# THE COVERAGE OF THE ISRAELI SIEGE OF GAZA STRIP (PALESTINE) IN THE BRITISH PRESS

Mohammed Wesam A. Amer

A Major Dissertation in partial fulfilment of the requirements of Anglia Ruskin University for the degree of Master of Arts in Applied Linguistics and TESOL

Submitted: April 2009

## Acknowledgement

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Sebastian Rasinger, for his great supervision of this study. The unlimited support, feedback, comments and suggestions he has given to me throughout the whole course and during the process of writing this dissertation have been invaluable.

My acknowledgement goes also to my brother Dr. Mohammed Mosheer Amer for his professional assistance and his invaluable advice as well as for his unfailing encouragement at every turn till the work was finally completed.

I would like also to extend my deep sense of gratitude and thanks to my friends Dr. Samir Mahmoud, Dr. Imad Karam, Jenny Hardacre and Julia Popp for their support and help to me through my dissertation and assignments as well. Finally, my biggest gratitude and thanks also go to my tutors and classmates for their encouragement and support during the writing process and the course.

## Dedication

I dedicate this dissertation to the people I respect and love.

To my family: father, mother, brothers and sisters whose support, love, words of encouragement and push for tenacity will always remain a beacon of inspiration, wisdom in my life and ring in my ears.

To my friends in the Gaza Strip, the UK and all over the world

**MohammedWesam Amer**

# Abstract

This study examines linguistic features, 'Transitivity selections', used in the British Press (*The Guardian* and *The Times*) to cover the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. This study aims to identify the linguistic structures, show how the Israelis and the Palestinians were represented and show the ideological-political dimensions behind the representation in the coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. To achieve these objectives, I follow Halliday's Systematic Functional Grammar as a tool in CDA and Critical linguistic generally. In particular, I focus on the Transitivity to analyse four news reports as the data corpus gathered from *The Guardian* and *The Times* in the period from 1 December 2007 to 28 February 2008.

The analysis shows that the main representation of the Israeli participants is 'Sensor' and 'Sayer' and that the processes attributed to those participants are 'Mental' and 'Verbal'. On contrary, the main representation of the Palestinian participants is 'Actor' in the role of 'attackers' and 'enemy' and the processes accompanied with those Actors are 'Material'. Behind the Transitivity selections, the analysis shows also ideological-political dimensions represented in the exclusion of the Palestinian voice in the British newspapers and the transferring of the moral responsibility of the occupation of Palestinian Gaza Strip from Israel to Egypt especially after the breaking of the border 'the Wall' (different from the Wall in the occupied West Bank/East Jerusalem) between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. The study concludes with a summary of the results from the analysis of the BP's coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip.

**Table of contents**

**i  List of tables (after checking the sub-headlines of the title)**

**ii List of  Appendixes**……………………………………………………

**The Coverage of Israeli Siege of the Gaza Strip (Palestine) in the British Press**

**Chapter I**

## 1.1. Introduction

The Mass media play a major role in moulding people's attitudes, perceptions, social values and ideologies regarding important political and social events. Various selective linguistic approaches have been used to reveal the ideological and political dimensions of the media/news discourse. To this purpose, the language used in the media has been studied and scrutinized by different scholars in a systematic discourse analysis approach focusing on Critical Discourse Analysis (Chouliaraki & Fairclough 1999; Fairclough 1992, 1995, 2000; Kress & van Leeuwen 1996, van Dijk 1997a, 1997b, van Leeuwen 1995; Wodak, 1997), Critical Linguistics (Fowler, et al., 1979, Hodge & Kress 1979), and Content Analysis (Hogben & Waterman 1997, Holsti 1969, Krippendorff 1980; Lasswell & Leites 1949).

Of all the mass media, newspapers are important in covering events around the world. The language used in newspapers plays an important role in influencing and shaping the thoughts, ideas, and opinions of many people thus affecting public opinion. Fowler, for example, (1991, p.1) holds that the "contents of newspapers are not facts about the world, but in a very general sense 'ideas'". The journalist takes a particular view of events, and talks about a specific issue by collecting facts and information and reporting them in accordance with that view. It is assumed that newspapers present them without bias and in a language which should be unambiguous, undistorted and agreeable to readers. However, reporting events depends on criteria of selection which are subjected to a process of transformation as it is intended for publication. "Both selection and transformation are guided by reference, generally unconscious, to ideas and beliefs" (Fowler, 1991, p. 2). For the same events, there are different ways of reporting which are not random or accidental. Every expression always carries an ideological element and a reason behind it; therefore, representations or reporting of events differ from each other.

The communication of news events cannot make a claim to being objective; it cannot be so because the events and the ideas must be transmitted through some medium, which is not value free and therefore conveys a particular perspective on

1

events. Once again, the language used to represent the events or issues differs from country to country and from one journalist to another. For example, "people in Western countries probably hear more language from the media than they do directly from the lips of their fellow humans in conversation" (Bell, 1991, p. 1). The people or the targeted audience feel that the way in which language is used must affect the content of what we receive from the different kinds of media (spoken or printed). Thus, freeing the press from its bias is very necessary to avoid any distortion of the truth.

Bearing in mind these thoughts, this study uses linguistic selections of Transitivity to examine the coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip in the British Press (BP) and critically analyses how the BP, specifically *The Guardian* and *The Times,* report the Palestinian and Israeli news actors and events. Despite *The Guardian* and *The Times* belonging to different sides of the political spectrum, their coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip shows remarkable convergences.

The first chapter is about the central role of the mass media and will include a brief historical background to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict focusing on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip specifying the central questions to be examined in relation to the British Press. It will include the purposes of the study and the sample of the study, which are four texts from *The Guardian* and from *The Times*.

Chapter Two covers topics related to the literature review for CDA explaining how CDA views and relates language with power and how language is used to express ideology. Moreover, Chapter Two includes explanations for concepts of discourse, discourse analysis and the ways the media select the news; in addition to various definitions of CDA which can be used in different ways such as criticizing media, politics, social background, historical events, etc. At the end of this chapter, there is a discussion of the different approaches to Transitivity focusing on the approach to 'Transitivity in Halliday's Systematic Functional Grammar (SFG).

Chapter Three includes the methodological framework and the procedures in the study. I specify the methodology and the framework of the study pointing out some steps that I will follow in analysing the data gathered from the newspapers. Furthermore, there is also an explanation of the concept of Critical Linguistics which

draws on Systematic Functional Language/Grammar. I will focus on 'Transitivity' as a method of analysing the linguistic features and structures in the four news reports. The way the data is analysed and collected will be explained clearly along with stating the questions that were posed in the analysis of the texts of the news reports.

In Chapter Four I will explore the four sample texts. I will state the initial findings followed by an analysis of each news report and an analysis of the Transitivity of the actors and processes embodied in each text. At the end of the chapter, I will explain the ideological-political dimensions behind the Transitivity selections used in the news reports. Chapter Five concludes the study by summarizing the findings of the analysis.

## 1.2. A Brief Historical Background

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict is considered one of the most longstanding and complex conflicts to date. The resolution of this conflict has been considered vital for world peace. Therefore, media outlets around the world have paid considerable attention to important events throughout this decades-long conflict. The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been represented in the media in different ways depending on the perspective of the media organizations, journalists, writers, etc. To understand how the media has been representing this conflict, I shall give a brief historical review about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The beginning of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict may be traced to the persecution of the Jews in Eastern Europe during the late 19th century (Berry & Philo, 2006, p.1). The negative treatment of Jews at the time prompted some Jews to envision establishing an independent national state for the Jews in Palestine.

After the First World War and the collapse of the Ottoman Empire, Palestine was controlled by Britain according to the Sykes-Picot agreement[1]. At that time Britain promised the Zionist leaders a homeland for Jews in Palestine. This assurance became more obvious and explicit in the British foreign minister Belfour's Declaration of 1917. Ovendale (1999, p.36) points out that "by 'national home' Balfour understood some of British, American and other protectorate Jewish to build up a 'real centre of national culture of focus of national life". Consequently, between

---

1 The Sykes-Picot agreement was held in 1916 between Britain, France and Russia (Italy later).

1919 and 1926 the Jewish immigration to Palestine "swelled with the arrival of a further 90.000 immigrants" (Bregman, 2003 cited in Berry & Philo, 2006, p.9). In 15 May 1947 the British Mandate to Palestine ended and handed the Palestinian question to the United Nations that later suggested partition, but this did not solve the problem between the Palestinian Arabs and Jews. In the first stage of the conflict lasting up to Israel's declaration of Independence on 14 May 1948, Jewish forces fought against Arab forces. Pappe (2006, p.138) said "three-quarters of a million Palestinians became refugees". This was for the Palestinians the Catastrophe known as 'Al-Nakbah[2]'.

In 1967, Israel overcame the Jordanian, Syrian and the Egyptian armies and occupied the Sinai Peninsula, the Golan Heights, the West Bank, the Gaza Strip and Arab East Jerusalem. Furthermore, an important event in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is the first Palestinian Intifada 'the uprising' in December 1987 as it came following the killing of four Palestinians. The Intifada lasted six years until it was called off by the Palestinian leaders in the wake of the Oslo agreements between the Israelis and the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO)[3].

Since the beginning of the Oslo Peace Accords and the establishment of the Palestinian Authority (PA) in 1994, Israel has consolidated its closure policy first introduced in 1991. Whereas Palestinians could move freely between the West Bank and East Jerusalem as well as between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank before the beginning of the peace process, this has changed dramatically, especially since the outbreak of the Al-Aqsa intifada after the visit of Ariel Sharon, the Israeli Prime Minister in September 2000, to Al-Haram al-Sharif[4] in Jerusalem. From 2000 up to now, the subsequent Israeli governments have been imposing a siege on the Palestinians in the occupied territories.

In October 2004, Israeli tanks and bulldozers attacked and destroyed Yasser Arafat's compound in Ramallah where he was suddenly taken ill and airlifted to a hospital in France and died there two weeks later. After that by two months, the Palestinians in the occupied territories elected the Fateh candidate Mahmoud Abbas as president, and in 2005 Israel pulled out of the Gaza Strip but retained control over

---

[2] ' Al-Nakbah' is a term has been used by the Palestinians since 1948 upon the large Palestinian immigration because of the Israeli devastative war against the Palestinians in 1948.

[3] PLO is the legal representative of the Palestinians since 1965.

[4] Al-Haram al-Sharif is one of the Muslim world's holiest sites.

the border crossings along the Gaza Strip. Pappe (2006, p.291) stated that the discourse that accompanied the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip is:

> an unilateral rearrangement of the way Israel controls the Gaza Strips, now from without rather than from within, bewildered the Israelis themselves. The outside world, especially the powers-that-be are involved in the Quartet – the ad hoc body, consisting the UN, the USA , Russia and Britain, that is a self-appointed mediator in the conflict- embraced the new move as a bold step towards peace, which it was not, as we understand today.

At the end of 2006, the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, West Bank and Jerusalem went to parliamentary elections, which the Islamic Resistance Movement (Hamas)[5] won. The reaction of Israel, US and Europe to the elections result was very negative, and they threatened to withdraw funding from the Palestinian National Authority unless Hamas renounced violence and recognized the State of Israel. Israel vowed to not deal with Hamas politically and in any way unless the group disarmed and renounced its commitment to the destruction of Israel. On June 25th 2006, a militant group belonging to Palestinian Hamas Movement captured an Israeli soldier in a cross-border raid. In response, the Israeli siege imposed around the Gaza Strip became stricter and then the Israeli government in 19 December 2007 declared the Gaza Strip an 'enemy entity'. As a result of the strict Israeli siege, the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip broke the wall (the border) between the Gaza Strip and Egypt on January 23rd 2008 to buy the most basic necessities of their daily life.

> The breakout was a spontaneous response to the humanitarian catastrophe provoked by Israel's long-term blockade of Gaza's 1.5 million residents, which culminated on January 17 in the termination of all food, medication, fuel and power supplies to Gaza (Shaoul, 2008).

This period is considered the most difficult period of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. For the difficulty and the importance of this period of the Israeli siege, in this study, I want to focus on the period from December 1st 2007 to February 28th 2008 (December 2007, January 2008 and February 2008). I will focus mainly on the breaking of the Wall/the border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt on January 23rd 2008. Therefore, I have chosen one month before and two months after the breaking of the wall to examine how the British press covered this period in which the Israeli siege affected the Palestinians' lives not only socially but also culturally, economically and politically. Israel controls movements between the West Bank and

---

the Gaza Strip as well as the borders between the occupied territories and Jordan, Egypt and Israel itself. In the Gaza Strip where the effects of the closure have been most severe, the standard of living has plummeted and the number of those unemployed has increased dramatically.

## 1.3. Study Questions and Statement of Purpose

To understand the general context of the British Press's coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip, my analysis will attempt to answer the following main question:

- How did the British Press cover the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip in the period from the December 1st 2007 to February 28th 2008?

Therefore, to answer this question I attempt to address the main question by providing answers to the following specific sub-questions:

- How do *The Guardian* and *The Times* frame the siege on the Gaza Strip?

- What are the Transitivity selections used in each frame?

The study will examine the language of the British Press for the following reasons: the media is a source of data for some language features, pertinent to this investigation. In Britain, the national newspapers have a dominant position. Reah (2002, p.54), in his argument regarding the importance of the British Press and whether it is superior to the press of other countries, points out that "it is a product of the culture it comes from". The British Press is widely distributed in the UK and all over the world, so its attitudes are important and effective in giving space to the international issues by covering conflicts around the world. Anderson and Weymouth (1999, p.64) point out that in the British Press, there is "a column space to major public figures, movements or parties either directly or in the form of an interview, as a platform for promoting their particular case".

This comparative study examines the coverage of the Israeli Siege of the Gaza Strip and aims at achieving the following objectives:

1. To identify some of the linguistic structures, namely, the Transitivity selections used by the British Press in their coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip during the period under study.

2. To show the ideological and political dimensions behind the representations of the Palestinians and Israelis in the British Press.

### 1.4. The Sample and Limitations of the Study

The study will focus on two British newspapers, *The Guardian* and *The Times*. *The Guardian* is a newspaper that is generally located on the Left of the political spectrum, while *The Times* is said to be associated with the Right. The focus will be on these two newspapers from Monday to Friday throughout the weeks of the proposed period from December 2007 – January 2008 (12 weeks) and the focus will be on four news reports from the two newspapers as a representation of the whole news reports (for more information on the selection of these newspapers and news reports see 3.7. Data collecting).

Furthermore, this study is particularly concerned with news reports as final products in the newspapers. In this study, I will not concentrate on the audience reception or on their interpretations of the coverage by the British Press (*The Guardian* and *The Times*).

This study examines the linguistic features (Transitivity selections) of the discourse in two British newspapers and examines the ideological and political dimensions behind the linguistic features (Transitivity selections) although in my view examining discourses like the BP requires closer attention to the various dimensions of discourse production and reception. To do this examination, the study employs linguistic approach, Critical Discourse Analysis, in which a particular analytic model is used. But first we need to have a look at a general overview of the literature on Critical Discourse Analysis.

## Chapter II

## Critical Discourse Analysis and Relevant Literature

## 2.1 Introduction

This study depends on a Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth CDA) framework in its analysis of the British Press's discourse on the Israeli Siege of the Gaza Strip and depends on a methodological model within CDA in analysing the linguistics features (Transitivity selections) used in *The Guardian* and *The Times* newspapers in their representative characterization of the Palestinians and the Israelis. To understand how the CDA approach is used to analyse the ideological-political dimensions behind the linguistic features used in the British Press, I discuss in this chapter the nature of language, ideology, discourse, discourse analysis approach and I review CDA and Transitivity.

## 2.2 The Nature of Language

The nature of language has been viewed in different ways. Language, despite its various meanings— whether the ability to speak and communicate or a vehicle to express ideas, cover issues and realize interpersonal relations— is a means of communication, so everyone "can only know a language" (Paul, 1993, p.10). The concentration on language as a means of communication between people refers to a specific form of expression. This is much clearer in Bussmann's (1998, p.253) definition for Language as "a vehicle for the expression or exchange of thoughts, concepts, knowledge, and information as well as the fixing and transmission of experience and knowledge". However, language is much more than just a means of communication as we shall see. Sociolinguistics views any language as inseparable from its sociocultural context (connection between language and society and culture).The functionalists view language as a vehicle for the expression of functional meaning. Richards (2001, p.21) states that language is "the vehicle for the realization of interpersonal relations and for the performance of social transactions between individuals". Accordingly, we can see that language is always used for a specific purpose and never randomly.

## 2.3 Language in Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA)

In CDA, language is seen as "everywhere and always political" (Gee, 1999, p.1). To nexplain Gee's definition, Davies and Elder (2006, p.140) state that "by politics Gee means anything and anyplace where human social interactions and relationships have implications for how 'social goods' are or ought to be distributed". CDA examines the relation between power and language as described by Wodak (2001b, pp.10-11):

> It gains power by the use powerful people make of it… Language indexes power, expresses power, is involved where there is contention over and a challenge to power. Power does not derive from language, but language can be used to challenge power, to subvert it, to alter distribution of power in the short and long term.

Wodak and Meyer (2001, p. 1) stated that CDA regards "language as social practice and takes consideration of the context of language use to be crucial". So we can understand CDA explores the relation between language and power. More specifically, Kress (1990) reasons CDA deals with language as a kind of social practice among many, used for representation and signification (including visual images, music, gestures, etc.).

## 2.4. Language and Ideology

Everybody has an ideology that determines his/her behaviour and perception of others which is mediated by language either written or spoken. So ideology and language are interrelated since language is the vehicle by which human beings express their ideas, ideologies and worldviews. There must be a language to express any ideology so the relation between language and ideology is interrelated. The word 'ideology' was originally coined and created during the French Revolution by Antoine Destutt de Tracy[6] (1754 -1836) who used the idea positively to denote a science of ideas. For de Tracy, *ideologie* refers to a new 'science of ideas, literally an idea-ology (Heywood 2003, McLellan 1995, Hoffman & Graham 2006).

Broadly speaking, one can posit that ideology underlines any form of the linguistic expressions in a text, a sentence or paragraph. There are different views and definitions of the meaning of 'ideology' and these views depend on the area in which ideology is defined or dealt with. Mclellan (1995, p.1) suggests it that "ideology is the

---

[6] Antoine Destutt de Tracy (1754 -1836) is a French philosopher who coined the term 'ideologie' in 1796. "De Tracy was an aristocrat, sympathetic to the French Revolution 1789. De Tracy was a rationalistic heir to the eighteenth century movement known as the Enlightenment-critical of traditional authority and the mystification of religious thoughts" (Eatwell & Wright,1999, p.4)

most elusive concept in the whole of the social sciences". Freeden (2003, p.1) argues that "when people hear the word 'ideology', they often associate it with 'ism'[7] such as communism, fascism, or anarchism", and then he defines 'ideology' politically as:

> a set of ideas, beliefs, opinions, and values that exhibit a recurring pattern are held by significant groups compete over providing and controlling plans for public policy do so with the aim of justifying, contesting or changing the social and political arrangements and processes of a political community.

This shows that ideology shapes the political and social paradigms through which people make sense of the world around them. Gee (1996, p.2) states that Antonine De Tracy (n.d.) argued that "all the ideas in our heads are based on evidence about the world we have gathered through our physical senses". Tracy's argument means that our thinking and the way we act is affected by our education, environment and the social world around us. An obvious definition of ideology is that of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (n.d.) who, "claimed that it was like a 'camera obscura' that showed reality but in an inverted form" (Hodge, 1990, p.39). This means that ideology contains not only a single representation, but also it breaks other aspects of reality in different manners, for example, moving from negation and inversion of some degrees of displacement to a more or less direct reflection; however, it could combine them together as an ideological complex.

Heywood (2003, p.12) explains that 'ideology' is "a more or less coherent set of ideas that provide the basis for organised political action, whether this is intended to preserve, modify or overthrow the existing systems of power". This definition focuses on that the complexity of ideology is between understanding and commitment, and between thought and action and comes from expanding the traditional boundaries between normative and descriptive ideas and between political practice and political theory. Another definition of ideology that shows how complex an idea it is, is that of Gee (1996, p.21) who refers to 'ideology' as "a social theory which involves generalizations (beliefs, claims) about the way(s) in which goods are distributed in society". In this definition by 'involves' he means the theory includes direct generalizations about the distribution of goods or generalizations of claims about the distribution of goods by which he means society.

---

[7] An 'ism' is a slightly familiar, faintly derogatory term

These differing definitions show that ideology plays an important role in any linguistic expression, whether written or spoken in any context. As such, one can conclude that the linguistic expression is not entirely neutral and has a determining effect on what people believe, think, and do. Therefore, competing linguistic expressions and media suggest a competition of ideologies. The above definitions of ideology also show that there is not even a consensus on the meaning of the word ideology itself.

## 2.5 Ideology and Critical Discourse Analysis

The interaction between language use and issues of power, ideology and social tensions and struggles has been intensively examined in the Critical Discourse Analysis literature (e.g., Teo 2000; Wodak, 1997; Martin Rojo, 1995; Nir & Roeh, 1992). Fowler (1991, p.42) states that 'ideology' is already "imprinted in the available discourse (all discourses). It is obligatory to select a style of discourse which is communicatively appropriate in the particular setting".

In CDA one of the areas of study is the relation between social power and discourse and how ideology can be expressed or contested in language use. The notion of language as a material form of ideology and as a site for ideological structures and processes has been examined carefully by (Fairclough, 1992; 1995a; Fowler, et al., 1979).

Fowler, et al. (1979), Fowler and Kress (1979), Fowler (1991), Trew (1979a, 1979b), Hodge and Kress (1979 and 1993) argue that ideological meanings can be involved in linguistic operations. For this case, Fowler (1991, p.67) views that "any aspect of linguistic structure, whether phonological, syntactic, lexical, semantic, pragmatic or textual, can carry ideological significance". Other scholars focused on linguistic features such as Transitivity, lexical processes and modality which, they suggested, are loaded with ideological implications.

A characteristic feature of CDA is its principal concerned with ideology and how it encodes and sustains domination and unequal power relations. Wodak (2001b, p.10) points out that one of the primary objectives of CDA is "to demystify discourses by deciphering ideologies". In addition to language structure, ideology also has a role to play in CDA.

Bearing in mind what has been stated above, CDA studies the relation between ideology, power and language. Fairclough (2003, p.9) considers ideology as "representations of aspects of the world which can be shown to contribute to establishing, maintaining and changing social relations of power, domination and exploitation". That is, he sees ideology as a modality of power. Fairclough (1995a) argues that ideology cannot possibly be 'read off' texts as text readers, listeners or viewers have different interpretations and understandings of the meanings expressed in a text and because ideological processes relate to discourses as whole social events and not to texts produced and consumed as moments of these events. Fairclough (1992) sees ideologies as constructions of reality including the material world, social relations and identities which are internalized in the forms and meanings of discursive practices which sustain, restructure, and transform relations of power and domination. In other words, ideology is realized in both the structures and the conditions. The structures shape the outcome of past events. The conditions are for present events and in events themselves as they reproduce and transform their conditioning structures. Despite the ideological investment of all discourse types, Fairclough (1992) contends that the degree of ideological investment varies from one discourse type to another; for instance, a text in natural or physical science is less heavily invested than an advertisement or a news report.

Ideology constructs sets of ideas and attitudes that affect all aspects of society; therefore, ideologies can provide the attitudes of different groups in societies with cognitive foundations and the furtherance of their own objectives and interests. van Dijk suggests a schema of the relation between society, cognition, ideology and discourse. van Dijk (1991a, 1993a) combines ideology with a socio-cognitive discourse-analysis framework; for instance, in the production and reproduction of racism. van Dijk (1991a) considered 'ideologies' the socio-cognitive systems which regulate, select and organize the collective social attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge, i.e. social cognitions in line with specific group interests and goals. An ideology works as a cognitive groundwork that produces and maintains a group's attitudes, positions, beliefs, and ultimately power. van Dijk suggested a schema to explain the relation between ideology, social interaction and discourse as follows: the social interaction is introduced in the shape of discourse which is then cognized according to a cognitive system that consists of short-term memory, in which strategic process, or

decoding and interpretation takes place. However, long-term memory serves as a carrier of socio-cultural knowledge that consists of knowledge of language, discourse, communication, persons, groups and events-existing in the form of scripts.

According to van Dijk, maintaining power in modern societies is persuasive and ideological. In this regard, van Dijk (1995a) states that discourse is the preferred site for the explicit articulation, transmission, and communication of ideological positions. Again, he conceives of ideologies as both cognitive and social for they function as a link connecting the mental representations and processes which underlie discourse and action, and the social practices, formations, and interests of social groups and structures. In other words, ideology has an essential and crucial role in the analytical method of van Dijk who considers ideology as interpretation frameworks which organize sets of attitudes about other elements of modern society. Thus, ideology determines the attitudes of different groups in different societies and provides the framework for people to pursue their own goals and interests.

We can fully appreciate the inextricable link between human linguistic expressions and ideology once we realize that no linguistic expression is possible without it simultaneously, implicitly or explicitly, reflecting one's ideological bias. That is, despite the different views of language which we saw earlier and despite the various meanings and definitions given to the word ideology, each linguistic expression carries an ideological dimension in addition to a certain intended meaning. Ideology is woven through the very fabric of all forms of linguistic expression.

CDA studies how ideology encodes and sustains domination and unequal power relations. In this part, I focused mainly on Fairclough's and Dijk's views about ideology. According to their views, we saw that Fairclough views ideology as a modality of power and construction of reality and argues that the degree of ideological investment varies from one discourse type to another. van Dijk concentrates on the crucial role of ideology in his analytical method. He views ideology as interpretative framework that provides cognitive foundation for the attitudes in societies.

To sum up, with this discussion of the concept of language, ideology in language and CDA, it becomes clear that language and ideology are interrelated and that any linguistic expression is implicated in ideological workings. That is, the

selection of one linguistic expression can often be seen as a reflection of the ideological position of the speaker/writer. Consequently, it may be argued that there is a need to look at the ideological and political dimensions deployed in the linguistic expressions used in the British newspapers (*The Guardian* and *The Times*) during the coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip in the period from December 2007-February 2008.

## 2.6 Discourse: Definitions and Conceptions

Discourse has been studied by different scholars and researchers who have viewed discourse in line with their theoretical orientations and methodological frameworks. All discourses take place inside the situated interests of the participants involved in an exchange. In this section, I will focus on definitions and the different concepts of 'discourse' and where to find discourse. Discourse can be found in different areas of language and life.

Discourse is "in vogue and vague" (Widdowson 1995a, p.158). Fasol (1990 cited in Schiffrin, et al., 2003, p.1) points out that "for many, particularly linguistics, discourse has generally been defined as anything beyond the sentence" and the study of discourse is "the study of language use". Such definitions focus on particular instances of language. van Dijk (1997a, p.1) points out that the term 'discourse' much like other blurry terms such as language, society, or culture and argues that the "notion of the discourse is fussy" (see also Fairclough, 1992 for a similar argument). Stillar (1997, p.5) sees discourse as "action", as discourse "makes things for social agents in the real contexts of their living." And Discourse is "an integral part of the complex goings-on that make up social life". Lemke (1995, p.20) argues that the discourse has an active role in society. "It not only reconfirms and re-enacts existing social relationships and patterns of invention, it also renegotiates social relationships and patterns of convention, ……and introduces new meanings and new invention".

Discourse is "a communicative event, including conversational interaction, written text, as well as associated gestures, face work, typographical layout, images and any other ' semiotic' or multimedia dimension of signification"( van Dijk, 2001 cited in Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p.20). Hanks (1996 cited in Bolmmaert, 2004, p.2) states that discourse is "language-in-action and investigating it requires attention both to language and to action". Blommaert (2004, p.2) argues that "this conception of

discourse, broadly speaking, underlies the development of contemporary linguistic pragmatics". In a different view but related to linguistics, Fowler (1991, p.42) points out that "discourse as it, in the present usage, is socially and institutionally originating ideology encoded in language". Cook (1994, pp.24-25), in the same vein, states that discourse as opposed to text, is "a stretch of language in use, taking on meaning in context for its users, and perceived by them as purposeful, meaningful, and connected".

In Critical Discourse Analysis, Wodak (1996, p.15) defines discourse as "the use of language in speech and writing as a form of 'social practice". Talking about discourse as a social practice includes connection between a specific discursive event and the situation, institution and social structure which form it. This shows that discourse is layered and conditioned in social dimensions as the discursive event is recognized by them, but it forms them as well. In the same vein, Fairclough (1993, p.134) defines discourse as "spoken or written language use"; however, he extends it to include linguistic elements and non-linguistic semiotic mediums like visual images such as photographs and films, nonverbal communication such as body moments and facial expressions and gestures. Fairclough (2003, p.26) explains the term 'discourse' in two different views: first, discourse refers to language use as a form of social practice as it is abstract noun and secondly discourse as a count noun that involves ways of representing aspects of the world; for instance, neoconservative discourse, feminist discourse, the political discourse of the New Labour, etc.

Furthermore, as a form of social practice, discourse is  as a mode of action as evidenced in work on pragmatics by Austin (1962) who considers discourse as a socially situated mode of action in a dialectical relationship with other forms of social actions or practices (also see Fairclough, 1995b, 2003 on the same conception). In addition, Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999) argue that discourse can be defined as a specific way of looking at semiotic elements and viewing them as forms of social practices which dialectically interact with other non-discursive forms. Furthermore, Gee (1999, p.17) differentiates between 'Big D' discourse which refers to distinct ways of thinking, interacting, ... and 'little d' discourse with which refers to language in use. The combination of language with other things can be used "to identify oneself as a member of a socially meaningful group or 'social network'" (for more information see Gee 1999, pp.13-17).

Because there are different definitions and conceptions of discourse Davies and Elder (2006, p.135-6) put a set of definitions in the style of a dictionary entry for discourse:

> the linguistic, cognitive and social processes whereby meanings are expressed and intentions interpreted in human interaction; the historically and culturally embedded sets of conventions which constitute and regulate such processes; a particular even in which such processes are instantiated, and the product of such an event, especially in the form of visible text, whether originally spoken and subsequently transcribed or originally written.

As general comment on the above mentioned definitions, I cite van Dijk's (1997, p.2) argument that there are three dimensions to discourse: "(a) language use, (b) the communication of beliefs (cognition), and (c) interaction in social situation". He means that discourse is used for the specific study of language and language use in linguistics. In another attempt to classify the definitions of discourse, Schiffrin (2003, et al., p.1), commenting on Jaworski and Coupland's (1991) work on discourse definitions, argues that all definition of discourses can be classified into three main categories: "1-anything beyond the sentence, 2-language use and 3- a broader range of social practice that includes non-linguistic and nonspecific instances of language".

## 2.7. Discourse Analysis: Concepts and Definitions

As there is no united consensus for the definition of discourse, this leads to different meanings of discourse analysis by linguists, analysts or scholars who depend on their specific scholarly postulates and methodological orientations. For example, van Dijk (1991a, p.45) gives a specific definition to the domain of discourse analysis stating that:

> [it] aims to show how the cognitive, social, historical, cultural, or political contexts of language use and communication impinge on the contents, meanings, structures, or strategies of text or dialogue, and vice versa, how discourse itself is an integral part of and contributes to the structures of these contexts.

Cook (1994, p.24-25) considers Discourse analysis "the study and the explanation of the quality of coherence. A discourse is a coherent stretch of language", and argues that discourse analysis must be "a study of the formal linguistics qualities of stretch of language (texts) and a study of the variable perception of these stretches of language by individuals and groups". More specifically, Howarth (2000, p.10) refers discourse analysis to "the analysis of discursive practices and examines both linguistic and non-linguistic materials that enable subjects to experience the world of objects, words and practices". Moreover, Johnstone (2002, p.27) posits that "discourse analysts work

outward from texts to an understanding of their contexts, trying to uncover the multiple reasons why the texts they study are the way they are and no other way". Wodak and Meyer (2001, p.35) argue that "discourse analysis encompasses the respective spectrum of what can be said in its qualitative range and its accumulation and/or can be said".

Alternatively, Halliday (1994, p. xvi) holds that "a discourse analysis that is not based on grammar is not an analysis at all" He proposes two levels of analysis in any discourse analytical framework: The first level which is based on grammar involves an understanding of the text by which the analyst attempts to find out what the text is about and what it means. The second level is based on an evaluation of the text by relating it to its socio-cultural contexts.

In surveying the different concepts of discourse analysis, it becomes clear that an essential common denominator underlying the different definitions of discourse analysis is that it examines the relationships between semiotic systems including language and the larger socio-political, cultural, and historical contexts in which such systems are couched.

## 2.8. Text, Context and Discourse Analysis

Broadly speaking, a text, whether spoken or written is an essential part of language or discourse. Starting by looking at the contents of the text, Reah (2002, p.55) argues all texts whether spoken or written have "a word or lexical level and all texts have a structural and grammatical or syntactic level". Similarly, Kaplan (1990) holds that text, whether written or spoken, is "a multidimensional structure"; and he argues that "any text is layered, like a sheet of thick plywood consisting of many thin sheets lying at different angles to each other". Furthermore, he argues the basics of a text "includes syntax and lexicon; its grammar, morphology, phonology, and semantics" in spite of the way in which the text is produced. Kress (1990) states that texts are produced by speakers and writers in socially situated contexts. This leads us to conclude that texts are never produced under the same conditions or under equal circumstances and therefore oscillate between one bias and another depending on the construction of the text by the author and its reception by the reader. van Dijk (1997, p.3) argues that like speech, "texts have users namely authors and readers". This agrees with what Cook (1994, pp.24-25) says about the text as being "the linguistic form in a stretch of language".

In the same vein, Stillar (1997, pp.2-3) views text as "a symbolic act", as it uses language and accompanies resources to accomplish the act, and linguistically text is semiotics, for "it draws upon linguistic signs for representing events as well as the people, and circumstances involves in those events". It might be argued that the text depends on linguistic features to construct relations between the readers and the writers of the texts. By choosing linguistic signs/features, "the text represents choice" as it is seen by Halliday (1978b, cited in Stillar 1997, p.15).) who considers text as "what is meant, selected from the total set of options that constitute what can be meant...... actualized meaning potential".

In discussing the relation between text and discourse whether it is distinct or interchangeable, Johnstone (2002, p.27) views texts as "the actual instances of discourse", and she refers to texts as "pieces of discourse that have or are given boundaries and treated as wholes". Fairclough (1995a, p.4) points out that a text is "a piece of written language" that could be a poem, an email, a chapter in a book, an article... Reah (2002, p.55) argues that texts "operate within a cultural context"; that is, they are immersed in a particular culture, and process within the system of that culture. Cook (1994, pp.24-25) writes "Text interacts with context" which is in his vision is a form of knowledge of the world; this shows the concern of the discourse analysis with the interaction of texts with knowledge of context to create discourse.

Fairclough (1995a, p.4) states that understanding the 'text' in the discourse analysis is by understanding the text as any "written or spoken discourse". He (1995, p.4) argues for the concept of text in cultural analysis which encompasses a view of texts as being linguistic and non-linguistic, i.e. texts are cultural artefacts such as a picture, a building or a piece of music, and linguistic material as well. He thinks that modern societies have become multi-semiotic with both linguistic and non-linguistic elements increasingly integrated as texts. He explains that a television programme incorporates language with visual and sound effects, and music; similarly, a newspaper article also includes words, photographs, diagrams as well as graphic design. Schiffrin (2003, et al., p.417) explains that the majority of linguists deal with news texts in one of two points: "that of discourse structure or linguistic function or according to its impact as ideology-bearing discourse".

In summary, it may be argued that a text is constituted by social elements, identities and/or institutions.

**2.9. News: Concepts and Selection**

Schiffrin (2003, et al., p. 416) argues that there are two key elements for the discourse of the news media: "the news story, or spoken or written text; and the process involved in producing the texts". He explains that the first dimension, that of the text, has been the primary focus of most media researches to date. The second dimension that of the process, including the norms and routines of the community of news practitioners, has been on the research agenda for the past several years, but to date no significant work has been completed.

Media organizations all over the world put great effort into covering events from around the world by ways of pinpointing or selecting special linguistic expressions 'News' for which there are different concepts. For Herbert (2000, p.229), News is specified by a set of "values, and the kind of language in which news is told reflects and expresses those values, and also the values of the journalist collecting, analysing, and writing the news". Fowler (1991, p.4) argues that News represent "the world in language because it is a semiotic code and imposes a structure of values, social and economic in origin, on whatever is represented". Fowler (1991, p.13) mentions that Philo (n.d.) points out that "news is a creation of a journalistic process, an artefact, and a commodity even". Moreover, Fowler (1991, p. 12) focuses as well on Stuart Hall's (n.d.) definition that "News is the end-product of a complex process which begins with a systematic sorting and selecting of events and topics according to a socially constructed set of categories". For the content of the news, Bignell (1997, p.81) thinks that "News does not consist of lists of facts or events" so it is not only facts, but also "representations produced in language and other signs like photographs".

Mellor (2005, p.125) shares the same view with Bignell (1997) that the content of news is not free or meaningless in case the news is a cultural product so it is then "implicit that the act of reading or listening to the news is culturally determined and is not context free". In other words, he posits that readers expect a certain structure to the news and certain textual markers or clues that refer to specific references in their social reality.

The reporting of news depends on the criteria of selection which is subject to a process of transformation by TV or newspapers (spoken or written language).

Fowler (1991, p.41-42) states that "the practice of news selection and presentation are habitual and conventional as much as they are deliberate and controlled". The events are very large and cannot be mentioned or covered by the news, so these events are subjected and controlled by a selection process by which these events become news reports that help the people understand the world events partially. Bignell (1997, p.91) states that "selecting news events for the news cannot be thought of as neutral, nor can it be prior to the representation of the event in a narrative code", but "the news selection "already involves an awareness of the narrative codes in news discourse". Fowler (1991, p.11) argues again that the news selection is done by "transformation, differential treatment in presentation according to numerous political, economic and social factors". Based on Fowler's opinion of different selections and presentation of the news, people would accept the possibility of the bias.

According to these concepts of 'news' definitions and selections, it becomes clear that the communication of news events cannot claim to be objective because the events and the ideas must be transmitted through a medium with its own philosophy, attitudes, linguistic expressions and social values which constitute a potential perspective on events.

## 2.10. Critical Discourse An alysis: Concepts and Definitions

As a discourse analysis approach with popular theoretical and methodological frameworks, CDA critically relates the analysis of discursive and textual practices and structures to the larger social, politico-historical and ideological contexts and structures that shape, frame, or reproduce these textual and discursive practices and elements (for more information about the theoretical levels of CDA, see Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p.19-20) . The subject of CDA is the study of links between domination, social power and inequality and language use. A key feature of CDA is its principal concern with ideology and how it encodes and sustains domination and unequal power relations.

Wodak and Meyer (2001, p.121) view CDA as much theory as method or rather "a theoretical perspective on language and more generally semiosis (including visual language, body language and so on". Critical discourse analysis can be used with different backgrounds including media criticism, politics, social background, etc. Slembrouck (2001) points out that CDA came into being on the premise that first

there was a need to espouse an interpretive mode of linguistic research with explanatory ambitions and to divorce from the much positivistic descriptivism of linguistic enquiry which had dominated sociolinguistics. Secondly, there was an urgency that language study should have a socially-oriented emancipatory programme which aims to resist, challenge, and eliminate asymmetrical power relations and domination among social groups and members. This empowerment objective required a marriage with relevant notions and concepts in social theory where contributions from social theorists such as Foucault, Bourdieu, and Habermas have been influential in crystallizing CDA as a critical approach for the analysis of discourse.

Davies and Elder (2006, p.140) state that CDA is "a political enterprise in the additional and crucial sense…… it seeks not just to understand the social work, but to transform it". That is CDA has obvious political agenda that helps CDA to set CDA off from other types of discourse analysis. Rogers (2003, p.4) points to another interpretation for CDA that "explicitly addresses social problems and seeks to solve social problems through the analysis and accompanying social and political action". The view here is to orient towards locating social problems and then analyse how the discourse operates to construct and is constructed by different issues. Luke (2002, p. 97) points out that CDA "sets out to disrupt and interrupt ideological common sense, everyday language, and the codification of discourse power by dominant groups and interests". This means CDA takes for its subject matter the study of the intertwined linkages between language use and social power, inequality and domination.

In more theoretical perspective, Fairclough and Wodak (1997, pp.271-80; also Wodak, 1996, pp. 17-20) suggest some principles of CDA which can be summed up as follows:

1. CDA addresses social problems
2. Power relations are discursive
3. Discourse constitutes society and culture
4. Discourse does ideological work
5. Discourse is historical
6. The link between text and society is mediated
7. Discourse analysis is interpretive and explanatory
8. Discourse is a form of social action

These principles generally specify the way CDA works and analyses the language. In short, Blommaert and Bulcaen (2000, p. 449) summarize the CDA approach:

> CDA's locus of critique is the nexus of language/discourse/speech and social structure. It is in uncovering ways in which social structure impinges on discourse patterns, relations, and models (in the form of power relations, ideological effects, and so forth), and in treating these relations as problematic, that researchers in CDA situate the critical dimension of their work. It is not enough to lay bare the social dimensions of language use. These dimensions are the object of moral and political evaluation and analysing them should have effects in society: empowering the powerless, giving voices to the voiceless, exposing power abuse, and mobilizing people to remedy social wrongs.

Wodak (2001b) argues that CDA examines critically how social power and control can be expressed, enacted or challenged in text and talk. In other words, CDA concerns itself with laying bare all those discursive elements responsible for invoking domination, exploitation, and control as indexed and exercised in language by dominant social groups. Kress (1990, p.85) puts it shortly:

> CDA practitioners have the larger political aim of putting the forms of texts, the processes of production of texts, and the processes of reading [text consumption], together with the structures of power which have given rise to them, into crisis.

van Dijk (2001) argues CDA holds a consistent position in favour of those dominated groups and serves as a monitor that seeks to dissect all elements of hegemony, discrimination and bias implicit in the discourses about dominated socio-political groups. Moreover, van Dijk (2001, cited in Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p.96) states that CDA is "a critical perspective on doing scholarship" and it is discourse analysis "with an attitude" which holds a consistent position in favour of those dominated groups and serves as a monitor that seeks to dissect all structures and practices of hegemony, discrimination, and misrepresentation embedded in the discourse on 'Other' social and political groups.

On the other hand, Chouliaraki & Fairclough (1999) posit that CDA combines critical social science and linguistics, particularly systemic functional linguistics, into a single theoretical and methodological framework. Fairclough (n.d. cited in Wodak & or and Meyer 2001, p.22) understands CDA as "the analysis of the dialectical relationships between semiosis (including language) and other elements of social practice". By this understanding Fairclough oscillates between concentration on action and concentration on structure. He depends on systematic functional linguistics that analyses language as shaped by the social functions it has come to help/present.

Wodak and Meyer (2001, p.15) argue that CDA, by different and critical approaches, "endeavours to make explicit power relationships which are frequently hidden and thereby to drive results which are of practical relevance". Therefore, using CDA in applied linguistics has led to the development of different approaches to realizing and understanding media texts, opinions and messages and this is why I want to use and focus on CDA in this study to analyze the coverage of the Israeli siege of Gaza because in spite of the different emphasis between the linguistic theories and grand theories, CDA according to Wodak (2001a) works eclectically in different respects, although each individual approach emphasizes a different level.

Surveying the definitions mentioned above and other definitions, it becomes clear that CDA tries to be an approach in which researchers can adopt various research paradigms and analytical models and tools to analyse any text or talk, so CDA is not a single method or a lonely/unitary approach (for a succinct discussion of these models, see Wodak, 2001b; O'Halloran, 2003). CDA critically "investigates social inequality as it is expressed, constituted, legitimized and so on by language use (or in discourse); stabilize or even to intensify iniquities in society" (Wodak & Meyer, 2001, p.30). Moreover, Rogers (2003, p.4) argues that a critical discourse analyst's goal is to "study the relationships between language form and function and explain why and how certain patterns are privileged over others". Furthermore, Wodak (2001b, p.10) contends that one of the primary objectives of CDA is "to demystify discourses by deciphering ideologies."

## 2.11. Transitivity

As there is a focus in this study on Halliday's systematic Functional Grammar (SFG), particularly the system of Transitivity, in this section I propose to provide a brief overview of the concept of transitivity.

Kress (1976) presents Halliday's first published system and how Transitivity might be organized. The method behind this system is described in 'Categories' firstly and then 'System' is elevated over the other three categories, and it "emerges as the pivotal grammatical category" (Kress, 1976, p.99). Halliday developed the system of 'Transitivity' in 1964 but it has been discussed in details in his 'Notes on Transitivity and Theme, Part 1' (1967). In these notes, Halliday (1969, 76) presents the clause in its entirety as a structure between notion and factual. He combines all features of the clause which contribute to the linguistic representation of the speaker's experience. In

an initial but not obvious way, this leads to 'Processes types' such as Material, Relational and Mental. He is concerned with "processes like 'doing' (relating to action and perception, and Processes of 'being (relating to description and identification)" (Halliday, 1967, p.39). We can understand here that Halliday recognizes the participants like 'actor' and 'goal'. Importantly in this paper, Halliday states "the expression of any given Participant Role is not obligatory" (Halliday, 1967, p.44). That is, a Participant can be covert; the role of the Process can be obligatory; however, the role of the Participant cannot be overtly realized/known.

Halliday, in these notes (1967) as well, suggests other roles of the Participants and calls these roles 'circumstances'. 'Beneficiary' is the first 'circumstantial' role for the Participants that Hallaiday describes here. That is to say the role is the 'beneficiary' gaining from the process, e.g. 'John' in the following example: John was given the book. Halliday notes that this is a "Circumstantial Role because 'structurally, (it) may be realized by the clause part complement'" (Halliday, 1967, p.53). His description of the 'beneficiary' states that it is not usual for an 'inanimate' Participant to occur as 'beneficiary' unless in a quasi-metaphorical usage. Halliday argues that the 'beneficiary' is the indirect object of the clause and can occur at complement of the clause/sentence. This shows a clear gathering/grouping of process types. The notion of this grouping has a significant role for the formulation of Halliday's 'Transitivity'. He states that "the class assignment of any verb is in effect a specification of those clause features which determine its potentiality of occurrence" (1967, p.52). So verbs will put themselves into semantically related sets.

As Halliday was not happy with his 1967 description of Transitivity, in his paper 'Notes on Transitivity and Theme, Part 3' (1968), he reviewed Transitivity and introduced the notion of causation into Transitivity. Halliday (1968, p.182) suggested that "the underlying form of clause organization in English, on the dimension of Transitivity, might be of the ergative rather than, or at least as well as, of the transitive type" and proposes that 'Actor' and 'Goal' are not always suitable as the labels for participants' roles. We can notice here the difference between the 'transitive' approach 'Transitivity', as described in Part 1, and the 'ergative' approach:

> instead of a 'transitive' form of organization, based on extension, where the question is whether the action extends beyond the actor or not, the alternative … is an 'ergative' form of organization, based on causation, where the question is whether the cause is external to the action or not" (Halliday, 1968, p.185).

Another difference that Halliday (1968, p.188) explains between the transitive and the ergative is that transitive functions are "fundamentally those of action clauses" while ergative functions "seem to be common to all types of process and, in fact, to all clause types, including relations and mental processes" (1968, p.189). According to this distinction between ergative/transitive, Halliday (1968, p.190) recognizes that "the structure 'action' clauses in terms of ergative patterning suggests some tentative observations concerning other clause types".

Based on the literature review related to CDA discussed in this chapter, in the following chapter — the nature of language, concepts and definitions for discourse, discourse analysis, text, discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis and Transitivity — I will discuss the methodology that I will apply in this study to analyse the news reports.

# Chapter III

## 3.1. Methodology and Framework: An Overview

Wodak and Meyer (2001, p.17) provide a succinct review of a number of methodologies and analytical models commonly practised in CDA:

> The theories range from micro-sociological predictive (Scollonto) theories on society and power in Michel Foucault's tradition (Seigfried, Fairclough and Wodak), theories of social cognition (van Dijk) and grammar, as well as individual concepts that are borrowed from larger theoretical traditions.

In this chapter I aim to specify the methodological framework that I will follow to answer the main question of my study: how did the British Press cover the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip in the period from 1st December 2007 to 28th February 2008? This study also employs a methodological model within CDA to answer my secondary questions, which is to analyse the representational patterns used by *The Guardian* and *The Times* in their discourse on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip:

1. How do *The Guardian* and *The Times* frame the siege on the Gaza Strip?

2. What are the Transitivity selections used in each frame?

To elaborate, and in order to answer these sub-questions, I will focus on Halliday's Systematic Functional Grammar in which Transitivity plays an important role in analysing texts. This means that the study makes use of techniques in Transitivity in lending support to the critical analysis of *The Guardian* and *The Times* data. In short, this chapter will discuss critical linguistics by Fowler, et al. (1979), Hodge & Kress (1979), and Fowler (1991, 1996) and Systematic Functional Grammar by Halliday (1985, 1994) focusing on Transitivity.

## 3.2. Critical Linguistics

Fowler, et al. (1979) and Hodge and Kress (1979) developed the 'Critical Linguistics' (henceforth CL) in their original works 'language and control' and 'language as ideology' respectively. Fowler (1991, p.67) points out that:

> The method of applied language analysis known as critical linguistics was devised in response to such problems of fixed, invisible ideology permeating language…. Critical linguistics seeks, by studying the minute details of linguistic structure in the light of the social and historical situation of the text, to display to consciousness the patters of belief and value which are encoded in the language – and which are below the threshold of notice for anyone who accepts the discourse as 'natural'.

CL draws on Halliday's systemic functional linguistics (1985) which is based on the notion that "texts are built out of choices from within available systems of options in

vocabulary, grammar, and so forth and the linguistic choices that are made in texts can carry ideological meanings" (Fairclough, 1995b, p.25). Fowler and Kress (1979, p. 188) point to three overriding tenets concerning Halliday's contention that language structure is used to fulfil the communicative needs of its users:

1) Language serves a number of specific functions, and that all linguistic forms and processes express one or all these functions.

2) The selections which speakers make from among the total inventory of forms and processes are principled and systematic.

3) The relation between form and content is not arbitrary or conventional, but that form signifies meaning.

Fowler (1991, p.5) states that the whole project of critical linguistics is "an enquiry into the relations between signs, meanings, and the social and historical conditions" that "govern the semiotic structure of discourse, using a particular kind of linguistic analysis". Trew (1979a) and Fowler (1991) focused on how ideology and ideological workings are realized through systems of linguistic processes and patterns whereby the selection of one linguistic process may have ideological consequences in a system of representation. They emphasized analysing news media discourses in their studies of the 'representation' of social groups specially minority and ethnic groups. In their studies, they employed linguistic analytical categories essentially drawn from functional linguistics such as Transitivity, nominalization, modality, and lexical choice. Critical linguistics views texts as having an ideational function of representing people, events and objects and the world out there, and as having an interpersonal language function of encoding social relations and identities and textual function (Fairclough, 1995b; Fowler, 1996) (for more information about these functions, see section 3.4. in this chapter).

For the relation between CL and CDA, Wodak and Meyer (2001, p.2) argue that CDA and CL are "fundamentally concerned with analysing opaque as well as transparent structural relationships of dominance, discrimination, power and control as manifested in language" which are used in the media to cover important issues and conflicts such as the Arab-Israeli conflict. Through this argument, it can be seen that CL and CDA have the same aim and they are interrelated, especially in their interest in understanding the relation between power and discourse.

### 3.3. Transitivity in Halliday's Systemic Functional Linguistics

A number of theoretical and analytical frameworks can be drawn from Halliday's systematic functional linguistics (e.g. Halliday 1978, 1994). Systemic-functional linguistics (SFL) is a lexico-grammatical theory that embraces the notion of studying language in its social contexts and in this theory language is perceived as "networks of interlocking options" (Halliday, 1994, p. xiv). It is this theory that CDA often draws on. Martin (2000, p.275) posits that CDA has rested its analytical paradigm fundamentally on SFL because of its ability "to ground concerns with power and ideology in the detailed analysis of texts as they unfold, clause by clause, in real contexts of language use". In the same vein, Thompson (1996) explains that functional grammar relates specific linguistic and textual features to their larger socio-cultural and ideological contexts and perhaps this explains the wider popularity of critical discourse analysis as an applicable framework for studying language-in-use and analysing texts (spoken or written).

In this analysis I will focus on Transitivity, which is one of the check list of Halliday's 'Introduction to Functional Grammar' (1985) and the basis for Fairclough's key questions for text analysis (1989, pp. 110-111):

1. Lexicalisation
2. Patterns of Transitivity
3. The use of active and passive voice
4. The use of nominalisation
5. Choices of mood
6. Choices of modality or polarity
7. The thematic structure of the text
8. Information focus
9. Cohesion devices

In media discourse the attenuating, accentuating or even mystifying responsibility, agency or causality of particular events are ideologically important; therefore it, may be argued that Transitivity can be an extremely powerful analytical tool to demonstrate how such ideologies operate and to analyse how the journalists represent the actors/participants in the texts and what kind of processes they accompany with the actors. Furthermore, Fairclough (1992) proposes that a motivation for examining Transitivity is to see what cultural, political, or ideological factors influence the choice of a particular process type in a specific discourse or text where the particular choices from these process types are the sites of ideological and political struggles. Halliday (1985, p.101) explains that the Transitivity system (Process, Participants and

Circumstances) "specifies the different types of processes that are recognized in the language and the structures by which they are expressed". Process, participant and circumstance are realized generally as Verb, Noun, and Adjunct, respectively (cf. Halliday, 1985; Bloor & Bloor, 1995; Thompson, 1996) and it is known as a verbal group, nominal group and circumstances, which are adjuncts. In Halliday's approach, there is also concentration on the clause not only in terms of groups and phrases, but also in terms of the clause structure such Subject, Predicator (verb), Complement and adjunct. The following table (3.1.) exemplifies and illustrates the Transitivity system.

**Table 3.1. Examples of Transitivity System**

| Subject | Predicator | Complement | Adjunct | Circumstances | |
|---------|-----------|------------|---------|---------------|---|
| Anna | sings | a song | quietly | in the house. | |
| participant | process | participant | circumstances | circumstances | Transitivity system |
| nominal group | verbal group | nominal group | adverbial group | prepositional group | Clause structure |

Because it plays such an important role in the analysis of discourse, there are different approaches to Transitivity such as Fillmore (1968), Lyons (1968), Halliday (1985) and Fairclough (1989). However, in this study, the focus will be on Halliday's approach to 'Transitivity' because his approach is, I think, much clearer than other approaches especially in analysing the actors and the processes on which I will focus in my analysis of the four texts from *The Guardian* and *The Times*. Halliday (1973, p.134) states:

> Transitivity is the set of options whereby the speaker encodes his experience of the process of the external world, and of the internal world of his own consciousness, together with the participants in these processes and their attendant circumstances.

So initially Transitivity concentrates on how a writer/journalist represents the agent (who acts) and who is affected by the actions/processes of others (who is acted upon). Iwamoto (1995 cited in Teo, 2000, p.25) states "Transitivity means who does what to whom". In this respect, Transitivity can help find the way by which language represents the actors, primary or dominant, who does what to whom in which circumstances.

The major process types of Action, Relational and Mental are explained clearly in Halliday's work (1985-1994). Another two main types, Behavioural and Existential processes have been included with the introduction of Verbal processes

(for more details on the processes, see section 3.5.). Lock (1996, p.73) points out that "the general term for the configuration of participants associated with different processes is Transitivity". That is, Transitivity is the study of the processes and participants and their relationships in certain/particular circumstances. Halliday (1985, p.101) defines Transitivity as a fundamental linguistic property that "enables human beings to build a mental picture of reality, to make sense of their experience of what goes on around them and inside them".

Bearing in mind the ideas outlined above, Transitivity could be the most useful and the key analytic component of Ideational Metafunctions and help in analysing the representation of the actors and the processes and refine an infinite variety of occurrences or 'goings on' into a finite set of process types. In this respect, (Teo, 2000, p.25) states that:

> Transitivity is a useful analytic tool that foregrounds the agency or, more accurately, the attribution of agency and process to the various participants in the text by the writer". Thus, in order to probe the way language represents reality in terms of how the primary or dominant agents are constructed, what they do to whom and with what consequences, Transitivity theory has much to offer.

Some studies use Transitivity as a tool for analysing different kinds of texts. For example, Stubbs and Gerbig (1993) focus on Transitivity in their research on the encoding of causation and agency in a comparison of geography textbooks. In another example, Trew (1979b) showed that the consistent deletion of agents was ideologically motivated to mystify agency and to obscure or even eliminate responsibility for killing by the police. This is demonstrated in his analysis of passive structures in the news reports and editorials of two British newspapers on clashes between Rhodesian police and demonstrators.

Richardson (2007, p.54) points out that "Transitivity describes the relationships between participants and the roles they play in the processes described in reporting". In short, this means who does what to whom. That is Transitivity could shape the representation and describe the relationships between participants and the roles they play in the processes. Mills (1995, pp. 143-144) argues that the study of Transitivity is concerned with "how actions are represented; what kind of actions appear in a text, who does them and to whom they are done". Richardson (2007, p.54) further states that the study of Transitivity "is the realization that in producing texts there is a range of choices to be made, and every text which has been produced could

have been produced differently"; that is, there is a choice to shape any event's actors and there is a choice to represent the event in the way it is represented.

Simpson (1993, p.88) demonstrates, in any process, there are three components that can be changed:

1.  The participants involved in the process. These roles are typically realized by noun phrases in the clause.

2.  The process itself, which will be expressed by the verb phrase in a clause.

3.  The circumstances associated with the process, normally expressed by adverbial and prepositional phrases.

## 3.4. Language Macro Functions (Metafunctions of Language)

According to Halliday (1973 cited in O'Halloran, 2003, p.16), language has three macro functions:

1.  Ideational- to represent people, objects, events, and states of affairs in the world,
2.  Interpersonal- to express the speaker's attitude to these representations, and
3.  Textual- to array 1 and 2 in a cohesive and appropriate manner.

Together these three functions build the larger configuarion of field, tenor and mode respectively. In this respect through these functions of language, SFG perceives and contributes to language as a system of meaning and structure and explains why language is used in the way it is used. Transitivity understands the Ideational Function by expressing processes. In Hallidayan grammar, Transitivity is a strong semantic concept to analyse the representation referring to Ideational Function of language.

> A central insight of Halliday's, made very explicit in his most recent book, is that Transitivity is the foundation of representation: it is the way the clause is used to analyze events and situations as being of certain types. And Transitivity has the facility to analyse the same events in different ways, a facility which is of course of great interest in newspaper analysis. If we see something, says Halliday, 'perceptually the phenomenon is all of a piece'; but when we talk of it, we mustn't analyse it as a semantic configuration, - that is, we must represent it as one particular structure of meaning. (Fowler, 1991, p. 72)

Halliday discussed the Transitivity as a whole system/network in the Ideational metafunction as a system in which situations, processes, and participants are constructed. The Ideational Function of language is to express or represent the content. It is the representation of the reality/accuracy which reveals who did what to whom and when. Halliday (1975c, p.17) pointed out that ".... there are the Ideational options, those relating to the content of what is said". To explain, Halliday means that

31

the writer/speaker can emoby his/her experiences of the phenomena of the real world in language through the Ideational Function of language which contains his/her experience and consciousness (perception, reaction and cognition besides linguistic acts to speak and understand). In a way to serve this function, language structures experiences and helps to specify how to look at things. This requires some intellectual effort to see them in a different way from the way the language suggests for us. Halliday (1970, p.143) states that to serve this Ideational Function language gives structure to experience, and "helps to determine our way of looking at things, so that it requires some intellectual effort to see them in any other way than that which our language suggests to us".

The Interpersonal Function is another function for language. Halliday (1971d, p.106) states:

> the speaker is using the language as the means of his intrusion into the speech event: the expressions of his comments, his attitudes, and evaluations, and also the relationship that he sets up between himself and the listener - in particular, the communication role that he adopts, of informing, questioning, greeting, persuading and the like.

This leads to the domain of using language to achieve purposes and the determintation of text-type. Here language is used to help establish and maintain all human relations. In this Interpersonal Function, indivduals are encouraged to interact with others as language helps in the development and expressions of the thoughts, ideas and openions. Francis and Kramer- Dhal (1992, pp.77-80) point out that the Interpersonal metafunction "is concerned with the interaction between the writer of the text and its intended audience".

The last function of language that Halliday stated is the 'Textual Function' through which  language links itself with itself and with the situation thereby making discourse possible because a text can be produced by either the writer or the speaker and can be recognized by the reader or listner. That is, Textual Function is concerned with "the internal organization of the sentence, with its meaning as a message both in itself and in relation to the context" (Alexander, et al., 2000, p.92). Francis and Kramer-Dhal (1992, pp.72-77) explained that the Textual Function depends on the meanings of the other metafunctions and assigns second order values to them. Through this function, language can make the link between itself and with situation. In this case, discourse can be possible for a writer/ speaker to produce a text which the reader/listener can recognise.

## 3.5. Halliday's Processes (1985/1994)

Halliday (1985, p.101) states that "Transitivity specifies the different types of processes that are recognized in the language and the structures by which they are expressed". Lock (1996, pp.60-63) points out that the term used to refer generally "to goings-on like doing, happening, seeing, feeling, thinking, as well as being and having is process" and "to entities involved in such processes is participants". Similarly Bloor and Bloor (1995, p.110) specify two senses "1) to refer to what is going on in the whole clause and 2) to refer to that part of the proposition encoded in the Verbal Group". This leads to different types of processes which involve different kinds of participants. Halliday (1985, p.101) states that a semantic framework for representing a process consists of three elements: a) the process itself; b) the participants in the process; c) the circumstances associated with the process (for the explanation of Halliday's process, see table 3.2).

Table3.2. A Summary of Process Types and Their Participants (adapted from Halliday 1985)

| Process Type | Category meaning | Participants |
|---|---|---|
| Material:<br>    action<br>    event | 'doing'<br>    'doing'<br>    'happening' | Actor, Goal |
| Behavioural | 'behaving' | Behaviour |
| Mental:<br>  perception<br>  affection<br>  cognition | 'sensing'<br>  'seeing'<br>  'feeling'<br>  'thinking' | Senser, Phenomenon |
| Verbal: | 'saying' | Sayer, Target |
| Relational:<br>    attribution<br>    identification | 'being'<br>    'attributing'<br>    'identifying' | Token, Value<br>Carrier, Attribute<br>Identified, Identifier |
| Existential | 'existing' | Existent |

Generally speaking, we can understand that process is the action in the clause and the doer of the action is the Participant and the situation of action and how the doer does the action is circumstance. I will start here by explaining and exemplifying Halliday's processes:

### 3.5.1. The Material Process

Halliday (1985/1994) explains that 'Material' processes are of a 'doing' type, and can be tested by asking 'what did it do?' or 'what happened to it?' 'Material' processes have the functions of 'Actor' and 'Goal' associated with them. That is Material processes represent the doing words and what is happening, the actions and events that are going on. Simpson (1993, pp.86-118) uses the following table 3.3 to show how Material processes are divided into smaller processes (adapted from Berry 1975).

Table3.3. Material Processes

|  | Action process | Intention process |
|---|---|---|
| *Material process (Action)* | John kicked the ball.<br>The lion sprang.<br>The boy fell over.<br>Mary slipped. | John kicked the ball.<br>The lion sprang.<br><br>*Supervention process*<br>The boy fell over.<br>Mary slipped. |
| *Material process (Event)* | The lake shimmered.<br>The car backfired. |  |

This type of process focuses on the action (Process) and who does the action (Actor-Agent) and/or against whom the action is done (Object/Goal). My own example below clarifies this type of process:

| The British police | killed | a G20 protester | in the last G20 demonstration. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Subject | verb | object | Circumstances |
| Agent (participant) | Process | Affected/goal (participant) | prepositional group |

### 3.5.2. The Mental Process

Halliday (1985, p.116) states the reason for considering the Mental process as a separate process type that is "associated with the less focused tense form, the simple tense". Halliday (1985) does not consider Mental processes as processes of 'doing' like the Material processes. Moreover, he identifies further semantic subclassifications of Mental processes such as 'perception', 'affection' and 'cognition'. That is Mental processes include thinking, believing, seeing, hearing, liking, wanting and hoping. Lock (1996, p.105) classifies the Mental Processes into four sub-type processes as follows:

> The first type, perception, includes processes such as seeing, hearing, noticing, feeling, tasting and smelling. The second type includes affection, includes processes such as liking, loving, admiring, missing, fearing and hating. The third type included cognition, including processes such as thinking, believing, knowing, doubting, remembering and forgetting.  The fourth type includes volition, includes processes such as wanting, needing, intending, desiring, hoping and wishing.

Apparently, the roles of 'actor' and 'goal' are abandoned in favour of the functions 'Sensor' – the Participant who 'senses', and 'phenomenon' as in my examples below:

(Sensor in **bold;** Phenomenon underlined)

**Ali** saw them. **George** saw them leaving the house.

**The teachers** condemned their students' behaviour.

Simpson (1993, p.86-118) gives the following examples (see table 3.4.) to explain the Mental processes (Also adapted from Berry 1975)

**Table 3.4 Mental Processes**

| | |
|---|---|
| *Mental process* | *Perception* <br><br> John saw Mary. <br><br> She heard the concert. |
| | *Reaction* <br><br> She likes Bach. <br><br> He hates wine. |
| | *Cognition* <br><br> She considered the question. <br><br> I thought hard |

### 3.5.3. The Relational Process

In SFG, Halliday presents a different and more detailed account. The best explanation of the functioning of Relational processes can be realized from the following (table 3.5.) that Halliday (1994, p.113) presents:

**Table 3.5. The Relational Process**

|  | **(i) attributive** | **(ii) identifying** |
|---|---|---|
| 1) intensive | Sarah is wise | Tom is the leader; The leader is Tom |
| 2) circumstantial | The fair is on Tuesday | Tomorrow is the 10th; The 10th is tomorrow |
| 3) possessive | Peter has a piano | The piano is Peter's; Peter's is the piano |

This table shows three main types of Relational process: (1)'intensive' ('x is a'), (2) 'circumstantial' ('x' is at a'), and (3) 'possessive' ('x has a'). Moreover, each type is cross-classified with two other types of meaning; either 'attributive' or 'identifying'.

Referring to 'table 3.2.' the roles of the participants, in the Relational Processes are token, value, carrier, attribute and identifier. My following examples clarify these roles.

Her car (*carrier*) is very expensive (*attribute*).

Macbeth (*Identified-Token*) is one of Shakespeare's most famous plays.

Shakespeare's most famous play (*Identifier-Value*) is Macbeth.

### 3.5.4. Behavioural Process

As a process type bordering between Material and Mental processes, the Behavioural processes are described as relating to physiological and psychological Behaviour-processes such as 'breathing; coughing; smiling; dreaming; and staring (Halliday, 1985, p.128). This kind of process stands between Material and Mental processes; thus, the verb of the Behavioural process is intransitive (just one participant). Also, its activity includes both inseparable and indispensable physical and mental aspects. Therefore, the participants are portrayed in the role of behavior as they are behaving.

My examples below clarify the meaning of Behavioural process: A) She (*behaviour*) was smiling. B) John (*behavior*) shouted. In this type of the process, as in the two examples, the actor performs the behaviour.

### 3.5.5. The Verbal Process:

The Verbal process type relates to "any kind of symbolic exchange of meaning" (Halliday1985, p.129), as in the following example: What did you say? I said it is noisy in the class. Halliday points out that this process type does not require a conscious Participant as it is possible to have a Participant as 'a watch', as in My watch says its ten o'clock (1985, p.29). The participant here is expected and would be an inanimate being, and typically human. The participant role assigned to this process type by Halliday is 'Sayer'. Three other possible Roles for Participant are: 'receiver' - the person 'to whom the verbalization is addressed'; 'verbiage' - what is said; and 'target'- the target of 'verbs such as insult, praise, slander, abuse, flatter' (summarized from Halliday, 1994, p.141). Lock (1996, p.116) summarizes the Verbal processes as follows:

> Verbal processes are processes of saying and are expressed by verbs such as say, tell, ask, reply and suggest. Verbal process clauses normally have one participant, the Sayer, plus in most cases a presentation of what is said, called the Saying. In addition, many verbal process clauses have participants which represent the person toward whom the words are directed. This participant is called addresses.

In brief, we can understand that Verbal processes are represented mainly in the verb 'say' and the participants are always in the role of 'Sayer'.

### 3.5.6. The Existential Process

The Existential process represents something that happens as in the following example: There is an amazing picture in the museum. In this case, the Subject 'there' does not have a representational function. Often, this kind of clause contains a distinct circumstantial element. Halliday (1985, p.143) states that the Existential processes type also "includes the special category of 'meteorological' processes", where the Subject also involves a non-referential Subject, as in: It is raining.

Halliday's works (1985-1994) show that the central notion is one of 'cause and effect'. That is, there is at least one Participant for every process and this participant is the 'Medium' through which the 'process' is actualized particularly in English. Halliday (1994, p.164) proposes that the Process and the Medium "together form the nucleus of an English clause; and this nucleus then determines the range of options that are available to the rest of the clause" and according to the process, as a Participant Role, the Medium functions in the clause functions in different ways.

Halliday (1994, p.165) states that

the ergative function Medium is equivalent to:
- in material process to Actor (middle), Goal (effective)
- in behavioural process to Behaver
- in mental process to Senser
- in verbal process to Sayer (middle), Target (effective)
- in attributive process to Carrier
- in identifying process to Identified
- in existential process to Existent

Thus, Halliday (1985, p.147) states that "the Medium is the nodal Participant throughout: not the doer, or the causer, but the one that is critically involved". Teo (2000, p.25) classifies and exemplifies Halliday's processes (see the table 3.6.)

**Table 3.6. A Summary of Process Types (adapted from Halliday, 1994)**

| Process types | Examples |
|---|---|
| **Material**<br>Action<br>Event | <br>The lion *caught* the tourist<br>The mayor *resigned* |
| **Behavioural** | She *smiled* at him |
| **Mental**<br>Perception<br>Affection<br>Cognition | <br>I hadn't *noticed* that<br>Mary *liked* the gift<br>No one *believed* his story |
| **Verbal** | John *said* he was hungry |
| **Relational**<br>Attribution<br>Identification | <br>Sarah *is* wise<br>Tom *is* the leader |
| **Existential** | There *was* a storm |

Bloor and Bloor (1995, p.126) explain Halliday's processes and Participants accompanied with the processes (see the table 3.6.)

**Table 3.7. Halliday's Process and Attributed Participants (adapted from Bloor and Bloor 1995:126)**

| Process | Participant |
|---|---|
| Material | Actor, Goal, Beneficiary, Range. |
| Mental | Sensor, Phenomenon. |
| Relational | Carrier; (Attribute – not exactly a Participant); Identified; Identifier. |
| Verbal | Sayer, Quoted/Reported (one or the other); Receiver; Verbiage, Target. |
| Existential | Existent |
| Behavioural | Behaver |

### 3.6. Data Analysis

To do the analysis, firstly I will specify generally the major linguistic features in *The Guardian* and *The Times* discourse using illustrations from both newspapers. Secondly, I will tie up the linguistic characterization of data with a micro analysis of selected news reports. In other words, I will undertake a linguistic analysis of news reports including micro analyses; Furthermore, I will examine the ideological and political contexts and structures that have influenced the production and comprehension of the discourse. Although, I will count the frequencies in the texts where the process types were used, the focus in the analysis is not so much on the number of times the Palestinians and Israelis were mentioned respectively but the ways in which they were portrayed (represented/framed) in the texts.

In this context, the study examines the British Press's coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip over three- month period between December 2007 and February 2008. In this period, the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip broke through the border, 'the wall' between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. This three-month coverage serves as the data corpus from which I have chosen the sampled news reports systematically: two news reports before breaking through the wall and two news reports after breaking through the wall. I believe such data corpus will help us reveal a comprehensive picture of the newspapers' discourses on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip and it will help situate the newspapers discourses in their ideological-political contexts. In the analysis I will link the linguistic understandings and realizations of the newspapers discourse to their ideological-political contexts. The understanding of the current situation cannot be realized without consideration of past or current events and contexts which seem to directly influence the linguistic event/expressions. In my linguistic analysis, I will employ linguistic categories from Halliday's systemic-functional linguistics (Halliday1985-1994) such as Transitivity but this does not mean that I may not look at other linguistic resources.

To answer the study's question, I shall deal with the data on a micro level and then discuss the political and ideological findings related to this discourse. I will summarize the news reports and then identify the Transitivity of the 'actors' and the 'processes' involved in the texts. This is to examine whether these features are embedded in political and/or ideological contexts.

Focusing on the text itself, I have identified a set of questions to help in analysing the texts.

**Part one: Questions about the text**

1. Who is the author of the text?
2. When did the journalist/author write the text?
3. How many words are in the text?
4. What is the text about?

**Part two: Questions about the actors**

5. Who are the most dominant actors in the text? What does this mean?
6. How does the journalist/newspaper represent the actors?
7. How does each newspaper frame the actors?

**Part three: Questions about the processes**

8. What types of processes are associated with which actors?
9. Who is responsible for most of the processes of doing and saying?
10. What meanings may be communicated though the distribution of process types and participant roles to news actors?

**Part four: Questions about the ideological and political dimensions of the text**

11. What does the comparative analysis of processes reveal about the ideological-political position of the reporter?

The data of the newspapers will be compiled and the linguistic features in each newspaper will be identified. Then I will discuss the political and ideological contexts associated with this discourse and how they influence and shape this discourse. The final procedure will be to draw a conclusion about the nature of this discourse.

### 3.7. Data Collection

The study's sampled data will include four (4) news reports published on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip generally and particularly on breaking the wall/border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. All news reports (29) focusing on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip were extracted, but the focus will be only on four news reports, two from *The Guardian* and two from *The Times*.

I have chosen systematically four news reports from the two newspapers in order to have a comprehensive representation of the newspapers' discourse regarding the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. By systematically, I mean that the sample includes all data that focuses on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip, specifically as its main subject. Furthermore, the sample excludes all the data, which does not refer to the siege as its main subject or which may simply contain some references to the Israeli siege. Moreover, to make sure the sample is systematically selected, the analysis will focus only on reports contributed by journalists who cover regularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and mainly write about the Israeli siege. Those regular journalists are Rory McCarthy from *The Guardian* and James Hider from *The Times*. To make the data sample of the news reports published in *The Guardian and The Times* consistent and reliable, the data corpus includes a total of 2 news reports from *The Guardian* and 2 news reports from *The Times* written by British journalists to ensure the journalists come from different political positions/backgrounds but are of the same nationality. I have excluded the news report written by the Israeli journalist. The reason for the exclusion is to make sure that the sample news reports reflect both sides of the British political spectrum through the perspective of two journalists and their coverage of the Israeli siege. Furthermore, the sample includes news reports published during the time of the breaking of the wall/border or related mainly to the border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt.

Traditionally, the press in Britain is divided into Left and Right wing. *The Time* is centre right whilst *The Guardian* is centre left. To the left of *The Guardian* is *The Independent* and to the right of *The Times* is *The Daily Telegraph*. The Guardian Media Group is owned by the Scott Trust and publishes *The Guardian* and *The Observer*. News International is owned by Rupert Murdoch and publishes *The Sun*, *The News of the World*, *The Times* and *The Sunday Times* (for more information, see Curran & Seaton, 2003). Based on this classification, I chose *The Guardian* from the political Left and *The Times* from the political Right. The selection of the two newspapers aims to gauge an understanding of how British newspapers with supposedly different ideological positions construct a highly charged political event. The aim is to identify the Transitivity realization of the two papers' constructions of the event.

To conclude, in this chapter I have discussed the methodology that I will use to analyse the news reports from The *Guardian* and *The Times*. To understand Halliday's SFG, I have firstly discussed Critical Linguistics and then Halliday's SFL and the techniques of Transitivity. I have also explained language metafunctions and Halliday's processes: the Material, Mental, Verbal, Relational, Behavioural and Existential.

I have described the way the data will be analyzed posing questions on which I will draw in analysing the news reports. In the final part, I discussed the methods that I will follow in collecting the data. In Chapter Four, I will analyse the news reports and then discuss the findings.

**Chapter VI**

## 4.1. Findings and Discussion

In this chapter, I will present my findings by applying the tool of SFG Transitivity in analysing the news reports texts and then I will discuss these findings explaining the ideological-political dimensions behind the linguistic features used in the news reports. In this study I examine the data for its linguistic features and interpret it for its ideological and political contributions to a particular representation of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. The analysis tries to answer the study's main question: 'how did the British Press cover the Israeli siege of Gaza from December 2007 to February 2008?' and the two sub-questions: 'How do *The Guardian* and *The Times* frame the siege on the Gaza Strip?', and 'what are the Transitivity selections used in each frame?'

As stated in section 3.3. language is a network of interlocking options, we can see that language offers its users a high number of options to help them produce texts for the communication of meanings, which is drawn on the options within the system that is chosen and/or not chosen because choice always is accompanied by inclusion and/or exclusion.

## 4.2. Initial Findings

Searching the news reports published in *The Guardian* and *The Times* newspapers, I counted 29 news reports that focus on the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip in the relevant period. Of these 29 news reports, 19 news reports were published in *The Guardian* and 10 news reports were found in *The Times*. Comparing these news reports, it was found that the amount of coverage of the situation varied from one month to another, as shown in Table 4.1. below. For example, January 2008 witnesses the highest level of reporting with 16 news reports in contrast with December 2007, which had 4 news reports, representing the lowest level of reporting. In December 2007 there were 3 news reports in *The Guardian* and 1 in *The Times*. In January 2008, *The Guardian* had 9 reports while *The Times* had 7. In February 2008, *The Guardian* had 7 news reports whereas *The Times* had 2 news reports (see table 4.1.).

**Table 4.1. Number of News Reports Published by the Two Newspapers Between Dec. 1 2007 to Feb. 28 2008.**

| Newspaper | December | January 2008 | February 2008 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| *The Guardian* | 3 | 9 | 7 | 19 |
| *The Times* | 1 | 7 | 2 | 10 |
| Total | 4 | 16 | 9 | 29 |

Furthermore, the results show that the main reporters (journalists) were 3 British journalists (2 in *The Guardian* and 1 in *The Times*) in the period of the study. Amongst these, there is one Israeli journalist (in *The Times*) and there are no news reports by Palestinian or Arab journalists in either newspaper (see table 4.2. for the nationality of the reporters 'journalists' and the number of the news reports they wrote.).

**Table 4.2. Nationality and Number of the News Reports Contributed**

| Name | Newspaper | Nationality | Feb. 2008 | Jan. 2008 | Dec. 2007 | Number of articles |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Toni O'Loughlin | *The Guardian* | British | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Rory McCarthy | *The Guardian* | British | 3 | 9 | 3 | 15 |
| James Hider | *The Times* | British | 2 | 7 | 0 | 9 |
| Sheera Frenkel | *The Times* | Israeli | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

In this study, I have focused on four texts from two different British newspapers, *The Guardian* and *The Times* (see appendix 1 for the exact texts) and for the Transitivity analysis I have followed Halliday's (1985) table of actors and process types (see table 3.2) to code these four texts (see appendix 2 for coding the texts) and for the classification of the participants and the process (see appendix 3). To analyze and comment on the texts, I posed some questions (see section 3.6.). To make my references to the texts consistent, they are labeled as follows:

- Text one from *The Guardian*: G1
- Text two from *The Guardian*: G2
- Text one from *The Times*: T1
- Text two from *The Times*: T2

**4.3. Analysis of the News Reports**

**4.3.1. Analysis of the Text and Transitivity –*The Guardian* (G1)**

-**Title**: Olmert rules out a ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements.
-**Date**: Dec 24, 2007
-**Byline**: Rory McCarthy, Jerusalem

G1 was written by Rory McCarthy, a Guardian journalist in the Gaza Strip, on the 24th of December, 2007. In a 538 word-news report, McCarthy talks about two issues. First, he reports on the Israeli Premier Ehud Olmert's comments on the continuation of rocket fire. From the title, "Olmert rules out ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements", the text implies that Israel is fighting a legal war against the Palestinian attackers but Israel seeks peace talks.

The journalist starts the news report by stating the Israeli Prime minister's comment about the ceasefire as he ruled out ceasefire negotiations with Hamas, the Palestinian Islamist movement, and Israel in the Gaza Strip is fighting a "true war" whose aim is to stop the Palestinians from firing rockets against Israel. Then the journalist reports the effect of the ruling out of the ceasefire negotiations as a dozen Hamas and the Islamic Jihad fighters were killed during the Israeli strikes against Gaza. After that, he reports the suggestions of a ceasefire which Hamas raised and sought to achieve with Israel through Ismail Haniyeh, the sacked Palestinian Prime Minister, in an interview with an Israeli television journalist. However, it is mentioned that the Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Olmert refused any negotiations with any group, such as Hamas, which does not accept the principles of the Quartet of Middle East negotiators - the US, the UN, the EU and Russia. "Whoever accepts the Quartet principles will be - in principle - a partner for negotiations," Olmert said. "Whoever is unwilling to do so, to our regret, cannot be a partner for dialogue. This policy will not change". McCarthy reported in *The Guardian* the Israeli desire to halt the firing of rockets and depose Hamas, which in his opinion would not be easy to achieve. For this McCarthy states the comments of Haim Ramon, Israel's deputy

prime minister who said that "we are fighting Hamas and are seeking to weaken its control of Gaza, and bring about the end of its reign there. Hamas should hand over control of Gaza to the Palestinian Authority", which is controlled by the Palestinian president Mahmoud Abbas, who is the leader of Fatah movement.

In the second part of the news report, McCarthy reported about the new Israeli plan to build 740 apartments in settlements in East Jerusalem in the West Bank. Rafi Eitan, Israel's minister for Jerusalem affairs, confirmed the construction plans but said he regarded the areas as "integral" parts of Jerusalem, adding that Israel did not regard the Road Map as applying to Jerusalem. McCarthy shows that this plan was condemned by the Palestinian leaders who regarded the new plan as a new obstacle to reviving peace talks between the two sides. These talks would come under the first phase of the US Road Map which Israel had committed to by agreeing to halt all settlement activity and to removing some of its latest settlements.

Detailed examination shows that the main participants in this text are Israelis. The Israelis are mentioned 15 times and the other participants are the Palestinians who are mentioned 7 times. A third party, the Egyptian mediators , is mentioned once (see table 4.3.). This shows that the most dominant actors are the Israelis and the result of this is that the main perspective in this text is the Israeli attitude toward the ceasefire negotiations and the building of settlements mentioned in this news report. In contrast, the Palestinians were mentioned 7 times and in a different way from the Israelis, which reflects the misconception of the Palestinians' attitudes who were under the Israeli siege, regarding the main subject of this text as well.

**Table 4.3. Classification of the Participants (G1)**

| Actors | Type of actors | | | | | | | | | | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actor | Goal | Behaviour | Sensor | Sayer | Target | Token/ Value | Carrier /attribute | Identifier | Existent | |
| Palestinian | 2 | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Israelis | 2 | 3 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| For other actors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 4 | 4 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

Focusing on the processes attributed the participants is essential to understanding how the journalist represents the main actors (the Israelis and the Palestinians) in the text (see table 4.4.).

**Table 4.4. Classification of the Processes (G1)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 5 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 18 |
| Palestinian | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 8 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 28 |

This table shows that the main processes assigned with the actors are the Material, Verbal and Mental processes. In more detail, tables (4.3. and 4.4.) show the number of

- Frequencies related to Israeli participants (20)

- Frequencies related to Palestinian participants (7)

- Frequencies related to Egyptian participants (1)

- Frequencies related to International participants (0)

- Frequencies related to processes (28)

To elaborate, tables (4.3 and 4.4) demonstrate that the journalist mainly represents the Israeli participants as 'Sensor' or 'Sayer' and that the processes assigned to those Israeli participants are Mental and Verbal and sometimes Material actions. However, the Palestinian Participants are represented as 'Actor' and the processes assigned to them are Material (action) in most representations.

In more detail the journalist represents, in this text (G1) line numbers 1, 4, 25, 33, 38 and 42 (see appendix 3.1.), the Israeli participants as 'Sensor', 'Sayer' and 'Actor' in the role of 'Victim' and 'Goal' and the processes accompanied with these

types of actors are Mental, Verbal and Material. The examples below explain more (see appendix 2.1.):

Lines 1-2: The Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmert, [Sensor] yesterday ruled out (process-Mental) ceasefire negotiations with the Islamist movement Hamas.

Lines 17-20: Olmert [Sayer] said (process-Verbal) there would be no talks with any group that failed to meet the principles of the Quartet of Middle East negotiators - the US, the UN, the EU and Russia - which last year called on Hamas to recognise Israel, halt violence and accept previous peace agreements.

Lines 25-29: Yesterday Haim Ramon [Sensor], Israel's deputy prime minister, confirmed (process-Mental) that his government [Actor-defendant/victim/goal] wanted to topple Hamas. We [Actor-victim/defendant] are fighting Hamas and are seeking to weaken its control of Gaza, and bring about the end of its reign there.

On the other hand, the Palestinian participants are described mainly as 'Actor'/ 'doer' in the role of 'attackers', and behaviors which are responsible for the processes of Material (Action). Consequently, the majority of the processes assigned to the Palestinian participants are Material (action) processes. The examples below show how the journalist represents the Palestinian participants in the text (G1):

Lines 5-6: …..which he *Ehud Olmert* [Sayer] said (process-Verbal) were intended to prevent Palestinian militants [Actor-Attacker] from firing (process-Action) makeshift rockets into Israel.
Lines 29-30: Hamas [Actor- Attacker] should hand over (processes-Material-Action) control of Gaza to the Palestinian Authority.

**4.3.2. Analysis of the Text and Transitivity –*The Guardian*- (G2)**

-**Title**: Border breach could let Israel cut Gaza link, say officials.
-**Byline**: Rory McCarthy, Rafah
-**Date:** Jan 25, 2008

Text two (G2) was 436 words long and was written by Rory McCarthy, a Guardian journalist in the Gaza Strip, on the 25th of January, 2008 after the border/the wall between the Gaza Strip and Egypt had been broken through. The text was about the Israeli reaction to the breach of the border/Wall between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. The journalist talked about how Israel tried to absolve itself of its responsibility toward the Gaza Strip as it provides a chance for Israel to leave, disconnect and relinquish responsibility for the crowded and terrible Gaza Strip after the breaking of the border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. Moreover, McCarthy talked about the Egyptians' reaction as well their desire to reseal the border after Palestinians poured into Egypt to buy basic necessities for their lives. He mentioned the desire of Hamas to re-build the border between Egypt and the Gaza Strip in order to control it later. Then he reported that the Israeli aim was to separate Israel from the Gaza Strip which was captured in 1967. Israeli withdrew its settlers and soldiers from inside Gaza as the international community regards the Gaza Strip as an occupied area because Israel still controls the borders, the sea, goods and Palestinian movements inside and outside the Gaza Strip.

McCarthy mentioned the Israeli Defence Minister's speech as well as the Israeli intention to invade Gaza as a way of stopping firing of rockets. However, the journalist in this text does not mention the reason why the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip broke through the wall separating the Gaza Strip from Egypt nor that firing rockets is a reaction to the Israeli siege imposed for long time around the Gaza Strip.

Focusing on the participants mentioned in the text (G2), we can find the central participants in the text are Israelis who are mentioned 19 times in contrast with the other actors like the Palestinians, who are just mentioned two times and the Egyptians who are mentioned twice in the text (see table 4.5). This means that the most dominant actors in the text are the Israelis and this shows that the journalist only reflects the Israeli viewpoint towards the siege of the Gaza Strip without mentioning

the Israeli role in imposing the siege or the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip suffering as a result of the Israeli siege.

**Table 4.5 Classification of Actors (G2)**

| Actors | Type of actors | | | | | | | | | | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actor | Goal | Behaviour | Sensor | Sayer | Target | Token/ Value | Carrier /attribute | Identifier | Existent | |
| Palestinian | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Israelis | 3 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| For other actors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Total | 4 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

A comparative analysis of the processes related to the actors reveal that most of the processes-especially the Verbal Processes are attributed to Israelis and the Material-Actions processes are attributed to Palestinians (see table 4.6.).

**Table 4.6. Classification of the Processes (G2)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Palestinian | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

This table shows the main processes attributed to the actors (Israelis and Palestinians) are Verbal, Mental and Material processes.

In more detail, tables (4.5. and 4.6.) show that the main representation of the Israeli participants is in the roles of 'Sensor', 'Sayer' and 'Actor' in the role of Victim and the process types used with these roles are Mental, Verbal and Material (Action).

50

However, the roles attributed to the Palestinian participants are Actor and the process types accompanied with these roles are Material and Behavioral. In more detail, the two tables show the following:

- Frequencies related to Israeli participants (19)

- Frequencies related to Palestinian participants (2)

- Frequencies related to Egyptian participants (2)

- Frequencies related to International participants (1)

- Frequencies related to processes (24)

To focus on the framing of the participants, the journalist represents the Israeli participants predominantly in the role of 'Sensor', 'Sayer' and 'Actor' (Victim defending themselves against the Palestinian attacks). For example (see appendix 2.2.):

Lines 1-3: Israeli officials [Sensor] yesterday suggested (process-Mental-Cognition) the newly open border between Gaza and Egypt offered a chance of Israel completely severing its ties with the small strip of crowded Palestinian land.

Lines 5-7: He, Matan Vilnai, [Sayer] said (processes-Verbal) Israel [Actor] wanted (process-Mental) to relinquish (process-Action) responsibility for the supply of water, power and medicine to Gaza.

Lines 20-21: In 2005 Israel [Actor] withdrew (process-Material-Action) its settlers and soldiers.

This shows that representing the Israeli participants as 'Actor' comes in lines 20-21 but it suggests that the Israelis left Gaza and did not want to keep control of it. On the other hand, the Palestinian participants are represented as 'Actor' who were making troubles for the Egyptians after they broke through the border. For example,

Lines 13-15: yesterday tens of thousands of Palestinians [Actor] were still pouring (process-Material-Action) back and forth across the border, buying up goods in Egypt that are not available or much more expensive in Gaza.

51

The journalist, also, represents the Palestinian participants as 'Sayer' who want to close the borders to keep controlling Gaza. For instance:

Lines 17-18: Even Hamas, the Islamist movement [behaviour] that controls (processes-Behavioural) Gaza, said (processes-Verbal) it expects to re-establish the official border crossing.


**4.3.3. Analysis of the Text and Transitivity –*The Times* (T1)**
**Title**: Broken border wall gives Israel chance to dump Gaza problem on Egypt
 **Date**: Jan 25, 2008
**Byline**: James Hider, Rafah


The first text (T1) I chose from *The Times* newspaper is a 725 word-news report and was written by James Hider, *The Times* journalist in Palestine, on 25th January 2008. To focus more on analysing and understanding what the text is about, I start from the title of the news report "Broken border wall gives Israel chance to dump Gaza problem on Egypt". This shows that the news report is about the breaking of the Wall/border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt and transferring the "Gaza problem" to Egypt as the journalist states in the title. At the beginning the journalist, James Hider, shows that Israel wants to leave the Gaza Strip after the breach of the wall and thousands of Palestinians crossing the border into Egypt. Moreover, he points to Israel's warning to its citizens to avoid visiting the Sinai desert in Egypt because of the threat that of Palestinian militants abducting Israelis. He also points to the Israeli desire to use the breaking of the wall as a chance to launch a massive propaganda campaign against the Palestinians, especially Hamas, and to stop supplying electricity, water and medicine which will come from another place, 'Egypt'. James states that "Mr Vilnai said that the destruction of the wall was an opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from Gaza and push it into Egypt's unwilling lap".

Moreover, the journalist mentions the declaration of the US Undersecretary of State, Nicholas Burns, who said "restoring order on the chaotic border was Egypt's responsibility". After that, the journalist reports that the Egyptian reaction to the breaking of the wall between Egypt and the Gaza Strip was that Egypt had not been consulted concerning any change in the status of the Gaza Strip, a potentially

explosive issue for the Arab state and the border would be closed as normal. But this might not be easy for Hamas which wants to seal the border crossing again and to play a central role in any future agreement on the border if Egypt agreed to open the border permanently.

Then, the journalist reports how the Palestinians pushed themselves into Egypt to shop for goods that have disappeared in the Gaza Strip as a result of the Israeli blockade which comes as a reaction against the Palestinian rockets. At the end of the news report, the journalist refers to the different masters who have ruled over Gaza starting from 13th century BC to 2005.

By examining this news report, we can see that the Palestinians, the Israelis and the Egyptians represent the main participants in this news report on whom the main focus will be. The Palestinians are mentioned 16 times; the Israelis are mentioned 13 times and the Egyptians are mentioned 9 times (see Table 4.7.).

**Table 4.7. Classification of the Participants (T1)**

| Actors | Type of actors | | | | | | | | | | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actor | Goal | Behaviour | Sensor | Sayer | Target | Token/ Value | Carrier /attribute | Identifier | Existent | |
| Palestinian | 7 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| Israelis | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Egyptian | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| For other actors | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Total | 13 | 1 | 1 | 15 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 44 |

This table shows that the Palestinians are represented mainly as Actor and also as 'Sensor' and 'Sayer'. In contrast, the Israelis are represented mainly as 'Sensor' and 'Sayer'. The Egyptians are mainly represented as 'Sensor'.

Focusing on the processes attributed to the actors in this news report, we find the main processes are Verbal, Mental and Material (see table 4.10.).

**Table 4.8. Classification of the Processes (T1)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Palestinian | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| Egyptian | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| International community | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | 14 | 1 | 15 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 44 |

The two tables show the following:

- Frequencies related to Israeli participants (16)

- Frequencies related to Palestinian participants (13)

- Frequencies related to Egyptian participants (9)

- Frequencies related to International participants (6)

- Frequencies related to processes (44)

Analysing how the journalist represents the participants in the text (T1), we can see that the Israelis are represented as 'Sayer', 'Goal, 'Sensor' and 'Avoider' of the problems and troubles caused by the Palestinians who are represented as the 'enemy' who broke the border between them and the Egyptians who are presented as simple and careless Actors for allowing the breaking down of the border between them and their neighbours, the Palestinians. That is, the Israeli participants are described as 'Actor', 'Sayer' and 'Sensor' who want to avoid the Palestinian troubles and who want to take the advantage of breaking the wall to relinquish themselves of the Palestinians. In examining the processes attributed to the Israelis, we find that most of these processes are Verbal but there are Action and Mental processes attributed to them as well. The following examples give a clear image.

Lines 1-2: Israel [Sayer] said (process-Verbal) that it [Sensor] wanted (process-Mental)to wash (process-Material-Action) its hands completely of the Gaza Strip yesterday.

Lines 4-6: Israel [Sensor] also warned (process-Mental) its citizens to avoid visiting popular tourist destinations in the Sinai desert, which abuts Gaza.

Lines 11-12:  Mr Vilnai [Sayer] said (process-Verbal) that the destruction of the wall was an opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from Gaza and push it into Egypt's unwilling lap.

Lines 37-38: Israel [Actor] tightened (process-Material-Action) its blockade in response to Hamas rocket attacks.

On the other hand, the Palestinian participants are represented as 'Actor'; 'enemies' who attack their neighbours, the Egyptians and the Israelis, and who break through the borders. Furthermore, focusing on the Palestinian participants and the processes assigned to them, we find the journalist portrayed them in different ways such as 'Sayer' with Verbal processes but by blaming other Actors, 'the Egyptians,' and as if they had the power to force the Egyptians to do something they did not want to do.

Lines 7-8: …..that Palestinian militants [Actor] now operating in Egypt were planning (process-Material-Action) to abduct Israelis.

Lines 27-29: Hamas [Sensor] is demanding (process-Mental) that it [Existent] be (process-Existential) a central player in any future agreement on the border, putting Egypt and the more moderate Palestinian Government  in Ramallah which nominally governs all Palestinians in a diplomatically awkward spot.

Lines 32-35: A Hamas militant [Sayer] on security duty at the smashed border wall said (process-Verbal) that his men [Existent] would be (process-Existential) able to seal [process-Material-Action] the border crossing again if Egypt [Sensor] agreed (process -Mental) to open [Process-Material-Action] permanently the official crossing point, closed since last summer's violent takeover of (process-Relational) Gaza by the Islamists.

However, the Egyptians are represented as careless people who don not care about their borders and allow others, the Palestinians, to move in and out of their lands. The processes attributed to the Egyptians in this news report are Verbal, Mental and Material but action with no concern about what happened at the border. For example:

Lines 17-20: Egypt [Sensor] which has shown (process-Mental) little willingness to tackle the tidal wave of desperate humanity across its frontier, said (process-Verbal) that it [Actor] had not been approached about any change in the status of Gaza, a potentially explosive issue for the Arab state.

Lines 42-43: Egyptian shopkeepers [Actor] restocked (process-Material) overnight to make the most of the bonanza, selling everything from cattle to Viagra.

### 4.3.4. Analysis of the Text and Transitivity –*The Times* (T2)

**Title: Human chain protesters trigger alert over new Gaza wall breach.**
**Date: Feb 26, 2008**
**Byline: James Hider in Jerusalem**

This news report (T2) was written on February 26th 2008 by James Hider. It is a 557-word news report about the forming of a human chain to protest against the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. The journalist reported that thousands of Palestinians from the Gaza Strip formed a human chain in protest against the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip so the Israeli soldiers along the border went on high alert to prevent any storming of the border between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. The journalist talked about Israel's fear that the Palestinian Hamas could exploit the human chain and break the border in the same way as the border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt had been broken down in January 2008. In relation to Hamas, the journalist quoted Hamas's declaration to *The Times* that they planned to organize a very large heroic demonstration to break the border between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. The journalist described the demonstration, organised by the Popular Committee Against the Siege, as peaceful and talked about the hope of the organizers of highlighting the plight of the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip who suffer from shortage of fuel and basic goods. However, the organizers failed to complete the chain between Beit Hanoun and Rafah, a 25 mile road, because the numbers of school children fell short. He

56

talked about the placards that the Palestinian participants carried in the demonstration. In regards to Israel's fear, the journalist talked about Israeli reinforcement of its security forces along the border to prevent any attempt to scale and break the border which is surrounded by razor wire fences. Then he talked about the peaceful end of the demonstration despite some youths burning tyres and throwing stones near Erez, the Israeli crossing point between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. In response the Israeli soldiers fired and wounded two of them. Then he talked about the continuous firing of rockets by the Palestinians on southern Israeli towns and how these rockets had wounded a young Israeli boy. He returned to mention Hamas's plan to organize a massive and popular demonstration near the Israeli crossing point, Erez by inviting kids, youths, elderly people and women as well. At the end of the report, he quoted an Israeli government spokesman expressing Israel's intention to continue its air raids and invasions into the Gaza Strip to stop the Palestinian rockets.

Focusing on the participants, we find that the Palestinians and the Israelis are the main actors in this news report but the most dominant actors are the Palestinians who are mentioned (19 times) while the Israelis are mentioned (8 times) (see table 4.9.). However, there is no any mention at all of the Egyptians in this news report. From this initial finding (T2), we can understand that the Palestinian participants represent the main actors but the Israeli participants also play a basic role in the whole text.

**Table 4.9. Classification of Participants (T2)**

| Actors | Type of actors | | | | | | | | | | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actor | Goal | Behaviour | Sensor | Sayer | Target | Token/Value | Carrier/attribute | Identifier | Existent | |
| Palestinian | 14 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Israelis | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| For other actors | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 15 | 2 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

This table (4.9) shows that the Palestinian participants are framed/represented as Actor (12) times and as 'Sensor'. The Israeli participants are represented as 'Sensor' and 'Sayer'.

Focusing on the processes in this news report (T2), we can find the Material, Verbal and Mental processes are attributed to the main participants (see table 4.10.).

**Table 4.10. Classification of the Processes (T2)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Palestinian | 14 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

In more detail, the table shows that the processes attributed to the participants are mainly Material, Verbal and Mental. The Palestinian participants are assigned Material-Action processes but the Israeli participants are assigned Mental and Verbal processes.

These two tables show:

- Frequencies related to Israeli participants (23)

- Frequencies related to Palestinian participants (7)

- Frequencies related to Egyptian participants (0)

- Frequencies related to International participants (0)

- Frequencies related to processes (30)

The Palestinian participants are represented in this text (T2) as 'Actor', i.e., who formed a massive human chain to protest against the Israeli siege and thus putting the Israeli soldiers (Goal) on high alert to stop the Palestinian actors breaking the wall.

However, the Israeli participants are represented as 'Sensor' as they fear the Palestinian participants, Hamas, could exploit the human chain to break the border.

Focusing on the processes in the news report, we can find the Verbal, Material and Mental processes are attributed to the main participants. To clarify, the processes attributed to the Israeli participants are mainly 'Mental' and 'Verbal' to reflect their feelings and viewpoints about the Palestinian chain. The examples below show how the journalist assigned the Mental and Verbal processes to the Israeli Participants (see appendix 2.4.):

Lines 3- 5: Israeli army commanders [Sensor] feared (processes-Mental) that Gaza's Hamas rulers could exploit the demonstration and try to repeat last month's surge across a damaged border wall with Egypt.

Lines 17-20: Israel [Sensor] strengthened (processes-Mental) its border security forces, with an extra 5,000 police drafted in to back up regular armed guards, and local media reports [Sayer] said (processes-Verbal) that snipers and even an artillery battery had been sent to make sure that the crowds did not attempt to scale the high concrete walls and razor wire fences that mark the boundary.

In contrast, the processes attributed to Palestinian participants are Material processes by which the journalist represents them as 'attackers' who clashed with the Israeli troops along the border, fired rockets against Israel and marched in a bloody demonstration to break the border. Clarifying examples are below (see appendix 2.4.):

Lines 1-3: Thousands of Palestinians [Actor- ] formed (processes-action ) a human chain across the Gaza Strip yesterday in protest against the Israeli siege as Israeli forces [Goal] along the border went on (processes- event) high alert in case demonstrators tried to storm the frontier wall.

Lines 20-22: The rally ended peacefully after a few hours, although a small group of youths [Actor] later set(processes- action)  fire to tyres near the Israeli crossing point at Erez in the northeast of the strip, and threw (processes-Action) stones at border guards.

**4.3.5 General Analysis of the Four Texts and the Transitivity (G1, G2, T1 and T2)**

Generally speaking the main subject, in the news reports analyzed in this study, is the breaking of the border between Gaza Strip and Egypt. In the first text (G1), *The Guardian* journalist talked about the Israeli Prime Minister, Ehud Olmer, ruling out ceasefire because of the Palestinian Hamas's continuation of rocket fire. Moreover, he talked about the Israeli plan to build new apartments in settlements in East Jerusalem and in the occupied West Bank. In the second text (G2), *The Guardian* journalist talked about how Israel reacted to the breaking of the wall. In the first text from *The Times* (T1), the journalist talked about the Israelis opportunity to dump the Gaza Strip problem on Egypt. In the second text (T2), the journalist reported the Palestinian human chain formed to protest against the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip along the border between the Gaza Strip and the West Bank.

Generally speaking, the journalists in these four texts did not talk about the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip as a reason for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip breaking the border 'the Wall'- between the Gaza Strip and Egypt. Furthermore, the journalists did not explain the effects of the on-going Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip which has been imposed since 2006 and how this siege had affected the life of the people in the Gaza Strip. The journalists never mentioned that the Palestinian rockets were fired as a response to the Israeli siege and as a result of the ruling out of a ceasefire agreement in 2006 between the Israelis and the Palestinians. The journalists did not talk about the Israeli and the international community's rejection of the results of the Palestinian elections in 2006 and how this rejection affected political life in Palestine generally and in the Gaza Strip particularly and how this rejection has led the Palestinians to break the Wall/border. The Palestinian perspective of the Israeli siege and the border is not clear at all in any of the four news reports.

The coverage of the Israeli siege in this manner gives the readers the Israeli perspective of the siege of the Gaza Strip. This is found elsewhere when dealing with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Baley said in answer to Barkho's (2008) question as to why the BBC has a glossary for the Middle East and not other areas, said

> To answer your question, I think the conflict has been going on for long and the language is part of the conflict and people read into your use of language, a sense that they know where you are coming from in your use of one particular word rather than another word (Barkho, 2008:5).

## 4.4. Analysis of the Ideological- Political Dimensions Behind the Transitivity Selections

We have seen that the nature of language is such that it can be used as a vehicle to convey thoughts and express opinions about different issues and is seen always and everywhere as being political (Gee, 1999). The linguistic expressions used in the four texts from *The Guardian* and *The Times* show political and ideological dimensions that try to mitigate Israel's siege of the Gaza Strip and show that it is the Egyptians who want to close the border and this of course helps make the siege imposed around Gaza stricter and more difficult for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip. This relates the problem to Egypt, not to Israel as if the Egyptians are the most dominant political group in the area and responsible for the suffering of the Palestinians in Gaza.

In the Transitivity analysis of the two texts (G1 and G2) from *The Guardian* and two texts (T1) and (T2) from *The Times*, we can find that the main representation of the Israeli Participants are Sensor, Sayer and Goal; the processes attributed to the Israeli Participants are mainly Mental and Verbal. In contrast, the Palestinian Participants are mainly represented as 'Actor' in the role of 'enemy' in the four texts as we have seen and the processes accompanied by these roles of Actor are Material (Action). The Egyptians are mainly represented as Actors and Sayers (for more information, see table No. 4.11 and 4.12. ).

**4.11. Classification of the Actors in the Four News Reports**

| Actors | Type of actors | | | | | | | | | | total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Actor | Goal | Behaviour | Sensor | Sayer | Target | Token/ Value | Carrier /attribute | Identifier | Existent | |
| Palestinian | 24 | 1 | 1 | 14 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 48 |
| Israelis | 8 | 6 | 3 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 59 |
| Egyptian | 2 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| For other actors | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Total | 36 | 7 | 5 | 43 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 126 |

The following table 4.12. shows that the main processes attributed to the Actors are the Material, Verbal and Mental processes with exclusion of the other processes like Relational and Existential processes.

**4.12. Classification of the Processes in the Four News Reports**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 14 | 3 | 22 | 19 | 1 | 0 | 59 |
| Palestinian | 25 | 0 | 14 | 7 | 0 | 2 | 48 |
| Egyptian | 2 | 1 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 12 |
| International community | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | 43 | 4 | 43 | 32 | 2 | 2 | 126 |

Representing and framing the Israelis and Palestinians in this way portrays the Palestinians as causing Israel to react. The context of Israel's responsibility for the occupation and imposition of a strict siege around the Gaza Strip and so preventing Palestinians from having access to the basic elements of life such as food and electricity is overlooked.

Fairclough (1995, p.204) points out that journalistic texts are "the outcome of specific professional practices and techniques, which could be and can be quite different with quite different results". This is shown clearly in the results found above. To say the least, the journalists, I think, just select and subject the news texts based on the information they include or exclude, the linguistic features they choose to talk about/ describe the events based on the ideology and policy of the organization to present, organize, produce, or represent the actors and the events of the news texts. This is in keeping with what has been argued in the literature review; that language and ideology are interrelated. Therefore, the news texts do not record the reality and they are not balanced at all in representing the Israeli and Palestinian participants

generally and in covering the Israeli siege, and, in particular the breaking of the wall between the Gaza Strip and Egypt.

Representing the Israeli participants as 'Sensor', 'Sayer', and 'Goal' shows the frame the journalists follow in their representation/framing of the Israeli participants in the texts. Moreover, the representation of the Palestinians as 'Actor' implies that the Palestinians cause troubles by firing rockets against Israel without any actual reason. They attack Israel because they want to attack Israel but not because of the strict and difficult siege. This representation hands over a propaganda victory to Israel by reflecting their opinions to the British people providing them with a misconception about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

As explained, the actions attributed to the Israeli Actors are evaluated as largely neutral or positive ones. However, the predominant role in the image of 'enemy' is assigned to the Palestinian Actors. The analysis unveils a consistent pattern of presenting Palestinian participants as agents of negative actions. This consistent image of Palestinian news actors is ideologically motivated since it aims to make visible their negative action and concentrate readers' attention on their responsibility for causing problems for the Israelis who are portrayed as merely defending themselves. Thus, the Palestinians are consistently associated with negative evaluations.

The Israeli participants are represented as Actors defending themselves against the Palestinian actors who are fighting against the Israelis with no justifiable reason such as the Israeli siege. For example, text 1 from *The Guardian* (G1), lines 7-9:

Olmert [Sayer] told (processes-Verbal) his weekly cabinet meeting in Jerusalem: "There is no other way to describe what is happening in the Gaza Strip except as a true war between the IDF [Israel Defence Force] and terrorist elements."

Another example from *The Times*, text 2 (T1), lines 6-8:

It, *Israel,* [Actor] had received (process-Material-Action) specific threats that Palestinian militants [Actor] now operating in Egypt were planning (process-Material-Action) to abduct Israelis.

Constructing Israeli participants as benevolent Actors places responsibility for current violence and for any future peace solely on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

The processes attached to the Israeli participants are mainly Mental and Verbal processes. We can see that by coupling Verbal, Mental and Action processes with the Israeli participants, the journalists reflect the Israeli viewpoint. However, the processes attached to the Palestinian participants are Material-Action processes. Representing the Palestinian participants in this way portrays the Palestinians as being responsible for the events and the trouble against Israelis by firing rockets against Israel. For example, text1 from *The Guardian* (G1), lines 4-6:

He [Sensor] warned of (processes- Mental) further Israeli military strikes in the days head which he [Sayer ] said (processes-Verbal) were intended to prevent Palestinian militants [Actor- Attacker] from firing makeshift (processes-Material-Action)rockets into Israel.

Another example from *The Guardian*, text 1 (G2), lines 28-30:

Israel **[Actor]** has imposed (process-**M**aterial-Action) a full closure of the Gaza Strip, restricting fuel and aid supplies, and mounted (process-**M**aterial-Action) several military operations to stop militants firing makeshift rockets into southern Israel.

This way of portraying the problem turns the attention away from Israel's moral responsibility. The 'Material-Action' processes in the news reports show the Israelis as wanting to leave the troubles created by the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and suggest the responsibility is on the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip, not on the Israelis. The ideological and linguistic dimensions behind these processes show a political dimension that the Gaza Strip is a problem for Israel and breaking the wall is the only chance for Israel to relinquish itself from its responsibility for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip because they are abductors. "It *Israel* [Sayer] said (process-verbal) that it *Israel* [Sensor] had received (process-Mental) specific threats that Palestinian militants [Actor] now operating in Egypt were planning (process-Material-Action) to abduct Israelis" (line 6-9, T1, appendix 2.3).

By analysing these processes, it becomes obvious that the journalists want to portray Israel ideologically and politically in a positive light and that Israel does not want to cause any problems for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and the siege is a reaction against the inhabitants of Gaza acting against Israel. This way of representing agrees with what has been argued in chapter two; that linguistic expression is not entirely neutral and with what Fowler, et al. (1979), Fowler and Kress (1979),

Fowler (1991), Trew (1979a, 1979b), Hodge and Kress (1979 and 1993) argue; that ideological meanings can be involved in linguistic operations.

Transitivity is the foundation of representation, in that it shows us how the construction of different clauses portrays the same events and situations in ideologically different ways. Comparative Transitivity analysis of the texts reveals the way in which the Palestinians and the Israelis are being presented in the texts. In the same vein, there is no difference in the ideological and political dimensions behind framing the actors and the processes that are attributed to the actors in the news reports in spite of the number of processes attributed to the participators. This shows that the whole discourse of the news reports cannot be expressive or well-prepared without a particular ideology, so consequently, language generally, and that of news particularly, is always represented in linguistic terms which realize discursive and ideological systems. Consequently, it may be argued that choosing one linguistic expression can often be seen as a reflection of the ideological position of the speaker/writer as we have seen in Chapter Two. On these grounds, it might be argued that the ideological-political dimensions behind the linguistic features (the Transitivity selections) used in the news reports have affected the general news discourse which is for Bignell (1997, p.82) "an ideological representation of the world because it selects what will be reported, and sets the terms of what is significant". So the fact that the number of news reports published at *The Guardian* exceeds the number of the news reports published at *The Times* is ideologically and politically significant but in this study the focus has been on ideological and political dimensions rather than on the number of articles. This indicates an ideology at work in that particular positions have more access to the public sphere and better representation in the newspapers than other positions, and readers of both newspapers will gain access to particular representations and versions of reality at the expense of others.

The news texts should carry ideological and political imprints of the news texts producers and the media organizations for which the readers do not expect the bias in covering the news/events. This agrees with what the CDA literature in different studies, e.g., Nir and Roeh, 1992; Martin Rojo, 1995; Teo 2000; Flowerdew, Li, and Tran, 2002; Bishop and Jaworski, 2003, have argued. They have discovered

the powerful effect of the press is to shape, frame or reproduce ideologies which interact with various socio-political groups.

The answers above to the sub-questions of the study about the way of framing the Israelis and the Palestinians show clearly the ideological-political context dimensions behind the Transitivity selections used in *The Guardian* and *The Times*. These answers lead to the main question of the study 'how did the British Press cover the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip?' for which two essential ideological-political dimensions become clear in the general context of the British coverage of the Israeli siege of Gaza in the period from 1 December 2008- 28 February 2008: a) the exclusions of the Palestinian perspective and voice and b) transferring the Gaza Strip from Israel to Egypt.

**4.4.1. Exclusion of Palestinian Perspective and Voice**

Representing the Israeli participants as 'Sayer' and 'Sensor' and representing the Palestinians as 'Actor' in the role of 'Attacker' affects the final impression that the readers may get when reading these texts by providing them only with the Israeli point of view to the exclusion of the Palestinian perspective. van Dijk (1999) explains that in the analysis of the representation of social actors it is important to focus on, not only who is present or absent from the representation of the events, but also the functions this expression or suppression of information has for the writer.

Bearing in mind these thoughts and referring to the results of the analysis, we can see that the journalists excluded and made the Palestinian voices very silent without covering/reflecting their opinions as to why they broke the border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt despite the meek mention of the Israeli siege in *The Times*. This way of representation and exclusion has an ideological-political dimension. In more detail, this exclusion and silencing of the Palestinian voices shows/underlines a process of inculcating readers with specific views and realities and orienting their subjectivity towards perceiving events in a particular way. This rather meek presence of especially Palestinian voices may point to what Thiesmeyer (2003, p.2) calls a discursive act of silencing which she postulates as a process that works best when disguised, that is, "when it displaces the silenced material by means of another discourse, or conceals or filters the unacceptable material through a discourse that is more acceptable".

On the other hand, the frequent use of the Israeli voice shows the imbalance, exclusion and un-balance of representing the Palestinian voice. Making the Israeli agency of the siege invisible in both newspapers creates the impression of impersonality and big distance between the subjects of the news reports and the readers and this hides the relationship between the effects of the siege and the Israeli responsibility for it.

Such exclusion completely does not give the British people a balanced perspective on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the tragic events in Palestine especially the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. The exclusion of the Palestinian voice is evidence of partisanship that does not offer a balanced perspective which is a necessary element for any hope of achieving a solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and ending the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip on which Seale (2006) comments that:

> One and a half million Palestinians, two-thirds of them under the poverty line, suffering 45 percent unemployment, packed into a narrow strip of 360 square kilometers, are being besieged, starved, cut off from the world and bombed on a daily basis. Following Israel's cutting off of fuel supplies, the Gaza Strip went dark completely for 3 days in 2008 and then 16 hours without electricity on a daily basis".

On the other hand, the inclusion of the Palestinian perspective will make the readings of the news reports more balanced and that readers will potentially feel less biased towards a particular viewpoint on the Israeli siege. The inclusion of the Palestinian perspective would contribute to a sense of even-handedness in British press coverage, which would benefit readers, and would of course give the British people a fair and balanced picture of the conflict in Palestine with two sided-opinions.

### 4.4.2. Transferring the Gaza Strip from Israel to Egypt

Another important ideological-political dimension revealed by analysing the four news reports from *The Guardian* and *The Times* is the portrayal of Gaza as a problem and transferring it from Israel to Egypt. The journalists reported how Egypt allowed the Palestinians entry into Egypt without any attempt to prevent them. It is worth mentioning here that the Palestinian-Egyptian border between the Gaza Strip and Egypt was controlled by the Israeli army before the Israeli withdrawal from the Gaza Strip but this withdrawal was not complete as Israel still does not allow a free Palestinian movement (from and to the Gaza Strip) by controlling all of Gaza's

borders. Gaza was controlled by the Palestinian Authority till Hamas controlled all Gaza Strip in June 2006.

The Palestinians in Gaza broke the border to buy the basic necessities of life during the period of ongoing Israeli two-year strict siege on Gaza. Politically, Israel, as portrayed in the news reports, took the chance of breaking the wall/border to transfer Gaza Strip over to Egypt. That is, Israel wanted to put the Gaza Strip under the Egyptian rule as it was established at the end of 1948 Arab-Israeli War in which the boundaries of the Gaza Strip were defined by the ceasefire lines, plus its airspace and territorial waters.

The constant closures of Gaza's borders are still commonplace and still under the active Israeli occupation, but Israel wants to relinquish its moral responsibilities as occupier of the Gaza Strip especially after its withdrawal from inside the Gaza Strip in August 2005 and maintains that Egypt did not seal its side of the border in order to allow Palestinians to smuggle weapons, money, etc.

Politically, this reflects the Israeli concern over the security of the Egypt-Palestine/Gaza border. This could affect the Israeli-Egyptian relations and Palestinian-Egyptian relations because Egypt refuses the Israeli accusation which has a political-financial US support to Egypt. Sharp (2008) reported to US Congress that:

> Egypt claims that Israel has not only exaggerated the threat posed by weapons smuggling, but is deliberately acting to "sabotage" U.S.-Egyptian relations by demanding that the United States condition its annual $1.3 billion in military assistance on Egypt's efforts to thwart smuggling.

Politically, this could affect the relationship between Israel and Egypt as Egypt allowed Palestinians to enter Egypt so the Gaza Strip could be transferred over to Egyptian responsibility. This would give Israel an opportunity to leave the Gaza Strip and stop its war against the Palestinians so there would  be real advantages in such an opportunity to achieve peace.

**Chapter VII**

**5. Conclusion**

This study examined the British Press coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip and analyzed how two British newspapers framed both Palestinian and Israelis news Actors and events. To achieve the study's aims, the study followed generally CDA in which Halliday's SFG plays an important role to answer the main question: How did the British Press cover the Israeli siege of Gaza in the period from 1 December 2007 to February 2008? The sub-questions that were answered are: How did *The Guardian* and *The Times* frame the siege on Gaza? What were the Transitivity selections used in each frame?

Initially in the analysis of two British newspapers, there were 29 news reports published by *The Guardian* and *The Times.* January 2008 recorded the highest level of coverage to the Israeli siege of Gaza in the period from 1 December 2007 to 28 February 2008.

By applying SGF on four news reports from *The Guardian* and *The Times* and written by two British reporters (journalists) from different sides of the political spectrum, the analysis showed that the main actors are the Israelis, the Palestinians and the Egyptians who are represented as Actor, Sayer and Sensor mainly. The main process types assigned to the actors are Material, Verbal and Mental processes with no more focus on the other processes (the Existential and the Relational).

The findings show that the discourses of the two newspapers represented the Palestinians and the Israelis in similar ways focusing on the 'Transitivity selections' used in covering the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. This requires that the two newspapers share the same representation and ideology towards the Israelis and the Palestinians despite each newspaper having a unitary and homogenous culture, and their belonging to different sides of the political spectrum. Like Carrol (2005, pp.9-10) I argue that there are "political and social circumstances which shape the ways in which knowledge is created and received" and broadcasted through media and press. This shaping always depends on the ideology which is represented in language. Thus, language and ideology are interrelated mainly in covering the conflicts.

The Israeli participants are mainly represented as 'Sayer' and 'Sensor' and the processes attributed to them are Verbal and Mental (see section 4.4. for more

clarification). In the meantime, the journalists in both newspapers represented the Israeli participants as Actors in the role of defendant and victim. This leads to the conclusion that the processes attributed to the Israelis, in the four texts, are Verbal and Mental.

In contrast, the journalists represent the Palestinian participants mainly as Actors with a very meek representation of Sayer and Sensor. The main process type attributed to the Palestinian participants is the Material(Action) process.

Ideologically and politically, this means that in the coverage of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip the journalists only focused on the Israeli perspective with no mention of the effect of the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip portraying the Palestinian rockets as the main problem to both the Israelis and the Egyptians who allowed the Palestinians to break and cross the border with no actions to stop the Palestinians pouring into Egypt. Describing the Israelis as Sensor, Sayer and Actors in the role of defendant reflects a one-sided viewpoint (the Israeli) with exclusion of the other (the Palestinian) and put the responsibility only on the Palestinian side in breaking the ceasefire, forcing Israel to impose a strict siege as a reaction to the firing of the rockets, and dumping the moral responsibility of occupied Gaza Strip from Israel to Egypt. Describing the Palestinian actors as attackers and controllers reflects the ability to control their borders with the outside world including Egypt and this is completely untrue as the borders are still under the Israeli occupation even though there are peace agreements. The linguistic expressions used in the texts try to mitigate Israel's siege of Gaza and describe the Egyptians as if they are against the Palestinians who poured in Egypt after breaking the borders.

The Transitivity analysis shows that the journalists just provide the British people with what the Israelis think and view, and why they imposed the siege on Gaza. The journalists want to portray Israel ideologically and politically in a positive light. Israel, according to this portrayal, did not cause any problems for the Palestinians in the Gaza Strip and the siege is nothing but Israel's reaction against the aggressive behavior on behalf of the people of Gaza against Israel. This confirms that texts are produced by socially and politically situated writers and/or speakers and the production of the texts is not always equal, and ranges from complete solidarity to complete inequality.

The Transitivity analysis shows the same representation of the Palestinians and the Israelis and shows that there is no difference in conveying the ideological and political dimensions behind framing the actors and the processes. This leads one to say that there is no real difference in the Transitivity selections used by *The Guardian* and *The Times* in representing the Palestinians and the Israelis despite their belonging to different sides of the political spectrum.

This one sided-coverage of the Israeli siege of Gaza confirms the general assumption about the media/press that there is no free media at all. I do agree here, as many scholars say, there is no media source free from bias especially the newspaper on which Bignell (1997, p.93) states "newspaper discourse takes the form of a coded discourse which stands in the place of the reader, asking the reader to identify with the subject position implied by the code".

Having summarized the results, it appears that there is no difference between *The Guardian* (Left wing) and *The Times* (Right wing) in representing the Palestinian and the Israeli actors and events during the Israeli siege of the Gaza Strip. It is evident that "language necessitates choices between different modes of meaning" (Hasan,1996b, p.34) and can defend one version of reality and examine the very reality created by its own power. So Hasan (1996b, p.34) suggests "the motivation for linguistics – linguistics can disrupt the 'suspension of disbelief' which the everyday practices of a community perpetuate". Language is an issue at the heart of impartiality. Further researches on words should be held, because of the importance of words in conveying the judgment and values of the authors/writers.

## 6. Bibliography

**Alexander, M., Halliday, K., Webster, J.**, eds., 2002. *Linguistic studies of text and discourse.* illustrated. London: Continuum.

**Anderson, P. J. & Weymouth, T.**, 1999. *Insulting the public? The British press and the European*. Harlow: Longman.

**Austin, J.**, 1962. *How to do things with words.* The William James Lectures, 1955. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

**Barkho, L.**, 2008. The BBC's Discursive strategy and Practices VIS-+C-VIS the Palestinian Israeli Conflict. *Journalism studies*, 9 (2), 278-294.

**Bell, A.**, 1991. *The language of news media*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**Berry, M. & Philo, G.**, eds., 2006*. Israel and Palestine: competing histories.* London: Ann Arbor, MI: Pluto.

**Bignell, J.**, 1997. *Media semiotics: an introduction*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

**Bishop, H, & Jaworski, A.**, 2003. 'We beat 'em':  nationalism and the hegemony of homogeneity in the British press reportage of Germany versus England during Euro 2000. *Discourse & Society, 14* (3), 243-271.

**Blommaert, J.  & Bulcaen, C.,** 2000. Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Anthropology, 29*, 447- 466.

**Blommaert, J.**, 2004. *Discourse :a critical introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Bloor, T. & Bloor, M.**, 1995. *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach*. London: Arnold.

**Bussmann, H.**, 1998. *Routledge dictionary of language and linguistics*. London: Routledge.

**Carrol, P.**, 2005. Who own democracy? Explaining the long-running debate over Canadian/American value differences. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology,* 42:3, 267-80.

**Chouliaraki, L. & Fairclough, N.**, 1999. *Discourse in late modernity: Rethinking critical discourse analysis*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

**Cook, G.**, 1994. *Discourse and literature: the interplay of form and mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Curran, J. & Seaton, J.**, 2003. *Power without responsibility :the press, broadcasting, and new media in Britain.* 6th ed. London: Routledge.

**Davies, A. & Elder, C.**, 2006. *The handbook of applied linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**Eatwell, R. & Wright, A**. eds., 1999. *Contemporary Political Ideologies* .2nd ed. London: Pinter/Continuum.

**Fairclough, N.**, 1989. *Language and Power*. London: Longman.

**Fairclough, N.**, 1992*. Discourse and social change.* Cambridge, MA: Polity Press.

**Fairclough, N.**, 1993. Critical discourse analysis and the marketization of public discourse: The universities. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2), 133-168.

**Fairclough, N.**, 1995a. *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language.* London: Longman.

**Fairclough, N.,** 1995b. *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

**Fairclough, N.**, 2000. *New labour, new language*. London: Routledge.

**Fairclough, N.**, 2003. *Analysing discourse: Textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

**Fairclough, N. & Wodak, R.**, 1997. Critical Discourse Analysis. In T.A. van Dijk, ed., Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction , l2. *Discourse as Social Interaction.* pp. 258–84. London: Longman.

**Fillmore, C.J.**, 1968. The Case for Case. In Bach, E. and Harms, R.T., 1968, eds., *Universals in Linguistic Theory*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

**Flowerdew, J., Li, D. & Tran, S.**, 2002. Discriminatory news discourse: some Hong Kong data. *Discourse & Society, 13,* 319-345.

**Fowler, R.**, 1991. *Language in the news: Discourse and ideology in the press*. London: Routledge.

**Fowler, R.**, 1996. On critical linguistics. In C. R Caldas-Coulthard & M. Coulthard, eds., *Texts and practices: Readings in critical discourse analysis* (3-14). London: Routledge.

**Fowler, R., Hodge, B., Kress, G. & Trew, T.**, eds., 1979. *Language and Control*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

**Fowler, R. & Kress, G.**, 1979. Critical linguistics. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew, eds. *Language and Control.* pp. 185-213. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

**Francis, G. & Kramer-Dahl, A.**, 1992. Grammaticalizing the Medical Case History. In Michael, T. ed., 1992. *Language, Text and Context.* pp. 56-89. London: Routledge.

**Freeden, M.**, 2003. *Ideology :a very short introduction.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

**Gee, J.**, 1996. *Social linguistics and literacies: ideology in discourses.* 2nd ed. London: Taylor & Francis.

**Gee, J.**, 1999. *An introduction to discourse analysis.* London: Routledge.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1967. Notes on Transitivity and Theme, Part 1. In *Journal of Linguistics.* 3.1.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1968. Notes on Transitivity and Theme. Part 3. In *Journal of Linguistics.* 4.2.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1969. Categories of the theory of grammar. In *Word* 17.3., pp. 241-292.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1970. Comparison and Translation. In M. Halliday, M. McIntosh, and P. Strevens, eds., *The Linguistics Sciences and Language Teaching.* London: Longman.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1971d. Linguistic Function and Literary Style: an enquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors*, in Chatman, S. ed. *Literary Style: A Symposium.* New York: Oxford University Press. pp. 103-40.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1973. Linguistic function and literary style: an inquiry into the language of William Golding's *The Inheritors.* In Halliday, M.A.K. ed. *Explorations in the Functions of Language.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1975c. *Learning How to Mean: Explorations in the Development of Language.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Halliday, M.A.K.**, 1978. *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Halliday, M. A. K.**, 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar.* London: Edward Arnold.

**Halliday, M. A. K.**, 1994. *An introduction to functional grammar.* 2nd ed. London: Edward Arnold.

**Hasan, R.**, 1996b. What Kind of Resource is Language? In C. Cloran, D. Butt and G. Williams. eds., *Ways of Saying, Ways of Meaning: Selected Papers of Ruqaiya Hasan.* London: Cassell.

**Herbert. J.**, 2000. *Journalism in the digital age: theory and practice for broadcast, print and on-line media*. Oxford: Focal Press.

**Heywood, A.**, 2003. *Political ideologies: an introduction*. 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

**Hodge, R.**, 1990. *Literature as discourse: textual strategies in English and history*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

**Hodge, R. & Kress, G.**, 1979. *Language as ideology*. London: Routledge.

**Hodge, R. & Kress, G.**, 1993. *Language as ideology.* 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

**Hoffman, J. & Graham, S.**, 2006. *Introduction to political ideologies*. Harlow: Pearson Longman.

**Hogben, M. & Waterman, C. K.**, 1997. Are all your students represented in their textbooks? A Content analysis of coverage of diversity issues in introductory psychology textbooks. *Teaching of Psychology*, 24(2), 95-100.

**Holsti, O.R.**, 1969. *Content Analysis*: *An Introduction to its methodology*. Beverly Hills: Sage.

**Howarth, D.**, 2000. *Discourse*. Philadelphia, PA: Open University Press.

**Johnstone, B.**, 2002. *Discourse Analysis*. MA: Blackwell.

**Kaplan, R.**, 1990.Concluding Essay: On Applied Linguistics and Discourse Analysis. ed. Robert Kaplan, *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, Vol. II, 1990.

**Kress, G.**, ed., 1976. *Halliday: System and Function in Language.* London: Oxford University Press.

**Kress, G.**, 1990.Critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics,* 11, 84-99.

**Kress, G. & van Leeuwen. T.**, 1996. *Reading images.* London: Routledge

**Krippendorff, K.**, 1980. *Content analysis: an introduction to its methodology*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

**Lasswell, H. D. & Leites, N.**, 1949. *Language of politics: studies in quantitative semantics.* New York: George W. Stewart Publisher.

**Lemke, J.**, 1995. *Textual politics*: *discourse and social dynamics*. London: Taylor & Francis.

**Lock, G.**, 1996. *Functional English grammar: an introduction for second language teachers.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Luke, A.**, 2002. Beyond science and ideology critique: Developments in critical discourse analysis. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, pp. pp.96-110.

**Lyons, J.**, ed., 1970. New *Horizons in Linguistics*. Middlesex: Penguin.

**Martin Rojo, L.**, 1995. Division and rejection: From personification of the Gulf conflict to the demonization of Saddam Hussein. *Discourse and Society*, 6 (1), 49-80.

**Martin, J. R.**, 2000. Close reading: Functional linguistics as a tool for critical discourse analysis. In L. Unsworth, ed. *Researching language in schools and communities: Functional linguistic perspectives* (pp. 275-302). London: Cassell.

**Mclellan, D.**, 1995. *Ideology.* 2n ed. Buckingham: Open University Press.

**Mellor, N.**, 2005. *The making of Arab news*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

**Mills, S.**, 1995. *Feminist Stylistics*. London: Routledge.

**Nir, R., & Roeh, I.**, 1992. Intifada coverage in the Israeli press: Popular and quality papers assume a rhetoric of conformity. *Discourse and Society, 3,* 47-60.

**Ovendale, R.**, 1999. *The origins of the Arab-Israeli wars*. 3rd ed. New York: Longman.

**O'Halloran, K.**, 2003. *Critical discourse analysis and language cognition*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

**Pappe**, I., 2006. *A history of modern Palestine: one land, two peoples*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Paul, P.**, 1993. *Linguistics for language learners: An introduction to the nature and use of language.* Melbourne: Macmillan.

**Rogers. R.**, 2003. *An introduction to critical discourse analysis*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

**Reah, D.**, 2002. *The language of newspapers*. 2nd ed. London: Routledge.

**Richards, J.**, 2001. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

**Richardson, J.**, 2007. *Analysing newspapers :an approach from critical discourse analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

**Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D. & Heidi E. H.**, eds., 2003.*The handbook of discourse analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell.

**Seale, P.**, 2006. *Israel's scandalous siege of Gaza Palestine* .International Herald Tribune. [Online] Available at
http://www.end-gaza-siege.ps/Articles/Old%20Articles/Israel's%20scandalous%20siege%20of%20Gaza.htm. [Accessed on 5 October 2008].

**Shaoul, J.**, 2008. *After the Gaza breakout: Israel launches sustained hostilities*. World Socialist Website .. [Online] Available at
**http://www.wsws.org/articles/2008/feb2008/gaza-f15.shtml**.[Accessed on 5 October 2008].

**Sharp, M. J.**, 2008. *The Egypt-Gaza Border and its Effect on Israeli-Egyptian Relations*. Available at http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/mideast/RL34346.pdf . [accessed on 10 March 2009].

**Simpson, P.**, 1993. *Language, Ideology and Point of View.* London and New York: Routledge.

**Slembrouck, S.**, 2001. Explanation, interpretation and critique in the analysis of discourse. *Critique of Anthropology,* 21 (1), 33-57.

**Stillar, G.**, 1997. *Analyzing everyday texts*: *discourse, rhetoric, and social perspectives*. London: Sage.

**Stubbs, M. & Gerbig, A.**, 1993. Human and Inhuman Geography: On the computer-assisted analysis of long texts. In M. Hoey (ed.), *Data, Description, Discourse* (pp.64–85). London: HarperCollins.

**Teo, P.**, 2000. Racism in the news: a Critical Discourse Analysis of news reporting in two Australian newspapers. *Discourse & Society*. 11 (1) pp. 7-49. London: Sage.

**Thiesmeyer, L.**, 2003. Silencing in discourse. In L. Thiesmeyer (ed.). *Discourse and Silencing.* (pp.1-33). Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing.

**Thompson, G.**, 1996. *Introducing functional grammar*. London: Arnold.

**Trew, T.**, 1979a. What the paper say: Linguistic variation and ideological difference. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew. eds.. *Language and Control.* pp. 117-156. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

**Trew, T.**, 1979b. Theory and ideology at work. In R. Fowler, B. Hodge, G. Kress, & T. Trew. eds. *Language and Control* (pp. 94-155). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

**van Dijk, T. A.**, 1991a. *Racism and the press*. London: Routledge.

**van Dijk, T. A.**, 1993a. *Elite discourse and racism.* 6. PAGE NUMBER. Newbury, CA: SAGE

**van Dijk, T. A.**, 1995a. Discourse analysis as ideology analysis. In Schaffner, C., & Wenden, A. eds. *Language and peace.* pp. 17- 33. Vermont: Darmouth.

**van Dijk,T.A.**, ed., 1997a. Discourse as social interaction. Discourse studies a multidisciplinary introduction, I, pp.1-34. London: Sage.

**van Dijk,T.A.** ed., 1997b. Discourse as structure and process.Discourse studies a multidisciplinary introduction. II. London: Sage Publication.

**van Dijk, T. A.**, 1999. Editorial: Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 10 (4), 459-460.

**van Leeuwen, T.**, 1995. Representing social action. *Discourse & Society* 6: 81-107.

**Widdowson, H. G.**, 1995a. Discourse Analysis: *A critical review. Language and Literature*, 4(3), 157-172.

**Wodak. R.**, 1996. *Disorders of discourse*. London: Addison Wesley Longman.

**Wodak, R.**, 1997. Critical discourse analysis and the study of doctor-patient interaction. In Guinnarsson, B.L , Linell.P & Nordberg, B. eds. *The construction of professional discourse.* pp. 173-200. New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

**Wodak, R.**, 2001a. The discourse-historical approach. In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer, eds. *Methods of critical discourse analysis* .pp. 1-13. London: SAGE publications.

**Wodak, R.**, 2001b. What CDA is about? A summary of its history, important concepts and its developments. In R. Wodak, and M. Meyer. eds. *Methods of critical discourse analysis.* pp. 1-13. London: Sage.

**Wodak, R. and Meyer, M.**, 2001. *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. London: SAGE.

**7. Appendixes**

**Appendix 1 : The exact Texts of the News Reports**

**Appendix 1.1: Text one (G1) -** *The Guardian* **-December 2007**

**Olmert rules out ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements.**
Source: ***The Guardian (London, England)*** (Dec 24, 2007): p.17. (543 words)
From *UK Newspapers Online*
Document Type: Newspaper

**Full Text:** COPYRIGHT 2007 Guardian Newspapers Limited

**Byline: Rory McCarthy, Jerusalem**

The Israeli prime minister, Ehud Olmert, yesterday ruled out ceasefire negotiations with the Islamist movement Hamas and said his military was fighting a "true war" against armed groups in **Gaza**.

He warned of further Israeli military strikes in the days ahead which he said were intended to prevent Palestinian militants from firing makeshift rockets into Israel.

"Counter-terrorist operations will continue as they have for months," Olmert told his weekly cabinet meeting in Jerusalem. "There is no other way to describe what is happening in the **Gaza** Strip except as a true war between the IDF [Israel Defence Force] and terrorist elements."

In the past week more than a dozen militants from Hamas and the Islamic Jihad have been killed during Israeli strikes in **Gaza**.

In recent days there have been suggestions that Hamas, which won Palestinian elections early last year and then seized full control of **Gaza** in June, was seeking a ceasefire with Israel.

Last week Ismail Haniyeh, a Hamas leader, raised the idea in a rare telephone conversation with an Israeli television journalist. Egyptian mediators have reportedly also put forward a ceasefire proposal on behalf of Hamas.

But Olmert said there would be no talks with any group that failed to meet the principles of the Quartet of Middle East negotiators - the US, the UN, the EU and Russia - which last year called on Hamas to recognise Israel, halt violence and accept previous peace agreements. Hamas has refused to accept the three principles.

"Whoever accepts the Quartet principles will be - in principle - a partner for negotiations," Olmert said. "Whoever is unwilling to do so, to our regret, cannot be a partner for dialogue. This policy will not change."

It is increasingly clear that Israel's policy in **Gaza** is not simply to halt the rocket fire but also to depose the Hamas movement. Yesterday Haim Ramon, Israel's deputy prime minister, confirmed that his government wanted to topple Hamas.

"We are fighting Hamas and are seeking to weaken its control of **Gaza**, and bring about the end of its reign there. Hamas should hand over control of **Gaza** to the Palestinian Authority," he said.

The Palestinian Authority is currently under the control of Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian president and leader of the Fatah movement, who is based in Ramallah, in the West Bank.

In a separate development, an Israeli cabinet minister confirmed that Israel had new plans to build apartments in two settlements in East Jerusalem and in the occupied West Bank. The announcement brought quick condemnation from Palestinian leaders and presents a new obstacle to attempts to revive peace talks between the two sides.

Under the first phase of the US road map, which once again is being used as the basis for talks, Israel has committed to halting all settlement activity and to removing some of its furthest settlements.

However, Israel's construction ministry has budgeted plans to build 740 new settlement apartments next year: 500 in Har Homa, in East Jerusalem, and another 240 in Ma'ale Adumim.

Rafi Eitan, Israel's minister for Jerusalem affairs, confirmed the construction plans but said he regarded the areas as "integral" parts of Jerusalem, adding that Israel did not regard the road map as applying to Jerusalem.

guardian.co.uk/israel

**Source Citation:**"Olmert rules out ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements.(Guardian International Pages)." The Guardian (London, England) (Dec 24, 2007): 17. UK Newspapers Online. Gale. Anglia Ruskin University. 16 Dec. 2008
<http://find.galegroup.com/ips/start.do?prodId=IPS>.

**Gale Document Number:**CJ172743069

**Appendix 1.2.: Text two (G2)-** *The Guardian* **- January 2008**

## Border Breach Could Let Israel Cut Gaza Link, Say Officials.

Source: ***The Guardian (London, England)*** (Jan 25, 2008): p.22. (436 words)
From *UK Newspapers Online*
Document Type: Newspaper

**Full Text:** COPYRIGHT 2008 Guardian Newspapers Limited

**Byline: Rory McCarthy, Rafah**

 Israeli officials yesterday suggested the newly open border between **Gaza** and Egypt offered a chance of Israel completely severing its ties with the small strip of crowded Palestinian land.

The deputy defence minister, Matan Vilnai, said the rush of Palestinians across the border - after explosives were used to breach the dividing wall on Wednesday - was an opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from **Gaza**. He said Israel wanted to relinquish responsibility for the supply of water, power and medicine to **Gaza**.

"We need to understand that when **Gaza** is open to the other side we lose responsibility for it. So we want to disconnect from it," Vilnai said. "We want to stop supplying electricity to them, stop supplying them with water and medicine, so that it would come from another place."

His comments sparked a sharp reaction from Egyptian officials, who said that the border would be re-sealed in the coming days. However yesterday tens of thousands of Palestinians were still pouring back and forth across the border, buying up goods in Egypt that are not available or much more expensive in **Gaza**. "The border will go back as normal," said an Egyptian foreign ministry spokesman, Hossam Zaki. "The current situation is only an exception and for temporary reasons."

Even Hamas, the Islamist movement that controls **Gaza**, said it expects to re-establish the official border crossing.

Israeli officials have often spoken of their intent to separate themselves completely from the **Gaza** Strip, which Israel captured and occupied in 1967. In 2005 Israel withdrew its settlers and soldiers but the international community still regards **Gaza** as occupied territory because Israel has effective control over the Palestinians there. It controls the population register as well as **Gaza's** sea space and air space, prevents large-scale use of the harbour and any use of **Gaza's** one airport, conducts frequent military operations in **Gaza** and controls all crossings into Israel.

The Israeli defence minister, Ehud Barak, who was at the World Economic Forum in Davos yesterday, said his government was still considering a major invasion of **Gaza**. Israel has imposed a full closure of the **Gaza** Strip, restricting fuel and aid supplies, and mounted several military operations to stop militants firing makeshift rockets into southern Israel.

"Probably we will find ourselves there," Barak told the Associated Press. "We are not rushing to reconquer **Gaza**, but we will not remove any option from the table when it comes to the security of our citizens."

When asked about plans for Israel to separate itself from **Gaza**, he said: "I don't go too far in my interpretation of this."

**Source Citation:**"Border breach could let Israel cut Gaza link, say officials.(Guardian International Pages)." <u>The Guardian (London, England)</u> (Jan 25, 2008): 22. <u>UK Newspapers Online</u>. Gale. Anglia Ruskin University. 16 Dec. 2008 <http://find.galegroup.com/ips/start.do?prodId=IPS>.

**Gale Document Number:**CJ173793532

**Appendix 1.3. Text one (T1) -** *The Times* **-December 2007**
**Broken Border Wall Gives Israel Chance to Dump Gaza Problem on Egypt;**
Source:*__The Times (London, England)__* (Jan 25, 2008): p.43. (725 words) From *UK Newspapers Online.*
Document Type:Newspaper

# THE ❧ TIMES

**Full Text :**COPYRIGHT 2008 The Times

Byline: James Hider, Rafah

Israel said that it wanted to wash its hands completely of the **Gaza** Strip yesterday, as the flow of hundreds of thousands of impoverished Palestinians across the breached border with Egypt showed no sign of letting up.

Israel also warned its citizens to avoid visiting popular tourist destinations in the Sinai desert, which abuts **Gaza**. It said that it had received specific threats that Palestinian militants now operating in Egypt were planning to abduct Israelis.

Matan Vilnai, the Israeli Deputy Defence Minister, tried to salvage something from the collapse of the wall, which clearly had taken Israel by surprise and given a massive propaganda coup to its sworn enemy Hamas, the Islamist rulers of **Gaza**.

Mr Vilnai said that the destruction of the wall was an opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from **Gaza** and push it into Egypt's unwilling lap. "We need to understand that when **Gaza** is open to the other side we lose responsibility for it," he said.

"We want to stop supplying electricity to them, stop supplying them with water and medicine, so that it would come from another place." Nicholas Burns, the US Undersecretary of State, also said during a visit to Tel Aviv that restoring order on the chaotic border was Egypt's responsibility.

Egypt, which has shown little willingness to tackle the tidal wave of desperate humanity across its frontier, said that it had not been approached about any change in the status of **Gaza**, a potentially explosive issue for the Arab state. It has strained diplomatic ties with Israel and receives massive subsidies from the United States. Both allies view the Hamas Government of **Gaza** as a terrorist organisation. Egypt also loathes Hamas because the Islamists enjoy close ties to the Muslim Brotherhood, a powerful opposition group that Egypt has tried to suppress for years.

"The border will go back as normal," said Hossam Zaki, Egyptian Foreign Ministry spokesman. That may, however, not be so simple - Hamas is demanding that it be a central player in any future agreement on the border, putting Egypt and the more moderate Palestinian Government in Ramallah which nominally governs all Palestinians in a diplomatically awkward spot. Mushir al-Masri, a Hamas MP, said that the Islamist movement had received no response from Egypt to its demand for three-way talks but Hamas would keep pushing the issue.

A Hamas militant on security duty at the smashed border wall said that his men would be able to seal the border crossing again if Egypt agreed to open permanently the official crossing point, closed since last summer's violent takeover of **Gaza** by the Islamists.

The Rafah crossing was jammed with tens of thousands of hopeful Gazans pushing into Egypt to shop for goods that have disappeared in their own towns since Israel tightened its blockade in response to Hamas rocket attacks. The United Nations said that 700,000 Gazans - almost half the population of the Strip - had made the return trip into Egypt in less than two days since the wall was blown up. The frantic throng of the day before had solidified into a steady stream of people buying up food, detergents, cement and petrol. Egyptian shopkeepers restocked overnight to make the most of the bonanza, selling everything from cattle to Viagra.

* MANY MASTERS

Until the 13th century BC, when the Philistines captured **Gaza**, the area was known as Canaan and was ruled by an Egyptian governor

**Gaza** became a Muslim city in AD635 when it was captured by the Arabs. It was invaded by Christian Crusaders in the 1100s, and recaptured by Muslims in 1187

The French controlled **Gaza** for ten years from 1799. After Napoleon's visit, below. **Gaza** City's palace, now a school, was named "Napoleon's Castle"

British forces drove the

Ottoman Turks from the area during the First World War

and ruled **Gaza** for ten years

After Israel's 1948 declaration of independence and the Arab-Israeli War, the **Gaza** Strip came under Egyptian control

The Six-Day War in 1967 brought the Strip under Israeli occupation, along with the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, and Golan Heights

Israeli settlements were dismantled in 2005 and Hamas gained control of **Gaza** last year

Sources: www.ipc.gov.ps; Art and History Museum, Geneva; Times archives

CAPTION(S):

More than 700,000 Gazans have flooded into Egypt to buy goods. Photograph by AP

**Appendix 1.4. Text two (T2) -** *The Times* **- January 2008**

Title:
Human chain protesters trigger alert over new Gaza wall breach.(Overseas news).

Source:***The Times (London, England)*** (Feb 26, 2008): p.37. (557 words)

# THE 🕮 TIMES

**Full Text :**COPYRIGHT 2008 The Times

Byline: James Hider in Jerusalem

Human chain protesters trigger alert over new Gaza wall breach

What is the text about

Thousands of Palestinians formed a human chain across the **Gaza** Strip yesterday in protest against the Israeli siege as Israeli forces along the border went on high alert in case demonstrators tried to storm the frontier wall.

Israeli army commanders feared that **Gaza's** Hamas rulers could exploit the demonstration and try to repeat last month's surge across a damaged border wall with Egypt, as they clashed with Israeli troops.

A senior Hamas official told The Times that the Islamist movement did have plans to organise a massive thrust of thousands of people at the Israeli border, and that it was ready to sacrifice "hundreds of lives" when the plan was put into effect.

Yesterday's demonstration, organised by the politically independent Popular Committee Against the Siege, was peaceful, however. The organisation had hoped to turn out at least 40,000 people to highlight the plight of **Gaza**, where basic goods and fuel are in short supply because of the Israeli closure, aimed at forcing Hamas to end all rocket fire from the Strip.

While thousands of school children braved the drizzle, the numbers fell short of those expected and the organisers failed to complete a chain all the way down the 25-mile road running from Beit Hanoun in the northeast to Rafah on the Egyptian border.

Demonstrators carried placards reading "The Siege of **Gaza** Will Only Strengthen Us" and "The World Has Condemned **Gaza** to Death".

Israel strengthened its border security forces, with an extra 5,000 police drafted in to back up regular armed guards, and local media reports said that snipers and even an artillery battery had been sent to make sure that the crowds did not attempt to scale the high concrete walls and razor wire fences that mark the boundary. The rally ended peacefully after a few hours, although a small group of youths later set fire to tyres near the Israeli crossing point at Erez in the northeast of the strip, and threw stones at border guards. Israeli troops opened fire, wounding two of the youths and arresting 50.

After the demonstration the daily rocket attacks from **Gaza** promptly resumed, with three home-made Palestinian missiles hitting the southern Israeli town and seriously wounding a ten-year-old Israeli boy. A senior Hamas adviser to Ismail Haniyah, the Hamas Prime Minister who was sacked by President Abbas after the Islamist takeover of **Gaza** last summer, gave warning that in future his organisation did plan to organise a massive, popular surge against the Israeli border walls at Erez. "We are going to march with our kids, our mothers, our sisters, our elderly people - everybody is going to join us on our march," said Ahmed Yousef. "I am sure it might be a bloody day, and many Palestinians will be killed."

David Baker, an Israeli government spokesman, said that Israel would continue its air raids and incursions into **Gaza** to attack those who fired the rockets. "Those who raise their hands against Israeli children will be pursued by Israel, and we will take all measures necessary to prevent such attacks." he said.

*For breaking news from Israel timesonline.co.uk/mideast

Copyright (C) The Times, 2008

CAPTION(S):

Palestinian protesters hoped that at least 40,000 people would turn out, but they failed to complete a chain all the way down the 25-mile road . Photograph by EYAD BABA/AP

**Source Citation:**"Human chain protesters trigger alert over new Gaza wall breach.(Overseas news)." The Times (London, England) (Feb 26, 2008): 37. UK Newspapers Online. Gale. Anglia Ruskin University. 16 Dec. 2008 <http://find.galegroup.com/ips/start.do?prodId=IPS>.

**Gale Document Number:**CJ175344521

**Appendix two - Coding the texts of the news reports**

**Appendix 2: Coding of Texts of the News Reports**

**Appendix 2.1. Coding Text 1 from *The Guardian* (G1)**

**Olmert rules out ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements.**

1.  The Israeli prime minister, Ehud Olmert, [Sensor] yesterday ruled out  ( Processes-Mental)
2.  ceasefire negotiations with the Islamist movement Hamas and said ( Processes-Verbal) his military
3.  was fighting ( Processes-Action) a "true war" against armed groups in Gaza.
4.  He [Sensor] warned of   (Processes- Mental) further Israeli military strikes in the days ahead
5.  which he [Sayer ] said (Processes-Verbal) were intended to prevent Palestinian militants [Actor-
6.  Attacker] from firing ( Processes-Action)makeshift rockets into Israel. "Counter-terrorist
7.  operations will continue as they have for months," Olmert [Sayer] told ( Processes-Verbal) his
8.  weekly cabinet meeting in Jerusalem. "There is no other way to describe what is happening in the
9.  Gaza Strip except as a true war between the IDF [Israel Defence Force] and terrorist elements."
10. In the past week more than a dozen militants from Hamas and the Islamic Jihad [Actor-Goal]
11. have been killed ( Processes-Event)  during Israeli strikes in Gaza. In recent days there have been
12. suggestions that Hamas [Sensor], which won Palestinian elections early last year and then
13. seized full control of Gaza in June, was seeking (Processes-Mental) a ceasefire with Israel.
14. Last week Ismail Haniyeh, a Hamas leader, [Sensor] raised (Processes-Metal) the idea in a rare
15. telephone conversation with an Israeli television journalist. Egyptian mediators [Attribute] have
16. reportedly also put forward (Processes-Relational) a ceasefire proposal on behalf of Hamas. But
17. Olmert [Sayer] said ( Processes-Verbal) there would be no talks with any group that
18. failed to meet the principles of the Quartet of Middle East negotiators - the US, the UN, the EU and
19. Russia - which last year called on Hamas to recognise Israel, halt violence and accept previous
20. peace agreements. Hamas [Sensor] has refused (Processes-Mental) to accept the three principles.

21. "Whoever accepts the Quartet principles will be - in principle - a partner for negotiations,"

22. Olmert [Sayer] said ( Processes-Verbal). "Whoever is unwilling to do so, to our regret, cannot be a

23. partner for dialogue. This policy will not change." It is increasingly clear that Israel's policy in

24. Gaza is not simply to halt the rocket fire but also to depose the Hamas movement.

25. Yesterday Haim Ramon [Sensor], Israel's deputy prime minister, confirmed ( Processes-

26. Mental) that his government [Actor- Goal] wanted to topple ( Processes-Action-Goal) Hamas.

27. "We [Actor- Goal] are fighting ( Processes-action) Hamas and are seeking(Processes-

28. Perception) to weaken ( Processes-Action) its control of Gaza, and bring about

29. the end of its reign there. Hamas [Actor- Attacker] should hand over(Processes-Action)

30. control of Gaza to the Palestinian Authority," he [Sayer] said (Verbal).The Palestinian Authority is currently under

31. the control of Mahmoud Abbas, the Palestinian president and leader of the Fatah movement, who is

32. based in Ramallah, in the West Bank.

33. In a separate development, an Israeli cabinet minister [Sensor] confirmed (Processes-Mental) that

34. Israel [Actor- Sensor] had (Processes-Mental) new plans to build apartments in

35. two settlements in East Jerusalem and in the occupied West Bank. The announcement brought

36. quick condemnation from Palestinian leaders [Actor]  and presents a new obstacle to attempts to

37. revive peace talks between the two sides. Under the first phase of the US road map, which once

38. again is being used as the basis for talks, Israel [Sensor] has committed ( Processes-Mental) to

39. halting all settlement activity and to removing some of its furthest settlements.

40. However, Israel's construction ministry [Actor] has budgeted ( Processes-Material-Action) plans to

41. build (Processes-Action) 740 new settlement apartments next year: 500 in Har Homa, in East

42. Jerusalem, and another 240 in Ma'ale Adumim.  Rafi Eitan [Senor], Israel's minister for Jerusalem

43. affairs, confirmed ( Processes-Mental) the construction plans but said ( Processes-Verbal)

44. he [Sensor ] regarded ( Processes-Mental) the areas as "integral" parts of Jerusalem, adding that

45. Israel did not regard the road map as applying to Jerusalem.

**Appendix 2.2. Coding Text 2 from *The Guardian* (G2)**

**Border Breach Could Let Israel Cut Gaza Link, Say Officials.**

1. Israeli officials [Sensor] yesterday suggested ( Processes- Mental-Cognition) the newly open border

2. between Gaza and Egypt offered a chance of Israel completely severing its ties with the small strip of

3. crowded Palestinian land. The deputy defence Minister, Matan Vilnai, [Sayer] said ( Processes-Verbal) the

4. rush of Palestinians across the border - after explosives were used to breach the dividing all on Wednesday

5. was an opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from Gaza. He [Sayer ] said ( Processes--Verbal)

6. Israel [Sensor] wanted (Processes-Mental) to relinquish (Processes-Action) responsibility for the supply of

7. water, power and medicine to Gaza.  "We need to understand that when Gaza is open to the other side we

8. lose responsibility for it.  So we [Sensor] want ( Processes-Mental) to disconnect from it,"

9. Vilnai [Sayer] said ( Processes-Verbal). "We want to stop supplying electricity to them, stop

10. supplying them with water and medicine, so that it would come from another place."

11. His comments [Sensor] sparked ( Processes-Mental-perception) sharp reaction from Egyptian officials,

12. who [Sayer] said (Processes-verbal) that the border would be re-sealed in the coming days. However

13. yesterday tens of thousands of Palestinians  [Actor]  were still pouring ( Processes-Material-Action) back

14. and forth across the border, buying up goods in Egypt that are not available or much more expensive in

15. Gaza. "The border will go back as normal," said ( Processes-Verbal) an Egyptian foreign ministry

16. spokesman, Hossam Zaki. [Sayer] "The current situation is only an exception and for temporary

17. reasons."  Even Hamas, the Islamist movement [behaviour] that controls ( Processes-behavioural) Gaza,

18. said ( Processes-Verbal) it expects to re-establish the official border crossing. Israeli officials [Sayer] have

19. often spoken(Processes-verbal) of their intent to separate (Processes-Material-Action) themselves

20. completely from the Gaza Strip, which Israel captured and occupied in 1967. In 2005 Israel [Actor]

21. withdrew ( Processes-Material-Action) its settlers and soldiers but the international community [Sensor]

22. still regards ( Processes-Mental-Perception) Gaza as occupied territory because Israel has effective control

23. over the Palestinians there. It [behaviour] controls (Process- behaviour) the population register as well

24. as Gaza's sea space and air space, prevents (Process- behaviour) large-scale use of the harbour and any use of

25. Gaza's one airport, conducts (Process-Material) frequent military operations in Gaza and controls (Process-

26. Material) all crossings into Israel. The Israeli defence minister, Ehud Barak, [Sayer] who was at the

27. World Economic Forum in Davos yesterday, said (Process-Verbal) his government[Sensor]

28. was still considering (process-Mental) a major invasion of Gaza. Israel [Actor] has imposed (Process-

29. Material-Action) a full closure of the Gaza Strip, restricting fuel and aid supplies, and mounted (Process-

30. Material-Action) several military operations to stop militants firing makeshift rockets into southern Israel.

31. "Probably we will find ourselves there," Barak [Sayer] told (Process-Verbal) the Associated

32. Press. "We are not rushing to reconquer Gaza, but we will not remove any option from the table when it

33. comes to the security of our citizens." When asked about plans for Israel to separate itself from Gaza,

34. he [Sayer] said ( Processes-Verbal) : "I don't go too far in my interpretation of this."

**Appendix 2.3.  Coding Text 1 from *The Times* (T1)**

**Broken Border Wall Gives Israel Chance to Dump Gaza Problem on Egypt (Jan 25, 2008)**

1. Israel [ Sayer] said (Process-verbal) that it [Sensor] wanted (Process-Mental)to wash

2. (Process-Material-action) its hands completely of the Gaza Strip yesterday, as the flow of hundreds of

3. thousands of impoverished Palestinians [Actor] across (Process- Material-Action) the breached border

4. with Egypt [Actor] showed (Process- Material-Action) no sign of letting up. Israel [Sensor] also

5. warned (Process-Mental) its citizens to avoid visiting popular tourist destinations in the Sinai desert,

6. which abuts Gaza. It said *Israel* [Sayer]  (Process-Verbal) that it [Actor] had received (Process-

7. Material-Action) specific threats that Palestinian militants now operating in Egypt [Actor] were planning

8. (Process- Material-Action) to abduct Israelis. Matan Vilnai, the Israeli Deputy Defence Minister

9. [Identifier], tried (Relational-Identification) to salvage something from the collapse of the wall, which

10. clearly had taken Israel by surprise and given a massive propaganda coup to its sworn enemy Hamas, the

11. Islamist rulers of Gaza. Mr Vilnai [Sayer] said (Process-Verbal) that the destruction of the wall was an

12. opportunity for Israel to "disconnect" from Gaza and push it into Egypt's unwilling lap. "We need to

13. understand that when Gaza is open to the other side we lose responsibility for it," he [Sayer] said (Process

14. -Verbal)."We[Sensor]want (Process- Mental) to stop supplying electricity to them, stop supplying them with water and

15. medicine, so that it would come from another place." Nicholas Burns [Sayer] the US Undersecretary of

16. State, also said (Process-Verbal) during a visit to Tel Aviv that restoring order on the chaotic border was

17. Egypt's responsibility. Egypt which has shown little willingness to

18. tackle the tidal wave of desperate humanity across its frontier, said (Process-verbal) that it had

19. not been approached  about any change in the status of Gaza, a potentially

20. explosive issue for the Arab state. It [Sensor] has strained (Process- Material-Mental) diplomatic ties

21. with Israel and receives (Process- Mental) massive subsidies from the United States.

22. Both allies [Sayer] view (Process-Mental) the Hamas Government of Gaza as a terrorist organisation.

23. Egypt [Sayer] also loathes (Process-Mental) Hamas because the Islamists [Sensor] enjoy (Process-

24. Material) close  ties to the Muslim Brotherhood, a powerful opposition group that Egypt [Actor] has

25. tried (Process- Behavioural) to suppress for years. "The border will go back as normal," said

26. (Process-Verbal) Hossam Zaki, Egyptian Foreign Ministry spokesman [Actor]. That may, however, not

27. be so simple - Hamas [Sensor] is demanding (Process-Mental) that it (Existent) be (Existential) a central

28. player in any future agreement on the border, putting Egypt and the more moderate Palestinian Government

29. in Ramallah which nominally governs all Palestinians in a diplomatically awkward spot. Mushir al-Masri

30. [Sayer] a Hamas MP, said (Process-verbal) that the Islamist movement [Sensor] had received (Process-

31. Mental) no response from Egypt to its demand for three-way talks but Hamas [Actor] would keep

32. (Process- Material-Action) pushing the issue. A Hamas militant [Sayer] on security duty at the smashed

33. border wall said (Process-Verbal) that his men [Existent] would be (Process-Existential) able to seal

34. the border crossing again if Egypt [Sensor] agreed (Process-Mental) to open permanently the

35. official crossing point, closed since last summer's violent takeover of Gaza by the Islamists. The Rafah

36. crossing was jammed with tens of thousands of hopeful Gazans [Actor] pushing (Process- Material-Action)

37. into Egypt to shop for goods that have disappeared in their own towns since Israel [Actor] tightened

38. (Process- Material-Action) its blockade in response to Hamas rocket attacks.

39. The United Nations [Sayer] said (Process-Verbal) that 700,000 Gazans [Actor] almost half the population of

40. the Strip - had made (Process- Material-Action) the return trip into Egypt in less than two days since the wall

41. was blown up. The frantic throng of the day before had solidified into a steady stream of people buying up

42. food, detergents, cement and petrol. Egyptian shopkeepers [Actor] restocked (Process-Material) overnight to

43. make the most of the bonanza, selling everything from cattle to Viagra.

44. MANY MASTERS  Until the 13th century BC, when the Philistines [Actor] captured (Process-

45. MATERIAL) Gaza, the area was known as Canaan and was ruled by an Egyptian governor. Gaza became a

46. Muslim city in AD635 when it was captured by the Arabs. It was invaded by Christian Crusaders

47. in the 1100s, and recaptured by Muslims in 1187. The French controlled (Process-material-action) Gaza for

48. ten years from 1799. After Napoleon's visit,below. Gaza City's palace, now a school, was named

49. "Napoleon's Castle". British forces [Actor] drove (Process-MATERIAL) the Ottoman Turks from the area

50. during the First World War and ruled (Process-MATERIAL] Gaza for ten years.After Israel's 1948

51. declaration of independence and the Arab-Israeli War, the Gaza Strip came under Egyptian control. The Six-

52. Day War in 1967 brought the Strip under Israeli occupation , along with the Sinai Peninsula, West Bank, and

53. Golan Heights. Israeli settlements [Goal] were dismantled (Process–MATERIAL) in 2005 and

54. Hamas [Actor] gained (Process-Material-Action) control of Gaza last year.


Notes:

- The square brackets [ ] denote the sub-type of participants, actors.

- The round and underlined brackets (   ) denote the processes under the categories of process.

**Appendix 2.4. coding Text 2 from The Times (T2)**

**Human Chain Protesters Trigger Alert over New Gaza Wall Breach    Feb 26, 2008**

Byline: James Hider in Jerusalem

1. Thousands of Palestinians [Actor- ] formed <u>(Processes-action )</u> a human chain across the Gaza Strip yesterday in

2. protest against the Israeli siege as Israeli forces [Goal] along the border went on <u>(Processes- event)</u> high alert in case

3. demonstrators tried to storm the frontier wall.  Israeli army commanders [Sensor ] feared <u>(Processes-Mental )</u> that

4. Gaza's Hamas rulers [Sensor] could exploit <u>(Processes-Mental )</u> the demonstration and try to repeat <u>(Processes-</u>

5. <u>action )</u> last month's surge across a damaged border wall with Egypt, as they [Actor]clashed <u>(Processes-Material-</u>

6. <u>Action )</u> with Israeli troops.  A senior Hamas official [Sayer] told <u>(Processes-verbal)</u> The Times that

7. the Islamist movement [Actor]did have plans to organise <u>(Processes- action)</u> a massive thrust of thousands

8. of people at the Israeli border, and that it was ready to sacrifice "hundreds of lives" when the plan was put into effect.

9. Yesterday's demonstration, organised by the politically independent Popular Committee Against the Siege, was peaceful,

10. however. The organisation [Actor- Sensor] had hoped <u>(Processes- Mental)</u> to turn <u>(Processes-Action)</u> out at least

11. 40,000 people to highlight <u>(Processes-Action)</u> the plight of Gaza, where basic goods and fuel are in short supply

12. because of the Israeli closure, aimed at forcing Hamas to end all rocket fire from the Strip. While thousands of school

13. children [Sensor ] braved <u>(Processes- Mental)</u> the drizzle, the numbers fell short of  those expected and the

14. organisers [Sensor] failed <u>(Processes-Mental)</u> to complete <u>(Processes- Action)</u> a chain all the way down the 25-

15. mile road running from Beit Hanoun in the northeast to Rafah on the Egyptian border.  Demonstrators [Actor] carried

16. (Processes- Action) placards reading "The Siege of Gaza Will Only Strengthen Us" and  "The World Has Condemned

17. Gaza to Death".  Israel [Sensor] strengthened (Processes-Mental) its border security forces, with an extra 5,000 police

18. drafted in to back up regular armed guards, and local media reports [Sayer ] said (Processes- verbal) that snipers

19. and even an artillery battery had been sent to make sure that the crowds did not attempt to scale the high concrete

20. walls and razor wire fences that mark the boundary. The rally ended peacefully after a few hours, although a small group

21. of youths [Actor] later set fire (Processes- action)  to tyres near the Israeli crossing point at Erez in the northeast of

22. the strip, and threw (Processes-Action) stones at border guards. Israeli troops [Goal] opened (Processes- Action)

23. fire, wounding two of the youths and arresting 50. After the demonstration the daily rocket attacks from Gaza

24. promptly resumed, with three home-made Palestinian missiles hitting the southern Israeli town and seriously wounding

25. a ten-year-old Israeli boy. A senior Hamas adviser [Sayer] to Ismail Haniyah, the Hamas Prime Minister who was sacked

26. by President Abbas after the Islamist takeover of Gaza last summer, gave (Processes- Mental) warning that in future

27. his organisation did plan to organise a massive, popular surge against the Israeli border walls at Erez. "We [Actor] are

28. going to march (Processes- action) with our kids, our mothers, our sisters, our elderly people - everybody is going to

29. join us (Processes- action) on our march," said Ahmed Yousef. "I am sure it might be a bloody day, and many

30. Palestinians will be killed."  David Baker[Sayer], an Israeli government spokesman, said (Processes- verbal) that Israel

31. [Sensor] would continue (Processes-Mental) its air raids and incursions into Gaza to attack (Processes- Action)

32. those who [Actor] fired (Processes- action) the rockets. "Those [Actor] who raise (Processes- action) their hands

33. against Israeli children will be pursued by Israel, and we [Goal] will take (Processes-Material) all measures necessary

34. to prevent (Processes- action) such attacks." he [Sayer] said(Processes- verbal).


It is better to analyse two texts from December and January and not from Feb if decided to analyse two texts.
[  ] actors
(   ) processes

# Appendix 3: Classification of the Actors and the Process of the News Reports

## Appendix 3.1. Classification of Text 1 (G1) from *The Guardian*

**Olmert rules out ceasefire as strikes on Hamas continue: Israel is fighting 'true war' with militants, says PM: Peace talks threatened by plans for new settlements.**

| No | The Actor | Type of the actor | Nationality | The process | Type of the process |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | The Israeli prime minister, Ehud Olmert | Sensor | Israeli | ruled out | Mental |
| 2. | / | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Verbal |
| 3. | / | Actor (Goal) | Israeli | Was fighting | Action |
| 4. | He (Ehud Olmert) | Sensor | Israeli | Warned of | Mental |
| 5. | He (Ehud Olmert)<br><br>Palestinian militants | Sayer<br><br>Actor(attacker) | Israeli<br><br>Palestinian | Said | Verbal |
| 6. | / | | / | Firing | Material – Action |
| 7. | Olmert | Sayer | Israeli | Told | Verbal |
| 8. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 9. | / | / | / | / | |
| 10. | a dozen militants more than from Hamas and the Islamic Jihad | Goal | Palestinian | / | / |
| 11. | / | / | / | Have been killed | Event |
| 12. | Hamas | Sensor | Palestinian | / | / |
| 13. | / | / | / | was seeking | Mental |
| 14. | Ismail Haniyeh, a Hamas leader | Sensor | Palestinian | Raised | Mental |
| 15. | Egyptian mediators | Attribute | Egyptian | / | / |
| 16. | / | / | / | Put forward | Relational |
| 17. | Olmert | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Verbal |
| 18. | / | / | / | / | |
| 19. | / | / | / | / | |
| 20. | Hamas | Sensor | Palestinian | Has refused | Mental |
| 21. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 22. | Olmert | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Verbal |
| 23. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 24. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 25. | Haim Ramon | Sensor | Israeli | Confirmed | Mental |
| 26. | his government | Goal | Israeli | Wanted to topple | Action |
| 27. | We (the Israelis) | Actor-Goal<br>Sensor | Israeli<br>Israeli | Are fighting<br>are seeking | action<br>perception |
| 28. | / | Actor | Israeli | To weaken | Action |
| 29. | Hamas | Actor- attacker | Palestinian | Hand over | Action |
| 30. | he | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 31. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 32. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 33. | an Israeli cabinet minister | Sensor | Israeli | Confirmed | Mental |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34. | Israel | Sensor | Israeli | Had | Mental |
| 35. | | | | | |
| 36. | Palestinian leaders | Sensor | Palestinian | Condemn | Mental |
| 37. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 38. | Israel | Sensor | Israeli | Has committed | Mental |
| 39. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 40. | Israel's construction ministry | Actor | Israeli | has budgeted | Action |
| 41. | / | / | / | To build | Action |
| 42. | Rafi Eitan | Sensor | Israeli | / | / |
| 43. | / | / | / | Confirmed<br>Said | Mental<br>Verbal |
| 44. | He (Rafi Eitan) | Sensor | Israeli | Regarded | Mental |
| 45. | / | / | / | / | / |

Frequencies related to Israelis (20)

Frequencies related to Palestinians (7)

Frequencies related to Egyptian (1)

Frequencies related to Internationals (0)

No. of processes (28)

**Classification of the processes (G1)**

| | Type of process | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Actors** | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | **Total** |
| Israel | 5 | 0 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Palestinian | 3 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 8 | 0 | 13 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 28 |

**Note: The figures reflect the number of frequencies/times of the process for each actor.**

## Appendix 3.2. Classification Text 2 (G2) from *The Guardian*

### Border Breach Could let Israel Cut Gaza Link, Say Officials.

| No. | The Actor | Type of the actor | Nationality | The process | Type of the process |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Israeli officials | Sensor | Israeli | suggested | Mental-cognition |
| 2. | / | / | | / | / |
| 3. | The deputy defence minister, Matan Vilnai | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 4. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 5. | He (refer to Israeli defence minister) | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 6. | Israel | Sensor Actor | Israeli Israeli | wanted relinquish | Mental Material-Action |
| 7. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 8. | We (Israelis) | Sensor | Israeli | want | Mental |
| 9. | Vilnai (Israeli defence minister) | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 10. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 11. | His comments (Vilnai's comment) | Sensor | Israeli | sparked | Mental –perception |
| 12. | Who (Egyptian) | Sayer | Egyptian | Said | Verbal |
| 13. | tens of thousands of Palestinians | Actor | Palestinian | were still pouring | Material- Action |
| 14. | / | / | | / | / |
| 15. | an Egyptian foreign ministry spokesman, Hossam Zaki | Sayer | Egyptian | said | Verbal |
| 16. | / | / | | / | / |
| 17. | Hamas, the Islamist movement ( Palestinians) | behaviour | Palestinian | controls | behavioural |
| 18. | Israeli officials | Sayer | Israeli | have often spoken | Verbal |
| 19. | | Actor | Israeli | to separate | Material- action |
| 20. | Israel | Actor | Israeli | Withdraw | Material-action |
| 21. | The international community | Sensor | International | | |
| 22. | / | / | / | regards | Mental – perception |
| 23. | It (Israel) | Behaviour | Israeli | controls | Behavioural |
| 24. | | Behaviour | Israeli | prevents | behavioural |
| 25. | | Sensor | Israeli | conducts + controls | behavioural |
| 26. | The Israeli defense minister, Ehud Barak, | Sayer | Israel | said | Verbal |
| 27. | his government (Israel) | Sensor | Israel | was still considering | Mental |
| 28. | Israel | Behaver | Israel | has imposed | material-action |
| 29. | | | | mounted | material-action |
| 30. | / | / | / | / | |
| 31. | Barak (The Israeli defense minister) | Sayer | Israel | Told | Verbal |
| 32. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 33. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 34. | He (The Israeli defense minister) | Sayer | Israel | Said | Verbal |

Frequencies related to Israelis (19)

Frequencies related to Palestinians (2)

Frequencies related to Egyptian (2)

Frequencies related to Internationals (1)

No. of processes (24)

**Classification of the processes (G2)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 3 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Palestinian | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| | 4 | 4 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 24 |

**Note: The figures reflect the number of frequencies/times of the process for each actor.**

## Appendix 3.3. Classification  Text 1 (T1) from *The Times*

Broken Border Wall Gives Israel Chance to Dump Gaza Problem on Egypt

| No. | The Actor | Type of the actor | nationality | The process | Type of the process |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Israel<br>It (Israel) | Sayer<br>Sensor<br>Actor | Israeli<br>Israeli<br>Israeli | said<br>wanted<br>To wash | Verbal<br>Mental<br>Material- action |
| 2. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 3. | the flow of hundreds of thousands of impoverished Palestinians | Actor | Palestinian | across | Material- action |
| 4. | Egypt<br>Israel | Actor<br>Sensor | Egyptian<br>Israeli | Showed | Material- action |
| 5. | | | | warned | Mental |
| 6. | It (Israel)<br>It (Israel) | Sayers<br>Sensor | Israeli<br>Israeli | said<br>had received | Verbal<br>Material- action |
| 7. | Palestinian militants now operating in Egypt | Actor | Palestinian | were planning | Material- action |
| 8. | Deputy Defence Minister (Matan Vilnai) | Identifier | Israeli | | |
| 9. | | | | tried | Relational-identification |
| 10. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 11. | Mr Vilnai | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 12. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 13. | He ( Mr. Vilnai) | Sayer | Israeli | said | Verbal |
| 14. | We | Sensor | Israeli | want | Mental |
| 15. | Nicholas Burns, the US Undersecretary of State | Sayer | American | | |
| 16. | | | | said | Verbal |
| 17. | Egypt | | | | |
| 18. | | Sayer | Egyptian | Said | Verbal |
| 19. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 20. | It ( Egypt) | Sensor | Egyptian | has strained | Mental |
| 21. | | Sensor | Egyptian | receives | Mental |
| 22. | Both allies ( Israel and US) | Sensor | Israeli and American | view | Mental |
| 23. | Egypt<br>The Islamists (Hamas) | Sensor<br>Actor | Egyptian<br>Palestinian | loathes<br>enjoy | Mental<br>Material |
| 24. | Egypt | Behavior | Egyptian | has tried | Behavioural |
| 25. | | | | said | Verbal |
| 26. | Hossam Zaki, Egyptian Foreign Ministry spokesman | Sayer | Egyptian | / | / |
| 27. | Hamas<br>It ( Hamas) | Sensor<br>Existential | Palestinian<br>Palestinian | is demanding<br>be | Mental<br>Existential |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 29. | Mushir al-Masri Islamist movement | / | / | / | / |
| 30. | | Sayer Sensor | Palestinian Palestinian | Said had received | Verbal Mental |
| 31. | Hamas | Actor | Palestinian | would keep | Material-action |
| 32. | A Hamas militant on security duty at the smashed border wall | Sayer | Palestinian | | |
| 33. | His men | Existent | Palestinian Palestinian | Said Would be | Verbal Existential |
| 34. | Egypt | Sensor | Egyptian | agreed | Mental |
| 35. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 36. | Gazans | Actor | Palestinian | Pushing | Material-Action |
| 37. | Israel | Actor | Israeli | Tightened | Material-Action |
| 38. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 39. | The United Nations | Sayer | International | Said | Verbal |
| 40. | 700,000 Palestinians in the Gaza Strip | Actor | Palestinian | had made | Material – action |
| 41. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 42. | Egyptian shopkeepers | Actor | Egyptian | restocked | Material- action |
| 43. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 44. | Philistines | Actor | Palestinian | captured | Material- action |
| 45. | | | | | |
| 46. | | | | | |
| 47. | | | | | |
| 48. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 49. | British forces | Actor | British | drove | Material- action |
| 50. | British forces | Actor | British | Ruled | Material- action |
| 51. | | | | | |
| 52. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 53. | Israeli settlements | Goal | Israeli | Were dismantled | Material-event |
| 54. | Hamas | Sensor | Palestinian | gained | Mental |

Frequencies related to Israelis (16)

Frequencies related to Palestinians (13)

Frequencies related to Egyptian (9)

Frequencies related to Internationals (6)

No. of processes (44)

**Classification of the processes (T2)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 13 |
| Palestinian | 7 | 0 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 16 |
| Egyptian | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | | 0 | 9 |
| International community | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| | 14 | 1 | 15 | 11 | 1 | 2 | 44 |

**Note: The figures reflect the number of frequencies/times of the process for each actor.**

## Appendix 3.4. Classification Text 2 (T2) from *The Times*

Human Chain Protesters Trigger Alert over New Gaza Wall Breach

| No. | The Actor | Type of the Participant | Nationality | The process | Type of the process |
|-----|-----------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|
| 1. | Thousands of Palestinians | Actor | Palestinian | Formed | Material-Action |
| 2. | Israeli forces | Goal | Israeli | went on | Material- Goal |
| 3. | Israeli army commanders | Sensor | Israeli | Feared | Mental |
| 4. | **Gaza's** Hamas rulers | Sensor<br>Actor | Palestinian<br>Palestinian | could exploit<br>try to repeat | Mental<br>Action |
| 5. | They | Actor | Palestinian | Clashed | Material-Action |
| 6. | A senior Hamas official | Sayer | Palestinian | Told | Verbal |
| 7. | the Islamist movement | Actor | Palestinian | Organize | Material-Action |
| 8. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 9. | / | / | / | / | |
| 10. | The organisation | Sensor<br>Actor | Palestinian<br>Palestinian | Had hoped<br>To turn | Mental<br>Material-Action |
| 11. | | Actor | Palestinian | to highlight | Material-Action |
| 12. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 13. | thousands of school children | Sensor | Palestinian | Braved | Mental |
| 14. | The organizers | Sensor<br>Actor | Palestinian<br>Palestinian | Failed<br>To complete | Mental<br>Material-Action |
| 15. | Demonstrators | Actor | Palestinian | Carried | Material-Action |
| 16. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 17. | Israel | Sensor | Israeli | Strengthen | Mental |
| 18. | local media reports | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Verbal |
| 19. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 20. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 21. | small group of youths | Actor/attacker | Palestinian | Set fire to | Material-Action |
| 22. | <br>Israeli troops | Actor<br><br>Goal | Palestinian<br><br>Israeli | Threw<br><br>Opened | Material-Action<br><br>Material-Action |
| 23. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 24. | / | / | / | / | / |
| 25. | A senior Hamas adviser | Sayer | Palestinian | Said | Verbal |
| 26. | | Sensor | Palestinian | Gave warning | Mental |

| 27. | We | Actor | Palestinian | | Material-Action |
|-----|----|-------|-------------|---|-----------------|
| 28. | our kids, our mothers, our sisters, our elderly people | Actor | Palestinian | to march | Material-Action |
| 29. | | | | Join | Material-Action |
| 30. | David Baker | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Sayer |
| 31. | Israel | Sensor | Israeli | would continue | Mental |
| 32. | those who | Actor | Palestinian | Fired | Material-Action |
| | those | Actor | Palestinian | Raise their hands against Israeli children | Material-Action |
| 33. | We | Actor | Israeli | Prevent | Material-Action |
| 34. | He | Sayer | Israeli | Said | Verbal |

Frequencies related to Israelis (7)

Frequencies related to Palestinians (23)

Frequencies related to Egyptian (0)

Frequencies related to Internationals (0)

No. of processes (30)

**Classification of the processes (T2)**

| Actors | Type of process | | | | | | Total |
|--------|----------|------------|--------|--------|------------|-------------|-------|
| | **Material** | **behavioral** | **Mental** | **Verbal** | **Relational** | **Existential** | |
| Israel | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Palestinian | 14 | 0 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Egyptian | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| International community | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | 17 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 30 |