reveals different framing techniques. The data show that central symbols such as the BDS movement and the figure of Omar al-Burghouti were not used as prominently; instead, the channel adopts a narrative frame focusing on Arab public opinion and internal divisions (McCombs & Shaw, 1972). In comparison with Al Jazeera, Israel was mentioned 15 times (12.7 %) and the United States 10 times (8.5 %), suggesting a reduced emphasis on transnational actors. Instead, Al Hadath focused on symbols of Arab solidarity, which were mentioned 20 times (16.9 %), and on Arab states, mentioned 15 times (12.7 %). This indicates the channel's preference to reframe the issue as an internal debate about Arab societies' reception of the boycott, while emphasizing divisions and divergent views within the public. Although the Palestinian cause still features prominently, with 25 mentions (21.2 %), the narrative focus remains on the direct influence of regional policies rather than on the international pressure mechanism or the global boycott movement. References to McDonald's (8 occasions; 6.8 %) and Pepsi Corporation (12 occasions; 10.2 %), percentages similar to Al Jazeera's coverage, indicate a shared interest in the economic dimension, though presented differently.

This similarity reveals that Al Jazeera uses a comprehensive framing strategy that casts the boycott as part of a global political struggle based on resistance and national liberation, in line with framing theory's emphasis on symbols of contention and mobilization (Scheufele, 1999; Snow & Benford, 1988). Conversely, Al Hadath's discourse is built on a regional frame focusing on internal debate, highlighting divisions in Middle Eastern public opinion and the influence of local actors. This approach shows that the boycott is not only part of a global resistance movement but also a product of domestic political dynamics and public discourse.

Finally, the divergence in the way symbols and figures are presented by the two channels reflects not only differences in content but also distinct agenda-setting and framing strategies. While Al Jazeera constructs a narrative that situates the boycott as an instrument of global civic and economic pressure against perceived colonial practices, Al Hadath frames the issue as an internal debate stressing regional divisions and pluralism. This diversity of approaches

underscores the importance of understanding how different media organizations can reshape their audiences' mental frameworks when confronting complex issues such as boycotts of companies supporting Israel, ultimately influencing both policy discourse and public opinion

4.8. Category – Numbers and Statistics

Table 8:

Category – Numbers and Statistics

Channel	Frequency of Numbers and Statistics	Percentage of Frequency
Al Jazeera	17	%14.05
Al-Hadath	8	%17.39

Excelsior Eight analyses the quantitative and qualitative use of numbers and statistics in the media coverage of the boycott issue across two distinct news programmes. The Al Jazeera segment contained 17 numerical or statistical references, representing 14.05 percent of its content, whereas the Al Hadath broadcast featured 8 such references, or 17.39 percent. To control for differences in programme length, these percentages were adjusted to reflect relative frequency per minute. The data show that both channels rely on numbers and statistics to convey information to viewers; however, the way these figures are deployed differs according to each channel's framing approach (Entman, 2008; Iyengar, 1991).

In the Al Jazeera discussion, a variety of figures underscored the economic, political, and historical dimensions of the boycott, reinforcing the notion that it is not merely a regional movement but a global political campaign with tangible effects on the Israeli economy and its international partners. For example, mention was made of US $900 million allocated to counter the BDS movement, US $25 million in Intel investments challenged by the boycott, and US $2.4 million in contracts that Veolia lost in Kuwait. References to the percentage of US states—between 50 percent and 35 percent—that have enacted anti-BDS legislation were also cited. Historical data such as "2014 as a turning point in the boycott movement" and "20 years of grassroots activism" framed the issue within a legal and performance-based narrative linked to global financial and civic capacities. Al Jazeera's aim was to reframe the boycott as a strategic campaign, using precise statistics to expose the economic losses imposed by Israeli policies and Western support for those policies. This tactic accords with agenda-setting theory, which emphasises repeated focus on an issue to shape public priorities, and with framing theory, which posits that statistics can reconstruct reality to influence audience perceptions (Tuchman, 1978; Druckman, 2001).

By contrast, Al Hadath's discourse used numbers and statistics primarily to highlight the boycott's direct impact on the local economic and social context within Arab countries—particularly Egypt. Figures cited included US $20 billion in assets held by multinational corporations in Egypt, 150 000 Egyptians employed by these firms, and one million job opportunities needed annually in the Egyptian labour market. These data underscored the boycott's limited ability to disrupt local employment and the national economy. Additional statistics—such as the number of McDonald's outlets in Russia following the Ukraine conflict and a 70 percent projected drop in retail sales due to the boycott—framed potential negative fiscal consequences beyond employment concerns. Reference to "the year 2000 as the start of Israeli aggression in Gaza" placed the conflict in historical continuity, stressing regional grievances (Kiousis, 2002).

This contrast in numerical usage illustrates agenda-setting in practice: Al Jazeera leverages large figures and exact data to position the boycott at the centre of global political debate, emphasising its economic impact on Israel above all else. In contrast, Al Hadath reframes the issue within a local economic and social context, highlighting uncertainty around domestic

economic prospects and prioritising regional concerns. Framing theory reminds us that numbers and statistics are not neutral; they are tools for crafting specific narratives. Al Jazeera's figures lend credibility to the boycott campaign by showcasing its scope and consequences, whereas Al Hadath's data underscore potential local economic harm, constructing a counter-narrative about the boycott's viability (Entman, 2008).

Ultimately, the quantitative and qualitative disparities in the use of numbers and statistics between Al Jazeera and Al Hadath reflect divergent editorial agendas and framing strategies. Al Jazeera presents the boycott as a global resistance movement with significant political and economic ramifications, justifying its support. Al Hadath, meanwhile, portrays the boycott as a phenomenon with potential adverse effects on local economies and labour markets in Arab nations. Thus, numbers serve not only to inform but also as strategic instruments that reshape media discourse and guide public opinion in alignment with each network's editorial objectives. This underscores the critical role of the media in informing the public on sensitive political and economic issues.

4.9. Category: Ethical and Legal Issues
Table 9:

Category – Ethical and Legal Issues

Category	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Ethical Issues	18	%42	12	%35
Legal Issues	10	%23	8	%24

The information shows that Al Jazeera mentioned "ethical issues" 18 times (42 %) and "legal issues" 10 times (23 %), while Al-Hadath covered "ethical issues" 12 times (35 %) and "legal issues" 8 times (24 %). These figures reveal a difference in priority and emphasis: Al Jazeera foregrounds the moral dimension—framing the boycott as a resistance movement rooted in values of justice and human rights, and legitimizing it as an instrument sanctioned by transnational norms and laws protecting peoples opposed to occupation (Gamson & Modigliani, 1989; Gitlin, 1980).

In Al Jazeera's reporting, ethical questions are raised to underscore the necessity of global solidarity with oppressed populations, guiding public opinion to embrace the boycott as a moral obligation that transcends economic and civic duties. The issue is recast within a narrative of international honor, stressing the imperative for the global community to combat injustice (Entman, 1993). In contrast, Al-Hadath's discourse adopts a more reserved argumentative stance: while it addresses ethical concerns, it questions the boycott's impact on local societies from economic and social perspectives. This approach retains an ethical dimension by exposing divisions within Arab public opinion and probing whether favorable outcomes can be achieved without undermining domestic welfare (McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

Moreover, Al-Hadath's coverage reframes the legal dimension by focusing on obstacles to implementing the boycott locally—especially in the absence of clear legislation—and on potential conflicts with investment-protection laws and international agreements that may constrain economic choices in Arab countries (Druckman, 2001).

Through this combined quantitative and qualitative analysis, it is clear that the disparity in repetition rates for "ethical" versus "legal" issues reflects more than mere statistical variation; it mirrors each channel's editorial agenda, grounded in agenda-setting and framing theories. Al Jazeera seeks to establish a broadcasting agenda that portrays the boycott as a morally and legally legitimate movement on the transnational stage, whereas Al-Hadath presents the boycott as a contested issue, intertwining moral and legal dimensions with local economic

concerns. This framing invites viewers to reconsider these standards in light of legal and social challenges (Chong & Druckman, 2007).

Thus, the analysis demonstrates that agenda-setting and framing go beyond topic selection—they shape the criteria through which issues are interpreted, influencing how audiences process information and form opinions. The divergent framing strategies of the two channels underscore the pivotal role of media in constructing public narratives around sensitive issues such as boycotts, where frame selection and topic emphasis together create a coherent image with moral and legal resonance that informs public opinion and policymaking.

4.10 Category: Social Reactions
Table 10:

Category – Social Reactions

Category	Al Jazeera: Frequencies	Al Jazeera: Percentage	Al Hadath: Frequencies	Al Hadath: Percentage
Boycott Supporters	18	%75	12	%50
Opponents/Hesitant	3	%12.5	8	%33.3
Neutrals/Mixed	3	%12.5	4	%16.7

According to the data shown on Chart Ten, it can be seen that Al Jazeera provided a very helpful discourse on the boycott, together with 75% of the opinion highlighted in the episode Living Caring , compared to just 12.5% for opposition or the hesitant, and 12.5% for these shows as impersonal or undifferentiated opinions. On the other hand, Al-Hadath presents an excessively balanced picture of opinion, with supporters accounting for 50 percent, opposition for a hesitant close to 33.3 percent, and 16.7 percent falling into the impersonal or mixed class.

The analysis of Al Jazeera's speech suggests that the boycott is intended to be a skilled way of resisting Israeli policies, focusing on the success of the BDS movement in coercing multinational enterprises and Western regimes into making decisions against Palestinian prerogatives. Examples of companies that, as a result of the boycott campaigns, had already lost money include, for instance, Vivolia, which had lost thousands of dollars, and Puma, which had been affected by a surge of boycotts in various countries in support of Israeli institutions. Similarly, a technique reframes the boycott in a narrative that highlights its accomplishments, demonstrating that it is not merely a human consumer choice but an international movement with a tangible impact that reinforces the credibility of the political campaign in public consciousness (Entman, 1993; McCombs & Shaw, 1972).

As for the opposition, or the hesitant in Al Jazeera's secondary coverage, this group appeared to be represented by a small proportion (12.5%), claiming that the program Make Nay does not provide equal space to viewpoints that question the effectiveness of the boycott. Alternatively, these opinions were dealt with within the framework of the obstacles affecting the political campaign, with a view to focusing on all obstacles as failures hindering their progress. The current method is characterized by a mobilizing framework guided by a steady stream of demanded support for the boycott through frontal triumph stories (Chong & Druckman, 2007).

On the other hand, Al-Hadath's speech adopted a distinct structure; it represents the boycott as a controversial issue within the limits of Arab society, allowing more space to oppose or hesitant pronouncements (33.3%). The discussion in the episode also focused on the potential fiscal impact of the boycott on local markets, with the guest highlighting the possible pessimistic consequences such as the closure of global business branches, the effect on local employment, and rising unemployment. The problem of replacing imported goods with

community-based options in key sectors such as food and technology has been illustrated by examples of nations like Iraq, suffering from a lack of community-based alternatives (Druckman, 2001).

Evaluation of these consequences from the point of view of agenda-setting and framing theory reveals that Al Jazeera relies upon a news method that reframes the boycott as a victorious movement, accompanied by effective global impacts, through the presentation of its achievements and accomplishments, thus encouraging the public to adopt a supportive attitude toward the political campaign. On the other hand, Al-Hadath uses a more debatable and analytical technique, stressing the monetary and social risks of boycotting in Middle Eastern society, which directs citizens to be more aware of the practical obstacles. The current disparity in the allocation of opinion and the use of percentages reflects a divergent editorial orientation, alongside all channels' efforts to shape citizens' awareness and inform policy approaches on a sensitive issue such as the fiscal boycott (Iyengar, 1991).

5. Study Results:

Based on the facts presented in the text, the findings of the investigative research on the duo episode with al Jazeera and Al Hadath in relation to the boycott of goods from companies aiding Israel can be summarised as follows.

5.1. Key Differences Between the Discourses

5.1.1. Al Jazeera

- Mobilizing and Resistance Discourse:

– Al Jazeera uses a mobilizing and calculated discourse, focusing on portraying the boycott as a tool of political and economic resistance against the Israeli entity.
– The BDS movement should be seen as a globally planned coercive campaign, with the term mentioned 43 times (6.3%), which highlights the channel's strategic intent to address the issue and influence global movements.
– The channel frequently uses terms such as "the occupation" (28 times), "Apartheid" (14 times), and "Palestinian citizens" (35 times) to express its strong opposition to Israeli policies.

- International and Political Orientation:

– Al Jazeera focuses on the transnational and political dimensions of the boycott, such as the pressure on governments and the role of global society (mentioned 5 times, 3.3%), reflecting an effort to emphasize the global perspective on the issue at hand.
– It highlights the economic impact of the boycott on the Israeli economy by repeatedly referencing the phrase "consequences of the boycott on the Israeli economy," mentioned nine times (6.0%).

- Use of Numbers and Statistics

– The Channel Trust provides extensive statistical data to reframe the boycott as a movement with significant financial and societal consequences, such as the losses suffered by international firms due to grassroots campaigns.

5.1.2. Al-Hadath

- Neutral and Analytical Discourse

– Al-Hadath adopted a further impersonal and diversified technique, focusing on the effects of the boycott on citizens' daily lives and purchasing opportunities.

- it underlines the local option (referred to 7 intervals next to 7.8 %) and support for the domestic economy, mirroring a position aiming at offering viable solutions without resorting to responsive civil difficulties.

- Social and Economic Challenges

- The channel focuses on internal divisions and economic challenges that Arab societies may face due to the boycott, as well as opportunities for employment and job creation within communities.
- Economic issues are emphasized at 28%, reflecting an effort to present a comprehensive view of the topic while addressing its financial dimensions.
- Absence of an International Framework:
- The BDS movement and aspects related to social and academic resistance are not emphasized in scholarly discourse, suggesting that Al-Hadath prioritizes local and regional perspectives over global dimensions.

5.2. Similarities and Differences in Framing

5.2.1 Similarities

- Agreement on the Importance of Discussing the Boycott:Both channels prioritize discussing the feasibility of the boycott as a strategic mechanism, as evidenced by the statement "the boycott can be carried out," cited at 5.3% for Al Jazeera and 6.7% for Al-Hadath.
- Emphasis on the Role of Major Companies:Both channels highlight the impact of the boycott on major organizations such as McDonald's and multinational corporations, reflecting a shared understanding of the significance of this dimension.

5.2.2. Differences

- Difference in Priorities

- al Jazeera concentrated on the political and global dimension of the boycott; during Al-Hadath dressed ore over the local fiscal and societal characteristics.
- Difference in Presentation Style:
- al Jazeera uses a mobilizing discourse based on a near increase in demand for aid, whereas al-Hadath uses a multi-dimensional debate that allows for a variety of opinions.

5.3. The Impact of Media Agendas

5.3.1 Media Agenda Theory

- al Jazeera seeks to make the boycott a priority issue in the global debate by repeatedly discussing issues related to the BDS movement and global burdens.
- Al-Hadath is looking for a way of redirecting the debate to the sensible and financial repercussions of the boycott on the societies of the Mideast.

5.3.2. Framing Theory

- al Jazeera frames the issue within a framework of conditions that link politics, economy, and tradition, making it seem to be an international issue with a calculable dimension.
- Al-Hadath reframes the issue within a further narrowly defined neighborhood situation, focusing on consumer and fiscal characteristics.

5.4. Key Findings

5.4.1. Difference in Editorial Objectives

- al Jazeera is attempting to mobilize Arab society opinion and encourage support for the boycott as a means of civic and economic resistance.

– Al-Hadath seeks a balanced prospect in this regard, focusing on the possibility of financial and interpersonal difficulties.

5.4.2. Differences in Framing Strategies
– al Jazeera relies on a civic and transnational foundation, while al-Hadath relies on a municipal monetary structure.

5.4.3. Diversity of Media Messages
– each channel shall transmit a distinct message consistent with its column agenda and target audience.
– Importance of Numbers and Statistics:
– Numbers and statistics are used as tactical tools for recasting the media's discourse and steering public opinion.
– These discoveries show how the two broadcasters differ in their approach to the boycott problem, as well as the important role of the media agenda and its methodologies in shaping public perceptions of politically and economically sensitive challenges.

6. Conclusion

This comparative analysis of Al Jazeera's Athir podcast (5 February 2025) and Al Hadath's Al Hadath fi Makanak episode (9 June 2024) has demonstrated that television discourse is strategically framed to guide public understanding and response to the boycott of goods from companies supporting the Zionist entity. Al Jazeera employs an explicitly mobilizing discourse, repeatedly invoking terms such as "occupation," "apartheid," and "resistance" to situate the boycott within a global struggle for justice and human rights. By foregrounding the BDS movement (6.3 % of key terms) and emphasizing the international legal-political context, it constructs the boycott as an extension of transnational civic resistance, aimed at pressuring regimes and multinational corporations

In contrast, Al Hadath adopts a more neutral, analytical stance. Its coverage privileges discussion of local economic and social ramifications—highlighting consumer markets, alternative local products, and national employment effects (e.g., "local alternative" appears 7.8 % of the time)—while omitting references to broader ideological movements like BDS

. This pragmatic framing draws attention to the immediate fiscal consequences of boycotts in Arab societies, thereby reinforcing a problem-solving agenda that prioritizes stability and domestic resilience over transnational solidarity.

Methodologically, applying framing and agenda-setting theories has illuminated how selective lexical choices, repetition of key phrases, and statistical invocations coalesce to shape viewers' perceptions. Al Jazeera's use of mobilizing terminology and emotive framing aligns with its editorial objective to foster pan-Arab solidarity, whereas Al Hadath's emphasis on economic data and balanced viewpoints reflects its orientation toward contextualized, consumer-oriented discourse. These findings underscore that even with identical subject matter, divergent editorial priorities yield markedly different narratives and potential policy impacts.

Looking ahead, this study highlights the need for broader, multi-channel analyses that incorporate audience reception data and visual semiotic elements to capture the full spectrum of media influence. Future research might examine how these framing strategies play out on digital platforms, where interactivity and user-generated content further complicate narrative control. By deepening our understanding of how broadcast language and imagery interact to produce persuasive effects, scholars and practitioners can better assess the ethical and societal implications of media discourse in shaping public opinion and political action.

References

Al Jazeera. (2024, April 5). UN Human Rights Council demands Israel be held accountable for possible war crimes. Al Jazeera.

AP News. (2024). UN human rights body calls for halt to weapons shipments to Israel as concerns about Gaza war mount. AP News.

Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1993). Agendas and instability in American politics. University of Chicago Press.

Mahboub, O. (2022). Acculturation across the Mediterranean Basin: The Impact of Ideological Affiliation upon Cross-Cultural Communication. Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 5(1), 18–26. Retrieved from https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/198470

Benarfa, brahim, & Boutagouga, M. (2024). Babbar Rug: Cultural Heritage in the Service of Sustainable Development. Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 7(3), 169–185. Retrieved from https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/261530

Rais Ali, I., & MEDJAHED, yamina. (2024). Media and history Dialectical relationship between media and history, documenting the historical memory with new visions in the frame of the information society. Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 7(1), 126–142. Retrieved from https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/250271

Letaief, R. (2022). Reality TV and the Promotion of the Individualism Thesis: MBC's Top Chef 2 as a Case Study. Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 5(2), 49–61. Retrieved from https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/214939

Emery, J. F. (2024). Un-framing the queer media body: a virtual reality experimentation. Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society (JSLCS), 7(2), 229–251. Retrieved from https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/255745

Buchanan, L., & Waller, M. (2024). The right to boycott: Anti-BDS laws violate the First Amendment to protect apartheid. University of Minnesota Law & Inequality Repository.

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing public opinion in competitive democracies. American Political Science Review, 101(4), 637–655.

Cristal, D. (2011). Internet Linguistics: A Student Guide. Routledge.

Curran, J. (2002). Media and Power. Routledge.

D'Angelo, P., & Kuypers, J. A. (2010). Doing news framing analysis: Empirical and theoretical perspectives. Routledge.

Ding, X., Horning, M., & Rho, E. H. (2023). Same words, different meanings: Semantic polarization in broadcast media language forecasts polarization on social media discourse. arXiv.

Dor, D. (2003). On newspaper headlines as relevance optimizers. Journal of Pragmatics, 35(5), 695–721.

Gee, J. P. (2011). An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method. Routledge.