



AN INTERNATIONAL HYBRID CONFERENCE

12th COTEFL

Conference on Teaching
English as A Foreign
Language

*Paths to Maximize the AI's Roles in
Shaping Future Language Education
and Literacy Studies*

5th CELTI

Conference on English
Language Teaching

Public Judgmental Towards Israel Attack Hospital: Appraisal of Al Jazeera Column Comments

Author's:

Ibnu Hudzaifah Hanief

Affiliation:

¹Universitas Muhammadiyah Purwokerto,
Indonesia

Corresponding email:

fuad.fudiyartanto@uin-suka.ac.id

DOI:

<https://doi.org/10.24090/celti.2025.1350>

Pages:

109-120

Abstract: This research analyzes social opinions made through the medium of online comments on Israel's military attacks on Gaza's hospitals, observed on Al Jazeera news website's comment pages. Based on a qualitative descriptive analysis and Appraisal Theory, specifically the Judgment dimension this study seeks to demystify internet users' judgment and opinion on the matter. The analysis yielded 84 instances of judgment that fell into the Social Esteem and Social Sanction categories. Under Social Esteem, 13 comments were identified and grouped under Capacity (12) and Tenacity (1). Conversely, Social Sanction was more evident with 71 comments comprising Veracity (17) and Propriety (54). The latter category was utilized largely to evaluate both Israel's and Hamas's actions against established social norms and sanctions. The results suggest that public communication is not merely evaluative but also shaped by underlying theological ideologies and personal beliefs. Most internet users situate their comments within religious or ideological frameworks, thereby deciding their evaluation of the conflict. The paper underlines the intricate relationship among language, ideology, and public opinion in online discussion, revealing how virtual communities frame and express opinions about contentious geopolitical conflicts.

Keywords: public judgmental; hospital; al jazeera

Copyright © 2025 by Author/s. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is widely discussed in mainstream media. As the digital age advances as a platform for reporting to the larger community on the war, the news media covers the conflict extensively through many channels where they play a significant role. Indeed, news about the conflict is reported from all around the world, in addition to the Middle East conflict. Regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, many people believe there will always be bloodshed between the two sides and that the situation is unsolvable. The broader Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the root cause of the Gaza-Israel problem. The interplay of historical, geographic, and social factors makes this debate more complex. The conflict intensified when the state of Israel was founded in 1948 and continued through the Israeli-Arab war (Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Global Conflict Tracker, 2022 quoted by). In this case, the conflict persists and seems never to end. al Conflict Tracker, 2022 quoted by (Suwarsono, 2022). In this instance, the conflict continues and never ends.

This research explores public comments that implicitly evaluate Al Jazeera's documentary videos. Previous studies, such as Amaireh (2024), have regarded Al Jazeera as a news media institution, emphasizing how its ideology is shaped by its writers. However, this study analyzes online user comments that express evaluative judgments in column comments. The column comment is open to the general public, allowing individuals to express their opinions, narrate their perspectives, or even simply vent their emotions across various media platforms. Comments sections serve as a venue for the public to express their opinions or even inspire others based on their knowledge or merely to convey an emotion toward a particular issue. According to Humprecht et al. (2020), In short, social media allows everyone around the world to come online and express their opinions on many topics. The comments sections or column comments for many such social media sites show that the public can now voice their opinions and attitudes about both public and personal issues, as a result of the nature of online social spaces.

Each individual possesses a unique approach to commenting and evaluating the subject under discussion, which can be regarded as a form of public sentiment toward the object being debated. This diversity in expression reflects the varied ways in which the public engages with and responds to topics of interest in the digital sphere (Simamora et al., 2024). Several researchers have conducted studies on public opinion within the comments sections related to various topics such as politics (Ayu et al., 2022; Khristianto, 2020), news (Kalogeropoulos et al., 2017), news platform (Ben-David and Soffer, 2018), depression (Gaus et al., 2021; Tao & Jacobs, 2019). Certainly, this indicates that research on public comments in the comments section attracts attention from broad audiences. As a result, this is a study that considers public comments concerning aspects of emotion, judgment, and appreciation within the comment sections of social media.

Therefore, appraisal theory is applied in these studies focusing on the Attitude system within Judgment. This framework examines how authors and speakers use language to construct their identities, negotiate intersubjectivity, and exercise ideological influence (Martin & White, 2005). The model is used here to analyze judgmental language in comments on mass media or YouTube sites, aiming to identify positive and negative judgments by the public and how they express their views on the issues presented in the videos. The Appraisal theory, particularly Attitude within the scope of this study, explains sentiment in written English. This aligns with the current research, which aims to analyze public opinion by examining the assessment attitudes expressed in comments. As White (2005) argued, "attitude" is the evaluative meaning that individuals choose to adopt toward events or propositions of specific phenomena, either positively or negatively.

Judgment is one of the types of attitudes used in this study. Martin & White (2005) assert that judgment involves evaluating individuals' behavior according to social norms. Judgment is further divided into two main categories: social sanction and social esteem. Social esteem includes three subcategories: normality, capacity, and tenacity, while social sanction includes two subcategories: propriety and veracity. Normality refers to the degree of normalcy, capacity to capability, and tenacity to reliability. Conversely, social sanction is formalized through written media, such as ethics, decrees, rules, regulations, and laws (Martin & White, 2005). Inappropriate, Social esteem, and Sanction are the core domains in the judgment subsystem, which involves character and behavior or judgment of human conduct or an act aimed at a particular social group, making judgments about such conduct made by people.

Social esteem facilitates an understanding of how individuals navigate social life and render their judgments about others' behavior in given contexts (Martin & White, 2005). It has specific applicability to ethics and social norms. It entails the evaluation of the extent to which individuals adhere to the expectations and behavioral norms in society. In contrast with social esteem, social sanction can be characterized as a judgment of human conduct or an act aimed at a particular social group making judgments about such conduct. Social sanction is a judgment with reference to moral or ethical principles, including the oppositions of right and wrong or good and bad. It is also bound up with laws, regulations, and social norms (Martin and White, 2005). Based on this theoretical framework, the current study uses public comments as the research data. The current study employs public comments as the research data.

However, some studies are quite similar to the subject of this research. These studies examine the subject matter of conflict and war through analyzing news media based on the approach of critical discourse analysis (Alyahya, 2023). Furthermore, some studies utilize Fairclough's theory, applying his three-dimensional model of analysis to reveal instances of Islamophobia in the Israel-Palestine conflict case (Aqeel & Hussain, 2024). In addition, the topic has been examined through several critical studies approaches to the conflict in Israel-Palestine (Amaireh, 2024; Fikri, 2024). Apart from that, research by Simamora et al. (2024) examines sentiment towards the conflict, although it employs the Naive Bayes Classifier algorithm as its distinctive methodological approach. Consequently, this highlights a deficiency in the existing literature when compared to the current investigation, as there has been a lack of previous studies that have examined public sentiment analysis through the Appraisal framework, particularly concentrating on the attitude category along with its judgment subcategory. Therefore, this study aims to reveal public opinion in commentary, more precisely in how judgments are expressed, either positively or negatively, and why the public evaluates sentiment in their remarks. This study, therefore, ought to contribute to sentiment analysis studies by applying the Appraisal framework, more specifically under the category of judgment.

Research Method

Pada penelitian berikut ini menggunakan data komentar public yang bersumber dari kolom komentar media berita Al Jazeera with entitled Why is Israel striking Hospital in Gaza? Al Jazeera World Documentary dengan memfokuskan pada komentar publik yang mengandung sebuah Judgement dalam berkomentar. Dengan demikian pada penelitian ini uses the method of collecting data with the observe and note approach (Sudaryanto, 2015), which involves carefully analyzing comments and copying and pasting those with emotive language, as well as the observation of written language. Written differently. This entails reading the comments attentively and copying and pasting the passages that match the requirements, i.e., the sections that either directly or indirectly use emotive language. The lexicographer program Antconc 4.3.1w is another tool employed for this study's analytic approach to finding keywords, distributions, and clusters.

This study focuses on the attitude aspect contained in public comments in the comment column. In this study, the data were subjected to an appraisal system analysis attitude aspect (Martin and White, 2005). Moreover, the analytical approach in this study utilized a data analysis model that was separated into multiple stages (Matthew B. Miles et al., 2014). This research exposes and discusses audience reactions to Al Jazeera Media's video documentaries on the column comment YouTube Channel platform.

Results & Discussion

In this study, a judgment was found which was divided into two categories, social esteem and social sanction, where overall 84 judgments were found in a comment that was thrown. In the Social Esteem category, although it is divided into three categories, in the following study only two categories were found. In Social Esteem there are 13 data divided into two, namely Capacity there are 12 and the rest are Tenacity. While in the Social Sanction category, 71 were found divided into two, namely Vercity with 17 data and Propriety 54 data were found.

Table 1. Number of Judgments

Judgement									
Apprais	Soc-Est				Soc-Sanc				Total
	Cap		Ten		Ver		Prop		
	+	-	+	-	+	-	+	-	
Mp		2						1	3
Pa						10	1	2	13
AJ	2		1			5		18	26
Is							1	13	14
Ha		7						16	23
N pro AJ					2				2
N pro Pa								2	2
N pro Ha		1							1
Total	2	10	1	0	2	15	2	52	84
	12		1		17		54		

Cap: Capacity, Ten: Tenacity, Nor: Normality, Ver: Veracity, Prop: Propriety

Apprais: Appraised, Pa: Palestine, Mp: Muslim people, Ha: Hamas, AJ: Al Jazeera, Is: Israel, N Pro AJ: Netizen Pro Al Jazeera, N pro pa: Palestine, N Prop Ha: Hamas.

Furthermore, the data will be explained based on the category and representative of each Appraised that is intended by the author in commenting with the code as above, the explanation of each data is as follows:

In the provided data bellow (Ju/Cap/Ne-Mp1), a netizen assesses Muslim people, categorically placing them under the category "Arab countries." This is a result of the author reacting to an event viewed as highly inhumane. The writer responds to the savagery of the event by pointing out the absence of reaction on the part of Arab or other Muslim nations, as brought out in the sentence "brutal acts and nothing dong," with "dong" being a typographical mistake for "doing." Furthermore, at the end of the sentence (Ju/Cap/Ne-Mp1), the author questions whether these Arab countries or other Muslims are "living or dead," implying a judgment on their existence (alive) or non-existence (dead) based on the absence of an effective or ethical response. This judgment emphasizes the assumed efficacy of Arab nations or Muslims, which suggests a sense of indifference or incapacity to respond competently (Martin and White, 2005).

1. Datum of Capacity

No	Data	App-er	App-ed
(Ju/Cap/Ne-Mp1)	"Surrounding Arab countries looking at these brutal acts and nothing dong mean what?Are they living or dead?"	Net	Mp-
(Ju/Cap/Ne-Ha1)	" Hamas is a very shrewd , byzantine organisation which has been able to craft their narrative using the bombing of hospitals by Israel through the media in a very effective way ..."	Net	Ha-
(Ju/Cap/Ne-Ha2)	"Tell Hummus not to turn hospitals into legitimate targets."	Net	Ha-
(Ju/Cap/Ne-NproAj1)	"..what do u expect blame Hamas .."	Net	NproAj-
(Ju/Cap/Pos-Aj1)	"One more thing! You will NEVER see a documentary like this on CNN or MSNBC!!!! "	Net	NproAj +

In the following datum Ju/Cap/Ne-Ha1, a sentence expresses a negative judgment towards Hamas. The author comments based on his perspective after viewing the documentary content produced by Al Jazeera news media. In his commentary, the author confidently asserts that the coverage was orchestrated by Hamas itself, particularly by indicating that Hamas's utilization of media to shape. The narrative surrounding the Israeli bombardment of hospitals is exceptionally effective. Also, in the data (Ju/Cap/Ne-Ha1), the adjectives "shrewd" and "byzantine" are positioned at the start of the sentence to imply that Hamas's strategies are seen to be ingenious in exploiting the media to construct the narrative of Israel's targeting of hospitals. This reveals Hamas's competence, as Martin and White (2005) have defined. The employment of these words and a variety of introductory phrases at the end imparts a negative tone to the sentence because it manifestly conveys a negative judgment, namely, a denunciation of Hamas's actions.

Also found the author comments, urging others to notify Hamas, primarily targeting Hamas rather than pro-netizen groups or others. Consequently, the author judges Hamas by declaring that it has made hospitals legitimate targets for attacks. However, this point is not the main subject of the next data, where a distinctive spelling mistake of the word "hummus" appears to be a purposeful typographical error by the author. The reference to "hummus" indicates a deliberate attempt to equate Hamas with "humus," a term in Latin denoting the dark organic substance in soil created from decaying plant or animal matter, essential for soil vitality (Cambridge Dictionary: 2025), or with "hummus," a well-known Middle Eastern dish. Additionally, this study revealed that many comments treated "Humus" and "Hummus" as interchangeable with "Hamas." This choice of words seems to aim for sarcasm, likening hummus, depicted as dark and underground, to Hamas, which is portrayed as lurking beneath hospitals or in hidden tunnels. This analysis pertains to the capacity category described by Martin and White (2005). Such a conclusion reflects the author's perspective on the incident, particularly holding Hamas accountable for the designation of hospitals as legitimate targets during the attacks.

The following datum Ju/Cap/Ne-NproAj1, provides a sentence structure that indicates a judgment regarding Hamas's organizational capacity. The sentence at issue is a rhetorical question, implying that holding Hamas responsible is a rational or expected response based on the author's viewpoint. This claim accords with the author that Hamas uses hospitals and schools as shelters or military bases. In this way, the sentence indirectly questions the logic or decision-making of individuals who are neither

anti-Hamas nor pro-Hamas, falling into the capacity subcategory of Martin and White's theoretical framework (2005). This can be observed through the words “expect blame Hamas,” where there is an evaluative component in this datum. However, this datum expresses to netizens that pro-Al Jazeera after the reaction to the documentary showing Israel striking a hospital in Gaza.

The following data Ju/Cap/Pos-Aj1 reflects a favourable assessment of the news outlet Al Jazeera. The author assesses it as a news source whose broadcasts differ from those of other media organizations. This distinction is particularly evident in comparisons made with outlets like CNN and MSNBC, showcasing Al Jazeera’s strengths as a news source. Additionally, the author highlights the distinctive and superior quality of Al Jazeera’s documentaries, asserting that its content is something “YOU WILL NEVER see.” This comparison implies that Al Jazeera’s documentaries possess exceptional credibility or delve into topics that few media outlets tackle. According to appraisal theory (Martin and White, 2005), this reflects a judgment of capacity, as the evaluation focuses specifically on the documentaries themselves.

2. Datum of Tenacity

No	Data	App-er	App-ed
(Ju/Ten/Pos-Aj1)	“Al Jazeera; true journalistic integrity . Bless you all”	Net	Aj+

In the provided data (Ju/Ten/Pos-Aj1), the commentator or netizen gives a judgment statement upon evaluating a documentary video report conducted by the news agency Al Jazeera. The commentator explicitly and directly expresses the opinion that Al Jazeera is a media outlet with journalistic integrity. Furthermore, this statement reveals that Al Jazeera has a sincere dedication to truth and moral principles, despite cases where publishing information may be challenging or perilous, as highlighted by the author's use of the phrase “true journalistic integrity.” This is a positive example of worthy persistence, applauding journalists who work with Al Jazeera for their determination in upholding professional standards (Martin and White, 2005). The speaker emphasizes Al Jazeera's unshakeable dedication to honesty and ethical journalism by saying the organization has “true journalistic integrity,” particularly in difficult war zones.

3. Datum of Veracity

No	Data	App-er	App-ed
(Ju/Ver/Ne-Pa1)	The world already know the answer by now. Hamas is Gazan civilians and Gazan civilians are Hamas. ”	Net	Pa-
(Ju/Ver/Ne-Aj3)	“Without lies , Aljazeera and ISLAM die ”.	Net	Aj-
(Ju/Ver/Ne-Aj2)	“Yes, because they are not liars like al Jazeera”	Net	Aj-
(Ju/Ver/Pos-NproAj1)	“Then it must be true .”	Net	NproAj+

In the following data (Ju/Ver/Ne-Pa1), there is a unique comment in which the same remark is repeatedly made. Notably, there are ten comments written by the same writer, which indirectly conveys a negative judgment toward Gaza’s civilians by equating them entirely with Hamas, a group that has long been viewed as controversial or even as a terrorist organization by opponents of Palestine. Furthermore,

this implies that all Gaza civilians share the same behaviors, values, or faults as Hamas, representing a strong negative evaluation of their character and morality (Martin and White, 2005). Therefore, the judgment expressed here is negative, as it criticizes or condemns an entire group of people based on their association, while the commenter asserts their perspective that the events of the conflict are justified and that Hamas is the legitimate target. Regarding this matter, the author is convinced that the Gaza community that was attacked was Hamas or by convincing the people who were attacked were Hamas, this makes the author's belief in commenting have a negative meaning. Moreover, by posting consecutive comments, the author appears to use commenting to reinforce their argument in the face of opposing viewpoints.

There is a comment in datum (Ju/Ver/Ne-Aj3), which the writer expresses a belief regarding a particular media outlet. This is demonstrated through a direct evaluation of both the news media AJ and Muslim people. The writer identifies AJ with Islam, pointing out that AJ is a large media company from the Middle East. In the sentence (Ju/Ver/Ne-Aj3), the writer believes AJ news media uses dishonest methods. The writer argues that the media would not be able to exist or function if it did not lie. Furthermore, the author claims that the documentary video is false. The writer also generalizes this perspective to Islam, arguing that it has survived on the foundation of lies, meaning that both parties have been broadly dishonest or deceptive. This kind of language significantly impacts how individuals view things because it represents the targeted groups as dishonest and deceptive. This is an extremely harsh negative judgment in any social or moral context. Martin and White (2005) Appraisal Theory informs that this is a judgment of truthfulness, which questions if a person or group is honest, truthful, or trustworthy.

In the datum (Ju/Ver/Ne-Aj2), there is a response to a comment from another author, in which the writer affirms the previous statement by referencing several other media outlets (x). Furthermore, this phrase simultaneously serves as an evaluation of AJ media by comparing it to these other outlets. The author asserts that media (x) is indeed credible and reliable, unlike AJ media, particularly in terms of the quality of news broadcasts or video content. By labelling AJ media as "liars," the speaker is making a judgment about truthfulness, which, according to Martin and White's (2005) Appraisal Theory, is a subcategory of Judgment related to honesty and credibility. The author emphasizes that the media (x) is honest (not a liar), while AJ is accused of dishonesty. This creates a clear contrast in ethical evaluation, positioning one group positively and the other negatively concerning truthfulness.

There is a comment sentence on following datum (Ju/Ver/Pos-NproAj1) that constitutes an answer to other netizens' comments. The author responds to netizens who stand for the Al Jazeera (AJ) media with a judgment about the media. In the response under datum (Ju/Ver/Pos-NproAj1), it serves as a positive judgment of veracity, meaning that the author accepts and genuinely believes that the information from the media is true and trustworthy (Martin and White 2005). In the other response (Ju/Ver/Pos-NproAj2), it maintains the highest confidence possible from the author with the expression, "100/true." This evaluation reinforces the judgment of Al Jazeera's reporting reliability, which goes along with other pro-Al Jazeera comments made by netizens. Such language adds to the development of public trust in the media by making explicit claims of truthfulness, since those are very significant in affirming the authority and legitimacy of information dissemination. This positive evaluation persuades the readers to accept the report as accurate and credible.

4. Datum of Propriety Negative

No	Data	App-er	App-ed
(Ju/Prop/Ne-Mp1)	"And where are the islamic countries hiding under. Shame on you all for not defending your own brother's and sisters. it shows you have no shame. "	Net	Mp-
(Ju/Prop/Ne-Pa2)	"Question. Why is Isreal targeting hospitals. Answer. Because the Palestinians have allowed Hamas to build tunnels within the hospital complex. Easy."	Net	Pa-
(Ju/Prop/Ne-Aj1)	"This is a Hamas propaganda channel sponsor by Qatar!"	Net	Aj-
(Ju/Prop/Ne-Is7)	"The Israeli soldiers know why they are targeting the hospitals bcs there's the babies and men women and many civilians freedom of palastine."	Net	Is-
(Ju/Prop/Ne-Ha12)	"A very stupid question in title the reason is HAMAS is using Palestine people as a Human SHIELD IS THIS NOT A KNOWN FACT ??????????????????"	Net	Ha-
(Ju/Prop/Ne-NproPa1)	"You people are one-sided people who are you to judge Israeli for what happened, blame Hamas so what if other people got killed"	Net	NproPa-

The following datum (Ju/Prop/Ne-Mp1) contains a comment that delivers an evaluation targeting people of the Muslim faith, specifically Islamic states, through direct mention. The observation was noted by the writer after watching a documentary by Al Jazeera and responding to the violence depicted, pointing out the lack of protection measures or responses by Islamic states. This is evidently shown by the author's utterance, "where are the Islamic countries hiding under." Moreover, the author expresses a Negative Judgment (propriety) to condemn actions that negatively impact the moral character of Islamic nations and people (Martin and White, 2005). The observation highlights an objectionable act—namely, the failure to assist or support fellow Muslims. In addition, the application of the term "shame" and the frequent rhetorical questions in the commentary are a form of contempt that denounces those nations for their apparent moral failings in supporting fellow Muslim nations.

In the subsequent data (Ju/prop/Ne-Pa2), one encounters a sentence that is both a question and a direct response uttered by the author. Not only does the author make the answer to the question, but he also provides a critical analysis of Palestine founded upon a social sanction presumed by the author. There is a question in the first half of the sentence, which happens to be the title of an Al Jazeera documentary video, "why is Israel targeting hospitals." This is followed by the author's response, which is an evaluative judgment. The author opines that these actions are allegedly legitimized by the Palestinian citizens themselves, who supposedly authorize or sanction the construction of tunnels and being present in medical centers, thus providing reason for Israel's military incursions. Such actions are viewed as being unethical and unprofessional in terms of enabling Hamas to utilize hospitals. According to Martin and White (2005), the measure based on social sanction, more particularly of propriety, is that the phrase makes a negative moral judgment about that particular portrayal of Palestine.

The author presents a critical review in this datum (Ju/Prop/Ne-Aj1). The author criticizes the news media outlet Al Jazeera (AJ), alleging its affiliation with Hamas. This implies that, from the author's perspective, AJ is perceived as either protecting or distorting facts or provoking through its journalistic practices. Additionally, this interpretation is supported by the author's clear designation of AJ as a "Hamas propaganda channel," indicating that the media is being utilized as a tool for Hamas propaganda activities. The author also mentions Qatar, the home country of AJ, thereby associating the media outlet

with specific geopolitical interests. The choice of words reflects a negative appraisal of the integrity and motives of AJ, as evidenced by the use of the phrase "propaganda channel" and its association with Hamas. According to Martin and White (2005), this type of language carries a negative assessment in that it not only critiques the media outlet but also links it to Hamas factions and depicts it as a propaganda machine.

The following information (Ju/Prop/Ne-Is7) provides a comment directed towards Israel, answering the headline of an AJ media source, where the writer reflects on Israel's actions concerning an attack on a hospital. The writer's response is indicative of a common reaction after witnessing the documentary footage produced by AJ. In addition, the writer explains the motive behind Israel's attack, claiming there is a specific reason behind this act. This is seen in the final part of the sentence, where the author speaks of "babies, men, women, and many civilians." Furthermore, implicitly, this evaluates the situation by emphasizing the presence of vulnerable people in the hospital, suggesting that their presence might sway Israel's decision to strike the building. Thus, the following analysis explicates the author's position regarding Israel's reasons for targeting the hospital while offering, at the same time, a critical exploration of Israel's actions as unethical and immoral (Martin and White, 2005). This observation is also reinforced by the evidence (Ju/Prop/Ne-Is7), which illustrates a realization of propriety.

The provided datum (Ju/Prop/Ne-Ha12) expresses a clear evaluative position on Hamas, as the author reacts to the headline of an AJ media article by saying, "What a stupid question." In this case, the author goes further with their comments as they criticize or blame Hamas. The writer puts strong belief in the aspect that the said action is purely being undertaken by Hamas, as stated in the line, "Hamas is using Palestinian people as a human shield." To claim or accuse someone of such is morally unacceptable and lacks humanity (Martin and White, 2005). Thus, the author describes and condemns this act under the prism of morality and ethics, indirectly expressing a significant negative judgment of Hamas activities as immoral and unethical.

The provided data (Ju/Prop/Ne-NproPa1) reveals a clear evaluative stance toward Npropa (Netizen pro Palestine). In the beginning, the author points out that judging is unilateral or unfair within Npropa (Martin and White, 2005). This aspect of unfair evaluation falls within the scope of Judgment under Propriety concerning social sanction. Moreover, there is a rhetorical question, "who are yours to judge?" which questions the moral legitimacy or appropriateness of criticism, implying that Npropa is not entitled to or misbehaves by personally blaming Israel. Hence, this serves as an example of negative judgment of propriety (Martin and White, 2005) as it brings up the ethical legitimacy on which Npropa grounds its judgment of Israel alone. Therefore, it implies that such an evaluation highlights impropriety or unethicity, such as Npropa's position according to social sanction.

Moreover, the author commands "blame Hamas," implying not so much a transfer of blame from Israel onto Hamas but rather that the author believes Hamas was morally culpable in this act too (Martin and White, 2005). This demonstrates a negative judgment of propriety against Hamas, indicating that their actions are wrong according to someone's ethical beliefs about them. It upholds a moral evaluation of an agreement regarding who should be blamed for that event. Furthermore, the author redirects this judgment against Npropa itself while presenting arguments from both sides-Israel and Hamas-as evidence that assessments are better made not based on one party but rather concerning ethical obligations. This, in turn, serves as a rhetorical move on the author's part to sway their intended

audience, namely, Npropa. Thus, in shorthand, the author is paradoxically attempting to blame Npropa for its unfairness, taking a one-sided view.

5. Datum of Propriety Positive

No	Data	App-er	App-ed
(Ju/Prop/Pos-Pa1)	"Free Palestine , Palestinians have the right to fight for their freedom "	Net	Pa+
(Ju/Prop/Pos-Is1)	".... God gave Israel spirit of wisdom ,knowledge and understanding . So what if they targeted nothing to hide there ,nothing bad or what. Show it the honest things. Anyway, God will reveal the truth."	Net	Is+

In this datum (Ju/Prop/Pos-Pa1), the author expresses a positive evaluation of Palestine. In the author's or netizen's comment, the phrase "The Palestinian people have the right to fight for their freedom" represents a positive judgment of the actions or ethics related to support and moral stance toward the Palestinian people (Martin and White, 2005). The author responds by commenting on the Al Jazeera documentary coverage of events in Palestine. Therefore, demonstrating confidence that Palestine has the right to freedom and resistance. This phrase affirms that their struggle is justified and appropriate, constituting a positive appraisal of their behavior and rights. Furthermore, the call to "Free Palestine" indicates growing support for this positive attitude, aligning with the idea that their actions are legitimate and worthy of support.

There is a comment that conveys an evaluative meaning toward Israel, as indicated in the datum (Ju/Prop/Pos-Is1). The author provides this comment in response to a title appearing in a documentary video content from Al Jazeera media. The author asserts that all actions of Is serve as a sign of wisdom and knowledge directed toward Is. According to Martin and White (2005), the phrase used by the author, "Spirit of wisdom, knowledge, and understanding," constitutes a positive judgment of capacity. This evaluation is intended to praise the abilities attributed to Israel. Furthermore, by associating wisdom with Is, the author claims to position them as capable and knowledgeable individuals. Naturally, this appraisal guides readers to perceive Israel's intellectual competence. Moreover, there is an introductory statement at the end of the sentence, which the author believes that the attacks targeting significant buildings neither exacerbate the situation nor are based on mere intuition, but rather represent divine intervention.

This study aims to reveal the ideologies and social attitudes in internet commentaries, emphasizing the various rhetorical strategies used by commentators to convince others and legitimize their stances. As indicated in evidence (Ju/Ver/Ne-Pa1), individuals tend to construct stories based on subjective perspectives, which aligns with the conclusions of Alfriandi & Zuhriah (2024) that media framing is controlled by political, editorial, and ideological circumstances. The discussion tends to equate Gaza or Palestinians with Hamas, showing a polarized public opinion: people critical of Hamas or Palestine tend to characterize Hamas as a terrorist organization, whereas sympathizers view them as militants fighting for the Palestinian cause. Worth mentioning, public discussions have a tendency to dismiss counter perceptions or facts, repeating original assertions and hence producing skewed accounts that reflect deep-seated ideological biases. Furthermore, the intentional use of misspellings like "hummus" for "Hamas" is a tool of ironic humor that links Hamas to meanings that are hidden and malevolent, thereby underscoring the prevailing negative feelings and ideological rejections implicit in such discourse.

Additionally, the research found that there were specific comments which clearly articulate ideological views based on religious beliefs, particularly those in support of Israel's actions on the grounds of theological justification. This provides an example of a strong theological ideology supporting political stands based on religious justification, something commonly observed in the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict and recognized by Suswanta (2012) as a factor complicating resolution in conflict. The longevity of these conflicting political-ideological and theological accounts underscores the flexibility of the issue. Overall, the findings demonstrate that authors' accounts are shaped by both attitudinal and ideological dimensions, including the use of theological citations and evaluative language. Evaluative comments tend to be used by internet users, as the appraisal theory posits, to express emotion, construct accounts, or employ sarcasm with negative value toward specific groups

Conclusion

In the conclusion of this study, it was found that Social Sanctions were found predominantly in comments; this was due to the tendency of netizens to comment on attitudes towards actions that violate legal ethics carried out towards two camps, namely Hamas and Israel. Moreover, there is a tendency for netizens to comment with theological ideologies related to religion or beliefs so that the incident becomes complicated, while some comment repeatedly with responses that are believed by the author in the hope of influencing many other netizens. Thus, in this study, it is proven that the theoretical framework can reveal a netizen's attitude in commenting with an assessment of the object of discussion and also find out how the netizen comments by bringing an ideology shown by the author.

References

- Alfriandi, & Zuhriah. (2024). Analisis Isi Framing Berita Konflik Israel dan Palestina di Media Kompas.com. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>
- Amaireh, H. A. (2024). A Critical Discourse Analysis of Al Jazeera's Reporting of the 2021 Israel-Palestine Crisis. *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies*, 24(1), 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.33806/ijaes.v24i1.559>
- Aqeel, M., & Hussain, M. S. (2024). Critical Discourse Analysis of Islamophobia Reflection in Gaza-Israel Conflict: A Case Study of BBC Reporting Publication Details Paper. *Journal of Arts and Linguistics Studies*, 2, 289–301. <https://jals.miard.org/index.php/jals>
- Ayu, D., Khrisna, N., & Dewi, I. K. (2022). Disclosing Social Identity from The Netizens Responses to The Indonesian Presidential Election Announcement: Appraisal Framework. *International Journal of Science and Applied Science: Conference Series P-ISSN*, 6(1), 2549–4635. <https://doi.org/10.20961/ijsascs.v6i1.69961>
- Ben-David, A., & Soffer, O. (2018). User comments across platforms and journalistic genres. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1468919>
- Fikri. (2024). The News Media in Raising Conflicts Tension: A Critical Study Toward News Conflict Between Israel and Palestine. *Tuturlogi*, 5(1), 7. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.tuturlogi.2024.005.01.2>

- Gaus, Q., Jolliff, A., & Moreno, M. A. (2021). A content analysis of YouTube depression personal account videos and their comments. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100050>
- Humprecht, E., Hellmueller, L., & Lischka, J. A. (2020). Hostile Emotions in News Comments: A Cross-National Analysis of Facebook Discussions. *Social Media and Society*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120912481>
- Kalogeropoulos, A., Negredo, S., Picone, I., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017). Who Shares and Comments on News?: A Cross-National Comparative Analysis of Online and Social Media Participation. *Social Media and Society*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305117735754>
- Khristianto. (2020). Persepsi Publik terhadap Tokoh Politik dalam Debat Politik di Kanal Youtube. <https://doi.org/Prasasti/UNS> *Journal of Language Studies*, 5(2), 176. <https://doi.org/10.20961/prasasti.v5i2.45368>
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation Appraisal in English*.
- Matthew B. Miles, A. Michael Huberman, & Johnny Saldaña. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: a methods sourcebook*. SAGE Publication, Third Edition, Third Edition.
- Simamora, S. D., Irwiensyah, F., & Hasan, F. N. (2024). Analisis Sentimen Terkait Konflik Palestina-Israel Pada Media Sosial X Menggunakan Algoritma Naïve Bayes Classifier. *Building of Informatics, Technology and Science (BITS)*, 6(1). <https://doi.org/10.47065/bits.v6i1.5344>
- Suswanta. (2012). Memahami Persoalan Palestina-Israel dari Perspektif Islam. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.18196/hi.2012.0008.70-75>
- Suwarsono, R. E. (2022). The Israel-Palestine Conflict in 2021: A comparative analysis of framing in The Jakarta Post and Gulf News.
- Tao, L., & Jacobs, L. (2019). "Inbox me, please": Analysing comments on anonymous Facebook posts about depression and suicide. *Journal of Psychology in Africa*, 29(5), 491–498. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14330237.2019.1665903>
- White, P. R. R. (2005). *Appraisal Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118611463/wbielsi041>