

**A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CNN AND AL
JAZEERA'S COVERAGE OF THE PALESTINIAN-
ISRAELI CONFLICT OF 2014**

BY

HALIMA SADIYYA ADAMU

P13SSMM8011

**A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF
POSTGRADUATE STUDIES, AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY ZARIA,
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
AWARD OF THE MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN**

MASS COMMUNICATION

DEPARTMENT OF MASS COMMUNICATION,

FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES,

AHMADU BELLO UNIVERSITY,

ZARIA

OCTOBER, 2018

DECLARATION

I declare that the work in this dissertation entitled A Comparative Analysis of CNN and Al Jazeera English Coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict of 2014 was written by me in the department of Mass Communication. The information derived from the literature has been duly acknowledged in the text and a list of references provided. No part of this thesis has been presented for the award of any form of academic qualification at this, or any other academic institution.

Halima Sadiyya Adamu

Date

P13SSMM8011

CERTIFICATION

This dissertation entitled A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF CNN AND AL JAZEERA'S COVERAGE OF THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT OF 2014 by ADAMU HALIMA SADIYYA meets the regulations governing the award of the degree of Masters of Science (M.S.c Hons) in Mass Communication of the Ahmadu Bello University, and is approved for its contribution to knowledge and literary presentation.

Mal. Usman Jimada _____

Chairman, Supervisory Committee
Date

Dr. Ibrahim Jimoh _____

Member, Supervisory Committee
Date

Dr. Mahmood Umar _____

Head of Department
Date

Prof. Sadiq Z. Abubakar _____

Dean, School of Postgraduate Studies
Date

DEDICATION

For my beloved late father, Mallam Sa' idu Hassan Adamu (Paapa) who was always so proud of me. May Allah have mercy on his amazing soul and grant him Al Jannatul Firdaus, amen.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Alhamdulillah! My utmost gratitude goes to Almighty Allah for keeping me alive and healthy to this day. Ya Allah, I cannot thank You enough.

My profound gratitude goes to my parents late Mal. Sa'idu Hassan Adamu and Haj. A'ishatu Adamu Fada, for training, supporting and encouraging me. Indeed, my gratitude knows no bounds. Paapa, there is no one like you in this whole world, so I feel so lucky! Before you died, I used to be nervous whenever I came home from school because the first question you often asked was, "how far have you gone with your project? When are you seeing your supervisors?" And so much more! And now, I won't even get the opportunity to present the work to you and have you flash me your I'm-proud-of-you smile, but Allah knows best. You are the most selfless, complaisant, compassionate, simple, patient, considerate, forgiving, generous, hospitable, humble, responsible, intelligent (super genius), quiet man I have ever met, MaashaAllah! I feel so blessed to be having your genes and honoured to have called you my father and I'm proud to say that I'll always be my father's daughter. Oh Paapa, I miss you every day. I never once thought there'd come a day when I'd refer to you in the past tense. May Allah in His infinite mercy pardon all your sins and grant you al Jannatil Firdaus, amen. And as for the strongest woman I know, an angel in the form of my mother, you are the best and you mean the world to me, mum. May Allah grant you long life in good health, ameen. I love you.

To my supervisors, Mal. Usman Jimada and Dr. Ibrahim Jimoh, words cannot express how I really feel but I am deeply grateful for your constant advice, criticisms, time, even your comforting smiles. To my *Baba*, Prof. Suleiman Salau, I don't just call you Baba for nothing: you are indeed a father to me. I will never forget you.

Here, I express my heartfelt gratitude to all my lecturers. Without them, I certainly cannot now boast of being a master's graduate.

I feel blessed belonging to such a wonderful family: Yaya Mariya (Quincy/Mrs. BT), Hannatu (Gwaggo Hans), Bilkisu ('Yar Billy/Queen Bee), Al Ameen (little bro), Abdulkadir, Umar and Anti Abu, thank you all for your support and encouragement, especially Billy who, despite living miles away, always asked, "have you finished your thesis?" Alhamdulillah Billy, now I have! Khalti Mardy is saying a big thank you to her handsome cutie, Sa'eed (Farhan/Twitat/Baba Karami/Tweety/Paapa's Big Man), for simply being there. May Allah bless you abundantly my little angel. To Quincy and little bro, thank you for driving me to school whenever the need arose! May Allah bless you guys. Gwaggo Hans, God Bless you for taking your time to correct the grammatical errors! I'm really grateful sugar plum! To my grandparents late Alh. Adamu Fada and Haj. Hannatu Abba, I say thank you. May Allah have mercy on your soul Grandpa, amen.

To my late best friend Safina, a once-in-a-lifetime kind of friend, if you were here now, you would have said, "Madam, I really even didn't think you can manage do the masters, well done! I'm proud of you. Better don't disgrace me with this certificate oo!" Oh Allah, have mercy on the soul of my late friend and grant her *Jannatil Firdaus*, amen. To My SJ, you and I know that words are never enough!

To my wonderful friends Aisha, Sa'adatu, Chioma, Hannatu, Fatima, Zainab, Farida. Thank you all for the genuine support, encouragement, care and concern you showed throughout this journey. I really appreciate this. May Allah bless you all.

To all my classmates of P13SSMM, I am very grateful for the various contributions you all made for the success of this amazing journey. Magdalene and Salomy, thank you.

ABSTRACT

This study analysed the published broadcast transcripts of CNN International and Al Jazeera English to find out if both news outlets had differences in their coverage of Palestinian-Israeli conflict of July 08th, 2014 to August 26th, 2014. This is because previous studies have revealed that there were inaccuracies and inconsistencies of news content by the international media on their coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict over a long period of time and this hugely contributes to international indifference and inaction concerning the conflict. Specifically, the study sought to examine the differences in tone, depicting of victim and villain hood frames and citation of sources by CNN International and Al Jazeera English. Framing theory was chosen as the appropriate theory with specific focus on content bias. Content analysis was adopted to analyse the data collected. Findings show that both stations had contrasting tones, victim and villain hood frames and sourcing of information differences on their coverage of the 2014 Gaza war. The study concludes that CNN International was more balanced in citing of sources, but still adopted the general official Israeli/American tone of framing the Palestinians as villains and the Israelis as victims while Al Jazeera English adopted a defensive position, framing the Palestinians as victims and the Israelis as villains. Therefore, this study recommends among others that, both networks should strive to ensure that their reports are always balanced in tone, when depicting victims and villains of the conflict and also both Palestinian and Israeli sources should be cited.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE.....	i
DECLARATION.....	ii
CERTIFICATION.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	v
ABSTRACT.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1	GENERAL BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY.....	1
1.2	PROFILE OF AL JAZEERA ENGLISH.....	8
1.3	PROFILE OF CNN INTERNATIONAL.....	9
1.4	STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM	10
1.5	RESEARCH OBJECTIVES.....	11
1.6	RESEARCH QUESTIONS.....	11
1.7	JUSTIFICATION.....	12
1.8	SIGNIFICANCE OF THE RESEARCH.....	12
1.9	SCOPE.....	13
1.10	LIMITATION TO THE STUDY.....	14

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1	INTRODUCTION.....	15
2.2	CONFLICT	15
2.3	MEDIA AND CONFLICT REPORTING.....	18
2.4	MEDIA COVERAGE OF PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT.....	31
2.5	REVIEW OF EMPIRICAL STUDIES.....	32
2.6	DIRECTION OF MEDIA COVERAGE OF THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT.....	33
2.7	MEDIA FRAMING OF THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT... ..	34
2.8	MEDIA SOURCING PATTERNS ON THE PALESTINIAN-ISRAELI CONFLICT	47
2.9	THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK.....	49
2.10	SUMMARY.....	51

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1	INTRODUCTION.....	52
3.2	RESEARCH METHOD.....	52

3.3	INSTRUMENT OF DATA COLLECTION.....	52
3.4	INTERCODER RELIABILITY TEST.....	53
3.5	CONTENT UNIVERSE.....	53
3.6	DATA DESCRIPTION AND SOURCES.....	53
3.7	UNIT OF ANALYSIS.....	54
3.8	CATEGORIES AND MEASUREMENT.....	54
3.9	METHOD OF DATA PRESENTATION, ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION	55

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1	INTRODUCTION.....	56
4.2	DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS.....	56
4.3	DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS.....	60

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1	INTRODUCTION.....	75
5.2	SUMMARY.....	75
5.3	CONCLUSION.....	77

5.4	RECOMMENDATIONS.....	78
5.5	FURTHER RESEARCH.....	79
	REFERENCES.....	81
	APPENDIXES.....	89

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 General Background to the Study

One of the most controversial wars in contemporary history, both in terms of ideological powers and continued struggle for over 70 years, is the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. The most recent outburst of the conflict in 2014, commonly known as the Gaza War, attracted extensive global media coverage. This conflict in a series of continuous clashes between the Israelis and the Palestinians – is exceptionally significant in terms of the extensive media coverage of the conflict which involved Israeli soldiers, armed combatants and civilians.

Being one of the longest in modern history, the ramifications of the daily events of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict go well beyond the clashing parties, attracting the attention of millions of people in many parts of the world. It is also extremely violent, continuously involving killing, assassination, injury, house demolition, and imprisonment. Dowty (2008:222) calls it the “perfect conflict” that has a “self-generating power for continued devastation and destruction” because each of its two sides has a strong sense of victimhood and a strong belief that it is in the right.

The media’s universally accepted role is to inform the public at large. In situations of conflict, war, or other tumultuous circumstances, this role entails more responsibilities. As with the Palestine-Israel conflict, there are ethnic and demographically, sometimes ideologically, opposed sides to represent fairly. For decades now, the conflict has persisted, alternately heating up and cooling down but never truly being resolved.

Media coverage of the Palestinian- Israeli conflict in recent years has been associated with international political, economic and social ideologies (Tucker, 2008). This happened due to the efforts of the media influence of Iran, Europe, Middle East, America and Israel. The evolution and rapid changes in international communication that occurred in the world

led to a great divergence of views and to an emergence of trends and beliefs that take media as a vehicle to pass ideologies and stances to the world. What matters in this regard is the role of international media coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict which is considered to be loaded with ideological leanings and bias (Johnson & Milani, 2010).

The roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict can be traced back to the late nineteenth century when Zionism emerged as a national Jewish movement aiming to solve the problems of European Jewry by establishing “an overwhelmingly, if not homogeneously, Jewish state in Palestine” (Finkelstein, 2003:6), which was then part of the former Ottoman Empire. The major turning point for the Zionist movement came during World War I when Britain, which was to become the de facto ruler of Palestine after the dissolution of the Ottoman Empire in the war, issued the 1917 Balfour Declaration, undertaking to “facilitate the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people” (Chomsky, 1999:90). At the beginning of the British mandate, however, the vast majority of the inhabitants of Palestine were Arab Muslims (650,000) and Christians (80,000), and Jews were only about 7.5% (60,000) of the population (Pappe, 2006:73).

The conflict can be divided into three stages. The first is the period from the late 1800s, when political Zionism emerged as a response to protests and anti-Semitism in Europe. Theodor Herzl, the father of Zionism, proposed in 1897, the establishment of an independent Jewish state in Palestine, the Biblical homeland of the Jewish people. The World Zionist Organization subsequently committed to the creation of a Jewish homeland in Palestine and the Jewish National Fund (JNF) began to purchase land in Palestine “for the purpose of settling Jews” in 1907 (Davis 2003: 85). This started the Jewish immigration to Palestine, which was said to be “a land without people for a people without land”.

The second stage started after the Holocaust in November 1947, when the United Nations General Assembly adopted the Partition Plan (Resolution 181). This recommended

partition of the Mandatory Palestine, which had been under British rule since 1917, and the establishment of a Jewish state on about 55 percent of the territory, as well as a UN administered regime in the city of Jerusalem, holy for Jews, Muslims, and Christians. In May 1948, David Ben Gurion and the Jewish People's Council unilaterally declared the establishment of Israel, "the Jewish State in Palestine", while leaving Israel's borders unspecified (Mayer 2008:218).

Since Jewish leaders understood that a Jewish state would not survive with a large and hostile Arab minority, Palestinian land was consequently seized and 700,000 Palestinians uprooted (Morris, 2009:109). Egypt, Syria, Lebanon and Transjordan then initiated a war against Israel over the Palestinian issue. Israel won and seized control over the Negev and the Galilee, while Jordan annexed the West Bank, and Egypt occupied Gaza.

The third period of the conflict started in June 1967 after Israel's victory in the Six-Day War. Israel then annexed East Jerusalem and began the occupation of the West Bank and Gaza, Golan and Sinai, adding about 1.5 million Arabs to the area under its control (Morris 2009: 70).

Israeli settlements and "facts on the ground" have been constructed in the occupied territories since September 1967. In 2012, about 500 000 Israeli settlers were living in the West Bank and East Jerusalem (Peace Now 2012). However, under Prime Minister Ariel Sharon's rule in 2005, Israel withdrew both its civilian and military presence from the Gaza Strip, but kept its control over the airspace and coastal line. Following the control of power in Gaza by Hamas in 2007, Israel blockaded the area.

In the period since 1967, there have been two violent Palestinian uprisings against the occupation: the First Intifada (1987-1993) and the Second Intifada (2000-2005), leading to severe material and human losses on both sides. *Intifada* in Arabic means "throwing off". Israel started the construction of the Separation barrier in 2002, dividing the Israeli

population from the Palestinians in the West Bank. Throughout this period till date, the United States has provided Israel with substantial military and economic support (Mark 2005). Israel has been the largest annual receiver of U.S. foreign assistance since 1976, receiving 3 billion dollars in grants annually since 1985 (Mark 2005).

It should be noted that till date, Israel still controls the vast majority of the West Bank, and the Gaza Strip which is also still defined as occupied territory by the United Nations. Occupied territories in this context refer to the West Bank and Gaza, occupied by Israel in 1967, as well as East Jerusalem, annexed by Israel in the same period.

Caplan (2009) argues that conception of righteousness and the expectation of the fulfilment of legitimate claims is an outstanding part of the conflict. Both sides insist on their right to the land and both feel that they have been deprived of their rights in various respects. He is of the opinion that the conflict gravitates around these rights which are absolute and not negotiable. He went further to state that for the conflict to be resolved, the following questions have to be answered: who was the first in the land and whose land is it? Is Zionism a national liberation or a colonial expansionist movement? Is Arab/Israel/Palestinian violence justified or must it be condemned? How did the Palestinians become refugees and why are they still considered to be refugees? Are the areas conquered in 1967 to be considered as occupied and can Israel build there? Does the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) attempt to eliminate Israel and replace it with an Arab state? etc. As one can easily see all of these questions will be answered in a diametrically opposing manner by the respective parties. Therefore, in Caplan's point of view, these questions are not winnable; because no side will yield to the other's account.

According to Schulze (1999) the Palestinian-Israeli conflict is as a result of the political and historical contexts of the environment of both parties. She further reflected that their negotiating approaches are primarily maximalist, with neither side being willing, except

under extreme pressure from outside political actors—such as the United States and the European Union—to step back from the brink of absolute confrontation. She notes, “the pattern that emerges is one of entrenched positions, dubious motives, poor timing, uninspired leadership and psychological obstacles” Schulze (1999:96).

Cultural differences have affected the decision making process of the two parties. Palestinians and Israelis are simply different with respect to their approach to decision making. According to the cultural identifier methodology of Hofstede (1997), these differences are distinguished by the fact that the Israelis tend to be individualistic and make decisions using a generally flat decision making hierarchy while the Palestinians reflect more of a collective society and exhibit a hierarchical decision making style Hofstede (1997). Sadly, the cultural identifier that both sides share is an enhanced tendency for confrontation and conflict. Cohen (1997) sees language barrier as a problem because the result is two different negotiating communication styles hindered by translations between at least three different languages (Arabic, Hebrew, and English).

Throughout the conflict, Israel, with the United States and the European Union, referred to the violence against Israeli civilians and military, as terrorism. The motivations behind Palestinian violence against Israeli civilians are multiple. However, a common motive is to eliminate the Jewish state and replace it with a Palestinian Arab state, Sela(2002).

Hamas views the conflict as a religious *jihad*:

The PLO's agreement to support the participation of a Palestinian delegation from the west bank and Gaza strip in the Madrid Peace Conferences in late October 1991 further fueled the tension between Fatah and Hamas, which embarked on an intensive campaign against the very idea of territorial compromise and peacemaking with the Jews as religiously forbidden and politically inconceivable. (Sela, 2002, p. 339).

Hamas, therefore uses suicide bombing as one of its defence tactics to attack the Israelis. A 2007 study of Palestinian suicide bombings during the second intifada (September 2000 through August 2005) found that 39.9% of the suicide attacks were carried out by Hamas, 2.64% by Fatah, 25.7% by the Palestinian Islamic Jihad (PIJ), 5.4% by the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine (PFLP) and 2.7% by other organisations. The first suicide attack was carried out in 1989 and the attacks stopped in 2008, Benmelech&Berrebi (2007). Other tactics include rocket firing, hostage taking, stone throwing, car crashing, stabbing and shootings. For Israel's defense, options have included military action (including targeted killings and house demolitions of perceived 'terrorist operatives' and Palestinian civilians), diplomacy, unilateral gestures towards peace, and increased security measures especially at checkpoints. The legality and the wisdom of all of the above tactics have been called into question by various commentators, Dershowitz (2005).

Lewis (2003:30) notes that jihad can be characterized both defensively as moral striving, and offensively as armed struggle. This, in his opinion, hinders conflict resolution efforts. According to Bishara (2002), Israel is to blame for failure to establish peace with the Palestinian people. This he perceives as Israel 'apartheid'. He argues that, "the Oslo peace process must, first and foremost, be understood in its historic and geo-strategic contexts. It resulted only after a series of fruitless Israeli attempts to defuse the Palestinian question without resolving it" Bishara (2002:3). Enderlin (2003) disagrees and blames lack of peace on leaders of both sides. He opines that both leaders would have reached peace at camp David II in September of 2000, or at the Taba conference in January of 2001 but did not for various political and personal reasons.

The Palestinian-Israeli conflict of July 8 to August 26, 2014, was a 50-day armed conflict that took place between Palestinians, Hamas fighters in the Gaza strip and the State of Israel. The conflict began when Israel launched a military campaign called *Operation*

Protective Edge in the Gaza strip on July 08 with the stated aim of stopping Hamas (an Islamic political party that won the 2006 Palestinian national election) from firing rockets into southern Israel and its alleged suspicion of arms smuggling into the Gaza Strip through tunnels. Hamas is widely condemned by Israel and the international community as corrupt, aggressive and anti-peace, Sela, (2002). Hamas on its part maintains that Israel has no right to occupy and control the Gaza strip.

According to Encarta 2009, the Gaza strip is a region bordered on the north and east by Israel and the south by Egypt. From 1967 until 1994 the Gaza strip was occupied and administered by the state of Israel. In May 1994, it became independent under the leadership of the Palestinian national authority and this made Israel to begin evacuating its settlers from the strip. The World Health Organization states that the Gaza strip is one of the most densely populated places on earth. It holds a population of 1,816, 379 million (July, 2014 est.) and an area of 360 square kilometres (CIA World Fact Book). However, Israel still controls Gaza's air space, territorial waters and most of its borders (so that it restricts movement of people or goods in or out of Gaza by air or sea). It closed off all remaining access to Gaza when Hamas gained control of the Gaza strip after winning the elections. Israeli's reason for this was that Hamas uses tunnels in the Gaza strip to smuggle terrorist equipment and this has made life difficult for the Palestinians living in the strip. According to Hamas, it had no option but to continue firing rockets and mortar into Israel in protest. During the conflict, Israel's forces attacked and destroyed government buildings, police stations, military targets, mosques, schools, shelter homes, UN buildings, homes, hospitals. Hamas also intensified its rocket and mortar attacks against southern Israel.

The conflict came to an end on 26th August 2014 when a ceasefire was agreed upon by both parties. The death toll of the conflict, according to Gaza Health Ministry resulted in 2,310 Palestinians (including at least 1,483 civilians i.e 70%) and 71 Israelis (including 66

soldiers; 6 civilians) deaths including military fighters of both sides along with massive destruction of the Gaza strip. Women and children constituted most of the casualties in Gaza.

The scale of damage and number of civilian casualties led to it being described as a massacre by several human right groups. Media coverage of the conflict has been dogged by allegations of bias on both sides. These perceptions of bias have generated more complaints of partisan reporting than any other news topic and have led to an increased number of media watchdog groups on both sides. Particularly, Accuracy in Media, which is pro-Israel and Arab Media Watch, which is pro Palestinian.

1.2.2 Profile of Aljazeera English

Al Jazeera English, headquartered in Doha, claiming to give a “voice to the voiceless” entered the competitive global news field in late 2006 as the world’s first 24-hour English language news channel based in the Middle East and North Africa. The channel aims to gain viewers from both the non-Islamic world and Muslim countries where Arabic is not spoken. With nearly 83 news bureaus worldwide (planning to add further bureaus), including Africa, Latin America, Asia, and as well as the Middle East, the channel reports “the voice of the South, ”where impartial news coverage has been marginalized by the Western media. Compared to Al Jazeera Arabic, the English network covers much more Western politics. AL Jazeera English nonetheless did not position itself as an Arab network merely broadcasting in English – a natural assumption given the prominence of it’s older, Arabic language sister channel. Rather, AL Jazeera English declared and maintains a “global” identity, contending to its public materials that shows it covers regions under-reported by western media giants such as CNN International and the BBC (Painter, 2008).

Furthermore, in the march towards realizing its mission statement, the channel was willing to take great risks, including the unprecedented step of engaging Arabs’ enemy; Israel, a taboo that no other Middle Eastern television station was willing to breach in the

past. It is customary nowadays to see Israeli politicians and IDF army officers appear in AL Jazeera English and present their point of view on political and military related debates. Hence, it is being hailed by supporters as the *CNN of the Arab World* for being one of the most important news organizations and a leading political actor in the world today (Seib, 2008). By its funding through loans or grants, rather than direct government subsidies, Al Jazeera claims to maintain independent editorial policy. In other words, the station is free of censorship and government control. Other major sources of its income include advertising, cable subscription fees, broadcasting deals with other companies, and sale of footage. AL Jazeera English is available to 130 million homes in over 100 countries via cable and satellite. It is one of the few global media outlets to maintain an agency in Gaza. It should be noted that Qatar is the number one supporter of Hamas and the Palestinians in the Middle East.

1.2.3 Profile of CNN International

CNN International, founded by media proprietor Ted Turner appeared in the eighties of the twentieth century in the US. It is the first news channel to provide 24 hour television news coverage and also the first all news television channel in the United States. It is an advertising-supported cable television network headquartered in Atlanta, Georgia, but also has other studios in Los Angeles, Washington DC and New York City. CNN International can be received in over 212 countries and territories around the globe. In essence, CNN International is a private and independent television station that relies heavily on advertising and individual or group sponsorship/donations for survival. CNN International conducts regular programming on international news, business and sport news, health issues, and entertainment news.

The importance of CNN International appears in the role it played through the news coverage of various events around the world and more importantly the impact it leaves on the

American people. CNN International reflects the viewpoints of the U.S. government on all the issues such as the issues of “war on terror”, and the war on Afghanistan and Iraq, and particularly the Palestinian-Israeli conflict (Barkho, 2008). It is interesting to note that the United States is the number one supporter of Israel. Both stations gave extensive media coverage of the 8th July to 26th August 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

The media have become the central means by which people around the world are informed, entertained, and made to construct an understanding of their local, national and global social, political and cultural surroundings. Equally significant, is the manner in which the news media have come to assume a central role in periods of war – in terms of war reporting on one hand, and the build-up and progression of war itself on the other (Webster, 2003: 57). In this sense, the ideal conception of media’s role should stand as “reporter-reflector-indicator of an objective reality” of the world “out there” (Molotch and Lester, 1997: 198). Any departure from this ideal tends to be treated as ‘bias’ manipulation or distortion of the actual events on ground. Few media people want to discuss or admit partiality and the resulting distortions. To do so would challenge the motives of the organization that broadcast their material in the name of objectivity and balance. Several controversies follow the international media in their news reportage. This is because international media channels, such as *BBC*, *CNN International*, *Press Tv* and *Al Jazeera* have global reach and as such, have an ‘agenda-setting effect’.

Bias has been found and analyzed in the IAK (2003), Falk & Howard (2007), Adamu (2011), Caballero (2010), Aguiar (2009), Ross (2003), Dunsky (2008), Philo & Berry (2004), Ozohu (2013), Amer (2015), Arqub (2015) studies proving that distortions of the truth do exist over specific date ranges concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Since the role of news media in the Palestine-Israeli conflict is a recurring topic of research in the field of

communications studies, few thorough comparative studies of Arab and Western media bias have been done in Nigeria with regard to the recent conflict that occurred in 2014. Therefore, this study focused on the analysis of CNN International and Aljazeera English on their coverage of the crisis. It highlighted a specific case study: Operation Protective Edge, [08/07/2014 - 26/08/2014]. The investigation was designed to determine whether both stations' bias continued, diminished, or increased during that period. Most times, inadequate and inaccurate reporting by international media on conflicts hugely contributes to international indifference and inaction, thereby worsening conflict situations.

1.4 Research Objectives

The objectives of this study are:

RO 1. To compare the direction of coverage of CNN International and Al Jazeera English on the Palestinian–Israeli conflict of 2014.

RO 2. To find out the frames used to represent the victims and villains of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in media outlets by CNN International and Al Jazeera English.

RO 3. To find out if both sides were given balanced representation in terms of quoting of sources by CNN International and Al Jazeera English.

1.5 Research Questions

The following research questions were raised for direction:

RQ 1. How did CNN International and Al Jazeera English differ in tone in their coverage of Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 8th July to 26th August 2014?

RQ 2. How were the victims and villains of the July-August 2014 Palestinian –Israeli conflict framed by Al Jazeera English and CNN International?

RQ 3. Which of Palestinian and Israeli sources of information on the 2014 conflict were mostly cited by the reports of CNN International and Al Jazeera English?

1.6 Justification

The United States is the number one supporter of Israel in the west and CNN International is headquartered in the west, i.e. United States while Qatar is the number supporter of the Palestinians and Al Jazeera English is headquartered in the Middle East i.e, Qatar. CNN International generally presents a western perspective on international events while Al Jazeera English generally presents an Arab view. Both networks have global outreach and both networks gave extensive coverage of the conflict even though Al Jazeera English gave more coverage than CNN International.

1.7 Significance of the Research

CNN International and AL Jazeera English bring distinct outlooks to viewers. This is because the dynamics between these two international news organisations and the values that they represent challenges everyone's views about politics and society. CNN International presents an American perspective on international events, while Al Jazeera English prides itself on being the voice of the Middle East, the southern hemisphere, and the most impoverished regions on earth. For news watchers, political stakeholders, and journalists, these two views create broader understanding of some events, especially if one has the luxury of considering both networks' coverage. This researcher had the privilege of watching how both networks' covered the 2014 Gaza conflict and also noticed differences on how each network covered the conflict. Again, during the same period, the researcher monitored online comments from people around the globe who kept on accusing both stations of being partisan in their coverage which further heightened the interest of the researcher to conduct a research on CNN International and AL Jazeera English's coverage of 2014 Gaza war.

Studies reviewed: IAK (2003), Falk & Howard (2007), Adamu (2011), Caballero (2010), Aguiar (2009), Ross (2003), Dunsky (2008), Philo & Berry (2004), Ozohu (2013), Amer (2015), Arqoub (2015) have shown that there was inaccuracy and manipulation of

news content by various media organisations on their coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict over a long period of time. This research aimed at identifying some of the strategies and frames frequently employed by news media to manipulate the representation of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in ways that reflect their own attitudes and ideologies. Therefore, this study analysed the existence, and the extent of such bias in the coverage of the July-August 2014 Palestinian–Israeli conflict by CNN International and Al Jazeera English.

This study will be relevant to the international public in that it seeks to provide a modest contribution to the array of literatures available on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. It will also serve as a source of reference to other researchers who intend to do further research in this area. The study will be significant in promoting easy understanding of ideologies of the news articles published in AL Jazeera English and CNN International on Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

1.8 Scope

This study focused on the analysis of all online published broadcast transcripts on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 2014 by AL Jazeera English and CNN International. It was meant to contrast and compare how both stations presented the news on their Websites. It was anticipated that due to divergence in ideology and political position, inconsistencies and differences could be found in their coverage of Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 2014 with particular focus on the July 08 to August 26, 2014 conflict. Opinions and commentaries were excluded from the analysis because they did not represent the views of the media outlets; instead, they represented the point of views of the writers and commentators who were under no obligation to be fair or balanced.

This study was limited to analysing only online published broadcast transcripts sourced from CNN International.com and Aljazeera.com respectively. The study did not cover video analysis due to inadequate resources; and in addition to that, the researcher

would have found it helpful to have visited the news outlets in order to interview their reporters and editors concerning coverage of the conflict.

1.9 Limitation to the Study

The limitation of this research is its methodology. This is because in qualitative research, interpretation is always contextualised and provisional, which gives room for a new interpretation as well as other meanings. As a result of this, validity becomes an issue as the researcher and research assistant's interpretation, are the only two versions of the many other meanings of the frames chosen for the study. In other words, the assessment of this study cannot be true or false and therefore, covers only one aspect of the researchers own assumptions and subjectivity, and cannot be repeated by other researchers or evaluated as valid or not.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

There is an array of literature on the topic under study. This chapter sets out to extensively explore the existing literature relevant to the study, discussing and reviewing their central arguments, researches, opinions and weighing the extent of various contributions to the theme under focus, with the aim of identifying what gaps in knowledge the study intends to fill. In addition theoretical framework suitable to the study was adopted and discussed as well with a view to justifying the adoption of the theory.

2.2 Conflict

The term *conflict* has no positive intonation because usually disturbing words like *discord*, *dispute* or *fighting* are associated with it, though this is a rather subjective view. Disagreement over the exact notion of the term *conflict* dominates until today. This is however, not surprising because it is about one of the most enigmatic and controversial terms, which itself triggers conflicts very often.

“A major armed conflict is defined as the use of armed force between the military forces of two or more governments or of one government and at least one organized armed group, resulting in the battle-related deaths of at least 1000 people in any single calendar year and in which the incompatibility concerns control of government and/or territory.”(Dwan&Holmqvist, 2005, p.97)

The above definition of conflict is a description of the on-going conflict between Israel and Palestine because it is a conflict between military forces of a government i.e. the IDF of Israel and one organized armed group i.e. the Hamas of Palestine. The incompatibility here is mainly for control of territory.

In the same context, Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research defines conflict as “the clashing of interests (positional differences) on national values of some

duration and magnitude between at least two parties (organised groups, states, group of states, organizations) that are determined to pursue their interest and win their cases” (HIIK, 2005, p.2).

From the above definition, it can be understood that both Israel and Palestine have interests to pursue in the ongoing conflict. Israel wants to be accepted and recognized as a state to exist in the Middle East while Palestine wants to be an independent state on its own, free from Israel’s control. Both sides refuse to back down until they win their cases.

According to Boulding (1957) conflict generally emerges whenever at least one party perceives that one (or more) of his goals or purposes or preference or means of achieving a goal or preference is being threatened or hindered by the intentions or activities of one or more of the other parties. Also, Boulding (1962) went further to state that “party ‘A’ perceives (either rightly or wrongly) that he is being threatened or injured by party ‘B’. He takes what he considers defensive action; A behaves in a way that B perceives as injurious or threatening. When B responds ‘defensively’, A perceives it, now that his initial fear and observation has been validated, increases his activities and thus the conflict intensifies” (Boulding, 1962, p.25). According to Boulding’s above explanation of how conflict occurs, it can be said that the party A is Israel while party B is Palestine or vice versa.

Pfetsch (1994) states that there are established “five types of conflict categorization: latent conflict, manifested conflict, crisis, severe crisis, and war. The most important difference between these conflicts is that the first two are of non violent nature, while the crisis, severe crisis and war include usage of violence during the conflict” (Pfetsch, 1994, p. 216).

Conflict enters a violent phase when parties go beyond seeking to attain these goals peacefully, and try to dominate, damage or destroy the opposing parties’ ability to pursue their own interests. For Davies (1973) the existence of frustration of substantive (physical,

social-affection, self-esteem, and self-actualization) or implemental needs (security, knowledge, and power) is the essential condition for one non-violent conflict to escalate into violent. “Violence as a response is produced when certain innate needs or demands are deeply frustrated” (Davis, 1973, p.251). In political conflict analysis (as in the case of Palestinian-Israel conflict) the use of force, physical damages and human casualties, are the characteristics of a violent conflict.

The Palestinian-Israel conflict has escalated to a point where both parties are severely violent. Sandole ‘s (1998) definition of violent is an apt description of what happened during the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of July to August 2014:

“... a situation in which at least two parties, or their representatives, attempt to pursue their perceptions of mutually incompatible goals by physically damaging or destroying the property and high-value symbols of one another (eg, religious shrines, national monuments); and/or psychologically or physically injuring, destroying, or otherwise forcibly eliminating one another.”(Sandole, 1998).

The above definition of violent conflict by Sandole is an apt In consideration of conflict causes and issues, Singer (1996) points out that “the usual” suspects are to be found in: territory, ideology, dynastic legitimacy, religion, language, ethnicity, self-determination, resources, markets, dominance, equality, and, of course, revenge. Having the Palestinian-Israel conflict in focus, Pfetsch and Rohloff (2000:3) have identified nine commodities that have historically proven to be the most disputed conflict issues between states: territory (border), secession, decolonization, autonomy, system (ideology), national power, regional predominance, international power, and resources.

Conquering of territory, secession and autonomy are the main issue of the Palestinian-Israel conflict. Conflicts over territory are what Burton (as quoted in Sandole 1998) has termed “classical conflicts”. According to Vasquez (as quoted in Sandole 1998), a major

issue in war is territory, and consequently he asserts that: "... of all the possible issues that could end in war, issues involving territorial contiguity are indeed the most war prone".

2.3 Media and Conflict Reporting

Despite new communication technologies, traditional media remains the most important source of information and this has always been significant during conflict time. With the huge increase in its reach and effectiveness, the importance of the media has grown further. On a daily basis, conflict is reported in the media. Reporting conflict in television because of the effect of sights and sounds, makes television emotional, appealing and perceptive. Conflict attracts, and people find stories of conflict interesting and stimulating especially when it is reported in television (Patrick & Samson 2013).

During the First World War the use of the mass media as an additional weapon of war assumed significance and it reached a level of higher sophistication in the Second World War (Taylor, 1997). The use of radio in particular and news agencies for management of information and disinformation became quite prominent in the Second World War period. The word 'propaganda' acquired its current negative connotation during that period. At the end of the First World War, it was said, "Mightier and more dangerous than the fleet or the army, is Reuters". The editor of the Manchester Guardian, C.P. Scott observed at the close of the First World War, "if people knew the truth, the war would be stopped tomorrow. But of course they don't know, and they can't know." The chief of the British Military Intelligence (during that war) was asked to describe the ideal war correspondent, "he is a man," said the general, "who writes what he is told is true, or even what he thinks to be true, but never what he knows to be true" (Rai n.d.).

The need for journalists reporting conflicts may be defined under three basic conditions: access to the battlefield, mobility on the battlefield and reasonable access to official military information (Young, 1992). The success and non success of these

requirements by negotiation between media and military, determines the effectiveness and the ultimate value of media coverage. Another perceptual dimension of conflict reporting is the intensification of the conflict. The notion of the intensity dimension is derived from the claim that television news tends to present only the more intense moments of social conflicts. By the frequency and the degree of coverage given to conflicts, television news can heighten tensions. For instance, while the ailing Late President of Nigeria, Umaru Yar'adua was in a Saudi Arabian hospital, the electronic news media like Channel television, and foreign ones like British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) were focusing on the intensity the conflict was generating in the country. Indeed, it generated a lot of controversies and conflicts of interest.

When the volume of television news coverage of conflicts continue to attract public comments, criticisms, and observations then tensions, anxieties, fears begin to increase (Patrick &Samson 2013). For this, Waisbord (2002) cited in Eti (2009) argued that news media especially the television establishes a “culture of fear” which they perpetuate by portraying “a vast array of threats”. Thus, such intensified portrayal of conflict in television news, as Eti (2009) observes, “presents and shapes negative perception of risk among members of the news audience, and creates a sense of helplessness when it does not cover aspects that communicate hope and a selection”.

“Decades of study of the role of media in ongoing conflicts suggests that media rarely report conflicts neutrally” (Ross, 2007:57). In her study on deconstructing conflict reporting, she points out several factors that contribute to the contemporary reporting of conflicts such as: government pressures, political influences, propaganda mechanism, foreign policy issues, commercial considerations, structural constraints, political cultures, norms and traditions of societies and nationalistic emotions. Under these influences, the media frames the news on conflicts in ways which serve the hidden or prominent interests of the various players in the conflicts (Ross, 2007).

The ability to affect public perception and knowledge among individuals is one of the most important aspects of mass communication. The framing and agenda setting by the media, in terms of what makes the news, determines not only the process of public opinion-making; it can also reflect the personal perceptions and prejudices of journalists in interpreting the conflict situations (Aslam, 2010). Hence, there have been efforts by academics to find alternative ways to help journalists engage in the 'journalism of attachment', one that 'cares as well as knows' (Bell, 1998, p.16); that is 'responsible' and 'accountable' (Howard 2003) in reporting conflicts. Such journalism would not contribute to escalating conflict situations but would find 'non-violent' responses to them (Galtung, 1996); such journalism would also be 'ethical' and professionally ascribe to the standards of 'good' journalism (Lynch, 2013).

Conflict reporting then becomes an opportunity for 'not only reporting the truth but the whole truth' (Lynch and Galtung, 2010:2). Truth, which can be gleaned through the journalistic supply of cues and clues, to alert readers and audiences to the propaganda trappings of the conflicting sides (Lynch 2013, p.38). It also gives a choice to the editors and reporters of what to report and how to report which in turn creates opportunities for the audiences to find non-violent responses in society (Lynch &McGoldrick 2005:5).

According to Harris (2004) the prime news value of the media is conflict or disorder i.e. negative events, because conflict, by its very nature, holds a forceful attraction for the mass media. A familiar adage in journalism is 'bad news is good news and usually good news is no news' unless it happens to the most powerful. She went further to state that media coverage is also event driven. As Owens-Ibie (2002:32) puts it, "the media are naturally attracted to conflict" and is the "bread and butter" of journalism. In other words a coup or an outbreak of disease or a cyclone will receive immediate coverage but ongoing reconciliation

efforts, or rebuilding of a nation's economy, which may take many years, won't receive the same coverage, if any.

Stories of conflict are framed within two binary categories of extreme good vs. Evil, or one ethnic race against another, inferior or superior, thus leading to an over implication of issues (McCormick 2004:5). The mass media should approach conflict discourse with the understanding that there are far more than two sides to every story. Hence, McCormick (2004:7) warns against representing "the image of conflict as a two-sided tug of war," but rather as the image of a "prism with many facets that are at once interconnected and distinct and also change with the angle of light and the angle of the viewer". This style of reporting came into favour during the Cold War era when two giant hegemonic systems—capitalism and communism—were in ideological confrontation. It has become further entrenched since 9/11 and the 'War of Terror' speeches of the then American President George W. Bush. As Puddephat (2003) put it, "is there a media in the world that does not have the sense of patriotism, convey a sense of fear in a conflict and project the sense of 'the other'. If any media were free from that, it could be interesting".

The media play an important role in integrating the members of the society, thus, in times of conflicts, whether religious, ethnic or political, the media of mass communication can be used to preach peaceful coexistence, thereby, bringing about peace. Commenting on the role of the media in conflict resolution, Obot (2004), notes that:

"In resolving conflict in modern societies, the media, to a great extent, provide rendezvous for all the interest groups or the aggrieved parties to sit and express their minds on issues in contention. This would be possible by providing and guaranteeing every citizen, easy access to media facilities. All the groups in conflict have to be represented in news and other programmes in which issues in conflict are discussed. The fact that divergent views are represented in the news and discussion programmes, usually goes a long way to calming frayed nerves. Thus, the mass media should go beyond reporting

eruption of conflict, to investigating and reporting remote and immediate causes of the crises.”(Obot, 2004, p. 105).

Ways of conflict reporting could be spatially represented on a single outline of two principles of reporting. On one side is a “bystanders” reporting. In such reporting the reporting reporter only stands by and describes the event as objectively as possible (Oppen, 2009). This is based on a classical idea of objective journalism. Reporters should represent events as they appear and not try to judge or interpret them. On the other side is “journalism of attachment”, proposed by Bell (1997), (a BBC reporter). In this approach, a reporter should be ‘attached’ to the event. The reporter’s position should not be passive observation but active engagement, taking sides, making judgement and influencing a conflict. That is, it should go beyond dispassionate neutral reporting on the scene of obvious gross humanity. Instead, Bell argued, the reporting should frame the report from the victims’ perspective to evoke greater public awareness and wider reaction to end the abuses.

He further criticised media neutrality and explained that bystanders journalism concerns itself more with the circumstances of violence such as military formations, weapons, strategies, manoeuvres, and tactics, while journalism of attachment concerns itself more with people— those who provoke wars, those who fight them, and those who suffer from them. Bell argued journalism of attachment cares, as well as knows, is aware of its responsibilities; and would not stand neutral between good and evil, right and wrong, the victim and the oppressor.

Bell’s colleagues in Bosnia (Amanpour 1996 & Vulliamy 1999) adopted a similar approach. Amanpour (1996) stated that journalists can be objective by giving all sides a fair hearing, but they do not have to be neutral and treat all sides equally. Another journalist, Todd (2001) argued journalists can best serve victims by balancing humanity and professionalism. Both positions have weak spots that were criticised, for example how to be objective and how to make moral judgments? So instead of advocating one of the two

extremes, balanced reporting should be applied which uses both types of reporting thereby avoiding the sensationalism way of reporting which does not help in conflict situations at all.

Truman (n.d.) once said “you can never get all the facts from just one newspaper, and unless you have all the facts, you cannot make proper judgements about what is going on”. This statement reflects the simple fact that newspapers are biased for one reason or the other.

Kurspahic (2003) drew upon his experience in the Balkans to emphasise that the media can just as easily have a strong influence/effect and cause an escalation of violence and hate speech. The media’s actions in the Balkans are a prime example of how the media can be a source of antagonism and an instigator of conflict rather than a source for peace. Each side (Serbian and Croatian) propagated an “us versus them” mentality among their respective populations, stated Kurspahic, “to the point of inventing crimes”. In addition to fanning the flames of ethnic tensions, the media was also guilty of obstructing peacemaking efforts by failing to objectively present views of the minority. The media challenges in Balkan, according to him, applies to any country and is broadly relevant to any zone of conflict.

Zohar (2012), analysed western media press reporting on Bosnian war in years 1992-1995 and came out with the conclusion that western media reporting on the conflict was often bias, confusing and unclear in explaining the roots of the conflict which was partially responsible for the prolongation of the conflict. He added, western media reporting pictured the Balkan people as irrational and emotional. Also, Burg & Shoup (2000) in their extended analysis of Bosnian war argued that extensive media coverage of the conflict presented it in a chaotic way. The coverage was focused on the main events, like the bombing of Sarajevo. In majority cases reporters expressed honest concerns about civil victims, but they did not explain the conflict. “The compelling nature of the story of Muslim victimisation deterred most reporters from any efforts to examine the complex issues underlying the war” (Burg

&Shoup 2000:162). Such reporting distorted the reality of the war and consequently, the idea of western military intervention had only minor public support.

Asemah&Edegoh (2012) studied the mass media and conflict resolution in Jos, Plateau state through a Focus Group Discussion (FGD) with residents of Jos North Local Government Area. The discussants revealed that the media, especially the print, have used sensational pictures to show the crisis in Plateau State. The tone used in some of the features, articles and responses reflect the partisan role of the media in times of conflict. This is very dangerous and it negates the principles of neutrality and objectivity in the media profession. More so these sensational acts of reporting, normally lead to reprisal attacks.

In a similar analysis by Adisa (2012) through content analysing the *Daily Trust* and the *Guardian* newspapers on their coverage of the Jos conflict, it showed that locational factors determined the level of attention given to conflicts by newspapers. However, the newspapers were partially conflict sensitive and reflect plurality about the conflict as substantial sources of their facts were based on journalists' observation and views of one party in the conflict. He suggested that journalists should take care to do balanced and careful fact finding before believing any facts about what is or has been going on. For example on the number of deaths in the Jos conflict at a particular time, government said over 400, the police said 150 but the media went for the magnitude for commercial interest (Adisa 2012). He concluded that journalists should avoid words such as "vicious", "fundamentalists", "Islamists", "extremists", "fanatics", "barbaric", "militants", "rogues", "terrorists", etc because it is likely that a party or group in the conflict must have been using them to describe others. This is because name calling sometimes suggests partisanship and promotion of hate speech.

Akpan, Ering&Adeoye (2013) came out with the same result when they examined the role of the Nigerian media in the Niger-Delta, Boko Haram and Jos crisis using desk research

and interviews. They are of the view that the Nigerian media disseminates only the kind of information those who pay their wages want them to, which often tends to instigate and escalate conflicts. Also the same goes with the study by Eti (2009) on the Nigerian Press with particular reference to the Niger-Delta crisis.

A content analysis study conducted by Acayo&Mnjama (2004) on the role played by the print media in conflict and conflict resolution in Northern Uganda exposes the fact that the media which could have played a role in de-escalating the conflict have been fuelling the conflict through their use of rumours and their dissemination of non-reliable information. On the other hand, it was also pointed out that the media coverage of the conflict in Northern Uganda has been limited. Two papers were selected for the analysis: *The WeeklyTopic/DailyMonitor*, a privately owned newspaper, and *The New Vision*, a government owned newspaper. Hettiarachchi (n.d.) conducted a study of the print media in Sri Lanka with particular reference to Katunayake incident (clash between thousands of workers at the Katunayake Free Trade Zone which resulted in the death of a young worker and hundreds injured. Content analysis method of three newspapers: *Divina*, *Dinamina* and *Lankadeepa* was adopted by the researcher subsequently revealing that it was the ownership of the media that decided what, when, where, why and how to report on the incident thereby leaving readers confused about where the truth lay.

McLeod (2009) examined the traditional national media in the United States: the television all news network *Fox News* and *CNN International* in their prevention and management phases on the American war in Iraq in 2003. The study argues that coverage of the Iraq conflict by the two networks, and perhaps by the entire American media, was dysfunctional because it failed to investigate and challenge the US government's assertions about key elements in the conflict, such as the existence of weapons of mass destruction in Iraq and the links between Saddam Hussein and al-Qaeda. The conflict between the Dutch-

speaking Flemish and the French speaking Walloons is an internal dispute in Belgium. Euwema&Verbeke (2009) explored and compared the news functions and dysfunctions of the traditional regional media in the management (escalation) and resolution (de-escalation) phases of the conflict. The authors noted the failed attempts by the major daily newspapers in both regions, *Le Soir* and *De Standaard*, to inspire dialogue and understanding through mutual exchanges of journalists. The dysfunction occurred because the journalists working and reporting from each other's regions could not free themselves from their ethnic biases.

According to Gilboa (2009) there is a fierce debate about the nature of the conflict over Tibet. From the Chinese perspective, it is an internal dispute. From the perspective of the Tibetans, their spiritual leader, the Dalai Lama, and many states, it is an international dispute. Lee (2009) compared coverage of the Tibet conflict in the international (western) traditional media and the national traditional Chinese media in the management phase of the conflict. He suggested that there are more similarities than differences in the coverage of the two media systems.

Peru suffered from a twenty year old internal armed conflict that began in the 1980s (Gilboa, 2009). Laplante&Phenicie (2009) explored the Peruvian national media's role during the reconciliation phase of the conflict. In this case, reconciliation was designed to prevent any reoccurrence of violence and abuses of power. The study focused on news, interpretation and mobilization function of the media. The authors concluded that the media's role in this particular case was mostly dysfunctional.

This ground reality of media vis-a-vis conflict situations contrasts sharply with the defined role of the media. In actual or potential conflict situations the role of the media is crucial. It should on no account contribute directly or indirectly to the creation of conflicts or situations which breed conflicts. It has to avoid oral or written words, projections of scenes

and depictions of pictures (most especially pictures), which may inflame passions of the people, create hatred between different sections of the populace, or lead to violence. All audio-visuals, news and views disseminated by it, and the manner and methods of their dissemination, must conform to the most elementary precautions taken for civilised living (Rai,n.d.).

Similarly, in a conference organised by Non Aligned Movement (NAM) in 1996, the members are of the opinion that human rights reporting of armed conflicts should be objective, fair and impartial, irrespective of the nationality, race, religion or ideology of the violators of the law, and of their victims, and has to be above all uninfluenced by bias and prejudices. As such, it is not an easy task. Even in peaceful situations, reporting is subject to internal manipulations and external pressures. In an armed conflict, it is more so. This is because few reporters can withstand the pressures and influences of the social groups in which they operate, and fewer still can overcome their predispositions actuated by their own nationality, race, religion, culture and ideology.

However, without being immune to outside and inside forces, one cannot discharge his or her duty as a humanitarian reporter. For example, during the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 2014, an Aljazeera English correspondent broke down in tears on air while reporting from Gaza, and had to walk off camera as his voice broke mid-sentence, highlighting the devastation felt by all those who witnessed the heartbreaking violence. This further shows correspondents are normal everyday people; people who invariably must struggle to remain balanced, detached and objective, despite their personal views and often in the face of the most horrible aspects of the human condition. Faced with the tragedies of conflict, it is difficult to remain a detached observer, though this, they are expected to do. A journalist is constantly under pressure to deliver compelling and captivating reports. Therefore, it is extremely difficult to resist the temptation to sensationalize, and to maintain access. It's often

impossible to avoid compromising a news report to satisfy those holding the power of access, (Media, Reporting and Propaganda).

In a similar vein, Allan & Zelizer (2002) have aptly stated: “confronted with the often horrific realities of conflict, any belief that the journalist can remain distant, remote, or unaffected by what is happening ‘tends to go out the window’ in a hurry” (Allan & Zelizer, 2002, p.3). Thus, journalism is always in a fix, caught between staying true to the principles of reporting and responding adequately to the urgent realities of conflict. Galadima, in Pate (2002) also argues that some of the reasons why journalists become biased during conflict reportage, among others may be: religion, ethnicity, ownership interest, unprofessionalism, etc. Howard (2015) advised journalists to apply more rigorous scrutiny to the words and images they apply in their reporting. He states that they should avoid emotional and imprecise words such as massacre and genocide, terrorist, fanatic and extremist. People should be called what they call themselves. Words like devastated, tragic, terrorised, etc should be avoided. He also advised journalists to avoid attributing claims and allegations, and also avoid unsubstantiated descriptions as facts. Similarly, implicit here is Allan and Zelizer’s (2004) ideal of professional war journalism. They describe journalists’ intricate function during war:

“To be present enough to respond to what is happening, yet absent enough to stay safe; to be sufficiently authoritative so as to provide reliable information, yet open to cracks and fissures in the complicated truth-claims that unfold; to remain passionate about the undermining of human dignity that accompanies war, yet impartial and distanced enough to see the strategies that attach themselves to circumstances with always more than one side. In these and related ways, then war reporting reveals its investment in sustaining a certain discursive authority –namely that of being an “eye witness” (Allan & Zelizer, 2004, p. 4-5).

In summary, this means the very notion of an “eye witness” is invariably connected to truth telling. In this information age, the media’s role in conflict situations has come to acquire added significance. Now, wars and political conflicts will be preceded by “infoattacks”—disinformation, psychological warfare and propaganda campaigns. Adversaries will attempt to win without firing bullets and rockets. It has already happened. CNN International won the war for the US led forces in the Gulf well before the Iraqi Republican Guards were destroyed. The Iraqis and others were led to believe that the Patriot missiles had per cent kill accuracy, but it turned out to be a myth only after the war. Rai (n.d.) is of the opinion that there is lack of depth and fairness in the reporting of dominant western media, especially the British and the American. He further states that even among Indian journalists who work for foreign media, there is a marked tendency to believe that it is the negative that sells.

Most especially in the international arena, the media assumes a central role in international affairs thereby attracting worldwide attention, argues Ross (2007) because “citizens are dependent on media to provide timely, credible information of distant events” (Ross, 2007, p.54) and because the mass media is a pervasive part of daily life especially in industrialised countries and thus able to shine on conflicts anywhere in the world. Global news networks can broadcast live from almost any place in the world to any other place. Commentators and scholars invented the term “CNN effect” to describe how dominant global television coverage has become in world affairs, especially in acute international conflicts (Robinson 2002). The term implies that television coverage forces policy makers to take actions they otherwise would not have taken. The ‘information failures’ of the media in providing timely and credible information can become a ‘primary contributor’ in escalating the conflict (Lake & Rothchild, 1996:73). Such failures occur when the media constructs and reinforces simplistic or negative portrayal of those representing the other side (Ibrahim,

1972). It is not uncommon to find conclusions claiming that media have even been directly responsible for inciting violent conflicts (Thompson, 1999). The Danish cartoon controversy demonstrates the media can cause violent conflict.

The media played a negative role in the incitement and direction in the genocidal killings in Rwanda in 1994 when the Rwandan *Radio Television Libre des Mille Collines* played a crucial role in initiating the slaughter of more than half a million people in less than one hundred days. The broadcast messages explicitly calling for the murder of the Tutsi population were believed to have contributed to the massacre (Metzl, 1997), and again in policies and acts of ethnic cleansing in the former Yugoslavia (Mark, 1999). Since most armed conflict these days have governmental and not territorial reasons, the parties are often concerned with making sure that the majority of people are on “their” side, which bears a lot of potential for misrepresenting facts and trying to seize control over the distribution of information. In other words, it has led to more sophisticated manipulation of the media by the parties in conflict.

International media sources such as the BBC, CNN International, Al Arabiya, and Al Jazeera have global reach, and as such “have an agenda-setting effect”. This effect, as Steven Livingston explained, revolves around the ideological components of political disagreements, and more specifically the way the key actors in conflict seek to manipulate public perceptions of the disagreements. That is, actors in any conflict will seek to either minimize or exaggerate the conflict, depending upon their relative position of power. Weak actors will want to “socialise” the conflict, i.e, to enlist allies in their cause against a greater power and to increase the perception of suffering. Actors in positions of dominance seek to “privatise” the conflict and limit attention to or awareness of the conflict while those in power will seek to minimise the extent of the problems (Bajraktari &Parajon 2007). For this very reason the

intervention of unbiased and free global media is important not only for the world public but also for the people directly affected.

2.4 Media Coverage of Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

A study of conflict reporting in the world's major news outlets in 2000 shows that the Palestine-Israel conflict was by far the most covered—five times greater than the next most covered conflict. Hawkins (2002) the researcher who covered the study, notes: 'by contrast, the conflict in Africa, which has been, in the post-Cold War world, responsible for up to 90 percent of the world's total war dead, suffered an almost complete media blackout. Coverage of the massive war in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), which caused in excess of one million deaths in the year 2000, was almost insignificant. This shows the importance of media coverage of the Palestine-Israel conflict in the international scene. In the experience of the *Columbia Journalism Review*, no news subject generates more complaints about media objectivity than the Middle East in general and the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in particular.

Almost every mass media outlet has been accused of media bias, that is to say slanted reporting either in favour of the Palestinians or Israelis. Studies of the role of the media in the Palestine-Israeli conflict suggest that the media rarely report the conflict neutrally. Both sides maintain monitoring organisations, which monitor video and print coverage for what they perceive as media bias against their side. The most visible of such organisations are *Arab Media Watch*, *The Britain Israeli Communications and Research Centre*, and the *Committee for Accuracy in Middle East Reporting in America*.

Although the Israeli and Palestinian media have not called for the extermination of either nation involved, they have resorted to a similar "us versus them" reporting style. The Israeli media constantly show images of Palestinians throwing rocks at Israeli soldiers patrolling the borders, perpetuating the stereotype of violent Palestinians. One such example is the Israeli coverage of the Palestinian commemoration of Al Nakba in May of 2011.

Gannot (n.d.) reveals that she was in her squadron when she passed the television room, noticing a group of soldiers watching Israel's Channel Ten that was showing footage of several Palestinians throwing rocks across the fence. "What brutes!" a senior reserve officer noted, shaking his head. Similarly, "children in Gaza and the West Bank are subject to negative depictions of Israeli soldiers in their morning cartoons – one example portrays IDF soldiers shooting and killing Palestinian children, attempting to prevent them from reaching the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem" (Victor,2003, p.186).

Alterman (2009) states that discussion of the 2008-2009 Israel invasion of Gaza is not only one sided in Israel's favour but also deeply contemptuous of anyone who deviates from that side. Abunimah (2005) states that mainstream media commentaries all over the world take their cue from US government agenda, almost never challenging America's unconditional support for Israel. Goldberg (1996) observes that:

"While Jews make up little more than 5% of the American working press nationwide, they make up one fourth or more of the writers, editors, and producers in America's 'elite media', including network news divisions, the top newsweeklies, and the four leading newspapers – *New York Times*, *Los Angeles Times*, *Washington Post*, and *Wall Street Journal*.(Goldberg, 1996, p.280).

Zogby (2009) observed during the Gaza offensive of December 2008-January 2009 that despite the disproportionate suffering of the Palestinians, media coverage attempted to 'balance' the story, giving an extensive treatment, with photos of anguished and fearful Israelis and the impact the war was having on them.

2.5 Review of Empirical Studies

This section of the review is broken down into three subsections vis-a-vis the research objectives with a view to having an insight into what exist in literature.

2.5.1 Direction of media coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict

Ozohu (2013) examined how leading providers of world news—the BBC World, CNN International, AlJazeera English and Press TV are trying to change the world's perception on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict by shifting from war to peace agenda. The study focused on how Malaysians and Nigerians understand the conflict through content analysis and survey method of research. The findings revealed all the stations showed a significant support for war journalism compared to peace journalism with Al Jazeera English revealing a significantly higher amount of peace journalism than war journalism contents. This study focused on how CNN International and Al Jazeera English differed in their coverage of the July 8th – August 26th 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict by applying the content analysis method of research.

Similarly, Adamu (2011) analysed the news reports, articles, opinions, etc. of CNN International and Aljazeera English to find out if both stations differed through differences in tone, how sources from both sides were frequently quoted, etc. on their coverage of Palestinian-Israeli conflict of December 27th, 2008 to January 20th, 2009. Content analysis was the method adopted to analyse the data collected which were 30 electronic news reports in text form collected through each station's website which was available 24hrs a day, 7 days a week, to viewers online. Findings were analysed, using frequencies and percentages in table form as well as in charts. From the study, it was found that both CNN International and Aljazeera English were biased in their reports (51.21% and 48.78% respectively) with CNN International having the highest percentage in terms of being partisan in favour of the Israelis through directing most of its reports in tone favourable to the Israelis and mostly quoting its sources from the Israeli side.

Three academics from major American Universities were engaged by the Jewish Federation of Metropolitan Chicago to examine coverage of Palestinian-Israeli in the

Chicago Tribune, New York Times and *Washington Post*. The study found a tendency among all three papers to use language aligned with an Israeli perspective on events. In other words, the papers adopted a tone favourable to the Israelis. Dunsky (2008) recounts that the study authors “wondered whether the *Times* had helped mobilize discussions of a pro-Israeli slant more generally in American coverage of the Middle East” (Dunsky, 2008, p.289).

2.5.2 Media Framing of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

Caballero (2010) conducted a study on the New York Times’ Coverage of Palestinian Israeli conflict. The study investigated how the impact of media bias affected the news coverage of catastrophic events with regard to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Particularly, the study focused on Operation Cast Lead, the 3-week Israeli military assault on the Gaza Strip that resulted in the death of nearly 1,400 Palestinians and 13 Israelis. The New York Times’ manner of covering the conflict, characterized in previous research as manifesting media bias toward Israel, was examined within a context of media manipulation, misrepresentation, framing, slant, and linguistic determinism. The study provided insight into the role played by the mainstream media in distorting the facts of the Palestine/Israel conflict in order to present a picture that portrays Israel in a more favourable light. Ninety-one articles were chosen from the New York Times’ news and editorial coverage of Operation Cast Lead, from December 27, 2008 to January 18, 2009, plus an additional week that allowed for corrections and further coverage.

The study employed content analysis to determine how the *New York Times* presents its stories and how often it reports Palestinian deaths and injuries incurred during the catastrophic period versus the number of Israeli deaths and injuries covered in the texts. Upon analyzing the articles’ entireties, the study found that the New York Times covered 83% of Israeli deaths and only 17% of Palestinian deaths. The study found that the Times framed the villains as the Palestinians with description of their actions like “terrorism”, “firing rockets”,

“missiles”, and “mortar shells” into Israel from within the Gaza Strip while the victims were the Israeli civilians. The major limitation of Caballero’s study is that it only focused on New York Times coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Aguiar (2009) also stated that both CNN International and Aljazeera English were biased not only in the speech they adopted but also by the use of images and victimhood representation. She noted that in the first reports of late December, both CNN International and Al-Jazeera English started with a brief summary of the latest happenings which began with the death toll followed by images of the destruction thereby framing the victims as Palestinian civilians and the Israel Defence Forces, the villains. Al-Jazeera English started using personal accounts in the third day of reporting, with their own reporters interviewing civilians. CNN International, on the other hand, did not use any ordinary civilian report whatsoever; instead it used Aid Workers (most of them foreigners) and a Palestinian journalist who works for the New York Times to give account of the situation in Gaza. In addition to that, it interestingly did not use any strong image to portray what their interviewees were relating; instead they used repetitively images of crowded hospitals, a few victims (mainly men) and aid arrival while their interviewees spoke. Both stations “named” the conflict according to their own point of view: while CNN International refused to call it a war and created a *Crisis in the Middle East* logo, Aljazeera started using *War in Gaza*. This study focused on Operation Protective Edge of 8th July to 26th August 2014 which was like an update on the study of Adamu’s and Aguiar’s.

Again, in a similar study conducted by Ross (2003) on the *Times* Editorials revealed that the paper framed the conflict in terms of US strategic interest in the region because the United States has actively supported the state of Israel for more than half a century, Americans identify strongly with the Israelis. It depersonalised the Palestinians and framed them as aggressors/villains rather than victims. Commentary on Israel acts of violence, in

contrast, often favoured law and other frames, and the personal suffering of Israeli victims frequently provided the context for discussion of regional violence. It should be noted that scholars have repeatedly studied framing in the New York Times and on its coverage of Palestine-Israel conflict because of the newspaper's prestige and its role in shaping national and international opinion (Baker & O'Neal, 2001).

Philo & Berry (2004) monitored and analysed four separate periods of news coverage by the *BBC* and *ITN*, Britain's two main TV news channels between the start of the Palestinian intifada in September 2000 and the spring of 2002. Philo and Berry found that news items were reported with little explanation about the origins of the conflict, the United Nations resolution establishing the state of Israel on part of Palestine, and the subsequent war between Israel and her Arab neighbours. Neither did the news spell out how the establishment of the State of Israel and the subsequent war had led to hundreds of thousands of Palestinians fleeing their homes, both because of the horrors of war and forced expulsions organised by the officials of Israel military forces and Zionist terrorist groups sanctioned by the then Prime Minister, David Ben Gurion. While news coverage focused on the day-to-day details of the Palestinian armed uprising, few reporters described how Israel had seized the West Bank and Gaza years ago and illegally occupied it in defiance of numerous UN Security Council resolutions. There was next to no explanation of the meaning of that occupation: that the Palestinians lived under military rule, had no civic rights and suffered enormous economic and social deprivation (Philo & Berry 2004). There were no visual pictures of their sufferings.

The study found that the language used by reporters routinely favoured the occupying Israel military forces over the occupied Palestinians. Victimhood frames favourable to the Israelis such as "atrocities", "mass murder", "lynching" and "slaughter" were used to describe Israeli deaths, but not Palestinians. Journalists used the villain frame "terrorist" to describe

Palestinians, but “extremists” or “vigilantes” to describe an Israeli group trying to bomb a Palestinian school. The bias was quite blatant. The news coverage was six times more likely to show the Israelis as victims “retaliating” to Palestinian “terrorism”, which led viewers to blame the Palestinians. There was no indication that the military occupation had spawned the resistance to Israel, or that the Israel armed forces had provoked Palestinian violence. Some journalists told the research team that they were instructed not to give explanations: “it’s covered as if it’s a very large blood feud and, unless there is a large amount of blood, it’s not covered” said Paul Adam’s, the BBC’s defence correspondent. Another BBC journalist told the research team that he had been instructed not to do “explainers” by his own editor. As he put it “its all bang bang stuff”. A limitation of Philo and Berry’s study is that it analysed news coverage of Britain’s main TV channels, i.e. a comparison between two internal TV stations of a country, while this study aimed and compared between two different regionally based tv stations that both have a stake on the outcome of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict: the Middle East and the United States.

In 2003, If Americans Knew (IAK), a media watch group based in Los Angeles began issuing “media report cards” to various media outlets across the country regarding their coverage of the Palestine/Israel conflict. The group has covered *The New York Times*, here on referred to as the *Times*, *The Associated Press*, *Los Angeles Times*, *San Francisco Chronicle*, *New London Day*, *San Jose Mercury News*, *BBC*, *ABC World News Tonight*, *CBS Evening News*, *NBC Nightly News*, *Associated Press* and others. By using quantitative data from respected human rights organisations, such as B’Tselem, IAK has conducted statistical analysis “that would be impossible in a qualitative study” (Weir 2005). It examined the headlines, first paragraphs, and article entireties, studying the coverage of Palestinian and Israeli deaths during a specific period of the conflict. Specifically, IAK examined the extent to which the media covered Israeli deaths over Palestinian deaths, and compared their

findings to the actual data from the B'Tselem (an Israeli human rights organisation that provides data on the number of cumulative deaths and children's death caused by the conflict. It has extensively researched and documented human rights violations on both sides of the conflict in numerous publications since 1989).

In each study, IAK discovered that every media outlet studied revealed “a pervasive pattern of distortion” with regard to their coverage of the Palestine/Israel conflict (Weir 2005). In other words, the American media report from a one-sided perspective in favour of the Israelis. The founder of the IAK Alison Weir took notice of the conflict after the beginning of the second Intifada. “News reports,” she said, “seemed to be largely written from an Israeli point of view” and that “Israeli sources were quoted first and far more frequently than Palestinian ones.” In other words, news reports directed their coverage favouring the Israelis and also quoted more Israeli sources than the Palestinians. Weir was drawn by the immense disparity between the information she was reading from the foreign press and international websites, and the opposite she was receiving from American media. It was this observation that led Weir to establish IAK-to “provide this information to the public, as well as to undertake a systematic study of U.S. media coverage of Israel/Palestine” (Weir 2005). IAK research is only limited to American media outlets while this research work aimed and compared between two different regionally based international media stations on their coverage of the July- August 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

Falk&Howard (2007) reported similar findings in their study and that conducted by IAK, the researchers analyzed the *Times*' media coverage from long periods of time [IAK: Sept. 2000– Sept. 2001 and Jan. 2004 – Dec. 31 2004; Falk/Howard: 2000 – 2006]. In their analysis, Falk & Howard (2007) uncovered patterns of distortions, omissions, and a disregard for the facts, similar to the patterns revealed by IAK. Although six years of the *Times*' coverage of the Palestine/Israel conflict was the central focus of Falk/Howard study, they also

scrutinized other issues. For example, their study identified key issues in the conflict that the *Times* framed in favour of Israel. Territorial disputes, United Nations resolutions, Israeli settlements, Palestinian self-determination, Palestinian refugees, and sovereignty over Jerusalem, key concerns to both Israelis and Palestinians, were generally framed within an Israeli narrative, according to the study.

Saariaho (2015) analysed American news reports on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict to see how the Israelis and Palestinians were represented in the American media with reference to the Gaza war of 2014. The data consisted of two online articles from two American newspapers, *The Washington Post* and *The New York Times*. The analysis showed that the representation of Israelis and Palestinians was not as equal and neutral as the ideals of the press gave reason to assume. For example, *Washington Post* often depicted Israeli violence as institutionalized and Palestinian as “militancy”, sometimes even “terrorism”, which gives Israeli violence a certain justification. *The Washington Post* framed the Palestinians as villains describing them with words like, “suspected militants”, “would-be terrorists” while describing the Israeli action as “reprisals”, “harsh retaliation”. Also, Israeli officials and military were referred to for instance as “forces”, “security forces”, “troops”, “authorities” and “Israel”. While Palestinians were generally referred to by their nationality, and once as “youths” and “recent attackers”.

Zaher (2009) conducted a critical discourse analysis of the newspaper reports on the Israel-Palestine conflict in selected Arab, UK and US newspapers. According to Zaher (2009), the Western perceptions of Israelis and Palestinians differ significantly from each other. The one important factor is the cultural proximity of Israel to the West, especially to the American culture. As a result, the American public identifies with the Israelis. Also, the ‘special relationship’ between Israel and the US, promotes the positive image of Israel. Palestinians, on the other hand, are perceived rather negatively. The findings were that in

most cases the newspapers used biased language to represent both sides of the conflict and framed their actions. Another finding was that Palestinian violence was always framed as illegitimate and unjustified. Zaher's analysis showed several differences between Arab and Western newspapers' representation of violence between both sides of the conflict. *Arab News* (AN) tended to highlight Israeli violence and its international condemnation more than Western newspapers. All newspapers presented Palestinian violence in a clear and coherent way, but Israeli violence was presented less clearly and coherently in Western newspapers than in AN.

Stawicki (2009) conducted a similar study and explored how three U.S. newspapers' covered the Israeli-Palestinian conflict following two peak incidents—Israeli leader Ariel Sharon's 2000 visit to Jerusalem's Temple Mount and 2002's Passover Massacre—by identifying and analyzing the frames used. It analyzed newspapers stories from *The New York Times*, *Christian Science Monitor* and *St. Louis Post Dispatch*. The study looked at seven identified frames, determining which were used most often in coverage of the Intifada by the three U.S. newspapers during the two specific time periods. The qualitative analysis looked at what language was used, the sources included, how different events and the players were described and even what topics were chosen. Only text was analysed, not images. The study found out that the dominant frame of the 2000 time period coverage was the "Israeli government's quest for security" frame which included sources that pointed to the need for Israeli security. Another dominant frame identified was the frame depicting the Palestinians as exotic terrorists while victimizing the Israelis. Another used frame framed the Israelis as militarily strong bullies while victimizing the Palestinians. The study was limited to three U.S. newspapers and two coverage periods in 2000 and 2002 only.

Shreim (2012) researched on BBC and Al Jazeera coverage of the 2008-2009 Gaza war. The study adopted a multi-method approach combining quantitative and qualitative

research methods. It employed content analysis to chart patterns and regularities within the four broadcast media (namely *BBC Arabic*, *BBC World*, *Al-Jazeera Arabic* and *Al-Jazeera English*). In a qualitative stance, it drew upon focus groups conducted in Jordan and England which examined the public's knowledge and understandings of the events on the ground, in addition to their evaluation of both organisations' levels of objectivity and impartiality. The study found out that Al-Jazeera networks (both Arabic and English) featured more reports on Palestinian casualties than did the BBC (12% on AJE, and 11% on AJA in comparison to 7% on BBC World and 9% on BBC Arabic). These were also accompanied with graphic and gruesome images of the dead and wounded; more horrific on Al-Jazeera Arabic. Also to further frame the Palestinians as victims, Gaza's humanitarian crisis was featured more prominently on the English-language channels (9% on AJE and 11% on BBC World).

Kandil (2009) analysed the discursive representation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in American, Arab, and British media, represented by CNN, Al-Jazeera Arabic, and BBC respectively through language. The study revealed that CNN and BBC used some words that favored Israel. Examples included referring to Israeli violence as *retaliation* and to Palestinian violence as *terrorism*, using the Israeli preferred words *targeted killings* instead of *assassination*, and using the word *killed* to refer to Israeli casualties and the word *die* to refer to Palestinian casualties.

The number of Al-Jazeera news articles covering the conflict was more than twice the number of articles devoted to the same issue by the BBC and more than six times the number of articles on the CNN over the same time period. Even though the average article length on the CNN was slightly higher than that of the articles from Al-Jazeera and the BBC, the total number of words still showed that Al-Jazeera devoted significantly larger space to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict than the BBC and the CNN. Another point that is worth highlighting was the different use of the word *terrorism* in Al-Jazeera and the CNN. In CNN, *terrorism* usually

associated with words like *Palestinian*, and *suicide*, obviously indicating its regular use to describe violence committed by Palestinians. In Al-Jazeera, on the other hand, *terrorism* associated with words like *Israeli* and *state*, clearly indicating that was used to describe Israeli violence. The word *civilians*, which appeared only in CNN was mostly used to refer to Israelis; and the word *martyrs*, which appeared only on Al-Jazeera, was only used to refer to Palestinians.

Schweitzer (2011) analysed the understanding of the broadcast of the Israel and Palestine among western students particularly French and American students. The online survey sent to the participants was aimed to show whether students were able to recognize the gaps in the media coverage of the Israel and Palestine conflict. The survey selected some issues stressed by authors and experts about the news coverage of the conflict. Then the participants had to indicate whether or not they were aware of such issues. The population consisted of undergraduate and graduate students from different majors. The research included students from different background and study interests in order to know if there was a link between the student awareness of the Israel and Palestine conflict and their field of study. The cluster random sampling procedures was adopted: the size of the French sample was 200 whereas the size of the American sample was only 17.

The research noticed that both groups of students were critical towards the media coverage of the conflict in their own country. Most of them recognised the existence of a pro-Israel bias in the way journalists broadcasted the news by framing the Palestinians as aggressors and the Israelis as the victims. France and the United States seemed to share similarities in the way they displayed Palestinians. Students were also not satisfied with the quality of the coverage. Despite the similarities, French students explained that the way events about the Israel and Palestine conflict were displayed in France were more satisfactory than the way U.S. displayed them in United States. They also emphasized the pro-Israel bias

in the United States. They thought that the bias was even more prominent in the United States where the Jewish lobby was often said to play an important part in the way the U.S. media displayed the news about the Middle East. They believed that the media tended to defend Israel more than the Palestinians which was harmful for the future resolution of the conflict and a good understanding of the events in the Middle East.

Sahhar (2015) engaged in analysis of Western media. The research illuminated the reliance of Western media coverage on Israeli narrative, and the way in which the media has conditioned Western publics to view the conflict. The project took as its source material the reports and editorials of three different newspapers during two Israeli assaults on the Occupied Palestinian Territories: Operation Defensive Shield 1st April -31st May 2002 and Operation Cast Lead (2008–9). The papers were *The New York Times*, *The Guardian* and *The Australian*. The study noted that the papers focused on Negative representation of the Palestinian, and focused on Jewish victimhood. Terrorism was the most dominant represented frame used to describe the Palestinians and self-defence victimhood frame used to describe Israeli action.

Deprez&Raeymaeckers (2010) conducted a study of the Belgian media which analysed the portrayal of Israelis and Palestinians during the first and the second Intifada. Their findings revealed an important shift in the depiction of the conflict throughout that period. During the first Intifada, Palestinians were mostly depicted as unarmed civilians with limited resources who defended themselves against the Israeli occupation. However, with the beginning of the second Intifada, which interestingly enough was after the events of 9/11, the narrative changed drastically to framing Palestinians as “anti-Semitic terrorists”, and framing Israelis as “victims of terror” (Deprez and Raeymaeckers 2010:93). Furthermore, the study illustrates how media treatment of a specific issue, as is the case for the Israeli Palestinian conflict, is framed according to specific foreign policy goals.

Nikou (2016) analysed the framing of the 2014 Gaza War coverage in two U.S. and Iranian newspapers. For the Iranian news source, *Keyhan* was chosen as the state's news arm and as a representation of the ultra-conservative, hard-liner political stance, and *Shargh* was chosen for its mainstream popularity among the Reformists' faction, and its function as the existing subtle dissent against the conservative faction. For the American press sources, the researcher selected the *New York Times* and the *Wall Street Journal*, because they were known as the top two highest circulated print and online pay wall-protected news sources across the U.S. The study also employed the content analysis method and sampled a total of 52 articles from *New York Times*, 50 articles from *Wall Street Journal*, 47 articles from *Sharq*, and 48 articles from *Kayhan*.

The findings suggested that two distinctive discourses emerged from the two media samples and the overall tone/general direction was regarded on how it depicted Israel and Palestinian actors. The United States' news media mirrored the official Israeli narrative of the events and chose to highlight Palestinian violence as the cause of a perilous relationship between Israel and Palestine, with frames like "Islamic terrorist organisation", "radical", "violent", "militants", "terror army", "terror squad" used in describing Hamas and victimhood frames like "retaliation", "self-defense" used in describing Israeli action. Whereas, the major narrative frames presented within the Iranian news sample were voiced by Palestinian officials and had a strong identification with and sympathy towards Palestinians centring the source of aggression from Israel to Palestine with frames like the "colonial state", "the tyrant Zionist regime", "the Hebrew regime", "Israeli aggression", "vipers", "savages", "Israel assaults", "Israel invasion", "fascists", "pharaohs", "cursed", "the enemy", "damned", etc while at the same time using victimhood frames for the Palestinians like "martyr", "oppressed muslim people of Palestine", etc.

Taha (2014) examined how the Palestinian-Israeli conflict was represented in the news reports of the two largest Arab satellite channels, which have different political affiliations: the Aljazeera channel funded by Qatar, and the Al-Arabiya channel funded by Saudi Arabia. The study deviated from a great majority of academic studies that focused on the role of the international media; instead, it focused on regional and local media. The study employed Critical Discourse Analysis, content analysis and interview.

The study exclusively looked at the Hamas and Fatah internal conflict in 2007, particularly as it was the first large-scale internal conflict in a series of on-going struggles with Israel. The period from 17 May 2007 to 14 June 2007 was selected and analysed. The period of 28 days of clashes between Fatah and Hamas military forces was one of the most violent events in modern Palestinian internal history. The period included the most critical period of the conflict (4 June to 14 June 2007), the so-called Fall of Gaza. A total of 31 news reports broadcast during May/June 2007 were chosen and analysed: sixteen news reports from Al-Jazeera and fifteen news reports from Al-Arabiya.

The study noted that during the first days of the conflict, Al-Jazeera, owned by the government of Qatar, focused on vivid images of bloodshed accompanied by commentary thick with moral outrage. Rival, Al-Arabiya, owned by Saudi interests close to the royal family, chose to avoid the most graphic footage and took a more measured tone. In other words, Qatar framed Fatah as the villains and Hamas as the victims while Al-Arabiya framed Fatah as victims and Hamas as the aggressors. The contrasting approaches reflected both the very different perceptions of the role of Arab journalism in the two newsrooms and the political rift between their respective patrons.

Baidon (2014) investigated the media coverage of two Israeli and two Palestinian media sources through the escalation of violence in Gaza in the period 20-25 December, 2013. The research consisted of 31 press articles from four media outlets: two from local

Israeli online newspapers, *Haaretz* and *The Jerusalem Post* (JP). Two from local Palestinian online news agencies, *Maan News Agency* (*Maan*) and *Al Ray* the Hamas owned media. The study revealed that the newspapers framed the violence in accordance with their ideologies. The Palestinian papers framed the Israelis as villains calling them as the “occupiers”, “oppressors”, “aggressors”, “militants” etc. The Israel papers on the other hand framed the villains as the Palestinians describing them as violent people/terrorists while having to defend themselves from “danger”, “threat”, “self-defence”.

Arqoub (2015) focused on the coverage of the Israeli media of the 2014 Gaza war and took *Yedioth Ahronoth* the most popular Hebrew speaking online newspaper as a case study. The study employed content analysis and found out that the newspaper focused on Israeli issues, depended on Israeli officials as sources, framed Israel as a victim by showing Israeli losses and destruction and Hamas as the villain by using words like “terrorists”, “militants”. The study was limited to covering only one newspaper.

Aziz (2007) conducted a study on the *New York Times* and *Associated Press* coverage of the second Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 2006 (July 12, 2006-September 8, 2006). The study employed content analysis method. The study found that both news sources assigned more prominence to the Israeli side of the conflict and framed the Israelis as victims/defenders and the Palestinians as the “attackers”, “killers”, “extremists”, “terrorists” etc.

Zelizer et al. (2002) also analyzed the Palestinian-Israeli conflict by examining thirty days of coverage in the *New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and the *Chicago Tribune* during the first ten months of the second Intifada, or Palestinian uprising (September 2000 to June 2001). The purpose of the study was to test the *New York Times* status as, “...a newspaper of record” (Zelizer et al., 2002, p. 284) by comparing it with the coverage of the other two newspapers. The study used the content research method. The study indicated that

the *New York Times* differed considerably in coverage content. It was found that the *New York Times* portrayed Israelis as victims and the Palestinians as aggressors. The *New York Times* more than in the other two newspapers displayed this bias.

2.5.3 Media sourcing patterns on the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict

ElMasry (2006) delved deeper into the issue of sourcing patterns used by the media in their coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. He studied the *New York Times* and the *Chicago Tribune* and their framing of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict during the second Intifada. He studied legitimating based on justification, condemnation, and prominence and formulated three hypotheses: the *New York Times* and *Chicago Tribune* will legitimate Israeli killings through justification more often than Palestinian killings; the two newspapers will delegitimize Palestinian killings through condemnation more often than Israeli killings; and the two newspapers will legitimate the Israeli side more often than the Palestinian side by assigning more prominence to the Israeli perspective than the Palestinian perspective.

ElMasry's findings indicated that Israeli killers and killings were justified, while Palestinian killers and killings were consistently condemned. The articles usually used the aggression frame to describe Palestinian killings and usually described Palestinian killers with criminal terms. Palestinian killers and killings were more likely to be described as cruel. ElMasry found that Israeli sources were quoted significantly more than Palestinian sources. Overall, the study suggested that the *New York Times* and *Chicago Tribune* tended to justify Israeli killings of Palestinians, assigned prominence to the Israeli perspective as opposed to the Palestinian perspective, and condemned Palestinian killings more than Israeli killings.

Amer (2015) analysed the coverage of the Gaza war of 2008-09 in four international newspapers: *The Guardian*, *The Times London*, *The New York Times* and *The Washington Post* i.e. 2 newspapers from the UK and U.S.A. The study employed the Critical Discourse Analysis method. The findings indicate that Israel was the victim reacting to Hamas firing of

rockets. The findings also indicated that Israeli politicians and Palestinian civilians were the most frequently included and quoted actors across the four selected newspapers. In quotation patterns, the selected newspapers showed Israeli efforts towards achieving ceasefire and justification for targeting Hamas and drew on Israeli news sources, e.g. Ha'aretz and Yedioth Ahronoth in quoting Israelis. On the contrary, the newspapers showed Hamas' rejection and conditions for a ceasefire agreement, calling for fighting Israel, and suffering of Palestinian civilians from consequences of war. The newspapers referred to Al-Jazeera and Hamas' TV – in quoting Hamas leaders, e.g. Khaled Meshal and Musa abu Marzouq. In other words, the papers framed Israel as the embracers of peace and Hamas as rejecters of peace. The study was limited to the coverage of the 2008-2009 Gaza war.

Viser (2003) investigated the American and Israeli media. He chose the *New York Times* because it has been described as America's most influential newspaper and the *Ha'aretz* because it is the leading newspaper in Israel and reputedly the leading intellectual Hebrew daily. The study focused on sources, end quotes, story topics, topic locations and framing of fatalities during three time periods: 1987-1988, 2000-2001, and post-September 11, 2001. Over all, the study concluded that the New York Times coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict provided a more one-sided version than the Ha'aretz newspaper in favour of the Israelis in terms of giving more prominence to Israel sources, end quotes, etc.

El Tuhami (2003) investigated the BBC World News and CNN Headline News online coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict in terms of framing and sourcing patterns. The researcher conducted a qualitative textual analysis and quantitative content analysis of the second Palestinian uprising. Content analysis was employed to investigate the framing procedures used in the articles, while textual analysis was employed to investigate the sourcing patterns used. El Tuhami (2003), like Zelizer et al., (2002), found there was variance between the two news organizations studied. Both the BBC and CNN, "...showed a greater

preoccupation with what officials had to say. CNN awarded governmental officials more access than did BBC” (El Tuhami, 2003, p. 71). Both news organizations rarely allowed members of the general public, who were directly affected by the conflict, to voice their arguments.

2.6 Theoretical Framework

For the purpose of this study, the framing theory was applied. At times, the media “seeks to predetermine our perception of a subject with a positive or negative label” (Parenti 1997:6). The outcome is the creation of a frame of perception for the audience, one that is aligned with a belief system that is held by the media. A frame is the appearance through which an event is viewed by the media. A frame is packaged in such a way as to encourage certain interpretations and discourage others.

According to framing theory, framing occurs in 4 different ways: communicators, text, audience and culture). The most important is text because texts contain frames (which are manifested by the presence or absence of certain key words, stock phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences) that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments (Entman,1993). Text can also involve stories, articles, electronic reports, etc. Framing theory explains that frames expose the means by which the presentation of an event influences human consciousness. This type of theory holds that specific elements of an event can be chosen for presentation and emphasis.

Framing, thus, can shape or modify interpretations of a media outlet’s readership/viewership, encouraging them to “think, feel, and decide in a particular way.” Through framing, the media construct their texts so as to influence certain agendas to which their readership can subscribe (Entman: 164-5). It is through framing that journalists and editors draw attention to specific elements of the news that they are covering (Weaver: 142).

Framing seeks to “influence the interpretation of incoming information rather than making certain aspects of the issue more salient.”

This study looked specifically at *distortion bias* i.e. news that is intentionally distorted or falsified, and *content bias*—news that favours one side of a conflict over another (Entman, 2007:163). Understanding these forms of bias can “advance understanding of the media’s role in distributing power” and could provide direction for journalists and editors who seek to perform in a manner seen as “fair and balanced” (Entman, 2007: 164). Entman defines framing as “the process of culling a few elements of perceived reality and assembling a narrative that highlights connections among them to promote a particular interpretation.” A study by Tankard, Hendrickson, Silberman, Bliss, and Ghanem (1991) define media framing as “the central organizing idea for news content that supplies a context and suggests what the issue is through the use of selection, emphasis, exclusion, and elaboration”. Specifically, framing theory holds that the way the media presents information (context, links to past experience, associations with other current events, the order in which the messages and images are presented, etc) influence the development of opinions on an issue by the people receiving those messages and images (Gandy, Kopp, Hands, Frazer, and Philips, 1997).

Entman(1993) opines that framing theory is one of the best theories in mass communication field that can be applied by researchers who want to compare between different media coverage on a specific case study. Therefore, journalists can use framing theory either for positive or negative reasons especially in conflict situations. Concerning media coverage of the Palestine Israeli conflict, Parenti (1997) stresses that as long as the media packages the framing of the issue appropriately, allowing for significant exposure in headlines, first paragraphs, and accompanying photographs, the propaganda will be effective. Strategic framing focuses on the root of the problem in question and coaxes moral judgments on behalf of the audience while advocating for the favoured side or policy (Entman: 164).

2.7 Summary

From the review, it was found that the major direction of coverage taken by the various international media on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict seemed to mostly come from an Israeli perspective mainly because the western media dominates the world news flow. Also, the most used frame for victimhood in favour of the Israelis was the use of the word “self-defence” and “retaliation” to describe Israeli action while the most used frame was the use of the word “terrorists/terrorism” or “militants” to describe Palestinians most especially the Hamas. It was also found in the body of the empirical literature that both sides of the conflict were not given balanced coverage in terms of citing of sources. Over all, the studies examined revealed one issue: the international media were partisan in their reports of Palestinian-Israeli conflict with either a pro-Israeli or a pro-Palestinian stance.

CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology of the research work adopted for this study. The chapter also discussed the population of the study, instrument of data collection as well as the appropriate data gathering method used for the research.

3.2 Research Method

This research was designed to carry out a comparative analysis of the news reports of CNN International and Al Jazeera English concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 8th July to 26th August 2014. The research work derived its data mainly from primary sources; these were archival sources of CNN International and Al Jazeera English news reports concerning the 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict directly from their websites. The study employed content analysis research method. This enabled the researcher to study the manifest content of the news reports on CNN International and Aljazeera English with a view to finding out if there was bias or one sided perspective in CNN International and Al Jazeera English reports concerning the conflict respectively. Therefore, a coding sheet was specially designed which maximised valid answers to the research questions and objectives. Taking into consideration the research objectives, the study had to employ both qualitative and quantitative content analysis.

3.3 Instrument of Data Collection

The instrument of a code sheet was designed for gathering of data. Since the major focus of this research was to compare how CNN International and Aljazeera reported the 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict, there was the need for qualitative content analysis in order to examine how the stations differed in their coverage of the conflict.

3.4 Intercoder Reliability Test

This study adopted inter-coder reliability check involving two coders (the researcher inclusive). The researcher trained one research assistant who coded the sampled contents independently. Ten percent of the sample was used for testing the reliability of the instrument (at 0.758). This suggests that, the instrument was reliable. Cohen's Kappa was adopted in calculating the intercoder reliability. The results of the inter-coder reliability test are presented accordingly with the content study categories as follows:

Categories	Cohen's kappa (Strength of Agreement)
Tone Frame	0.960 (Almost perfect)
Villain and Victimhood Frames	0.984 (Almost perfect)
Source	0.998 (Almost perfect)

3.5 Content Universe

The content universe of this research work constituted the entire published transcripts of CNN International and Al Jazeera English on the 50-day conflict between Palestine (Gaza) and the State of Israel that was published online. The total news reports on CNN International.com was 41 while the total news reports on Aljazeera.com was 151. The researcher therefore, conducted a census study of all the news reports from the two media networks.

3.6 Data Description and Sources

The data used for this study were published broadcast transcripts derived from websites of CNN International and Al Jazeera English, that is CNN International.com and Aljazeera.com respectively. The websites showed the channels' latest developments and keep a complete record of what they produce in huge databases that are made available to the audience. The data were collected through the application of key word researches on CNN International and

English language Al Jazeera website that is, Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 8th July to 26th August 2014 or Gaza-Israeli war of 2014. The websites maintain searchable archives of news, feature and background information. Both websites are staffed 24 hours, seven days a week, by their employ of media professionals.

3.7 Unit of Analysis

This constituted published online news stories only of CNN international (41 news reports) and Al Jazeera English (151 news reports) concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 8th July to 26th August 2014.

3.8 Categories and Measurement

The following variables were derived from the research objectives and included in the code sheet.

1. *Tone*: Tone/direction favourable to Palestinians or Israelis occurs when background information favourable to only one side is being stated only. This basically means for example, when background information favourable to the Palestinians is stated only, the report is automatically unfavourable to the Israelis in tone and vice versa. A balanced story tone report will state both sides' viewpoint/background information whether favourable or unfavourable.
2. *Villain and Victimhood Frames*: Villain hood frame favourable to Israelis or Palestinians means descriptions of a villain action or a villain actor on its victims. The same goes for victimhood frames: words like "assassinated", "death", all refer to how victims are described; and words like "martyrs" and "civilians" refer to the victims of violence. The word "civilians", reflects a positive attitude which considers certain individuals or communities who have been affected by violence as innocent bystanders who are not legitimate targets to the acts of violence. For example the use of 'civilians' and 'bloodshed' would imply a negative attitude towards those who

committed the acts of violence being described. Balanced frames means the report described both Israelis and Palestinians as victims or villains.

Victimhood frames	Villain hood frames	Balanced frames
Martyred, lynched, brutal murder, attacked, targeted, tragedy, mass murder, defenceless, bloodshed, devastating, barbaric, pathetic, cruel, vicious, assassinate, massacre, genocide, killed, destruction, deadly, monstrous, cold blooded killing, traumatised, collateral damage, innocent people, flinch, horrendous, fearing, charred bodies	Terrorist, fanatic, extremists, picture of Israel Defences Forces with their sophisticated guns and war trucks, picture of Hamas fighters in turbans, militants, Hamas Islamist fighters, Hamas gunmen, Israel attacks	Died, Hamas fighters, casualty, civilians, Qassam Brigades fighters/soldiers, freedom fighters, Israeli military operation/campaign

3. *Source*: A report favouring the Israelis will cite Israeli sources only. A report favouring the Palestinians will cite Palestinian sources only. A balanced report will cite both sources, that is representatives from the two sides of the conflict, commentators, civilians, etc, will be given equal proportional chance to air their views.

3.9 Method of Data Presentation, Analysis and Interpretation

The data generated were analysed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Quantitatively, the summary or the analysis from the 2 media houses were presented in tabular form. Qualitatively, the data gathered were interpreted and findings discussed. The discussion of data gathered was guided by the three variables contained in the coding sheet namely tone, villain and victimhood frames and source.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

4.1 Introduction

This chapter gives detailed presentation of the data gathered, analysed and interpreted so as to establish findings. CNN International had a total of 41 reports on the conflict while Al Jazeera English had a total of 151 reports.

4.2 Data Presentation and Analysis

Table 1: Direction of the reports on the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of 08 July to 26th August 2014 by CNN International and Al Jazeera English

Network	Favourable to Israelis	Favourable to Palestinians	Balanced	Total
CNN INTERNATIONAL	23(56%)	2(4.9%)	16(39%)	41(100%)
AL JAZEERA ENGLISH	1(0.66%)	87(57.6%)	63(41.7%)	151(100%)

From the table above, it can be seen that CNN International offered background narration from both the Israeli and Palestinian sides in 16 reports (39%) on a balanced tone basis. It favoured the Israeli narrative in 23 reports (56%). The tone depicted was usually accusatory of Hamas blaming them for the escalation of the conflict. For example:

“Hamas is defiant, saying the blood of the martyrs will be fuel for the Intifada. On Monday night, it claimed responsibility for 60 missiles fired into Israel. They’re on a war footing”.

Al Jazeera English sets its tone favouring the Palestinians in 87 (57.6%) of its reports. The reports usually highlight Palestinian sufferings. For example:

“...Palestinian families huddled inside their homes fearing more airstrikes...”

The network maintained a balanced tone in 63 reports (41.7%).

Table 2: Framing of victims of the July-August 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict by Al Jazeera English and CNN International

Network	Victimhood Frame for Israelis	Victimhood Frame for Palestinians	Balanced Frame	Total
CNN INTERNATIONAL	10(24.3%)	4(9.7%)	27(65.8%)	41(100)
AL JAZEERA ENGLISH	1(0.66%)	88(58.2%)	62(41%)	151(100%)

Table 2 above depicts framing of the victims of the conflict by CNN International and Al Jazeera English. From the table, CNN International depicted frames favourable to the Israelis describing them as victims terrorised by rockets attacks from the Palestinians in 10 (24.3%) reports. For example:

...“Tal Tzukan live in Ohad, a community next door to Nirim. Her five year old has caught on to what the hissing and crashing sounds of rockets mean, the **booms** from across the border in Gaza, shaking their windows...”

But interestingly, the network adopted a balanced frame depicting both sides as victims in the bulk of its reports i.e. 65.8%. For example:

...“Images from the conflict between Israel and Hamas depict apparent civilians, **innocent people** caught in the middle...”

It also depicted the Palestinians as innocent describing them as being terrified by Israeli bombs in 4 (9.7%) of its reports. For example:

...“Thousand are forced to flee their homes, and those who stay are left **terrified** by the bombs raining down...”

Aljazeera English depicted frames favourable to Palestinians in 88(58.2%) of its reports stating that Palestinians were “tragically killed”, “massacre of Palestinians”, etc: For example:

“... Among those who fled the Shujayea **massacre** was 29 year old Ibtessam Batniji, walking with three children and clutching an infant, looking for a taxi to pick them up in a city devoid of cars...”

The network adopted a balanced frame describing both sides as victims in 62(41%) reports.

Table 3: Framing of villains of the July-August 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict by Al Jazeera English and CNN International

Network	Villain hood Frame for Israelis	Villain hood Frame for Palestinians	Balanced Frame	Total
CNN INTERNATIONAL	17(41.4%)	1(2.4%)	23(56%)	41(100%)
AL JAZEERA ENGLISH	1(0.66%)	87(57.6%)	63(41.7%)	151(100%)

Table 3 above depicts villain hood frames used by CNN International and Al Jazeera English in describing the villains of the conflict. CNN International had 41.4% in depicting the Palestinians as villains using words like “militants”, “terrorists”, Islamist fighters”, etc along with pictures of Hamas fighters in turbans holding guns. For example:

“Israeli airstrikes pounded targets in Gaza, killing scores of people Wednesday as dozens of **militant** rockets streaked into Israel...”

The network adopted a balanced frame blaming and placing both sides as villains in 23 of its reports.

Al Jazeera English depicted villain hood frames favourable to the Palestinians in 87 of its reports. It described the Israelis with frames like “Israel targets civilians”, “Israeli assault”, etc. For example:

...“Israel has resumed air strikes on Gaza after its declared seven-hour humanitarian truce ended, pledging that there would be no end to its **bloody military campaign** in the strip...”

A balanced frame depicting both sides as villains occurred in 63 of Al Jazeera English’s reports.

Table 4: CNN International and Al Jazeera English stating Palestinian and Israeli sources of information on the 2014 conflict

Network	Israel sources only	Palestinian sources only	Balanced	Total
CNN INTERNATIONAL	12(29.2%)		29(70.7%)	41(100%)
AL JAZEERA ENGLISH	4(2.6%)	55(36.4%)	92(61%)	151(100%)

Table 4 data above depicting Palestinian and Israeli citing of information shows CNN International having 29.2% in citing Israeli side only and 70.7% in citing both Palestinian and Israeli sources. For example when CNN International cited Israeli sides only:

“...Imagine what is like to fall asleep wondering if a terrorist is tunnelling under your home...”

Data for Al Jazeera English in citing both sides of the conflict shows the network with 61% and 55% from citing Palestinian sources only. For example when it cited Palestinian sources only:

...“we were forced to flee our homes and seek shelter in an UNRWA school, as protection. But sadly, bullets of hatred chased us even into the schools where we thought we would be safe, said Jamal Salman, 56, farmer...”

4.3 Discussion of Findings

On July 08, 2014, the Israeli government ordered the Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) to embark on *Operation Protective Edge* as part of its duty to protect its citizens following continuous rocket fire on Israeli communities in southern Israel by Hamas and other armed groups in the Gaza strip. Nearly 2,310 Palestinians were killed (most of them civilians) and more than 10,181 were injured. Rockets and mortar shells fired by Palestinians killed six Israeli civilians (including one child) and sixty six soldiers. CNN International and Al Jazeera English covered the conflict.

Findings show that CNN International and Al Jazeera English revealed distinctly different ways of how both stations covered the 2014 Gaza war. Both networks fell into their previous typical patterns of coverage: Al Jazeera English reported the war as an epic humanitarian disaster adopting “*a war on Gaza*” logo while CNN International’s coverage was more balanced in citation of sources than Al Jazeera English but yet still portrayed the war as just another “*Middle Eastern Crisis*”. For example it stated

...“the recently renewed violence in the **Mideast** claimed more lives Sunday as Israeli strikes killed at least sixteen people and a Hamas attack on a border crossing wounded four Israeli civilians...”

Table 1 finding shows that the readers of news reports on the CNN International website usually get significantly less information about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict than the readers of Al Jazeera English. It also corroborates the results of earlier empirical studies

reviewed (Caballero, 2010; Adamu, 2011; Aguiar, 2009; Dunsky, 2008; Ross, 2003; Philo & Berry, 2004; IAK, 2003; Falk & Howard, 2007; Zingarelli, 2010; Taha 2014; Stawicki 2009; Zahir 2009; Viser 2003; Shreim 2012; Sahhar 2015; Saariho 2015; Nikou 2016; Kandil 2009; El Tuhami 2003; El Masry 2006; Deprez & Raeymaeckers 2010; Baidon 2014; Aziz 2007; Arqoub 2015; Amer 2015) which all have been consistent in suggesting that the international media play a dominantly biased role in supporting the Israelis or Palestinians (through victim and villain presentation, sources cited, etc).

In answering research question one which asks on the direction of CNN International and AL Jazeera English's reports on the 2014 conflict, Table 1 reveals that out of the 41 reports coded for CNN International, it offered background information from both the Israeli and Palestinian sides in 16 reports (39%). It is also in line with the findings of (Adamu 2011; Aguiar 2009). CNN International's direction of reports favouring the Israelis is usually accusatory of the Palestinians, blaming Hamas for the escalation of the conflict for using human shields. Consider the following examples from CNN International reports:

Example 1:

...“The tunnels have also been used by Hamas to bring in weapons and launch attacks on Israel”

Example 2:

...“Grinding poverty has made Hamas desire to strike at Israel”

Example 3:

...“From the Hamas point of view, the desperation they were in may have driven them to risk getting involved in this escalation on the assumption that a major crisis would result in a major reappraisal of the entire economic situation of Gaza...”

Example 4:

... “The Israeli military accused Hamas militants of refusing to let people at the shelter leave, saying they were being used as human shields...”

Example 5:

... “Most Gazans would like to see an immediate return to peace. They are frustrated that since 2006 when Hamas won election and took over, Gaza has been under siege. It’s very difficult to leave here, it’s very difficult to earn a living, therefore few people are supporting this flare-up...”

Again, it stressed that Hamas is a Palestinian militant group that governs Gaza and is considered a terrorist organisation by the United States, EU and Israel:

Example 7:

...“Hamas, the Palestinian militant group that governs Gaza is considered a terrorist organisation by the United States, the European Union and Israel...”

Example 8:

... “The US considers Hamas to be a terrorist organisation...”

CNN International consistently stated this Israeli viewpoint/background information on almost every report thereby favouring the Israelis. Al Jazeera English was slanted in tone favouring the Israelis only once in the entire 151 reports where it stated:

...“Southern Israel frustrated by rocket fire. Four Israeli citizens were killed when a rocket slammed into their apartment building. Residents of the village are worried when they hear rockets fly above their heads...”

In the entire 41 reports coded for CNN International in direction of coverage favouring the Palestinians, it occurred in 2 reports. The headlines stated:

Example 1:

“...Nafoz Muhammed is living in a cramped two-room apartment with sixteen other people, including several children, who spend the day-and night-time hours holed up in fear. For more than the 1.8 million people squeezed into a territory about twice the size

of Washington, chaos has always infringed on the daily rhythms of life. But the latest conflict with neighbouring Israel has compounded the misery of many...

Example 2:

...For many Gazans the search for safety means packing whatever they can into cars, buses and trucks to flee the impending bombings. Many people despise the war but their anger is eclipsed only by Gaza's current state of affairs. For that they blame Israel. Gaza has been called the world's largest open-air prison.

Al Jazeera English direction of coverage in favour of the Palestinians highlights their sufferings while being accusatory towards the Israelis and Israeli army. Report is in a sombre mood.

For example:

“... As Muslims began celebrating Eid al-Fitr, there was fear and mourning on Monday instead of holiday cheer in large parts of Gaza. Palestinian families huddled inside their homes, fearing more airstrikes. Amid more eerie calm, the call to Eid prayer echoed in the southern town of Rafah on Monday morning. Dozens of worshippers lined the rows of a severely destroyed mosque, with a collapsed roof and missing walls. Many of the faithful looked sombre during the traditional holiday sermon”...

In a balanced tone, both media outlets were objective in background information stating both sides' viewpoints. Parenti (1997:6) has stressed that at times, the media “seek to predetermine our perception of a subject with a positive or negative label”. The outcome is the creation of a frame of perception for the audience, one that is aligned with a belief system that is held by the media. This study purposely looked at *content bias*—news that favours one side of a conflict over another (Entman, 2007:163). Framing an issue for the benefit of one side for example, (Israel) requires that the information that supports that side come at the

beginning, while information of importance to the other side (Palestine) comes later. For example, a CNN International report stated:

*...“Israel responded with shelling after Palestinian **militants** fired a rocket into the southern Israeli town of Sderot...”*

Al Jazeera English stated:

*...“Israel **attacked** the Gaza strip with heavy shelling killing five people in the same family and damaging four buildings...”*

The above reports clearly showed whose side both stations were supporting. CNN International framed the report in a way that makes Israel the victim defending itself and framed Palestinians as militants, while Al Jazeera English framed its report in a way that frames Israel as the villain attacking helpless civilians.

Research question two stated: How were the victims and villains of the 2014 Palestinian-Israeli conflict framed by Al Jazeera English and CNN International? This is similar to the findings of (Philo & Berry 2004; Caballero 2010; Kandil 2009) on how the media framed victims and villains of the conflict. Table 2 figure (23%) on victimhood framing for CNN International favourable to Israelis showed a strategy adopted to downplay Israeli acts of violence was avoiding the use of the word “terrorism” to describe these acts even if the victims were civilians. Israeli acts of violence were also sometimes downplayed by emphasizing that they were directed against —terrorists while hiding the status of civilian victims by describing them as bystanders who were not the main target. For example:

*...“on Tuesday Israeli warplanes flattened a house. It belonged to a member of the militant group Hamas’ military wing. And several men were forming a human shield on the roof. Before most strikes, the Israeli military makes warning calls, known as “knock on the roof”, to minimise civilian casualties. But, as cramped as Khan Yunis is, **collateral damage** is sometimes inevitable. Seven people died in the Tuesday attack, including two boys, ages 10 and 11...”*

It presented the war in a rational and unemotional way but also showed the reality of civilians' sufferings. The pictures of the war mainly consisted of distant shots of gunfire and smoke from explosions, ambulances rushing by, and shots of bombed-out buildings.

CNN International depicted victimhood framing in favour of Israelis by stating that the Israelis are terrorised by 'rocket attacks from the Palestinians' accompanied with pictures of scared Israelis running for their lives on their streets. Compared to Al Jazeera English, few casualty shots showed graphic human suffering.

Example 1:

...“On Monday, Israel dropped fliers telling residents that **terrorists** groups and those who smuggle weapons continue to hide among residents...”

Example 2:

“Tal Tzukan, Dagan, live in Ohad, a community next door to Nirim. They have two daughters, ages 5 and 2. Every time a door shuts hard or a loud car goes by, they flinch. Her five year old has caught on to what the hissing and crashing sounds of rockets mean, the booms from across the border in Gaza, shaking their windows. So common are the sounds that their parrot has learned to imitate them...”

Example 3:

...“Adele Raemer lives in Kibbutz Nirim, a Jewish community in Eshkol and she jumps when she hears every boom or hiss. Because when those rockets arrive, she has to be ready to duck and take cover in her indoor bomb shelter. She thinks she and her neighbours have signs of post-traumatic stress...”

On CNN International victimhood framing in favour of the Palestinians this occurred in 4 reports (9.7%), the station used words like 'bloodshed', 'killing of innocent people', 'terrified by bombs', to describe Israeli act on Palestinians, for example:

Example 1:

...“Abdul-Hadi doesn’t know what to say about the deaths of **innocent** people in a Gaza hospital that several artillery shells struck this week...”

Example 2:

...“The cease-fire agreement came hours after U.N. Secretary General Ban Ki-Moon called for the cease-fire, with the hopes it would be extended to seven days, while diplomats work to broker an end to the **bloodshed**...”

Example 3:

(3)...“Many more civilians are injured. Thousands are forced to flee their homes, and those who stay are left **terrified** by the bombs raining down...”

Al Jazeera English’s presentation gave in detail about the sufferings of families, showed bloodied and even dead children lying in hospital beds. The reports covered both the physical and psychological aspects of the war. The network reported that Israel launched attacks to destroy Hamas and its illegal tunnels, but as a rule the reportage condemned Israel for using illegal weapons, employing sophisticated military tactics, waging a war for domestic political gain, and generally destroying lives. The reports captured heart-wrenching pictures of extensive destruction, bloodied children, furious mothers and fathers. After reading the reports, one becomes emotionally sympathetic towards the Gazans thinking that the airstrikes and ground invasion unjustly came out of nowhere. The reports gave an overall sense of sympathy towards the Gazans, portraying them as heroes and victims. In addition, it gave several reports about worldwide protests against the war. Al Jazeera English depicted its victimhood framing through personalising its victims by stating their names, ages, what they were doing at the time they were killed along with devastating pictures of the Gaza strip, dead bodies, terrified civilians on the run and those at the hospital. It stated Palestinians were ‘tragically killed’, ‘bloodshed of Palestinians everywhere’, ‘charred bodies lying in the

streets’, ‘destroyed districts’, ‘deadliest Israeli airstrike’, ‘massacre of Palestinians’, children in Gaza are suffering from PTSD and in need of psychological help as a result of the Israeli military offensive’.

Table 2 showed 58.% victimhood frame on Al Jazeera English favourable to the Palestinians. For example:

Example 1:

... Aljazeera’s Imtiaz Tyab, reporting from the hospital, said that there were chaotic scenes as a number of small bodies were brought into this hospital”. “It’s believed that because it’s been relatively calm, many of these children went outside to enjoy themselves on this Eid holiday but **tragically** they’ve been killed,” Tyab said...

Example 2:

...“Israeli forces have pounded multiple sites across the Gaza Strip, including the enclave’s only power station, as diplomats intensified efforts to end the **bloodshed**...”

Example 3:

...“Overnight on Sunday, several **deadly** Israeli air strikes were reported in northern Gaza Strip, including a strike that killed three people from the Sherafy family and another that killed six people sheltering in two homes in Jalabiya...”

Example 4:

...“On Sunday, at least 72 people were killed in central Gaza during an Israeli assault that destroyed much of the Shujayea district and left **charred bodies** lying in the streets...”

Example 5:

“...At least half a million children returned to their school in the Gaza strip on Sunday, where many will be given special attention and psychological counselling before their regular classes begin. This initiative aims to help children deal with the **traumas** the war has inflicted on them...”

Example 6:

...“Al Jazeera’s Stefanie Dekker, reporting from Al-Shifa hospital in Gaza City, said medical facilities in the territory were overwhelmed. Most of the casualties we are seeing here are, overwhelmingly, civilians. It really is a **horrendous** scene, she said. People are absolutely terrified...”

Also on the killing of Hamas leaders, it stated Israel ‘assassinated Hamas leaders’ further framing them as victims too because overall, it generalised the Palestinians deaths i.e. it did not differentiate between fighters and civilians. For example:

...“The Qassam Brigades, Hamas’ military wing, said Mohamed Abo Shamaleh, Raed al-Attar and Mohamed Barhoum were killed in an attack in Rafah on Thursday, little more than a day after an attempt on the life of its leader Mohammed Deif. Hamas condemned the **assassinations**, with Sami Abu Zuhri, the group’s spokesman, calling them a “big Israeli crime” for which it would pay...”

Another issue is on the framing of the word ‘terrorist’, CNN International report stated:

“...Israel’s military said it had carried out an airstrike in the home of a senior Islamic Jihad **terrorist** who was responsible for several murderous terrorist attacks...”

While Al Jazeera English stated:

“...Israel’s military has **attacked** the home of a senior Islamic Jihad **member**, Salah Abu Hasnin killing him instantly...”

CNN International used the word ‘terrorist’ in identifying the victim while Al Jazeera English used the word ‘member’ in identifying same victim while also stating his name and framed the Israeli military as the villains who attacked. Both media outlets attempted to balance in victimhood by stating that both sides are suffering and defenceless, which therefore makes them victims.

CNN International had 65.8% in balanced frame while Al Jazeera English had 41%.

For example a balanced frame for CNN International stated:

...“Images from the conflict between Israel and Hamas depict apparent civilians, **innocent people** caught in the middle. Often, the dead are children...”

Table on villain framing for CNN International favourable to the Israelis occurred in 17 reports (41.4%). It showed its villain framing with frames like, ‘Hamas are terrorists’, ‘militants’, Islamist fighters’, ‘Hamas attacks Israel’, along with pictures of Hamas fighters in turbans with guns. Reports imply that Hamas attacks with each attack potentially lethal on the Israelis while Israel retaliates that is defending itself. For example:

Example 1:

...“Rockets being fired from Gaza into Israel are menacing and can be dangerous. Every day, there are more such **attacks**, each one potentially lethal...”

Example 2:

...“Israeli airstrikes pounded targets in Gaza, killing scores of people Wednesday as dozens of **militant** rockets streaked into Israel. The continued Hamas barrage prompted Israeli’s Prime Minister to step up the offensive against the militant group...”

Example 3:

(3)...“ While Hamas has shown itself to be a formidable guerrilla army, Israel’s military dwarfs the resources available to the **militant Islamist organisation**, which controls Gaza...”

Statements like these leaves readers to believe that Hamas is a militant group instead of a legitimately democratically elected government with political, administrative and military wings. In addition, other freedom fighters in the strip have military wings too, which a reader would never see when reading the CNN International’s reports. Instead, it generally

frames them (along with Hamas) as Islamist Fighters. For example, the al-Quds Brigades, is the military wing of Islamic Jihad, yet this is never seen on CNN International.

On the other hand the table shows Al Jazeera English with 57.6% villain framing in favour of the Palestinians depicting the Israelis as villains with pictures of Israeli Defence Forces (IDF) soldiers holding sophisticated guns alongside their war trucks with frames like 'Israel attacked', 'Israel targets civilians', 'Israeli assault', 'Israel bloody military campaign' which implies it was deliberate and cruel. Examples:

Example 1:

...“On Sunday, at least 72 people were killed in central Gaza during an Israeli **assault** that destroyed much of the Shujayea district and left charred bodies lying in the streets...”

Example 2:

...“How can the world accept the **Israelis targeting civilians** in an area which is completely shut off? There are no shelters, no early warnings systems, no sirens. The population is basically completely naked to the enormously strong Israeli military machine...”

Example 3:

...“Israel **attacked** the power station which provides electricity to half the population of Gaza”...

Example 4:

...“Israel has resumed air strikes on Gaza after its declared seven-hour humanitarian truce ended, pledging that there would be no end to its **bloody military campaign** in the strip without achieving long-term security for its people...”

Example 5:

...“**Israeli attacks** have killed 97 people in the Gaza Strip, raising the overall Palestinian death toll to 435 since the start of a major military campaign on July,8...”

A balanced frame on Al Jazeera English occurred in 63 reports (41.7%). Example:

...“Palestinian patients received permission from the Israeli authorities to reach the city since **Israel’s military operation** in the Gaza Strip began over three weeks ago...”

‘Israel military operation’ is a balanced frame because that was the original name of the operation which should have been used throughout the reports.

Research question 3 stated: which of Palestinian and Israeli sources of information on the 2014 conflict were the reports of CNN International and AL Jazeera English mostly cited from? El Masry (2006), Amer (2015), El Tuhami (2003) all reported similar findings on how the media was not balanced on its sourcing patterns. Table 4 findings for CNN International on the aspect of sources of information favourable to Israeli sources only i.e. citing Israel source only, revealed 29.2% figure, it quoted the Israeli government spokesman, Israeli prime minister, the Israeli Defence Forces spokesman and citizens of Israel who usually provided justifications for the acts of violence committed by Israel and presented the Israeli side in the position of self-defence. On a balanced basis, out of the 41 reports coded for CNN International on which it quoted both sides, this occurred in 29 (70.7%) reports. In all the reports coded for CNN International not once did it state Palestinian sources only.

AL Jazeera English depicted sources of information in favour of the Palestinians by citing only Palestinian sources. This occurred in 55 reports (36.4%), that is, it cited Hamas spokesman, Qassam Brigade spokesman, senior Hamas leaders, Palestinian civilians. And of course the sources cited would only state their own point of view. For example when AL Jazeera English cited Palestinian sources only:

Example 1:

...“We are suffering and will suffer but we need our rights, our houses, our lands and our farms to return to us and we will not accept living a miserable life,” said Abu Saber Jalees, who fled fighting to seek shelter at the school...”

Example 2:

...“We were forced to leave our homes and seek shelter in an UNRWA school, as protection. But sadly, bullets of hatred chased us even into the schools where we thought we would be safe. It is only today we have been able to receive condolences. Our hearts are burned. We lost loved ones which can't be estimated at any price. We have survived to tell the story of how our family members were slaughtered by Israeli tank shells, said Jamal Salman, 56, farmer...”

Example 3:

...“My children are traumatised from the bombing-what did they do to deserve this? Khader Khader, fifty five, father of five, a respected university professor of linguistics, said. His children, aged between seven and sixteen, have yet to return to see the damage. The trauma is so immense, that they fear coming back to their home, where we escaped by a miracle, he told Al Jazeera....”

Example 4:

...“When they decided on this operation they have to expect that their soldiers may be killed, captured, or injured, senior Hamas official and spokesman Osama Hamdan told Al Jazeera...”

Example 5:

...“Khaled Meshaal, the political leader of Hamas, on Wednesday blamed the latest round of violence on the “extreme” Israeli government of Benjamin Netanyahu. He urged Israelis to change their leadership of force their leaders to end their assaults on Gaza...”

Example 6:

...“Sami Abu Zuhri, a Hamas spokesman, accused Israel of a “grave escalation” and said it would “pay the price”...”

Meanwhile, when CNN International cited Israelis only, it appeared like this:

Example 1:

...“Imagine what it is like to fall asleep wondering if a terrorist is tunnelling under your home or to wake up and wonder if your children will be safe on their way to school. Just yesterday, heavily armed Hamas terrorists emerged from a tunnel 200 metres from a kindergarten...”

Example 2:

...“Your enemy is about to blast his way into your dining room from below the floor while you are feeding your family. Sounds like a B-rated horror movie, right? This scenario is one real example of a Hamas tunnel discovered just in time by the IDF leading into a kibbutz communal dining hall, Benay Browne Katz, a volunteer medic and grandmother who lives in Jaffa, told CNN....”

Example 3:

...“We know that Hamas terrorists are operating underground, and that’s where we will meet them,”the IDF said in a statement...”

Example 4:

...“Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu reiterated before his weekly Cabinet meeting that airstrikes will continue and that Israel targets militants. The Hamas is paying and will pay a heavy price for the crimes it is carrying out. I call on the citizens of Gaza to leave every place that the Hamas is carrying out terror activity. Every place like this is a target for us...this is true on all fronts and for all countries, he said...”

In a balanced report, both networks cited both sides.

Furthermore, regarding the presentation of Palestinian and Israeli views, the opinion/commentary pages of both stations served as a platform where mostly the views of pro-Israeli and pro-Palestinian columnists could be read even though these were not analysed in the research. For CNN International, these writers include Abraham Foxman, Michael Oren, William Safire; a passionate defender of Israel, David Brooks; a ceaseless defender of

the Israeli position, and Thomas Friedman; a moderate who almost never takes the Palestinians' side. On rare occasions, however, readers may have the opportunity to hear a Palestinian perspective and sometimes a neutral perspective on CNN International's array of columnists. For Al Jazeera English, these outspoken and passionate Palestinian commentators include Richard Falk, Marwan Bishara, Rachel Shabi, Avi Shlaim, Adam Shapiro, Brad Parker and so on. In fact, not one columnist in Aljazeera's cache of regular columnists is a consistent defender of the Israelis or a neutral commentator. This basically means even if a reader does skip the news reports in order to read the opinions and commentaries of these networks, it is guaranteed that they were not written on a balanced basis.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This chapter summarises and concludes the study along with recommendations that could go a long way in solving problems identified from the major findings of this study.

5.2 Summary

The media has always been linked with controversies when it comes to its coverage of conflict situations. Media coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict has been associated with accusations of bias and one sidedness in particular international media coverage of the conflict. The emergence of how the media of Iran, Europe, Middle East, America and Israel covered the conflict in recent times has diversified and further widened how the world viewed the conflict entirely. Media coverage of the conflict is a recurrent topic of research in the field of communication studies most especially comparative studies of Arab and Western media. Due to divergence in ideology, region and political position, inconsistencies and differences are always found with respect to their coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict, particularly those depicting sources of information and framing of victims and villains.

CNN International is located in the United States while Aljazeera English is headquartered in Doha. CNN International presents a Western perspective on international events while Aljazeera English presents an Arab view. When news viewers have the luxury of viewing both networks, they provide an individual with a broader understanding of world events thereby influencing everyone's views and stance concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict.

The study was guided by three main objectives: research objective one sought to examine the direction of coverage of how both networks covered the conflict. Research objective two identified with the framing theory with particular focus on how CNN

International and Al Jazeera English used frames to represent the victims and villains in the conflict. Research objective three focused on whether both sides (Palestinians and Israelis) were given balanced representation in terms of citing of sources by CNN International and Al Jazeera English.

Content analysis was adopted as the most appropriate method of data collection. Content universe of the study was a census study which constituted the entire news reports of both media outlets on the conflict. Data were derived from the websites of CNN International and Al Jazeera English from their archives. Instrument of data collection was a coding sheet designed from the research questions.

The study confirmed what other similar studies have confirmed too that both CNN International and Al Jazeera English had contrasting tones, villain and victimhood framing and sources of information differences in their coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict of July 08 to August 26, 2014. Considering the special relationship between the United States and the participants in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and how much this issue influences American foreign policy, it is expected that the 2014 Israeli-Palestinian conflict should have received greater media attention from CNN International; instead it only had 41 reports on the conflict.

The finding that Al Jazeera English devoted much space to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict (151 reports i.e. four times more than CNN International) is hardly surprising since the conflict is the top priority of its Arabic-English speaking audience. The data from Al Jazeera English showed that the network was mainly concerned about countering the image commonly presented in Western media about the conflict. It was still clear that the network was interested in the positive representation of the Palestinians and the negative representation of the Israelis. Concerning direction of reports data, the network was favourable to the Palestinians in 87 reports, adopted a balanced tone in 63 reports and was

favourable to the Israelis as against the Palestinians just once. CNN International was favourable to the Israelis in 23 reports, favourable to the Palestinians in 2 reports and was balanced in 16 reports.

CNN International adopted the Western view that sought to label Hamas and the Palestinians as terrorists and attackers in framing of victims and villains while Al Jazeera English was more blatantly biased in favour of the Palestinians. CNN International was favourable to the Israelis in victimhood framing in 10 reports, favourable to the Palestinians in 4 reports and adopted balancing in victimhood framing in 27 reports. Al Jazeera English was favourable to the Israelis in one report, favourable to the Palestinians in 88 reports and adopted a balanced frame in 62 reports. In framing of villains i.e. those conducting the evil acts, CNN International was favourable to the Israelis in 17 reports out of its total of 41, favourable to the Palestinians in 1 report and was balanced in 23 reports. Al Jazeera English on the other hand was favourable to the Israelis in villain hood framing in 1 report out of its total of 151, favourable to the Palestinians in 87 reports and was balanced in 63 reports.

Lastly, on citing sources of information, CNN International revealed Israel sources only in 12 reports. Not once did it cite Palestinian sources only, then it stated both Palestinian and Israeli sources in 29 reports. Al Jazeera English cited Israeli sources only in 4 reports, cited Palestinians sources only in 55 reports and cited both Palestinian and Israeli sources in 92 reports.

5.3 Conclusion

In the case of CNN International and Al-Jazeera English, data gathered showed a subtle struggle over the control of audiences' viewpoint concerning the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. Most importantly, in the case of victimhood and villain hood framing, i.e. those who conduct evil acts and those who suffer from it, CNN International generally adopted the official Israeli/American version of the story that sought to impose the label of terrorism on

Palestinian acts of violence. But it was more neutral than Al Jazeera English because out of its 41 reports, it adopted a balanced frame depicting both sides as victims in 27 reports and adopted a balanced frame depicting both sides as villains in 23 reports. Interestingly Al Jazeera English, on the other hand, seemed to generally adopt a defensive position contesting the official Israeli/American use of this label. It was more favourable to the Palestinians than balanced. Out of its 151 reports, it was favourable to the Palestinians depicting them as victims in 88 reports, while painting the Israelis as villains in 87 reports.

The two networks attempted in balancing when citing sources from both sides: CNN International cited both sides in 29 reports while AL Jazeera English cited both sides in 92 reports. This means when an Israeli official or citizen is given a chance to speak, then his/her Palestinian counterpart is given same opportunity. This gives readers a chance to hear both sides and makes a report balanced. These representations are in line with what is commonly believed about the positions of the two networks on the conflict. Like most American media, CNN International is believed to take the Israeli side partly because of pressures from influential pro-Israel lobbying, the government itself and media watchdog organizations. Al Jazeera English, on the other hand, is believed to position itself as a counter-force to the official Arab indifference towards the plight of the Palestinians and to the pro-Israeli Western media.

5.4 Recommendations

As a result of these findings the following are recommended:

- i. The Palestinian-Israeli conflict is a very sensitive issue given the nature of the parties involved and their supporters all around the globe so frames depicting victims and villains favourable to either Palestinians or Israelis should be completely discarded by CNN International and AL Jazeera English. Both networks should strive to ensure

that their reports are always balanced when depicting villains and victims of the conflict.

- ii. This study observed that from majority of the by lines of reporters of both stations (Arabs for AL Jazeera English and Jews/Americans for CNN International) and since the importance of objectivity cannot be overstated in conflict reporting, the majority of reporting and editing positions for both media outlets should be filled by individuals without connections to either side so as to avoid partisanship.
- iii. Both stations have an obligation to their audiences and both sides of the conflict equal chance to air their views to ensure fairness and balance and this gives opportunity for the audiences to hear both sides. All reports on the conflict should from now on, state both Palestinian and Israeli sources. When the representatives of both parties refuse to comment, a report should clearly state that.
- iv. Journalism schools should make efforts to engage the already working journalists in academic debates and forums on how to adopt a neutral direction and remain objective when reporting in conflict situations. It can be in form of short courses, workshops or seminars. Such steps will not only enhance their conceptual and practical understanding of objective reporting but will also provide a good platform for the working journalists to come together with other professionals, share experiences and brainstorm over the practical issues involved when reporting in conflict situations. Such interactivity can also be useful in bridging the academic/professional divide between them.

5.5 Futher Research

Subsequent studies may consider covering video analysis of how CNN International and AL Jazeera English covered the conflict. Also, further studies could be expanded to include more

framing categories to provide a more comprehensive understanding of how the media covers an issue.

References

- Abunimah, A., (2005). *Gross Misinformation: the Media in the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict*. Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.electronicintifada.net>
- Acayo, C., & Mnjama, N. (2004). The Print Media and Conflict Resolution in Northern Uganda. *African Journal on Conflict Resolution*, 4 (1), 27-43.
- Adamu, H., S. (2011). *A comparative Study of CNN and Aljazeera's Coverage of Palestinian-Israeli Conflict of 2008-2009* (unpublished bachelor degree thesis), Ahmadu Bello University, Zaria.
- Adisa, R., M., (2012). Conflict Sensitive Journalism and Newspaper Coverage of Jos Conflict. *Entrepreneurial Journal of Management Sciences*, Al-Hikmah University, Ilorin, Nigeria, 1 (1), 174-188.
- Aguiar, L. (2009). Framing a Global Crisis: an Analysis of the Coverage of the Latest Israeli-Palestinian Conflict by Aljazeera and CNN. *Estudos em Comunicacao*, 6 (12),1-17.
- Akpan, F., E., Ering, S., O., & Adeoye, A., O., (2013). The Media and Conflicts in Nigeria. *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 3(11), 2279-2287.
- Allan, S. & Zelizer, B. (2002). *Rules of Engagement: Journalism and War in Reporting War: Journalism in War Time*. Allan, S. & Zelizer, B. (eds.) London & New York: Routledge.
- Allan, S. and Zelizer B. (2004) *Rules of Engagement: Journalism and War in Allan, S. and Zelizer, B. Reporting War: Journalism in War Time*. London: Routledge
- Alterman, E. (2009). *Gaza Agonistes: The Liberal Media*. The Nation, January 15, 2009. Retrieved July, 03 2015, from <http://www.thenation.com/doc/20090202/alterman>
- Amanpour, C. (1996). Television's Role in Foreign Policy. *The Quill*, 84 (3), 16-17.
- Amer, M. (2015). *War Reporting in the International Press: A critical Discourse Analysis of the Gaza War of 2008-2009* (unpublished doctoral dissertation), University of Hamburg, Germany.
- Arqoub, O.,A.(2015). *Israeli Media Coverage for the Gaza War 2014; Case Study of Yedioth Ahronoth Newspaper* (unpublished masters thesis), Eastern Mediterranean University, Gazimagusa, North Cyprus.
- Asemah, E., S., & Edegoh, L., O. (2012). Mass Media Agenda and Conflict Resolution in Jos Plateau State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Arts and Humanities Bahir Dar*, Ethiopia, 1 (4), 112-129.
- Aslam, R. (2010). Perspectives on Conflict Resolution and Journalistic Training. In R.L. Keeble, J. Tulloch & F. Zollman (Eds.), *Peace Journalism, War and Conflict Resolution* (pp. 335-352). UK: Peter Lang.
- Aziz, M. (2007). *An Analysis of the Print Media Coverage of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict during the Second Israeli Invasion of Lebanon in 2006* (unpublished masters thesis), Clemson University, South Carolina.

- Baidon, A. (2014). *The Gaza Conflict 2013 and Ideologies of Israeli and Palestinian Media: A Critical Discourse Analysis* (unpublished masters thesis), Orebro University, Sweden.
- Baker, W., D., & O'Neal, J., R. (2001). Patriotism or Opinion Leadership? The Nature and Origins of the 'Rally Round the Flag' Effect. *Journal of conflict Resolution*, 45 (5), 661-87.
- Bajraktari, Y. and Parajon, C. (2007). *The Role of the Media in Conflict*. Retrieved on June 17, 2015 from <http://www.unitedstatesinstituteofpeace.org>
- Barkho, L. (2008). *The Discursive and Social Power of News Discourse: The case of Aljazeera in comparison and parallel with the BBC and CNN*. Retrieved on August 15, 2015, from <http://www.citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary>
- Bell, M. (1997). TV news: How Far Should We Go? *British Journalism Review*, 8 (1), 7-16.
- Bell, M. (1998). The Journalism of Attachment. In K. Matthew (Ed.), *Media Ethics*, (pp. 15-22). London: Routledge.
- Benmelech, E. & Berrebi, C. (2007). Human Capital and the Productivity of Suicide Bombers. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 21(3), 223-238.
- Bishara, M. (2002). *Palestine/Israel: Peace or Apartheid: Occupation, Terrorism and the Future*. London: Zed Books.
- Boulding, K.E (1957). Organisation and Conflict. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 1(13), 122-134.
- Boulding, K.E (1962). *Conflict and Defense: A General Theory*. New York: Harper Torchbooks.
- Burg, S. and Shoup, P. (2000). *The war in Bosnia Herzegovina: Ethnic Conflict and International Intervention*. New York: M.E. Sharpe.
- Caballero, J., X. (2010). *The Impact of Media Bias on Coverage of Catastrophic Events: Case Study from the New York Times' Coverage of the Palestine -Israel Conflict* (unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh.
- Caplan, N. (2009). *The Israel-Palestine Conflict: Contested Histories*. Malden: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Chomsky, N. (1999). *The Fateful Triangle: The United States, Israel, and the Palestinians*. Boston, MA: Southend Press.
- Conflict barometer (2005). *Crisis, Wars, Coups d'etat, Negotiations, Mediations, Peace settlements*. Retrieved August 15, 2015, from <http://www.hikk.konflikbarometer.org>
- Cohen, R. (1997). *Negotiating Across Cultures*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Davies, J. D. (1973). Aggression, Violence, Revolution, and War, in Jeanne N. Knutson (Ed.), *Handbook of Political Psychology* (pp 234-260).San Francisco.

- Davis, Uri (2003): *Apartheid Israel: Possibilities for the Struggle Within*. Pretoria: Media Review Network.
- Deprez A. & Raeymaeckers K. (2010). Bias in the News? The Representation of Palestinians and Israelis in the Coverage of the First and Second Intifada. *International Communication Gazette*, 72(1), 91-109.
- Dershowitz, A. (2005). *The Case for Peace: How the Arab Israeli Conflict can be Resolved*. Hoboken: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.
- Dowty, A. (2008). *Israel/Palestine*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dunsky, M. (2008). *Pens and Swords: How the American Mainstream Media Report the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dwan, R. and Holmqvist, C. (2005). Patterns of Major Armed Conflicts. *SIPRI year book 2005*. Vol. XIV No. 12: Stockholm. pp 97-113.
- ElMasry, M. (2006). *Death in the Middle East: An analysis of how the New York Times and Chicago Tribune Frame Violence in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict* (unpublished masters thesis), University of Qatar, Doha.
- El Tuhami, H. S. (2003). *A Content and Textual Analysis of the BBC World News and CNN Headline News Online Services: Frames and News Sources in Coverage of the Second Palestinian Intifada*.
- Enderlin, C. (2003). *Shattered Dreams: The Failure of the Peace Process in the Middle East 1995-2002* (Susan Fairchild, Trans.). New York: Other Press.
- Entman, R.M (1993). Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4), 53-54.
- Entman, R., M.(2007) Framing Bias: Media in the Distribution of Power. *Journal of Communication*, 57 (1), 163-73.
- Eti, C., I. (2009). Objective and Balance in Conflict Reporting: Imperatives for the Niger Delta Press. *Journal of Pan African Studies*, 3 (3), 91-103.
- Euwema, M. & Verbeke, A. (2009). Negative, and Positive Roles of Media in the Belgian Conflict: A Model for De-escalation. *Marquette Law Review*, 93 (1), 139.
- Falk, R., & Howard F.(2007). *Israel-Palestine on Record: How the New York Times Misreports Conflict in the Middle East*. New York: Verso.
- Finkelstein, N. G. (2003). *Image And Reality Of The Israel-Palestine Conflict (2nd Ed.)*. London and New York: Verso.
- Gandy, O.H, Kopp, K., Hands, T., Frazer K., and Philips, D., (1997). Race and Risk: Factors Affecting the Framing of Stories about Inequality, Discrimination, and Just Plain Bad Luck. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 61,158-182.
- Galadima, J. D. (2002). "Basics of Conflicting Reporting," in Pate, A. U. (Ed). Introduction to Conflict Reporting in Nigeria. Lagos: Frankard Publishers.

- Galtung, J. (1996). *Peace by Peaceful Means: Peace and Conflict, Development and Civilisation*. London, UK: Sage Publications, Ltd.
- Gannot, S. *A Force of Distortion: Effects of Media Bias on the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict*. Retrieved 17 June, 2015, from <http://www.english.umd.edu>
- Gaza. Microsoft Encarta 2009 DVD. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation, 2008.
- Gaza Strip. *World Fact Book*. Retrieved 17 June, 2015 from, <http://www.cia.gov>
- Gilboa, E., (2009). Media and Conflict Resolution: A Framework for Analysis. *Marquette Law Review*, 93 (1), 87-102.
- Goldberg, J., J. (1996). *Jewish Power: Inside the American Jewish Establishment*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Harris U.S. (2004). *The Role of the Media in Reporting Conflicts*. Paper presented at a symposium in Sydney, Australia, April 9. Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.epususa.org>.
- Hawkins, V. (2002). The Other Side of the CNN Factor: the Media and Conflict. *Journalism Studies*, 3 (2), 225-240.
- Herman, E. And Chomsky, N. (2002). *Manufacturing Consent: the Political Economy of Mass Media*. New York: Pantheon.
- Hettiarachchi, D., R. *The role of Media in Conflict Resolution: With Particular Reference to Print Media-A Case Study of Katunayake Incident*. Retrieved June 17, 2015 from, <http://www.cmb.ac.lk>
- Howard, R. (2003). *The media's Role in War and Peacebuilding*. Paper presented at the Democratic Control of Armed Forces Conference, Budapest, February 6-9. Retrieved June 18, 2015 from, <http://www.impacs.org>.
- (2015). *Conflict Sensitive Journalism in Practice*. Retrieved June 18, 2015 from, <http://www.journalismethicfortheglobalcitizen.org>
- Hofstede, G. (1997). *Cultures and Organisations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Ibrahim, S. (1972). Arab images of the United States and the Soviet Union before and after the June War of 1967. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 6 (2), 227-240.
- Johnson, S. & Milani, S. (2010). *Language Ideologies and Media Discourse: Texts, Practices, Politics*. London & New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Kandil, M. A. (2009). *The Israeli-Palestinian conflict in American, Arab and British Media: Corpus-Based Critical Discourse Analysis* (unpublished doctoral dissertation), Georgia State University, Georgia.
- Kurspahic, K. (2003). *Prime Time Crime: Balkan Media in War and Peace*. Washington, DC: USIP Press.

- Lake, D.A. and Rothchild, D. (1996). Containing Fear: the Origins and Management of Ethnic Conflict. *International Security*, 21 (2), 41-75.
- Laplante, L., J. & Phenicie, K. (2009). Mediating Post-Conflict Dialogue: the Media's Role in Transitional Justice Processes, 93 (1), 251.
- Lee, A., W. (2009). Tibet and the Media: Perspectives from Beijing, 93 (1), 209.
- Lewis, B. (2003). *The Crisis of Islam: Holy War and Unholy Terror*. New York: Modern Library.
- Lynch, J. and McGoldrick, A. (2005). *Peace Journalism*. Stroud: Hawthorn Press.
- Lynch, J. and Galtung, J. (2010). *Reporting Conflict: New Directions in Peace Journalism*. Australia: University of Queensland Press.
- Lynch, J. (2013). *A Global Standard for Reporting Conflict*. NY: Routledge.
- Mark, T. (1999). *Forging War: the Media in Serbia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Luton: University of Luton Press.
- Mark, Clyde R. (2005): *Israel: U.S. Foreign Assistance. CRS Issue Brief for Congress. Washington: Congressional Research Service*. Retrieved April, 04, 2013 from, <http://oai.dtic.mil/oai/oai?verb=getRecord&metadataPrefix=html&identifier=ADA476246>.
- Mayer, A. J. (2008): *Plowshares into Swords: From Zionism to Israel*. London: Verso.
- McCormick, K. (2004). A Method of Reading, Writing and Thinking Critically. In That's the Question: Answers from the Humanities. Allen, P., Almonte, P., Cox, H., & Christiansen, R., (eds.) Boston: Pearson Custom Publishing.
- Media, Propaganda, Reporting. Retrieved June 15, 2011, from <http://www.mediapropagandareporting.com>
- McLeod, D., M. (2009). Derelict of Duty: the American News Media, Terrorism and the War in Iraq. *Marquette Law Review*, 93 (1), 113.
- Metzl, J. (1997). Rwandan Genocide and the International law of Jamming. *American Journal of International Law*, 91 (4), 628-651.
- Molotch, H. and Lester, M. (1997). News as Purposive Behaviour: On the Strategic Use of Routine Events, Accidents and Scandals in Berkowitz D. (Ed.), *Social Meanings of News: A Text Reader*. London: SAGE.
- Morris, B. (2009): *One State, Two States: Resolving the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Nikou, A.,H.(2016). Depicting the Other: Iranian and American Media Coverage of the 2014 Gaza War (unpublished masters thesis), University of Houston, Houston.
- Obot, C. (2004). Mass Media and Conflict Management, in Nwosu, I. E. and Wilson, D. (Eds.), *Communication, Media and Conflict Management in Nigeria*. Enugu: ACCE.

- Oppen, V.K. (2009). Reporting from Bosnia: Reconceptualising the Notion of a 'Journalism of Attachment'. *Journal of Contemporary European Studies*, 17 (1), 21-33.
- Owens-Ibie, N. (2002). Socio-cultural Considerations in Conflict Reporting in Nigeria. In Introduction to Conflict Reporting in Nigeria. Pate, U. A. (Ed.), Lagos: Fredrich Ebert Stiftung.
- Ozohu, Suleiman.Y. (2013). *Media and Peace Building in Israel/Palestine: an Empirical Study*. Kaduna: Richvalues Concept.
- Painter, J. (2008). *Counter-hegemonic News: A Case Study of Al-Jazeera English and Telesûr*. University of Oxford, England: Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Pan, Zhongdang and Gerald M. Kosicki. (1993). Framing Analysis: An Approach to News Discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55-75.
- Parenti, M. (1997). Methods of Media Manipulation. *The Humanist*, 57(4), 5-7.
- Pappe, I. (2006). *A History of Modern Palestine: One Land, Two Peoples (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patrick, A., I., & Samson, O., E., (2013). Television News Perspective of Conflict Reporting: The Nigerian Television Authority as a Reference Point. *Journal of Media and Communication Studies*, 5 (2), 12-19.
- Pfetsch, F. R., (1994). *Internationale Politik*. Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer.
- Pfetsch, F. R. and Rohloff, C. (2000). *National and International Conflicts, 1945-1995: New Empirical and Theoretical Approaches*. London: Routledge.
- Philo, G., & Berry, M. (2004). *Bad News from Israel*. London: Pluto Press.
- Puddephat, A. (2003). *How to Improve Conflict Reporting. A report on the International Roundtable on New Approaches to Conflict Reporting*, Copenhagen, October 5-6. Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.internationalmediasupport.org>
- Rai, A.K. *Conflict Solutions and the Media: A Critical Look*. Retrieved June 18, 2015, from <http://www.idsa.org>
- Robinson, P. (2002). *The CNN Effect: The Myth of News, Foreign Policy and Intervention*. London: Routledge.
- Ross, D.S. (2007). (de-) constructing Conflict: A Focused Review of War and Peace Journalism. In D. Shiner, & W. Kempf (Eds.), *Peace Journalism: The State of the Art* (pp. 53-74). Germany: Regener.
- (2003). Framing of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict in Thirteen Months of New York Times Editorials Surrounding the Attack of September 11, 2011. *Conflict and Communication Online*, 2 (2). Retrieved June 18, 2015, from <http://www.cco.regener-online.de>

- Saariaho, K. (2015). *Representation of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict in American Newspapers* (unpublished bachelor of degree thesis), University of Jyväskylä, Finland.
- Sahhar, M.E (2015). *Occupied Narrative: on Western Media Collusion with Israel's 'Wars' and Recovering the Palestinian story* (unpublished doctoral thesis), University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Sandole, D. (1998) *Comprehensive Mapping of Conflict and Conflict Resolution: A Three Pillar Approach*. Retrieved August 15, 2015, from <http://www.gmu.edu/academics/pcs/sandole.htm>
- Schulze, K. E. (1999). *The Arab-Israeli Conflict*. London and New York: Longman Plc.
- Schweitzer, J.(2011). *The Media Coverage of the Israel and Palestine Conflict in the United States and in France* (unpublished masters thesis), Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma.
- Seib, P. (2008). *The Aljazeera Effect: How the New Global Media are Reshaping World Politics*. Washington, DC: Potomac Books, Inc.
- Sela, A. (2002). *Hamas*. The Continuum Political Encyclopaedia of the Middle East, (Ed). New York: Continuum International Publishing Group, pp.822-836.
- Shreim, N. (2012). *War in Gaza: a Cross Cultural Analysis of News Reporting and Reception: The case of BBC and Aljazeera* (unpublished doctoral thesis), Loughborough University
- Singer, D. J. (1996). Armed Conflict in the Former Colonial Regions: From Classification to Explanation, in Luc van de Goor, D., Kumar, R., and Sciarone, P., (Eds.), *Between development and destruction: an enquiry into the causes of conflict in post colonial state*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Stawicki, M. (2009). *Framing the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A Study of Frames Used by Three American Newspapers* (unpublished masters degree thesis), University of Missouri, Columbia.
- Taha, S. (2014). *Arab Media Representation of the Internal Palestinian Conflict: A Comparative Analysis of News Reporting* (unpublished doctoral thesis), Brunel University, London.
- Tankard, J., Hendrickson, L., Silverman, J., Bliss, K., & Ghanem, S., (1991). Media Frames: Approaches to Conceptualisation and Measurement. Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Communication Theory and Methodology Division. Boston, MA.
- Taylor, P.M. (1997). *Global Communications, International Affairs and the Media since 1945*. NY: Routledge.
- Thompson, M. (1999). *Forging War: the Media in Serbia, Croatia and Bosnia-Hercegovina*. Luton, U.K.: University of Luton press.
- Todd, G. (2001). Finding the Right Moral Attitude. *Media Studies Journal*, 15, (1).

- Trueman, H.S. Retrieved June 20, 2011, from http://www.sayings-quotes.com/harry_trueman_quotes/
- Tucker, S. C. (2008). *The Encyclopaedia of the Arab-Israeli Conflict: A Political, Social, and Military History*. California: ABC-CLIO, Inc.
- Victor, B. (2003). *Army of Roses: Inside the World of Palestinian Women Suicide Bombers*. Emmaus, Pa.: Rodale.
- Viser, M. (2003). Attempted Objectivity: An Analysis of the *New York Times* and Ha'aretz and Their Portrayals of the Palestinian-Israeli Conflict. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 8, (4), 114- 120.
- Vulliamy, E. (1999). Neutrality and the Absence of Reckoning: A Journalist's Account. *Journal of International Affairs*, 52 (2), 603.
- Weaver, D., H. (2007). Thoughts on Agenda Setting, Framing, and Priming. *Journal of Communication*, 57 (1),142-147.
- Webster, F. (2003) 'Information Warfare in an Age of Globalization' in Thussu, D. and Freedman, D. (Eds.), *War and the Media*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Weir, Alison (2005). *Americans for Middle East Understanding, Inc. Americans for Middle East Understanding*. Retrieved June 17, 2015, from <http://www.iaak.org>
- Young, P.R. (1992). *Defence and the Media in Time of Limited War*. London: Routledge.
- Zahir, A. (2009). *A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reports on the Israeli/Palestinian Conflict in Selected Arab and Western Newspapers* (unpublished) Nottingham Trent University, UK.
- Zelizer, B., Park, D., and Gudelunas, D. (2002). How bias shapes the news: Challenging the *New York Times*' status as a newspaper of record on the Middle East. *Journalism*, 3, 283-307.
- Zogby, J., (2009). How Israel's Propaganda Machine Works. Retrieved October 10, 2008, from <http://www.aaiousa.org/washington-watch/3762/how-israels-propaganda-machine-works>
- Zohar, B. (2012). Misrepresentation of the Bosnian War by Western Media. *Journal of Comparative Research in Anthropology and Sociology*,3 (2).

CODING SHEET (II)

CNN AND ALJAZEERA ENGLISH'S COVERGE OF PALESTINIAN ISRAELI-
CONFLICT OF 8TH JULY TO 26TH AUGUST 2014 CALLED OPERATION PROTECTIVE
EDGE

VICTIMHOOD FRAME

CNN	VICI	VICP	B	ALJAZEERA ENGLISH	VICI	VICP	B
Total =							

Codes

VICI= victimhood frame for Israelis

VICP= victimhood frame for Palestinians

B= Balanced frame

APPENDIX TWO (2)

END NOTE

In a recent development, Israel has announced its plans to revoke media credentials of Al Jazeera journalists (both the Arabic and English channels) and close the network's office in Jerusalem. In addition, it is also seeking to shut down the network's cable and satellite transmissions in the country. It is accusing the network of being used by groups to incite violence against Israel-an accusation the network has denied. It should be noted that the network's offices in the Palestinian territories of Gaza and the occupied West Bank city of Ramallah would not be affected.

APPENDIX THREE (3): Headlines of the 151 Reports Coded for Al Jazeera English

Below are the headlines of the reports coded for Aljazeera English including by lines, dates and time the reports were published.

1. Israel Vows 'Lengthy' Offensive in Gaza. Israeli air force launches 50 airstrikes, after at least 20 rockets were fired from Gaza. By Gregg Carlstrom. 8th July 2014.
2. Gaza Hospitals Struggle to Treat Wounded. Palestinian health officials face a shortage of medicine and supplies, as Israeli air strikes on Gaza continue. By Fares Akram. 8th July 2014.
3. Rockets from Gaza follow Israeli air strikes. Hamas' armed wing says it fired latest salvo as Israel calls up 1,500 reservists for "Operation Protective Edge". By Gregg Carlstrom. 8th July 2014.
4. Israel Steps up Deadly Gaza Offensive. At least 27 dead and 130 wounded in air strikes on strip, as Palestinian president appeals for international help. 9th July 2014.
5. 'We Need a Truce': Gaza under bombardment. Palestinians in the Gaza strip express anger and despair as the death toll from Israel's military campaign rises. By Fares Akram. 9th July 2014.
6. Israel's Next Step in Gaza. Israel's strategy in Gaza remains uncertain, as internal politics are at play for PM Netanyahu. By Gregg Carlstrom. 10th July 2014.
7. Palestinian Children Killed in Israel Strikes. At least thirteen Palestinian children have been killed in Israeli air strikes so far. By Mohammed Omer. 10th July 2014.
8. Scores killed as Israeli Jets Bombard Gaza. Hundreds of bombs shake Gaza, leaving 81 dead and hundreds injured, as Palestinian fighters fire rockets into Israel. 10th July 2014.
9. In pictures: Assault on Gaza Continues. By Wissam Nassar. 11th July 2014, 12:05 GMT.

10. Toll mounts as Israel Steps up Gaza air raids. Eight members of Palestinian family, including five children, among 98 dead so far, with no deaths on Israeli side. 11th July 2014.
11. Rafah Crossing Provides hope to Exit Gaza. Palestinians try to escape Israeli shelling, but exit is limited to the severely wounded and Egyptian passport holders. By Fares Akram. 11th July 2014.
12. Palestinian Journalists under Israeli Fire. The death of Hamed Shehab on Wednesday in an Israeli air strike has triggered fear and anger among journalists in Gaza. By Mohammed Omer. 11th July 2014.
13. Southern Israel Frustrated by Rocket Fire. Jewish residents of southern towns complain of discrimination, while pushing for stronger military intervention in Gaza. By Gregg Carlstrom. 11th July 2014.
14. Gaza Toll Soars as Israeli Raids Continue. At least 121 Palestinians killed by five days of bombardment as Israel brushes off pressure for ceasefire. 12th July 2014.
15. 'I Never Like the Night'. Palestinian families fear Israel's night-time air strikes, as the civilian death toll soars in the Gaza strip. By Mohammed Omer. 12th July 2014.
16. Gaza Death Toll Soars with no End in Sight. Bloodiest day of Israeli bombardment kills 52 Palestinians, raising the toll to 154 since Tuesday. 13th July 2014.
17. Israel Bomb Hits Disabled Centre in Gaza. Rehabilitation centre hit on fifth day of Israel's aerial offensive on Hamas, which PM Netanyahu says will not stop. 13th July 2014.
18. In pictures: Israeli strikes devastate Gaza. By Wissam Nassar. 13th July 2014, 11:14 GMT.

19. Israeli Troops Launch First Incursion in Gaza. Commandos clash with Hamas fighters in Gaza, after deadliest night of bombings that killed 18 members of same family. 13th July 2014.
20. 'No Real Mediation' for Gaza Ceasefire. Israel and Hamas seem far from reaching a truce to end ongoing violence, as the death toll rapidly mounts in Gaza. By Gregg Carlstrom, Fares Akram. 13th July 2014.
21. Palestinians fear 'no place is safe' in Gaza. Locals furious over bombing of residential homes that Israel insists are military targets. By Mohammed Omer. 14th July 2014.
22. Israel says it has Downed Drone from Gaza. Israeli army says it shot down drone near city of Ashdod after Hamas said it sent several drones on "special mission". 14th July 2014.
23. Gaza's most Vulnerable Fear Israeli Assault. Medical patients and doctors fear being targeted by Israeli air strikes, after a bomb killed four at Gaza health care centre. By Khaled Alashqar. 14th July 2014.
24. No Halt to Gaza Raids despite Ceasefire Calls. Israel continues with its air and naval bombardments of Gaza as hospitals struggle to cope with casualties. 14th July 2014.
25. Thousands of Families Flee North Gaza. Eighteen members of al-Batsh family were killed in Gaza strike, as more than 16,000 others seek refuge at UN schools. By Fares Akram. 14th July 2014.
26. Thousands Flee Gaza as Israel Raids Continue. Air strikes target Palestinian territory's north following warnings as toll from six days of attacks crosses 170 mark. 14th July 2014.
27. Ambulance Workers Brave Gaza Dangers. Paramedics, emergency responders, and ambulance drivers in Gaza city face great risks as they tend to be injured. By Mohammed Omer. 15th July, 2014.

28. Hamas Rejects Egypt Ceasefire Plan for Gaza. Armed wing of Palestinian group calls proposal an “initiative of submission” as death toll in Gaza climbs to 189. 15th July 2014.
29. In pictures: Gaza survivors take refuge. By Wissam Nassar. 16th July 2014, 16:17 GMT.
30. Israel Threatens to Step up Gaza Campaign. Netanyahu warns Israel will intensify offensive after Hamas says it was not consulted on Egyptian truce proposal. By Fares Akram, Gregg Carlstrom. 16th July 2014.
31. Tens of Thousands flee Israeli raids on Gaza. Palestinians evacuate homes as fresh air strikes on the enclave kill at least 17 people, including four children. 16th July 2014.
32. Israel Intensifies Bombardment on Gaza. Palestinians told to evacuate their homes as the Israeli offensive claims more than 200 people and injures 1500 others. By Gregg Carlstrom, Fares Akram. 16th July 2014.
33. Gaza faces Imminent Water Crisis. Israel’s assault had a devastating impact on Gaza’s already fragile water infrastructure. By Ala Qandil. 17th July 2014.
34. Israel ‘considers Egypt Plan for Gaza Truce’. Reuters news agency reports Israel examining Egyptian proposal for comprehensive ceasefire, but no word from Hamas. 17th July 2014.
35. Gaza Fighter Attempt to Tunnel into Israel. Israel says it killed eight Palestinians trying to enter Israel, as five-hour humanitarian truce begins in Gaza. 17th July 2014.
36. Gaza Residents Nervous despite Brief Truce. Short five-hour pause in fighting has ended as Palestinians brace for what comes next in the Israeli offensive on Gaza. By Fares Akram. 17th July 2014.
37. Israel and Hamas to Observe Brief Gaza Truce. Both sides to hold a five-hour pause in fighting to allow UN humanitarian aid to enter the Gaza strip. 17th July 2014.

38. Israel FM says no Gaza Ceasefire Reached. Foreign minister Avigdor Lieberman says reports on fresh Gaza ceasefire between Israel and Hamas are “far from reality”. 17th July 2014.
39. Gaza toll Rises as Israel Widens Invasion. Israeli PM instructs army to prepare for wider operation in Palestinian territory, after a night of deadly bombing. 18th July 2014.
40. In pictures: Palestinians mourn Gaza children. By Anne Paq. 18th July 2014, 00:55 GMT.
41. Israel Threatens to Step up Gaza Invasion. Palestinian death toll crosses 294 mark as tanks and troops roll into Hamas-ruled territory as art of ground assault. 18th July 2014.
42. Israel Launches Gaza Ground Invasion. Hamas says Israel to pay “high price” as tanks and troops enter Palestinian territory in major escalation of offensive. By Gregg Carlstrom. 18th July 2014.
43. Gaza under Intense Fire as Death Toll Mounts. At least 34 people killed in “relentless” shelling by tanks and artillery on second day of Israeli ground invasion. 19th July 2014.
44. In pictures: Global Gaza solidarity protests. 19th July 2014, 19:13 GMT.
45. No Respite in Gaza as Casualties Rise. At least 55 civilian Palestinians, including children, have been killed since Israel began its Gaza ground invasion. By Mohammed Omer. 19th July 2014.
46. Israel Strikes Gaza Apartment Blocks. A Gaza city apartment building has been hit by repeated Israeli strikes, leaving families in fear of the next bombing. By Mohammed Omer. 20th July 2014.

47. Toll Mounts as Israel Shells Northern Gaza. Death toll passes 360 after Israeli tanks bombard Palestinian enclave throughout the night. 20th July 2014.
48. Israel Steps up Eastern Gaza Bombardment. Thirteen Israeli soldiers die inside Gaza, as ground offensive's heaviest shelling kills more than 60 Palestinians. 20th July 2014.
49. Thousands Flee Israeli Shelling on East Gaza. People flee their homes by foot after heavy overnight bombardment killed dozens of Palestinians. 20th July 2014.
50. Israeli Shelling Kills Scores in Eastern Gaza. At least 60 Palestinians die in Shujayea district alone as Hamas' military wing claims abduction of Israeli soldier. 20th July 2014.
51. Gaza's Infrastructure on Verge of Collapse. Experts warn of 'catastrophic' consequences as power, water, and medical facilities struggle to cope under bombing. By Mohammed Omer. 20th July 2014.
52. 'The Smell of Death was everywhere'. Seventy-two people have been killed in Shujayea, east of Gaza, in the heaviest barrage of Israel's ground assault. By Fares Akram. 21st July 2014.
53. Businesses Strike in Israel over Gaza. Thousands of businesses across the country join strike in protest over the Israeli offensive on Gaza. By Gregg Carlstrom. 21st July 2014.
54. Death as Israeli Tanks Shell Gaza Hospital. Civilian toll rises as patients die in al – Aqsa Hospital in third attack on medical facility since start of offensive. 21st July 2014.
55. Israel Denies Capture of Soldier in Gaza. Diplomat dismisses claims that a soldier was captured during overnight fighting, as Palestinian death toll passes 500. 21st July 2014.

56. UN Chief Condemns 'Atrocious' Gaza Killings. Ban Ki-moon condemns killing of civilians by Israel as UN Security Council meets on Gaza. 21st July 2014.
57. Palestinian's killing caught on camera. Civilian appears to be targeted by Israeli sniper during humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza as rescuers approach him. 21st July 2014.
58. 'Tank Shells were falling like hot raindrops'. Survivors of Shujayea bombardment recount horror tales amid frantic search for lost family members. By Mohammed Omer. 21st July 2014.
59. In pictures: Destruction and Devastation in Gaza. 22nd July 2014, 04:41 GMT.
60. Israel Hits Dozens of Targets in Gaza Strip. Seven Palestinians killed overnight as jets and tanks attack at least 70 sites, raising the death toll to more than 580. 22nd July 2014.
61. Rights Groups Accuse Israel of War Crimes. Leading Palestinian activists say the Israeli bombardment of Gaza's Shujayea neighbourhood amounts to a war crime. By Fares Akram. 22nd July 2014.
62. Israel pummels Gaza amid new Truce Bid. Israeli air strikes and shelling rain down across the besieged coastal enclave as US and UN seek to broker a ceasefire. 22nd July 2014.
63. Israeli Soldier Reported Missing in Gaza. Military presumes the soldier is dead, as Israel's continued assault on Gaza raises the death toll to more than 607. 22nd July 2014.
64. In pictures: Childbirth under Israeli Attack. By Alison Baskerville. 23rd July 2014, 14:09 GMT.

65. Israel Pounds Gaza amid Renewed Truce Efforts. Israeli forces target multiple sites across Gaza, as US secretary of state arrives in Tel Aviv to pursue ceasefire. 23rd July 2014.
66. Gaza under Heavy Attack despite Truce Efforts. Israel bombards southeastern Gaza, killing at least 17, as US secretary of state says “progress made on ceasefire”. 23rd July 2014.
67. Hamas Rejects Gaza Truce unless Blockade Ends. Hamas leader Khaled Meshaal says there can be no ceasefire unless Israel ends its eight-year blockade of the Gaza strip. 24th July 2014.
68. Hiding in the Shadow of the Pastor in Gaza. Gaza’s churches provide families with shelter but they remain a possible target for Israel’s war machine. By Mohammed Omer. 24 July 2014.
69. Israel Rejects US Truce Proposal for Gaza. Israel says it wants changes to US-initiated plan but reports say it is considering a 12-hour humanitarian ceasefire. 25th July 2014.
70. West Bank Protests over Gaza turn Deadly. Israeli police kill two Palestinians during rallies in solidarity with battered Gaza strip, where death toll topped 800. 25th July 2014.
71. Gaza Death Toll Rises amid Diplomatic Push. Israel’s assault in Gaza kills 33 more Palestinians, pushing death toll over 840 as diplomacy efforts intensify. 25th July 2014.
72. Rockets from Gaza Fired at Tel Aviv Airport. Qassam Brigades, Hamas’ military wing, has fired three M75 rockets at Israel’s main international airport. 25th July 2014.

73. UN Shelter in Gaza ‘struck by Israeli shells’. Gaza health ministry says bombardment killed at least 16 people and injured 150 in UN-run school in Beit Hanoun. 25th July 2014.
74. Bodies Recovered From Gaza Rubble Amid Truce. Discovery of more than 70 bodies during “humanitarian pause” takes death toll in Palestinian territory past 900 mark. 26th July, 2014.
75. In pictures: West Bank anger. 26th July 2014, 13:13 GMT.
76. Gazans Survey Devastation as Truce Broken. Gaza health ministry says death toll from 19 days of Israeli offensive has hit 1,032 as ceasefire broken with mortars. Fares Akram. 26th July 2014.
77. ‘Only Stones Remain’: Gaza lies in ruins. Palestinians in Gaza have been shocked by the scale of Israeli destruction, as long-term truce efforts continue. By Mohammed Omer. 27th July 2014.
78. Israel Resumes Shelling of Gaza Strip. Decision to restart bombardment comes after Hamas rejects Israeli terms for 24-hour extension of humanitarian ceasefire. 27th July 2014.
79. Hamas Agrees to 24-Hour Truce in Gaza. Announcement from Palestinian group comes hours after Israel resumes shelling of Gaza, killing at least five people. 27th July 2014.
80. Gaza Women bear Psychological Scars of War. Fearing for their lives and that of their children, Palestinian women are suffering from severe mental health issues. By Ala Qandil. 28th July 2014.
81. UN Security Council Calls for Gaza Ceasefire. Plea for immediate humanitarian truce to allow aid deliveries comes as Palestinian side’s death toll crosses 1,035 mark. 28th July 2014.

82. Dozens Dead in Israel's Gaza Bombardment. Residents endure night of intense air raids and shelling as Israeli Forces Strike targets across Palestinian territory. 29th July 2014.
83. Truce Hopes Fade as Gaza Pummeled Again. Violence soars as seven Palestinian children perish in a playground four Israeli soldiers killed in a mortar attack. 29th July 2014.
84. Gaza mourns the Dead During a Joyless Eid. Palestinians in Gaza are spending a somber Eid holiday, as the death toll from Israel's bombardment mounts. By Mohammed Omer. 29th July 2014.
85. Palestinian Truce Offer Hangs in Balance. PLO says all Palestinian factions want 24-hour ceasefire in Gaza, which Hamas says depends on the agreement of Israel. By Dalia Hatuqa. 29th July 2014.
86. Children Killed in Gaza Playground Shelling. Israel denies striking Gaza's main hospital and a playground, where seven children have been killed. 29th July 2014.
87. Gaza Families Bake Eid 'Cake of resistance'. Displaced Palestinians are baking traditional holiday cakes under Israeli bombardment, to bring joy to their children. By Mohammed Omer. 30th July 2014.
88. Mass Casualties as Gaza Market Area Bombed. At least 17 killed and 200 injured in Shujayea, an area Israel said was not included in four-hour humanitarian window. 30th July 2014.
89. Hamas Demand End to Siege before Truce. Qassam Brigades chief says Israel must lift blockade of Gaza, hours after PLO attempt to agree 24-hour ceasefire stalls. 30th July 2014.
90. In pictures: Gaza civilians pay price of war. By Oren Ziv. 31st July 2014, 08:17 GMT.

91. US: 'little doubt' Israel bombed Gaza school. White House says shelling of civilians "totally unacceptable and indefensible", as diplomats prepare new truce push. 31st July 2014.
92. US Supplies Israel with Bombs amid Gaza blitz. Pentagon says Israel allowed to tap local US arms stockpile in past week to resupply it with grenades and mortar rounds. 31st July 2014.
93. Israeli Fire Kills Nineteen in Gaza UN School. Attack on school used as shelter condemned by UN agency as "source of universal shame" that breaks international law. 31st July 2014.
94. Israeli Military Announces End to Gaza Truce. Israel and Hamas accuse each other of breaking ceasefire that only lasted for a few hours. 1st August 2014.
95. 'Smell of Death thick' in Gaza air. Al Jazeera reporters touring devastated districts during brief truce speak of decomposing bodies still under rubble. 1st August 2014.
96. Short-lived Truce gives Gazans respite. Gazans and displaced families took to the streets to inspect their homes during a brief ceasefire. By Fares Akram. 1st August 2014.
97. Israeli Buffer Zone Tightens Gaza Chokehold. A buffer zone surrounding Gaza has been continuously bombed, with a high rate of civilian casualties. By Mohammed Omer. 1st August 2014.
98. Gaza Strikes Rage on as Diplomacy Falts. Gaza University and major mosque targeted as Israel announces it will not attend truce talks set in Cairo. 2nd August 2014.
99. In pictures: Gaza Devastation. 2nd August 2014, 14:45 GMT.

100. Palestinians struggle to ‘dig out bodies’. Dozens of dead bodies remain under the rubble in Rafah, as Israel’s assault on southern Gaza kills scores of civilians. By Mohammed Omer. 2nd August 2014.
101. Israel Strikes University in Gaza City. Islamic university and one the city’s largest mosques among the latest targets hit by bombardment. 2nd August 2014.
102. Gaza Truce Diplomacy: The Ever-Changing Mess. Palestinian negotiators agree on how to end the Gaza war, while Israel shuns new Cairo truce talks. By Dalia Hatuqa, Gregg Carlstrom. 3rd August 2014.
103. North Gaza Families Reluctant to return Home. Families in Gaza are scared to go home, after Israel said it was withdrawing ground troops from areas in the north. By Fares Akram. 3rd August 2014.
104. Israeli PM Vows to Continue Gaza Operation. Netanyahu says Israel to keep up Gaza campaign for as long as needed, in speech Hamas calls a “declaration of failure”. 3rd August 2014.
105. UN Voices Outrage over Gaza School Strike. Israel confirms firing on a target near UNRWA school, which left at least 10 people dead. 4th August 2014.
106. Gaza Shelled during Israel’s Limited Truce. Seven-hour pause announced by Israel after attack near school is broken almost immediately, Gaza health official says. 4th August 2014.
107. Gaza: No Place to Bury the Dead. Under continuous Israeli shelling, Palestinians in south Gaza face a shortage of space and supplies to bury loved ones. By Mohammed Omer. 4th August 2014.
108. Israel Resumes Gaza Assault as Truce Ends. Israel resumes air raids in Gaza after a seven-hour self-declared truce, vowing to proceed with its military campaign. 4th August 2014.

109. In pictures: US march against Israel's war. By Wes Bruer. 4th August 2014, 06:18 GMT.
110. Palestinians decry Gaza Journalist Killings. At least 11 media workers have been killed in Israel's Gaza offensive, prompting calls for international enquiries. By Mohammed Omer, Dalia Hatuqa. 5th August 2014.
111. Israel and Palestinians Agree 72-Hour Truce. Ceasefire to be followed by talks aimed at securing permanent deal as global fury over civilian deaths in Gaza builds. 5th August 2014.
112. Gaza Ceasefire sets Stage for Cairo Talks. Humanitarian truce brokered by Egypt holds in Palestinian enclave as both sides agree to take part in indirect talks. 6th August 2014.
113. Hamas Says No Gaza Truce Extension Agreed. Israel reportedly offers unconditional ceasefire renewal but Hamas says no deal can be reached unless demands met. 7th August 2014.
114. In pictures: offensive on Gaza in numbers. 7th August 2014, 13:45 GMT.
115. Voices from Gaza: Survivors speak out. The ceasefire holds for now, but many in Gaza fear it will be broken unless the Palestinian factions' demands are met. By Mohammed Omer. 7th August 2014.
116. Obama Questions Blockade as Gaza talks goes on. US President puts pressure on Cairo talks to extend truce, saying Gaza could not remain cut off from the world forever. 7th August 2014.
117. Israel 'willing to extend Gaza ceasefire'. Official quoted as saying Israel is ready to extend truce "under current terms" but Hamas says no new deal is in place. 7th August 2014.

118. Israel and Hamas Claim Victory as Truce Ends. Fighting resumes in Gaza after a brief ceasefire collapses, as both Israel and Hamas claim victory in the war. By Dalia Hatuqa, Gregg Carlstrom. 8th August 2014.
119. Last-Ditch Talks Underway to Save Gaza Truce. Mediators race against time to extend truce between Israel and Hamas expiring at 05:00 GMT on Friday. 8th August 2014.
120. Gaza Fighting Resumes After Ceasefire Ends. Five Palestinians including ten-year-old boy killed after three-day truce between Israel and Palestinian factions ended. 9th August 2014.
121. World ‘day of Rage’ over Israel’s war on Gaza. From London to Paris, and Tehran to Cape Town, demonstrators take to the streets to demand an end to Israeli offensive. 9th August 2014.
122. Gaza Truce Efforts Continue Amid Air Strikes. Mediators hope to reach agreement in Cairo after three-day ceasefire expired between Israel and Hamas. 9th August 2014.
123. Gaza Fishermen Demand End to Blockade. Gaza’s fishermen are particularly hard-hit by Israel’s offensive, with many decrying the bombing as ‘economic war’. By Mohammed Omer. 9th August 2014.
124. Cairo Talks in Disarray Amid Gaza Violence. Palestinian representatives threaten to pull out of Egypt-mediated negotiations as Israel continues to pound Gaza strip. 10th August 2014.
125. Hamas Vows No Truce until Demands are Met. Group’s negotiators in Egypt say Israel must lift blockade of Gaza strip and reopen seaport and airport amid more deaths. 10th August 2014.

126. Fresh Ceasefire Agreement Holds in Gaza. Israel is expected to send negotiators to meet with Palestinian factions on Monday after new 72-hour truce agreed. 11th August 2014.
127. Israel's Attack in Gaza Town 'a war crime'. Witnesses say Israeli soldiers used Palestinians as human shields and fired on civilians in Khuza'a in Southern Gaza. 11th August 2014.
128. Deadline looms as Gaza Truce Efforts Continue. Palestinians demand end to blockade at talks in Cairo, as deadline at midnight on Thursday approaches. 13th August 2014.
129. Gaza Ceasefire Extended by Five Days. Welcome reprieve continues for Gaza as sides agree more time needed to hammer out a permanent end to conflict. 14th August 2014.
130. New Life is born amid Gaza Destruction. Palestinian officials say that at least 4,500 babies have been born since Israel's military operation began in Gaza. By Mohammed Omer. 14th August 2014.
131. Gaza Truce Holding despite Shaky Start. Talks continue in Egypt amid reports truce was breached with Hamas firing rockets, prompting Israel to strike back. 14th August 2014.
132. Gaza Zoo Ravaged by Israeli Shelling. Monkeys, Ostriches, and Eagles are among the many animals killed in Israeli bombings at a zoo in northern Gaza. By Fares Akram. 15th August 2014.
133. Gazans Return to Ruined Homes as Truce Holds. Five-day ceasefire between Israel and Hamas encourages many Palestinians to head back home to inspect damage. 15th August 2014.

134. Hamas: Peace Deal Must Meet People's Demands. Palestinian group's delegate at Cairo talks lists demands Israel has to meet before fighting in Gaza is halted. 15th August 2014.
135. In pictures: West Bank shops boycott Israel. By Dalia Hatuqa. 16th August 2014, 09:27 GMT.
136. Israel: No Gaza deal Until Security Needs Met. Netanyahu says there will be no long-term truce agreed at Cairo talks without 'clear answer' to Israel's security needs. 17th August 2014.
137. Palestinians find shelter at Gaza hospital. With emergency shelters overcrowded, displaced Palestinian families have sought refuge at Gaza city's Shifa hospital. By Mohammed Omer. 17th August 2014.
138. Gaza Truce Extended by 24 Hours. Israeli and Palestinian leaders agree to extend ceasefire despite differences in indirect talks for permanent truce. 19th August 2014.
139. Family of Hamas Military Chief Buried in Gaza. Thousands gather to mourn death of wife and baby son of Mohammed Deif, as sides trade blame over collapse of ceasefire. 20th August 2014.
140. Gaza Children Unable to go back to School. The new Year will be delayed indefinitely in Gaza, as more than 38,000 Palestinians remain displaced. By Fares Akram. 20th August 2014.
141. Israel presses ahead with Air Strikes on Gaza. Two Palestinians killed hours after funerals were held for three senior Hamas commanders struck by Israeli air strikes. 22nd August 2014.

142. Gaza comes Under Fresh Israeli Airstrikes. At least seven, including five from one family, killed as Hamas says it will support Palestinian effort to join ICC. 23rd August 2014.
143. Israeli Air Strikes Level Gaza Buildings. Seven-storey office building and 11-floor residential tower collapse injuring dozens, as death toll crosses 2100. 24th August 2014.
144. Gaza High-rises Hit by Israeli Strikes. At least 20 Palestinians wounded as Israeli rockets destroy much of one of Gaza's tallest buildings. 26th August 2014.
145. Palestinian joy as Israel agrees Gaza Truce. Hamas and Israel agree long-term deal which will ease Israeli blockade of enclave after talks brokered by Egypt. 27th August 2014.
146. Israel says Hamas 'Hit Hard' in Gaza Fighting. PM Netanyahu speaks about truce amid criticism at home that offensive has done little to rein in Palestinian group. 28th August 2014.
147. Gaza Children back to School After 50-day War. More than 250 schools are damaged, while some 64,000 refugees are still being housed in 20 Gaza schools. 14th September 2014.
148. The Orphans of Gaza. The number of children living at the al-Amal Institute for orphans has nearly doubled since the 2014 war. By Megan O'Toole. 8th January 2015.
149. The Deep Scars of Gaza's war. One year after Israel's assault, thousands still live in temporary shelters while children suffer from trauma. 8th July 2015.
150. 'Strong Evidence' of Israeli War Crimes in Gaza. In a brutal assault in Rafah during 2014 Gaza war, Israeli forces purposely targeted scores of civilians, report finds. By Megan O'Toole. 29th July 2015.

151. 'Palestinian Children Live in Trauma Without End'. Chronic warfare in the Gaza strip is leaving a generation of children with post-traumatic stress disorder. By Creede Newton. 6th December 2015.

APPENDIX FOUR (4): Headlines of the 41 Reports Coded for CNN International

Below are the headlines of the reports coded for CNN International including by lines, dates and time the reports were published.

1. Gazans Exhausted by Crisis, Wars, Clashes, Upheavals. By Ben Wedeman. 9th July 2014, 12:33 GMT.
2. Ground Operations in Gaza ‘might become Necessary’, Israel official says. By Diana Magnay, Ed Payne and Josh Levs. 9th July 2014, 02:14 GMT.
3. Israel’s President: Gaza Ground Offensive ‘may happen quite soon’. By Diana Magnay, Michael Pearson and Ed Payne. 10th July 2014, 05:15 GMT.
4. Medical Crisis in Gaza as Conflict Endures. By Mariano Castillo and Kareem Khadder. 12th July 2014, 00:12 GMT.
5. Israel Raids Gaza Missile site as Rockets, Rhetoric Fly in Israeli-Hamas Face-off. By Mariano Castillo and Ralph Ellis. 13th July 2014, 02:33 GMT.
6. Running from Death in Israel, waiting for it to come in Gaza. By Ben Brumfield and Samira Said. 13th July 2014, 21:51 GMT.
7. Amid Fighting, Israeli Cabinet to consider possible cease-fire. By Ben Wedeman and Jethro Mullen. 15th July 2014, 03:27 GMT.
8. Israeli Military’s ‘Knock on Roof’ warnings criticized by Rights Groups. By Tim Lister and Salma Abdelaziz. 15th July 2014, 23:04 GMT.
9. Racing toward Danger: War-Scarred Gaza Medical Crews also in Harm’s way. By Ian Lee and Karl Penhaul. 16th July 2014, 12:03 GMT.
10. ‘They went to the Beach to Play’: Deaths of 4 children add to growing toll in Gaza Conflict. By Jethro Mullen and Ben Wedeman. 17th July 2014, 7:51AM EDT.
11. Life in Gaza: Search for Safety, or wait for Destiny. By Ian Lee and Karl Penhaul. 17th July 2014, 11:51 GMT.

12. As Death Toll Rises, Fighting between Israel and Hamas lights up Gaza Skies. By Michael Martinez and Ben Wedeman. 18th July 2014, 7:50 PM EDT.
13. Israel Launches Ground Operation in Gaza; Hamas says Israel to 'pay a heavy price'. By Ralph Ellis, Ben Wedeman, and Michael Pearson. 18th July 2014, 3:07 GMT.
14. Israel to Expand Ground Incursion after Hamas Militant Infiltration. By Ben Brumfield, Ben Wedeman and Michael Martinez. 20th July 2014, 1:36 AM EDT.
15. Hamas claimed it captured an Israeli Soldier; Israel says no. by Josh Levs, Ben Brumfield, and Karl Penhaul. 21st July 2014, 1:13 PM EDT.
16. Netanyahu: Israel seeks 'sustainable quiet' with Gaza. 21st July 2014, 17:04 GMT.
17. Deaths Mount in Gaza and Israel as U.S. Pushes Cease-fire. By Josh Levs, Ian Lee and Karl Pehnaul. 22nd July 2014, 11:03 AM EDT.
18. Travelers Reassess Plans amid Mideast Conflict. By Caitlin Schmidt. 22nd July 2014, 14:41 GMT.
19. Violent Passions of Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Echo across the World. By Jessica Ravitz and Catherine E., Shoichet. 22nd July 2014, 00:18 GMT.
20. Israel finds Hamas are no longer Amateur Fighters. By Ben Wedeman. 23rd July 2014, 10:27 AM EDT.
21. Talk of Peace doesn't Slow Flow of Blood, Rockets in Gaza and Israel. By Michael Pearson, Chelsea J., Carter and Ian Lee. 23rd July 2014, 3:47 AM EDT.
22. What is Hamas' Endgame in Gaza? By Mariano Castillo. 23rd July 2014, 12:36 GMT.
23. For some Americans, Gaza conflict Strikes Close to Home. By Ashley Fantz. 25th July 2014, 20:14 GMT.
24. Israel, Hamas Agree to 12-Hour Cease-fire as Casualties Mount. By Chelsea, J. Carter, Salma Abdelaziz and Karl Penhaul. 26th July 2014, 1:22 GMT.

25. Israeli Troops' face Threat from the Ground Beneath their Feet. By Jethro Mullen and Martin Savidge. 28th July 2014, 17:56 GMT.
26. Why Qatar's Intervention won't help end the Gaza Crisis. By Sultan Sooud Al-Qassemi. 30th July 2014, 09:47 GMT.
27. Israel-Gaza Conflict: How to Help. By Katie Walmsley. 31st July 2014, 11:08 AM EDT.
28. This time, Gaza Fighting is 'proxy war' for entire Mideast. By Josh Levs. 1st August 2014, 17:48 GMT.
29. War in Gaza: A Chance for Iran, Hamas to turn a page? By Ale Vatanka and Mohammed Najib. 1st August 2014, 14:56 GMT.
30. Gaza Conflict: can economic isolation ever be reversed? 4th August 2014, 2:16 GMT.
31. Life in Gaza: Misery Heightened by War. By John Vause and Ray Sanchez. 4th August 2014, 10:43 GMT.
32. Gazans return to Shattered Homes as Negotiators Prepare to discuss Cease-fire. By Karl Penhaul, Salma Abdelaziz, Steve Almasly and Matthew Chance. 6th August 2014, 01:00 GMT.
33. 3,300 Rockets, 1,900 Lives- but is Mideast peace as far away as ever? By Tim Lister. 6th August 2014, 16:26 GMT.
34. Why are so many Civilians Dying in Hamas-Israel war? By Ashley Fantz. 6th August 2014, 13:16 GMT.
35. War Zone Wedding: Gaza couple marry at U.N. Shelter. By Bryony Jones. 14th August 2014, 17:35 GMT.
36. Gaza's Zoo Animals Caught in Crossfire of Israel-Hamas Conflict. By Frederik Pleitgen. 23rd August 2014, 00:28 GMT.

37. Israeli Airstrikes Kill 16 in Gaza, Palestinian officials say. By Steve Almasy. 25th August 2014, 11:20 GMT.
38. Report about Israeli soldiers in 2014 war: ‘if you shoot someone in Gaza, it’s cool’. By Kareem Khadder and Khushbu Shah. 5th May 2015, 20:13 GMT.
39. The Gaza that you didn’t know. By Nic Robertson. 2nd June 2015, 11:23 GMT.
40. U.N.: Israel, Palestinians both may have committed War Crimes in 2014 Conflict. By Don Melvin. 22nd June 2015, 20:25 GMT.
41. Praise, Condemnation, for U.N. Gaza report from two sides in Conflict. By Oren Lieberman. 23rd June 2015, 20:39 GMT.