

Israeli Media Coverage for the Gaza War 2014; Case Study of “Yedioth Ahronoth” Newspaper

Omar Abu Arqoub

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Communication and Media Studies

Eastern Mediterranean University
August 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçiođlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Communication and Media Studies.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ümit İnatçı
Chair, Department of Communication and Media Studies

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Arts in Communication and Media Studies.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Efe Özac
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Özac

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Yetin Arslan

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Metin Ersoy

ABSTRACT

On 7th July 2014, the third Gaza war in Palestine between the Israel and the Palestinian resistance erupted. It lasted for 51 days and left thousands of dead and wounded victims, most of whom are Palestinians. It was an important event in which both the local and international media were interested. The present study focuses on the coverage of the Israeli media for the 2014 Gaza war, taking Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper Hebrew-speaking as a case study. It was selected because it is the most widely spread newspaper in Israel; it is a private one, and due to its independent ownership. It is an important study due to the lack of research in this filed, especially in English language. It is also important to understand how the Israeli media works, especially during the war times.

The study is based on testing three media theories; Agenda Setting, Gatekeeping, and Framing Analysis Theory. Furthermore, the quantitative methodology and content analysis method has been carried out in the study. The researcher developed checklist and analyzed the sample of study that includes 116 news taken from Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper; in other words, the news that were published during 5 days of the war.

The main findings of the present study can be summarized as follows: in the use of interesting frame by Yedioth Ahronoth to present information and make it more convincing, the focused on Israeli issues and the dependence on Israeli official news sources and narrative, provided justifications for Israel and portrayed it as a victim of

the war. So the newspaper was supporting the war against Gaza and was not neutral in its coverage. It was biased to the Israeli side.

Keywords: Gaza war 2014, Yedioth Ahronoth, Agenda Setting Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, Framing Analysis Theory.

ÖZ

7 Temmuz 2014'te, İsrail ve Filistin direnişi arasında 3. Gazze Savaşı patlak vermiştir. 51 gün süren savaşta çoğu Filistinli olan binlerce ölü ve yaralı kurban olmuştur. Bu önemli bir olaydı ve hem yerel hem de uluslararası medya konuyla ilgilienmişti. Bu çalışma, Yedioth Ahronoth çevirimiçi İbranice gazetenin durum çalışması olarak alındığı, 2014 Gazze savaşının İsrail medyasında nasıl yansıtıldığına odaklanmaktadır. İsrail'deki en yaygın gazete olduğu için seçilen bu gazete bağımsız mülkiyete sahip olduğundan özel bir gazetedir. Bu çalışma bu alanda araştırma olmadığı, özellikle de İngiliz dilinde, İsrail medyasının özellikle de savaş zamanlarında nasıl çalıştığını anlamak için önemlidir.

Bu çalışma Gündem Belirleme, Eşik Bekçiliği, Çerçeve Analizi olarak Medya Kuramlarını test etmeye dayanmaktadır. Dahası, çalışmada nicel yöntem ve içerik analizi metodu kullanılmıştır. Araştırmacı bir liste hazırlayıp Yedioth Ahronoth çevirimiçi gazetesinden alınan 116; başka bir deyişle, savaşın 5 gününde yayımlanan haberleri incelemiştir.

Bu çalışmanın ana bulguları şöyle özetlenebilir: Yedioth Ahronoth'un bilgiyi aktarmada daha inandırıcı yapmada, İsrail konularına yoğunlaşmada ve İsrail konularına ve resmi haber kaynaklarına bağımlılığı ve anlatısı hakkında ilginç çerçeve yaratmadaki, İsraili haklı çıkarmak ve savaşın kurbanı olarak göstermede çerçeve olarak kullanılmıştır. Böylece gazete Gazze aleyhindeki savaşı desteklemektedir ve kapsam olarak tarafsız değildir ve İsrail tarafına yönelik taraf tutmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Yedioth Ahronoth, 3. Gazze Savaşı, Gündem Belirleme Kuramı, Eşik Bekçiliği Kuramı, Çerçeve Analizi Kuramı.

DEDICATION

To the spirits of who were killed by the silence of media.

To the Palestinian Journalistic Institution to reorder its agenda and formulate a conscious media speech that is able to face the Israeli media and to convey the message of what is really happening in Palestine to the whole world.

To my family, mainly my mother who gave me whatever she could to get this stage.

To all those who contributed to the achievement of this thesis.

My warm regards and respect.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to thank my supervisor Assoc. Prof. Dr. Bahire Efe Özad for her great support, guidance, and making this thesis possible by helping me and sharing her ideas and opinions, which helped me to get the best results from my study.

I would like also to thank the jury members Assist. Prof. Dr. Metin Ersoy, Assist. Prof. Dr. Yetin Arslan and all my professors in Faculty of Communication and Media Studies for their support and adding a lot to my knowledge.

Many thanks also go to my friend who supported me during my study period in foreignness Adib Barakat, and my colleague Duaa Elayyan for supporting me in the language editorial issues.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vii
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xii
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background of the Study.....	2
1.2 Motivation for the Study.....	5
1.3 Aims of the Study.....	6
1.4 Research Questions.....	7
1.5 Significance of the Study.....	8
1.6 Limitations of the Study.....	9
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	10
2.1 Short History of the Palestinian- Israeli Conflict.....	10
2.2 The 2014 Gaza War.....	17
2.2.1 The Objectives and Reasons for the 2014 Gaza War.....	18
2.2.2 The Course of 2014 Gaza War.....	18
2.2.3 Outcomes and Impact of the 2014 Gaza War.....	20
2.3 Brief History of the Israeli Media.....	21
2.3.1 Press.....	21
2.3.2 Radio.....	23
2.3.3 Television.....	24
2.3.4 Digital Media.....	26

2.4 Mainstream Israeli Newspapers	26
2.4.1 Yedioth Ahronoth Newspaper (Last News).....	26
2.4.2 Haaretz Newspaper (The land)	29
2.4.3 Maariv Newspaper (Evening)	29
2.5 The Israeli Media Censorship	30
2.5.1 The Editors' Committee Agreement	31
2.5.2 Press Decree (1933)	31
2.5.3 Penal Code (Confidential Information).....	32
2.5.4 Military Censorship	32
2.5.5 Israeli Army Spokesman	33
2.6 The Recent Israeli Media Map.....	34
2.6.1 Israeli Media Authorities	34
2.6.2 Israeli Media Outlets	35
2.7 How Palestinians are Mentioned in the Israeli Press	39
2.8 The Characteristics of the Israeli Media	41
2.9 The Theories Related to This Study.....	44
2.9.1 Agenda Setting Theory (AST)	44
2.9.2 Gatekeeping Theory (GKT)	47
2.9.3 Framing Analysis Theory (FAT)	49
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	52
3.1 Research Methodology	52
3.2 Research Design.....	53
3.3 Data Collection Instrument	53
3.4 Population and Sample	54
3.5 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures	55

3.6 Validity and Reliability of Data Collection of Instrument.....	55
4 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	57
4.1 Framing Category	57
4.2 Format Category	63
4.3 Findings.....	82
5 CONCLUSION.....	86
5.1 Summary of the Study	86
5.2 Conclusions Drawn from the Study.....	87
5.3 Recommendations for Further Research.....	95
REFERENCES	97
APPENDICES	106
Appendix A: Content analysis chick list, the frame category.....	107
Appendix B: Content analysis chick list, the content category.....	108
Appendix C: Sample from Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper news.....	111

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: The press materials in terms of including banners	58
Table 2: The press materials in terms of including designs & Info-Graphics	59
Table 3: The press materials in terms of include a video.....	60
Table 4: The press materials in terms of including pictures	61
Table 5: The press materials in terms of length	62
Table 6: The subjects of press materials	64
Table 7: Classifications of the political subjects.....	65
Table 8: Classification of military and security subjects	66
Table 9: Classification of the humanitarian subjects	67
Table 10: The main news sources of press materials.....	69
Table 11: Providing justifications for the Israeli army operations.....	70
Table 12: The most repeated main terms	72
Table 13: The most repeated sub-terms	73
Table 14: The aim of press material.....	75
Table 15: The image of Israel in the press materials	76
Table 16: The usage of sensational press materials	77
Table 17: The direction of the press materials	78
Table 18: The narrative of the war	79
Table 19: Press materials in terms of showing losses	81

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The Israeli media is written and produced in Hebrew language that most of the Arabs and westerns do not know. The present study seeks to present an analysis of the Israeli media and its coverage for the Gaza war 2014, especially “Yedioth Ahronoth” which is published in Hebrew. The study is considered as the pioneer study that is conducted by a Palestinian researcher who analyzes Hebrew-speaking media, which is specifically directed to the Israelis only.

The media in Israel is very important and effective because the audience there is educated and the vast majority follows the media. There are numerous Israeli media outlets. The most popular newspaper is “Yedioth Ahronoth” (Jammal, 2005). The coverage of this newspaper during the 2014 Gaza war is analyzed in this study. In a nutshell, it could be stated that media in Israel affects the political, military, and economic life directly, and it contributes to shaping the public opinion about these issues, especially in the election processes.

The Gaza war 2014 affected the Middle East area, especially Palestine and Israel. It has territorial political, military and economic repercussion continuing until now. The researcher conducted this study to find out how the Israeli media covered the 2014 Gaza war for Israelis in Hebrew language in terms of the frame and content by doing a quantitative content analysis of the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper.

The study shows a brief history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from the eighteenth century (based on Hajjar & Beinin, 2014), (Philo & Berry, 2011), (Saleh, 2012) & (Odwan, 2012) till the Gaza war 2014 according to the reports of the studies centers and human rights organizations, such as Euro-mid Observer for Human Rights and Al-Zaytuona Center for Studies and Consultations. Then, it talks in detail about the Israeli media history, mainstreams and map of the Israeli media, the Israeli media censorship and characteristics based on what is mentioned in Jammal, (2005), Wafa, (2011), Odwan, (2012), Hassouna, (2014), Nairab, (2010).

This study also analyzed the content of the Israeli media according to three media theories, Agenda Setting Theory (AST), Gatekeeping Theory (GKT) and Framing Analysis Theory (FAT) based on what was mentioned in Baran & Davis, (2003), Hassouna, (2014), Freeland, (2012), Onwubere, (2011), and Chong & N. Druckman, (2007).

1.1 Background of the Study

Firstly, the historical background of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict was full with actions and wars, especially in the last decades. The most important events that happened and are still affecting the current conflict include the 1948 war which was called (Al-Nakba) that happened after the Israeli Military Forces committed massacres against Palestinians and established the state of Israel (Philo & Berry, 2011). The second one is the 1976 war that was called (Al-Naksa), that happened after the occupation of Jerusalem and the displacement of thousands of Palestinians (Philo & Berry, 2011).

In addition, some crucial events and wars happened later, such as the first Intifada in 1987, the second Intifada in 2000 that are still going on without solution till now (Hajjar & Beinin, 2014). This the last Gaza war 2014, the coverage of which by the Israeli media is analyzed in this study. According to the statistics of human rights organizations, there are 2,147 Palestinians who were killed and 10,870 Palestinians who were injured. On the other hand, 70 Israeli were killed and 720 were injured (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014).

During these wars, the Israeli media was working hard to cover them and convince the Israelis to adopt the official opinion of the government, army and political parties. The Israeli media initiated in Palestine before establishing the Israeli state. It started by newspapers and radios, then in 1967 the Israeli television was launched, and in 2002 the use of the digital media on internet started (Odwan, 2012). The Israeli media was partisan media that belongs to the Israeli parties which were working during that time, but now the most popular Israeli media is private (Jammal, 2005). After establishing the state, the Israeli media was the strongest media in the Arab World. In sixties, they had multilanguage press and radios. In addition, because the Israeli society is a multinational one, the media has been supporting pluralism until these days (Hassouna, 2014).

Currently, the mainstream Israeli newspapers are: “Yedioth Ahronoth”, “Haaretz”, and “Maariv” (Wafa, 2011). They all have private ownerships, but they also have some trends. The researcher in this study analyzed the coverage of online version of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper of the Gaza war 2014. “Yedioth Ahronoth” is the most widespread newspaper in Israel that is owned by “Moses” family, and it was

established in 1939. These days, the company of “Yedioth Ahronoth” issues 17 local newspapers, 6 periodical magazines and has a huge publishing house (Aidanem) which prints 100,000 books annually (Hassouna, 2014). The newspaper distributes about 100,000 copies every day and 135,000 copies on Fridays. The estimated income of this newspaper is 200 million dollars annually, and its capital is around 400 to 500 million dollars (Jammal, 2005).

Since the establishment of the Israeli media until these days, the Israeli government and army have been censoring the media by the law and legal regulations. In 1933, they issued the press decree that determines the relation between the official side and press and gives permits to the new newspapers. After 1948, the press decree became a part of the Israeli law, and it is still so till now (Hassouna, 2014). In 1945, the editorial board initiated an attempt to censor everything that press publishes by giving it pre-permit. The members of this committee are editors, government, and military officials. In addition to that, the penal code in the Israeli constitution imposes punishment against anyone who publishes or seeks to get confidential information (Jammal, 2005). Moreover, there is a military media censorship department in the army to censor the media and to coordinate with the military spokesperson (Odwan, 2012).

The Israeli media is generally considering the Palestinians as enemy, so when it covers the issues that are related to the Palestinians, it tries to portray them in the worst image or to incite against them especially in the religious media (Jabari, 2014). Moreover, one of the main characteristics of the Israeli media is the dependence on

the governmental or military sources for its news. This leads the media to adopt their narrative (Hassouna, 2014).

This study is based on testing three media theories that affect the public opinion. The Agenda Setting Theory which believes that media is setting the agenda of audience (Freeland, 2012). Gatekeeping Theory is about persons who control the media and what to publish or not after filtering the information according to specific agenda (Barzilai-Nahon, 2008). The last and not the least Framing Analysis Theory which says that the frame or the way that media present specific issues is affecting audience's opinion toward it (Chong & N. Druckman, 2007).

In this study, the researcher analyzed the details of the coverage of the Israeli media, especially "Yedioth Ahronoth" newspaper for the 2014 Gaza war. The study analyzed the Hebrew-language news that are directed to the Israelis, and the sample of the study is 116 press releases from 5 days spread over period of the war which lasted for 51 days. The quantitative content analysis was used as the data collection method to find out how the Israeli media in general and "Yedioth Ahronoth" newspaper in particular covered the war.

1.2 Motivation for the Study

A number of issues motivated the researcher to do the current study based on its importance in the field of media and communication. It is a unique study conducted in the English language by a Palestinian researcher in which Hebrew news and coverage of the 2014 Gaza war are analyzed. On the other hand, the researcher was working for two years as a specialist in the Israeli media and affairs; also he was studying the Hebrew language.

The researcher conducted this study because he wanted to explore and find out how the Israeli media covered the 2014 Gaza war in terms of frame, content, terms, narrative, positions of media outlets...etc. in addition to enabling him to be aware of the way in which the Israeli media is working during the wartimes. The researcher wanted to know this because he believes that the effects of Gaza war 2014 still exist. The war between the Palestinians and the Israelis may start again at any time, because the area is considered as a hot conflict zone and there is no clear agreement for truce.

1.3 Aims of the Study

The research aims to find out how the Israeli media, especially “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper covered the Gaza war 2014, and to recognize the features of the Israeli media coverage in wars' times, especially in the last Gaza war in terms of certain aspects as follow:

- This study aims to form a clear background about the Israeli media in terms of its launch, like when the Israeli media started and where, who initiated it; how was it formed and mapped, and the history of the Israeli media.
- The present study answers questions about the structure of the Israeli media in terms of media types, ownerships, and the most widespread.
- To find out the Israeli media aims and priorities, especially during the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper coverage of the Gaza war 2014 according to the Israeli ideologies and thoughts.

- The study also explores if the Israeli media is supporting the war and military operations against Gaza and attitude of the Israeli government, or if it is providing justifications for the war.
- The researcher aims to find out the kind of news sources that the Israeli media uses, especially in the Gaza war 2014.
- The main point that the researcher wanted to explore is what are the features of the Israeli media coverage of the 2014 Gaza war?
- Furthermore, the research aims to find out if the Israeli media covered Gaza war 2014 from its view of point according to the Israeli narrative for the entire world with ignorance for the Palestinian narrative.

1.4 Research Questions

This study is seeking to find out the features of the Israeli media coverage for the Gaza war 2014 by analyzing the press releases of Hebrew-speaking “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper. So the researcher needs to answer the following research questions:

RQ. 1 What are the features of the coverage of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper during the Gaza war 2014?

RQ. 2 What are the most frequent issues that the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper focused on during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

RQ. 3 What is the attitude of the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper for supporting the war and the Israeli army against Gaza?

RQ. 4 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” ignore mentioning the Palestinian losses during the war?

RQ. 5 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” provide justifications for the Israeli military operations in Gaza?

RQ. 6 What are the prominent terms that “Yedioth Ahronoth” used to cover the war?

RQ. 7 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” adopt the military and governmental sources of news and narrative during covering the war and did not contrary to the official narrative?

RQ. 8 How did “Yedioth Ahronoth” portray Israel in the Gaza war 2014?

RQ. 9 What is the extent of using “Yedioth Ahronoth” for Palestinian sources for its news?

RQ. 10 Did Yedioth Ahronoth used emotions frame and provoke emotions during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

RQ. 11 What are the main aims appeared in the press materials of the Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

1.5 Significance of the Study

This research is important due to the lack of specialized studies in the Israeli media, and it will benefit those who want to know more about the Israeli media coverage. It

also measures the role of the Israeli media in the coverage of the war and how it dealt with it. Moreover, there is a lack of studies in this field, especially in English language, so this study is expected to raise the knowledge of researchers, journalists, specialists in the Israeli media. It is also important to understand how the Israeli media works, its tools during the war, and how deep it goes in the coverage of the Israeli media to Gaza war 2014. There were some political decisions in Israel that affected by the Israeli media and its direction for the public opinion; it will let us know the extent to which the Israeli media consistent with governments views.

In addition to these, the conflict in Palestine, especially in Gaza, is still going on, and a new war might take place in Palestine anytime. This study is supposed to be a base for understanding the possible work and tendency of media in the next wars.

1.6 Limitations of the Study

The present study focuses on the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper coverage of the 2014 Gaza war Hebrew edition. The website of the newspaper was the source of the news that the study analyzed. The Gaza war 2014 lasted for 51 days from 7 July to 26 August 2014, so the sample of study was 116 press releases Hebrew language from 5 days spread over period of the war. The researcher downloaded the releases form the electronic archive.

The study is conducted in the Republic of North Cyprus at East Mediterranean University. The researcher suffered from the lack of the previous studies, especially in English, and the lack of references that talk about the Israeli media, because he was not in the area that study talks about while conducting the study.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter is designed to give a considerable background about the subjects that are related to the present study in order to make it more understandable. The researcher, in this chapter, reviews the literature of the study which includes: short history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from the nineteenth century to the 2014 Gaza war, brief history of the Israeli media including (press, radio, television, digital media), the mainstream Israeli newspapers especially “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper, which is the case of this study.

In addition to that, the literature review covers the Israeli media censorship and the censorship regulations in Israel, the recent Israeli media map in terms of (authorities, outlets and ownership), how Palestinians are mentioned in the Israeli press, the characteristics of the Israeli media, then the theories that the researcher tested in this study which are (the Agenda Setting Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, Framing Analysis Theory).

2.1 Short History of the Palestinian- Israeli Conflict

In this part, the researcher presents a brief history of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict from the nineteenth century when the Jews started thinking of creating a national homeland and forming the Zionist movement until the third Gaza war in the summer of 2014, which was the most prominent event in the last year. Also this section is

sub-divided into four periods as the following: (1800-1948), (1948-2000), (2002-2012), (2014 Gaza war).

2.1.1 1800 – 1948 Period

Due to the difficult circumstances under which the Jews in Russia and Europe lived in the nineteenth century, they started thinking of creating a homeland where they can gather all the Jews. They chose Palestine to be that homeland after some meetings that were held within the Zionist movement under the leadership of the father of the political Zionism “Theodor Herzl” (Philo & Berry, 2011, pp. 10-12). As a result, the first wave of the Jewish immigration to Palestine was in 1882 (Hajjar & Bein, 2014).

Herzl organized the meeting of the first Zionism congress in Basel, Switzerland in 1897. In that event, he declared establishing the Jewish state, and meanwhile the Jews in that were raising the slogan which says, “We need a land without people for a people without land” (Brownfeld, 1998).

In conjunction with the weakness of the Ottoman Empire which was ruling Palestine at that time, and due to the strong relations with the Zionism, the British Foreign Affairs Minister Lord Arthur Balfour announced on 2 November 1917 The Balfour Declaration in which he promised the Jews that the British government will support establishing the Jewish national homeland in Palestine (Hajjar & Bein, 2014).

After the First World War, Britain and France convinced the League of Nations to divide the Arabic world and the legacy of Ottoman Empire. In 1922, the League of Nations admitted officially the British Mandate in Palestine based on The Balfour Declaration, which continued until 1948. During this period, Britain prepared

Palestine for Zionism and facilitated Jews immigration (Philo & Berry, 2011). According to Beinín & Hajjar, (2014), the numbers of population in Palestine in 1946 was 1,269,000 Arab and 608,000 Jewish (Hajjar & Beinín, 2014).

Some political developments and changes that occurred in Palestine pushed the League of Nations to take the division decision (181) in November of 1947. This decision states the division of Palestine to three parts (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 30). In accordance with this decision, Palestine was divided into three parts; the biggest part for the Jews, a small area for the Arabs and the third part was put under the international trusteeship. This area includes the holy places and Jerusalem (British Mandate, 2011). The Palestinians protested against that by different ways, including the military ones. On 14th, May 1948, the British government announced that it has finished its mandate in Palestine. On the next day; 15th, May 1948, the Jews troops and Zionism movement declared the birth of Israel in Palestine (Philo & Berry, 2011, pp. 32-34).

This was the first war between the Jews and the Arabic countries during which the Jewish gangs occupied the majority of lands (Philo & Berry, 2011). According to Aljazeera (Al-Nakba, 2013), the Palestinians named the event AL Nakba Day which means the catastrophe due to the massacres that were committed by the Israeli gangs. For example, in Deir Yaseen massacre, 254 Palestinians were killed without consideration. After the war, more than 700,000 Palestinian refugees have lost their homes and villages (Hajjar & Beinín, 2014).

2.1.2 1948-2000 Period

The Palestinians were seeking to find a body to represent them officially in order to unite the efforts of liberation. In 1964, the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded with the support of the neighboring Arabic countries. Next year in 1965, the Palestinian National Liberation Movement, Fatah launched officially (Saleh, 2012, pp. 77-78). The escalation continued till the 1967 war, The Six Day War when Israel defeated the Arabic countries and completed occupying the rest of the Palestinian land West Bank, Gaza Strip, whole Jerusalem and the holy places (Philo & Berry, 2011, pp. 50-51). The war also came up with 330,000 Palestinian refugees; some of whom went to Gaza to establish new refugee camps (Saleh, 2012, p. 82).

Aftermath 1967 war, the United Nation Security Council took the decision 242, which states that Israel should withdraw from the territories that were occupied during the war. However, Israel withdrew from some settlements only (Hajjar & Beinin, 2014). In the following days when Israel was ruling the land, the Palestinians founded many parties and opposition movements (Saleh, 2012, p. 98).

Towards the end of 1987, the first intifada (uprising) erupted after four Palestinians were killed after being ran over by an Israeli van (Saleh, 2012, p. 103). The intifada left 1450 dead, 130,000 injured Palestinians and 116,000 prisoners who were jailed for various durations during six years of intifada (Saleh, 2012, p. 104). The intifada prevailed the whole occupied places with the participation of people from all groups (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 77).

The Islamic movements participated in directing the people during the intifada. On 14th, December 1987, the Islamic resistance movement (Hamas) had launched the first statement and declared its establishment (Saleh, 2012, p. 105). Hamas has been playing the vital role in the Palestinian resistance since 1987, especially through Al-QASSAM Brigades. It mounted well-organized military attacks against Israeli targets using various weapons during its struggle. It started with using knives and continued until having rockets that can attack the depth of Israel (Al-Madhoun, 2012).

In 1993, after two years of negotiation that started after the peace conference 1991 in Madrid, the PLO has signed Oslo agreement in Norway with Israel. The agreement gave the Palestinians self-governing authority in some parts of Palestine and Gaza Strip. In conjunction with that, the negotiation is to continue for security coordination and civilian matters with limited authorities (Philo & Berry, 2011, pp. 84-87). PLO has acknowledged that Israel has the right of existence and legitimacy on the 77% of the Palestinian land (Saleh, 2012, p. 113).

As Philo & Berry, (2011, p. 104) argued, in 2000, the second intifada erupted after Sharon's visit to the Al-Aqsa mosque with 600 Israeli policemen who were with him to ensure the security for his visit. The Palestinians demonstrated against that and they started the confrontations with the Israelis from that moment. The Israeli journalist Amira Hass stated that "frustration of Palestinians and failures of Oslo agreement were the reasons" (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 104). The public participation in this intifada was clear and an evidence of that is that till 2005, 4242 Palestinians were killed. (Saleh, 2012, p. 126)

2.1.3 2000-2012 Period

After five years of intifada, Israel decided to end its military existence and withdraw its settlers and troops from Gaza Strip in August 2005 (Philo & Berry, 2011, pp. 118-119). The Palestinians considered it as a victory and a national day because they believed that the Palestinian resistance forced Israel to withdraw from Gaza (BBC News, 2005).

In the Palestinian arena, especially Gaza, Hamas was going to be the strongest party in Palestine. In 2006, it won the legislative election and got the highest representation in the legislative council (Middle East Studies Center, 2006). However, due to the limitations of Israel and the international community on one side (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 122), and the Palestinian division and absence of unity on the other side, Hamas controlled Gaza Strip by force in 2007, and is still so far (BBC News, 2009).

Gaza and Hamas were subjected to the siege that included closing the outlets of Gaza and the international boycotting for aids. Thus, the life and human circumstances in Gaza got worse. In 2007, Israel, along with other Arabic countries, declared that Gaza is a hostile territory (Hajjar & Beinin, 2014). During the period 2006 to 2008, the military escalation between Gaza and Israel continued. Hamas carried out a military operation on 25th, June 2006 where three Israeli soldiers were killed and one was captured "Gilad Shalit". The exchange of fire shooting between the two sides continued until 2008 (Odwan, 2012).

It is worthy to mention that until 2006, the population of Gaza strip was 1.5 million (Sahli, 2008) and in 2013 it became 1.7 million people who live in 360 km² with high population density (Population, 2011). Also the Strip has a strategic place in the

border of the Levant and Egypt; it is located from the west on the Mediterranean Sea (Sahli, 2008).

On 27th, December 2008, Israel started a war against Gaza by an air attack that left 225 killed Palestinians and more than 700 who were injured (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 141). The war lasted for 21 days, during which the Israeli forces bombed the official Palestinian institutions, headquarters of government, mosques...etc. (Philo & Berry, 2011, p. 142). The war was through three stages, the air operation that bombed the entire Israeli targets using “phosphorus bombs”, and then the ground operation, which enabled Israel to control some areas. This operation was covered by air and naval operation (Odwan, 2012, pp. 58-59).

The most important reasons that were given for launching the war include attacking the Palestinian resistance, especially Hamas, undermining the Hamas regime in Gaza and restoring the Israeli deterrence (Odwan, 2012). During the war, there were many invitations for ceasefire. The war stopped after a decision that was issued by the International Security Council 1850 (Odwan, 2012). The war came up with 1430 Palestinians who were killed, 5450 were injured, and 9000 people who become refugees and homeless. Hamas stated that the Israeli losses were 48 killed Israeli soldiers and 411 injuries (Rachel Corrie Palestinian Center for Human Rights and Follow-up of International Justice, 2013).

The Palestinian Authority in Ramallah worked through negotiation and political ways for solving the conflict, but the rounds of failures forced it to apply to be non-member state (observer state) in the United Nation as an independent country according to the 1967 borders. It was thought of this as a way for getting the

international recognition and pushing Israel to agree on peace agreement that gives the Palestinians a state with full sovereignty (Seyoury, 2014). On 23th, September, the Palestinian president handed over the application to the General Assembly of the United Nation. 138 states voted to favor Palestine, 9 voted against, 41 states did not vote (BBC News, 2012).

The Israeli army started another war on 14th, December 2012 through the assassination Hamas military leader Ahmad Aljabari in Gaza strip. Israel carried out hundreds of air strikes during the eighth days of the war, and the Palestinians fired rockets to Israel (Chernofsky & Abu-Qamar, 2013). According to the United Nations, 185 Palestinians were killed, and the Israeli government said that six Israelis were killed (Chernofsky & Abu-Qamar, 2013). Aljazeera mentioned that the objectives of starting out the war were to stop firing the rockets from Gaza to Israel by killing the leaders of Hamas, to determine the deterrent power of the Israeli army, and to examine the new Egyptian regime. The Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu was seeking to win in the next election (Aggression on Gaza Motives and Results, 2012). The war revealed the ability of the Hamas rockets that reached to the depth of Israel (Aggression on Gaza Motives and Results, 2012).

2.2 The 2014 Gaza War

Israel exploited the worst political situation in Palestine to erupt the 2014 Gaza war by attacking Palestinians in Gaza on 7th, July 2014 (Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies, 2014). This war was the longest and toughest war in the last decades in Palestine. It lasted for 51 days and ended on 26th, August 2014. This war came up with war crimes committed by Israeli army in Gaza, and the Palestinian resistance appeared stronger in this war (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014).

2.2.1 The Objectives and Reasons for the 2014 Gaza War

The aims of the Israeli escalation in Palestine were to direct an attack to Hamas in West Bank and Gaza, to try to disable the new Palestinian conciliation agreement, and to remove the international legitimacy of the new Palestinian government (Arab Center for Research & Policy studies, 2014). The declared reasons of the war were, to stop firing rockets from Gaza to Israel and to destroy the infrastructure of the terrorists in Gaza as the Israeli officials said (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014).

Aljazeera Center for Studies mentioned some reasons for the war, one of which was related to the intention of Netanyahu to show his care of the Israeli security to save his position in the next Israeli election. Simultaneously, there was failure in the peace process; it was a good chance for Israel to emphasize that Hamas was a terrorist organization (Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies, 2014). Also the changes in The Arab Spring which have been changing against the Islamic movements, especially in Egypt and Hamas in Gaza (Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies, 2014).

2.2.2 The Course of 2014 Gaza War

The Israeli-Palestinian escalations evolved gradually, starting from the hijacking of the three Israeli settlers in the West Bank on 13th, June 2014. These settlers were found dead after three weeks in Hebron (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014). Israel accused Hamas for this and started arresting its members in the West Bank. The firing started between Israel and Gaza (Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies, 2014). The Israeli settlers in Jerusalem also hijacked a Palestinian boy and burned him to death. The Israeli army received orders to be ready for a wide operation in Gaza and West Bank with some air strikes on Gaza. Hamas was

expecting that and responded by firing short-range rockets (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014).

As Al-Zaytuna center documented the first action, which was considered as the beginning of the war, on seventh, July 2014 when the Israeli air forces had attacked Gaza and killed seven of Hamas fighters. Hamas responded to that by attacking some Israeli towns (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014). On the next day, Israel declared the beginning of the war operations and named it: Protective Edge. After a few days, Hamas named it Eaten Straw (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014). The Israeli army damaged the infrastructure of Gaza and had interred in the ground operation, killed and injured thousands of people, in contrast, the ability of the Palestinian resistance was limited, but it has achieved perfect military operations during the war (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014).

During the war, Al-Zaytouna Center recorded that Hamas revealed on new weapons like drone aircraft, and long-range rockets, and an ability to bombing and snake into Israeli towns, and Al-QASSAM fighters were also able to arrest Israeli soldiers. However, Israel killed some of Hamas and Palestinian leaders and committed massacres according to the human rights organizations (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014).

There were few invitations for short ceasefire that permeated the war for human reasons. The war has attracted the world's attention and it became on the news bars of the world media. The war ended with an agreement that there is a comprehensive ceasefire versus opening Gaza outlets, increasing the fishing distance, opening the

Gaza port and interring the building materials to Gaza Strip (Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations, 2014).

2.2.3 Outcomes and Impact of the 2014 Gaza War

The team of Euro-Mid Observer for Human Rights (2014) was working in Gaza during the war there. Its members described the horrible situation that the Israeli army created in Gaza by destroying the people, infrastructure, institutions, schools, electricity structures, hospitals, universities, human rights...etc. (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014).

According to Euro-mid Observer for Human Rights (2014), the last statistics of the losses and results of the war shows that 2,147 Palestinians were killed, including 530 children, 302 women, 23 from medical staff, 16 journalists, and 11 UN staff. The first of August 2014 was the toughest day in terms of the number of dead, Israel killed on that day 145 Palestinians (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014). The number of Palestinians who were injured was 10,870, including 3303 children (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014).

During the war, the Israeli army carried out 8,210 air strike attacks, 15,736 attacks by Navy Missiles, 36,718 attacks by artillery shells. These attacks led to destroy 17,132 Palestinian houses, harm 39,500 houses, and 171 mosques (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014). The statistics also shows that the Palestinians who have lost their homes were 100,000 people. The economic losses were estimated to 3 billion and 6 million dollar (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014).

The losses in the Israeli side were very few in comparison to the Palestinians'. Seventy Israelis were killed, vast majority of them soldiers, and 720 civilians and

soldiers were injured (Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights, 2014). According to the Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper 4500 Palestinian rockets were fired to Israel, the cost of the war was 2 billion dollar (Al-Qadi, 2014).

2.3 Brief History of the Israeli Media

In this part, the researcher presents a brief history of the Israeli media which will give us background history about press, radio, television, and digital media. This would shed light to the content of the thesis.

2.3.1 Press

The Israeli or Jews press was founded in Palestine before establishing the Israeli country. There was a Jews minority in Palestine and they launched the first Hebrew newspaper in 1863, which was named “Halbanon”. The press in that time was focusing on religious topics more than others (Odwan, 2012). During the British mandate in Palestine, there were many Israeli newspapers that were owned by the Israeli parties and the Zionist movement. When Israel was established in 1948, there were more than 13 newspapers (Jammal, 2005).

In 1942, the Israelis established the committee of editors, which had a responsibility of the censorship on the Israeli press. It aimed to prevent the right and important information from reaching people who are considered as enemies of Israel. This committee signed some agreements with the military censorship for censoring the press and preventing the newspapers from going to the court if they prevent publishing some of its press materials. It is worthy to add that these agreements still work until these days in Israel (Jammal, 2005).

After the establishment of the Israeli state, the press had partisan nature. It was serving the aim of parties to support the Israeli state (Wafa, 2011). The founder of Israel “David Ben-Gurion” said to the journalists and press that time, “We need an honest and free censorship on press, but we should be careful about our words, and do not give the enemy information”. The Israeli press applied what he said literally (Jammal, 2005, p. 50).

In the seventies and eighties, the press went to be more private and independent. In addition to that, the emergence of the local press was strong, and the partisan press could not continue its strength as it used to be in the past due to the huge political, economic, and social changes in Israel (Odwan, 2012). In the nineties, there were just three partisan newspapers issued in Israel, roughly 16 partisan Israeli newspaper were closed for many reasons, such as their increased monthly costs and the decline in the number of their readers. Until now there are almost 12 Israeli partisan newspapers which are still issued in Israel (Odwan, 2012, pp. 29-30).

The Israeli society is composed of people from many nationalities who gathered themselves in Palestine, so they had more than one language and culture. This led the Israeli press to be multilingual. When Israel was established, some newspapers were issued in Arabic, Russian and English languages, but they became more powerful in eighties and after. The first newspaper in this field was Jerusalem post, which was issued in English language and was launched in 1932. Its name was “Israel Post” but it faced some financial problems and its team again relief it by a new name “Jerusalem Post”, which is still issued till now (Jammal, 2005).

The Israeli press by Russian language emerged in the beginning of forties. However, before establishing Israel, there were two newspapers supported by Zionist movement (Odwan, 2012, p. 32). After 1967, the immigration of Jews from Russia raised and they issued other newspapers during the seventies (Jammal, 2005, p. 86). From 1989 to 2001, the number of Russian Jews was one million. At the end of nineties, more than 137 newspapers were issued in Israel. Most of the publications, periodicals, journals and monthly magazines which were issued in Russian language were owned by the private media companies (Odwan, 2012, p. 33).

The Israeli press in Arabic language started after establishing Israel. During fifties, some Israeli parties issued newspapers in Arabic language, the mission of which was to reach to the Palestinians who live in Israel in an attempt to create a social harmony, and to convince them to adopt the Israeli and party ideas (Odwan, 2012). Then, the Israeli government became interested in reaching the Palestinians by establishing the radio and television and allocating special hours for broadcasting in Arabic, which still works till now (Wafa, 2011). There were also some Arabic newspapers that are owned by Palestinians, but the Israeli government was bothering them and it imposed imitations on its work. Thus, a number of them were closed (Jammal, 2005).

2.3.2 Radio

The broadcast of the first Israeli radio was in 1940 before establishing the Israeli state. The radio was named “kool Yesrael” which means (voice of Israel) in Hebrew. It was the official radio in Israel and owned by the government (Wafa, 2011). The radio was extended for many networks (A, B, C, D), some of it broadcasting by

Arabic language such as (network D) which was launched in 1958 and still broadcasts till now with wide Palestinian audience (Hassouna, 2014).

The second important radio in Israel is “Gali Tzahal” which means (Waves of Israeli Army), it was founded in 1950 for producing and serving the Israeli army (Wafa, 2011). It was considered as an official radio of the Israeli army, the role of which was clear in times of wars. It also concerned about military matters and Israeli propaganda, and it was owned and funded by the Israeli army. The majority of its team are soldiers and workers in the army or Israeli security devises. This radio is still working till now (Jammal, 2005).

In 1965, the Israelis founded the Israeli broadcasting authority which has the responsibility about the Israeli radios and televisions after that. Nowadays, there are many radios in Israel; the most famous ones are about 20 radios that broadcast in several languages (Hassouna, 2014). Some of these radios are directed to the Arabic people, and most of them belong to the government, while others belong to the Israeli parties and religious sides. These radio stations earn their money mostly from the advertisements (Hassouna, 2014).

2.3.3 Television

The first Israeli television (Channel 1) began broadcasting its programs in 1967 to fight what the Arabic televisions were broadcasting about Israel. It had a wide audience of Israelis and Palestinians because it was the only channel in whole Palestine, and some of its programs were in Arabic language. But now its audience is just 10% because there are many and advanced competitors. The channel is considered as the official television of Israeli government, and it is funded by the

government and advertisements. This channel is still operating till now and it has a network of channels over Israel (Wafa, 2011).

In 1990, the Israeli parliament voted for establishing a new authority for television and for the establishment of the Israeli channel 2 with some of local channels which work by cables. Later on, Israel was divided for more than 30 areas, which meant that the coverage of the channels included the whole houses. The Channel 2 became the most effective and followed in Israel. Its programs are in Hebrew, Russian and some of it are in Arabic language (Jammal, 2005). It was considered as a private media and it works professionally in the coverage of the Israeli internal issues (Jammal, 2005).

In the nineties, the Israeli authority allowed the Israelis and some of Arabic people to open their own channels. There were some private channels; one of which was an Arabic channel and some local channels for the Israeli parties and religious sides (Jammal, 2005). In 2002, the Israeli channel 10 was launched, and it became the first competitor of Channel 2. Also it is a private media like a company of businessmen, but also the government and media ministry has an authority about it, it can get some of financial aids from the government (Hassouna, 2014).

There are also many Israeli channels such as Channel 3, which is considered as territorial channel and it broadcasts its programs in three languages. In addition to the channel of Israel, which broadcasts in Arabic language because it is directed for Palestinians the parliament channel and Channel 7...etc. (Wafa, 2011).

2.3.4 Digital Media

Due to the technology and internet, developments in the world and Israel, the Israeli government began to use the internet websites to inform its people about everything that they need in 2002. It established a website for every ministry, army, school and Israeli institution (Wafa, 2011). In addition to that, the Israeli newspapers, magazines, televisions and radios created their own websites and transmuted their programs to the website. Furthermore, there are some online Israeli agencies such as (Walla News) (Hassouna, 2014). Then, a tendency to the social media especially Facebook, YouTube, Instagram, Twitter and Whatsapp, appeared clearly. (Top Sites in Israel, 2015).

2.4 Mainstream Israeli Newspapers

There are three mainstream Israeli newspapers which are considered as the most popular and affective in the Israeli society. These newspapers are; Haaretz Newspaper, Maariv Newspaper, Yedioth Ahronoth Newspaper, in addition to the “Israel Hayom” newspaper which means (Israel Today). The last one was issued the first time in July 2007, and it has few readers when compared to the other newspapers. It is distributed freely because the government owns it and thus it is considered as the one that speaks on behalf of the Israeli government. This newspaper represents the right wing in Israel. (Hijazi, 2014).

2.4.1 Yedioth Ahronoth Newspaper (Last News)

Yedioth is considered the most popular Israeli Hebrew daily newspaper. Arnon Moses, a Jewish intellectual established it in 1939 as an evening newspaper, and it became a morning newspaper in the beginning of the sixties due to the technology developments (Hassouna, 2014). In 1948, it was the most important and popular evening newspaper, but it went under a financial crisis, which pushed the editorial

team to quit it. However, after some years the newspaper overcame on crisis and recovered its position (Odwan, 2012).

Yedioth Ahronoth is considered as a private newspaper in Israel. The Moses family, who owned also a set of the local newspapers, in addition to issuing 17 local newspapers and 6 periodical magazines, owns it. The Moses family also owned a Russian-speaking newspaper, a huge publishing house (Aidanem) which prints 100,000 books annually, a weekly newspaper for women, a youth magazine, and shares in other companies such as companies of the television cables. It also has shares in the companies that run the second Israeli channel (Odwan, 2012). Yedioth Ahronoth distributes about 100,000 copies every day and 135,000 copies on Fridays (Al-Mutairi, 2004). The estimated income of this newspaper is 200 million dollars annually, and its capital is around 400 to 500 million dollars (Ramadan, 2005).

Yedioth Ahronoth is considered more popular than other newspapers because it targets all society elites. The newspaper tries to differentiate between who owns it and how it is managed. The journalists consider it as a representative newspaper of the successive governments, regardless to who is running the government and to the party that wins in the election (Odwan, 2012)

Yedioth also used to try to be close to the decision-making places. Its founder declared in 1973 that the Yedioth Ahronoth is the newspaper of the succeeded governments in Israel, taking into account that the governments are formed by right wing (Al-Mutairi, 2004). In conjunction with that, the majority of the newspaper's writers belong to the left-wing in Israel, which pushed the labor party (leftist) to support the newspaper about 1, 5 million dollars in 2003 (Al-Mutairi, 2004).

Some resources mention that there are some classes and groups in the Israeli society who do not like Yedioth Ahronoth, such as the Jews who came from Western Europe under excuses that this newspaper serves the interests of Ashkinaz, the Jews who came from the Eastern Europe (Al-Mutairi, 2004). One of the most prominent writers is Samosel Ajnon who won Nobel Prize, and Amos Karmel one of the prominent American Jews (Al-Mutairi, 2004).

The newspaper seeks to mention multiple opinions without any interference from its owners. It also used to use distinguished and simple designs, in addition to prominent titles that can create emotions and interactions as the polls mentioned (Hassouna, 2014).

The “Ynetnews” presents the English-language edition of the Yedioth Ahronoth web site, which was established in 2005. The newspaper mentioned in its web site that it has “professional standards in order to be an authoritative and accurate source of online news” (Mozes, 2005). In addition to that, it was designed to give holistic news for Israel and international affairs. It also presents services such as breaking news, newsletter and world class news reporting. The direct general of the Yedioth Ahronoth until 2015 is (Avi Ben Tal), and the chief editor is (Eran Tiefenbrunn) (Mozes, 2005).

However, there are many Israeli newspapers but the present study focuses on the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper as a case study, and the researcher analyzed the Hebrew-speaking stories that newspaper published for covering the 2014 Gaza war.

2.4.2 Haaretz Newspaper (The land)

Haaretz in Hebrew means the land in English. Haaretz newspaper is considered the oldest newspaper in Israel. It was issued in 1919, and it is trusted in the Israeli society (Hassouna, 2014). Haaretz is owned by the Shoken family which has left trends and presents the leftists in Israel. The Shoken family also owns some local and small newspapers, printing house, publishing house, and some computer companies (Odwan, 2012, p. 35).

The majority of people who read Haaretz belong to the educated and intellectual class. The general direction of the newspaper is supporting the peace process, but it also tends to support the Israeli government sometimes, especially in the matters that are related to the security and army, according to the military censorship (Odwan, 2012).

2.4.3 Maariv Newspaper (Evening)

It is a daily newspaper that was established in 1948 by a group of journalists, and some private investors own it. Its name means the evening pray in Torah. In 1991, the company of (Hkhsharat Hyeshov), which was owned by (Namrodi) family that bought the newspaper (Hassouna, 2014). Maariv was the second widespread newspaper in Israel at that time. It was an evening newspaper, but it transferred to become a morning newspaper. It tries to issue news and information according to its ideologies that are close to the right wing in Israel. Maariv also has conservative nationalist political positions that support the (Lecoud) party, which it the biggest Israeli party. The newspaper has popularity among (Ashkinaz); the Jews who came from the Eastern Europe (Odwan, 2012).

Maariv has a big section for the Arabic affairs, and it was distributing 80,000 copies daily. The Namrodi family also owned a publishing house in partnership with the Israeli Ministry of Defense. Maariv got support from the (Lecoud) party in 2003, the estimation of which is 1.1 million dollars. This aid pushed the newspaper to be more close to the right wing under command of the (Lecoud) party (Al-Mutairi, 2004). As the book of the media and the press in Israel (2005) mentioned, the annual income of the newspaper is estimated 95 million dollars and its capital is 200 million dollars (Ramadan, 2005).

2.5 The Israeli Media Censorship

Media censorship is one of the most prominent problems that face the freedom of media all over the world, including the democratic countries. It is one of the Israeli media characteristics because it has an obvious impact on the media coverage, and it is controlled by the regulations and instructions of the media censorship office and the legislative council.

In this part, the researcher will present the origin of the Israeli media censorship, its regulations, how it works—and its establishment through (The Editors' Committee Agreement, Press Decree (1933), Penal Code (confidential information), Military censorship, Israeli army spokesman).

There is a set of restrictions imposed on the Israeli media through the instructions of the censor officer. These restrictions—prevent press from publishing some news and stories under the justification that it harms the National Security and serves the enemy (Jammal, 2005).

In some cases, pre-media censorship is practiced by the censor officers who ask the press men to not write in certain topics (Odwan, 2012). There are three frames for the media censorship; giving permissions for the media outlets to launch mediums or to close them when they harm the national security, preventing publishing any security information and the informal restrictions, such as the self-censorship of the Israeli journalists (Jammal, 2005).

2.5.1 The Editors' Committee Agreement

In 1945, an agreement was concluded between the Israeli army in the settlements before establishing the Israeli state and editors' committee of the Israeli press. According to the agreement, the editors do not have to object to the decisions of the military censorship when it prevents publishing certain stories. In 1949, the editors' committee forced the Israeli journalists and mediums to take a pre-permit from the committee before publishing any news or story related to the military and security matters, or any one that is expected to harm the country or serves the enemy. (Jammal, 2005) The minister of defense is appointing the head of the committee, which still works until these days with a little reform (Ramadan, 2005).

2.5.2 Press Decree (1933)

During the British mandate, the Israelis enacted the press decree that determines the relation between the political and press in Israel. It aimed to censor the publications of press and to give permits for the new newspapers. After 1948, the press decree became a part of the law, and the interior minister has its powers (Jammal, 2005). The press decree prevented issuing any newspaper without getting a permit from the chief of region. The newspaper should publish freely all the government and military ads and statements. The interior minister has a right to close the newspaper if it publishes material that harms the security of the state. In addition, the court has the

right to close mediums for three years on charges of incitement or others. All these regulations are valid-till now (Odwan, 2012).

2.5.3 Penal Code (Confidential Information)

According to the penal code on the Israeli constitution, “any journalist who publishes or seeks to get secret information will be jailed for 7 years if he did not have intention for that, and 15 years if he has intention to get secret information related to the security”, according to the 113 and 117 articles of penal code (Jammal, 2005). The law defines the confidential information as any information that the government and security forces consider as secret information, or certain documents. In specific words, it means the information that is related to the foreign relations of Israel, or information about meetings with delegates of certain countries (Jammal, 2005).

2.5.4 Military Censorship

In Israel, which considers itself as the most democratic country in the Middle East, the previous regulation came up with the military censorship device on everything that media and press publishes. There is a military censorship on the information and news inside and outside the country, the army censors the foreign agencies and their correspondents, and it prevents the local media from transferring information from outside the state to inside. This way has been used–since 1945 according to the British emergency law. The military censorship can punish journalists and close mediums that do not commit to its instructions and they cannot appeal to that (Hassouna, 2014) (Ramadan, 2005).

The minister of security is the one who employs the military censorship officer, and his team includes the officers and soldieries or men former army. They have two offices; one in Tel Aviv and the other in Jerusalem. Anyone who wants to publish

any material about the security of the state has to get a permit from the military censorship. Otherwise, he/she will be punished. In the same context, the military censorship closed “Hadashot” newspaper for 3 days, and forced the channel 2 to apologize because it published information without permission from the military censorship (Odwan, 2012).

2.5.5 Israeli Army Spokesman

In the Israeli Army, there is a unit, the mission of which is dealing with the information and media means. This unit has an impact on whatever published by the Israeli media, and it prevents publishing any information related to the army without its permission. This unit also recommends the information and the contents that the journalists can publish (Wafa, 2011).

These things are not based on law or formal regulations; but they are just orders got from the Israeli army spokesperson unit. This unit is also responsible for the appointments of the military correspondents in the Israeli mediums, and no one can be military reporter without its permission (Jammal, 2005).

For these reasons, people should understand that everything the Israeli media publishes pass under the scissors of the Israeli media censorship. Israel is a state that is based on the security and secret information, especially the information or news that may serve their enemy or that is related to the security matters. It started to use media censorship before it is founded by using tough ways, but now it has formal regulations and articles from the constitution to censor the media and control the minds of people.

According to the Spiegel Online International Website, this conducted an interview with Israel's chief censor in April 2010, the Israeli chief censor said:

“I will censor anything that will be useful to the enemy. The Israeli journalists have a self-censorship, they were deciding by themselves if the publication will harm the national security or not, they are more security-oriented than we are at the censor's office” (Spiegel Online, 2010).

The chief censor considers everything that he does as legal because there are gag orders that prevent publishing some information and judgment procedures exclude them. In addition to that, the foreign press portrayed Israel as a third world country.

The chief Censor said:

“Every month there are more than 100 items came to the censor offices, we make some corrections for 15% of them before publishing” (Spiegel Online, 2010).

2.6 The Recent Israeli Media Map

In this part, the researcher shows recent Israeli media map or structure that will help to understand how the Israeli media is working and what its most widespread and effective outlets. The researcher divided the Israeli media to six classifications; (newspapers, radio, television, departments and media offices in ministries, electronic media and other media means). Three authorities supervise, control and censor the Israeli media.

2.6.1 Israeli Media Authorities

There are three main authorities control the Israeli media. They are:

- **Israeli media ministry and broadcast authorities:** it is the official and governmental side that is responsible for organizing the Israeli media outlets and giving them permissions to work. The Israeli ministry comprises underneath the authority of broadcasting and regulations that have a responsibility to organize the

televisions and radios in Israel (Jammal, 2005). Its mission is to regulate the work of media in Israel and outside Israel (Our-Vision, 2011).

- **The committee of editors:** it was founded in 1945. Its mission is to censor the Israeli press and to coordinate with the army about what press should to publish or not. In addition, the press cannot complain about the gag orders or prevent publishing some information (Jammal, 2005, p. 203).

- **The military censorship:** it is a military side; all its team members have military background or work in the Israeli army. It subjects to the Israeli defense ministry. They have a right to censor all information that Israeli media outlets are publishing like a pre or post censorship, especially which related to the security matters (Jammal, 2005, p. 211).

2.6.2 Israeli Media Outlets

In this part, the researcher shows the Israeli media outlets map and sections in terms of print media, radio, television, media departments and offices in ministers and digital media. Also the Israeli media outlets in this part are divided according to the language and ownership.

❖ **Print Media and Newspapers**

The languages that print media and newspapers issued by:

1- **Hebrew language:**

➤ Partisan ownership: “Hatsofeeh” newspaper belongs to religious party “Hamevdal”. “Hamodiaa” newspaper which is owned by the religious party “Agodat Yesrael”. Also “Yiteed Neman” newspaper, “Yom Shishi” weekly newspaper,

“HamaHaneh Hayahodi” all of these newspapers are owned and belong to the religious parties (Odwan, 2012).

➤ Private property and commercial companies: “Yedioth Ahronoth” the most widespread newspaper is Israeli with right trends, “Maariv” with right trends; “Haaretz” has left trends, “Glops” (Hassouna, 2014).

➤ Governmental ownership: “Yesrael Hayom” which is issued and distributed freely (Odwan, 2012).

2- Arabic language:

➤ Israeli ownership: “AL-Ahali” which belongs to “Maariv” company (Odwan, 2012, p. 34).

➤ Arabic ownership: “AL-Etihad” newspaper, “Sawt ALhaq Walhorria” newspaper, “Fasel Almaqal” newspaper...etc. which are owned by Arabic parties. In addition to “Kul AL-Arab”, “Panorama”...etc. whichre independent (Jammal, 2005, pp. 111-114).

3- Russian language: “Festee” newspaper, which is owned by Yedioth Ahronoth Company and is considered as the most widespread, “Nopisti Nedli” weekly newspaper, which is owned by media companies mostly, “Glops” newspaper as appendix (Jammal, 2005, p. 88).

4- English language: the most popular and oldest English-speaking newspaper in Israel is “Jerusalem Post” newspaper (Odwan, 2012).

❖ Radio

There are four types of the radios in Israel in terms of the ownership: governmental ownership, army ownership, partisan ownership and private ownership.

1- **Governmental ownership:** there are four main radio networks owned by government network A the oldest one 1940, network B for especially news, network C for music and entertainment matters, network D which contents the Arabic-speaking radio “Koul Yesrael” which means the voice of Israel (Jammal, 2005).

2- **Army ownership:** the radio of army which named “Gali Tsahal” was founded in 1950. It belongs directly to the Israeli defense ministry and serving the military and army matters (Wafa, 2011).

3- **Partisan ownership:** such as the radio of channel 7 which is a religious radio, and a few other radios (Jammal, 2005).

4- **Private radios.**

❖ Television

The Israeli television channels can be divided in terms of ownership to governmental, partisan and private ownership.

1- **Governmental ownership:** the main governmental television in Israel is channel 1 that started in 1968 and is broadcasting in two languages; Hebrew and Arabic. Also the channel 3, “Kenisset” channel for the Israeli parliament, and other few channels (Hassouna, 2014, p. 20).

2- Partisan ownership: the channel 7, which belongs to religious party and represents the right-wing extremist (Hassouna, 2014, p. 18).

3- Private ownership: the most widespread channels in Israel are considered as private ownership, such as “channel 2” 1990, channel 10” 2002 and other local channels work by cables (Wafa, 2011).

❖ **Media departments and offices in ministries:**

All the Israeli ministries created media departments and started to promote their vision, news, statements...etc. According to (Hassouna, 2014) the most effective media departments are:

- Media department in the foreign ministry.
- Media department in the defense ministry and Israeli army.
- Media department of the education ministry.
- Media department of the tourism.
- The media department in the office of prime minister.
- The media department in the interior ministry.

❖ **The Israeli Digital Media:**

In this part the researcher shows the main Israeli digital media divided to three sections: governmental and military media websites, websites of traditional media, Israeli media agencies and local news websites.

1- Governmental and military media websites: They include the websites of the Israeli ministries media departments, and all the state media institutions that work.

For example, the website of the Israeli army and foreign minister (Wafa, 2011).

2- **Websites of traditional media:** all the Israeli traditional media such as newspapers, magazines, radios, televisions and media institutions created their own websites on the internet. For example “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper, “Nana” the website of the channel 10...etc. (Hassouna, 2014).

3- **Israeli media agencies and local news websites:** in the last decade , many of the Israeli media agencies appeared for news and media services such as “Walla” news agency, 4040 news website (Hassouna, 2014), Times of Israel by foreign languages... etc. (About the Times of Israel, 2015)

❖ **Other Means of Israeli Media**

There are many of media outlets in Israel. The researcher tried to mention the most widespread and important ones with stressing that there are much media means he will talk about quickly as (Hassouna, 2014) mentioned:

- The institutions of polls, media studies, Arabic studies and public opinion.
- Cinema, theater, media companies, publishing houses.

2.7 How Palestinians are Mentioned in the Israeli Press

When we talk about the image of Palestinians in the Israeli press and how it portrays the Palestinians and their affaires, terms, culture ...etc., we should talk about the Israeli media censorship, especially (military censorship). The specialists in the Israeli media explained that everything about the Palestinians, whether they were security or military matters, subject to the military censorship, even the terms that the Israeli media used, to prevent any information to reach to The Palestinians (Wafa, 2011).

The Israeli press insists to portray the Palestinians savage who commit brutal acts against Israel. Meanwhile it is masking the real face of the Israeli settlers and army actions in the Palestinian lands (Jabari, 2014). The Israeli media is also practicing inciting against Palestinian by using some terms and focusing on certain issues and actions. For example, they describe the Palestinian resistance as a (terrorism). In addition to that, some articles in the Israeli newspapers describe the Palestinians as Nazis, or insects (Wafa, 2011).

There are many examples that show the terms used in the Israeli media to describe Palestine. For example, they use “Judea and Samaria” instead of West Bank. The name they use is a religious name from the Torah. They also use the word residents instead of settlers, towns instead of settlements ...etc. (Wafa, 2011). In addition to that, the Palestinian demonstrations are named riots (Hassouna, 2014).

The center of democracy in Israel prepared a report in 2006, which showed that the Israeli press ignored to mention the Israeli attacks in which Palestinians were killed. In the few cases they mention these attacks; it is all based on the narrative of the Israeli army, without any critical discussion for these actions. For example, the killing of the dog “Arkos” when it was hunting one of the Palestinians wanted in 2005, got a wildly Israeli media coverage more killing six Palestinians in the same period (Odwan, 2012).

The Israeli discourse usually lames the Palestinians for the war and violence actions by accusing them of starting the war and violence. In addition to that, it provides justifications for the Israeli military crimes and violations during wars. In addition to

that, the Israeli media is fighting to deny or question the Palestinian narrative of the actions (Hassouna, 2014).

Among the main characteristic of the Israel newspapers is that they do not abide on the objectivity and neutrality when they cover issues related to the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. They usually support the perspective of the Israeli government (Hijazi, 2014). Therefore, it is possible to measure what the researcher mentioned above when talking about the coverage of The Israeli media on the Gaza war 2014.

2.8 The Characteristics of the Israeli Media

The Israeli media has passed through many changes in its history due to the continuity of Israeli-Arabic conflict, and stages of privatization and liberalization. Also the development of the Israeli parties map has changed the form and characteristics of the Israeli media. In this section, the researcher will present the most important characteristics and futures of the Israeli media in terms of structure and how it does work.

According to the poll of the Hertzog center for media, society, and politics in 2003, 40% of the Israelis are reading newspaper every day, 15% do not read newspapers. This means that the vast majority of Israelis are educated and reading news (Jammal, 2005). In the same time, there are 65% of the Israelis following the Israeli television and radio, that means the Israeli society needs a good level of media to be equal with its educated and rich people (Odwan, 2012).

Below are some characteristics of the Israeli media which the specialists have mentioned after their different studies and researches:

- 1) **Sunset of the partisan press:** the partisan press only existed in the Israeli society till the end of sixties. Then some changes in the Israeli society led to improving the economic situation, with rising of living standard. In that time to issue a newspaper was cost a lot of money, the parties could not able to stay in the front of Israeli press or owned it (Jammal, 2005).

- 2) **The rise of private and commercial press (most widespread):** in the seventies and eighties, the private media spread over Israel, the people who came from other lands were seeking to follow neutral media without any ideological background. In the eighties, the private newspapers such as “Yedioth Ahronoth”, “Haaretz” and “Maariv” achieved the most widespread in Israel. Also this kind of media was trying always to be deathly and discussed the political, social, economic, humanitarian topics, but if the subject related to Palestinians or the Israeli-Arabic conflict, all the Israeli media will be recruited in favor the Israeli government vision (Jammal, 2005).

- 3) **The rise of religious press (least widespread):** the religious sect of Israelis did not find private press able to express their opinions or visions for the life or future of Israel because the majority of it belonged to secular parties or secular personalities (Jammal, 2005). Then they established a private religious press specialist in the religious people and religious matters in Israel. They launched many of newspapers during the eighties such as “Hatsofeih” “Hamodi’a”, “Yatid Neaman”, which were owned and belonged to the religious Israeli parties, in addition to the existence of other journals and weekly newspapers (Jammal, 2005).

- 4) **Pluralistic press:** all the previous characteristics, multi-language of the Israeli society and the economic and political changes in Israel, led to pluralistic press (Hassouna, 2014). During the sixties of the last century, the number of newspapers and journals in Israel were (400). In eighties the number rise to (500) newspapers and journals (Hassouna, 2014).
- 5) **Media censorship:** the Israeli media is suffering from the media and military censorship, which became pre-censorship by according to the Israeli law (Hassouna, 2014). The researcher will talk about the Israeli media censorship later deeply with more details.
- 6) **Israeli government and army is the first source for narrative of events:** all the Israeli press is attempting to deny the Palestinians' narrative of actions that happened between Israel and Palestinians (Hassouna, 2014). Its narrative is based on what the military and Israeli officials say as a first news resource. The media is just applying what the security and government asked it to say, especially about actions related to the Palestinians (Hassouna, 2014).
- 7) **Bias to Israel and inciting against Palestinians:** it is clear in the coverage of the Israeli media that it is bias to Israel through adopting certain terms, like considering the settlers as citizens, riots or violence instead of protests or demonstrations (Hassouna, 2014). Also the Israeli press justifies all the actions that the Israeli government and army committed and publishing some statements and sayings of Israeli officials or writers who insult and cursing the Palestinians in his talking (Wafa, 2011).

8) **The correspondents who specialists in the Palestinian or Arabic affairs have a military or intelligence background:** most of the Israeli correspondents are chosen according to their security and political backgrounds, not just as journalists but also they work as counselors for the Israeli officials (Wafa, 2011). A lot of them were working in the army or as investigator in the Israeli intelligence (Nairab, 2010). Such as “Roni Shakid”, “Yahodi Ari”, “Yoni Ben Manahem”, “Eitan Ben Elyaho” and “Amos Malka”, all these famous names in the Israeli media had worked as officers in the Israeli army, or in the intelligence devices (Wafa, 2011).

2.9 The Theories Related to This Study

The present study tested three media theories and the researcher talked about it by details in this part. The theories are (Agenda Setting Theory, Gatekeeping Theory and Framing Analysis Theory).

2.9.1 Agenda Setting Theory (AST)

The history of Agenda Setting Theory (AST) started in 1922 when Walter Lippmann issued his book (The Public Opinion). Lippmann said that “media helps the audiences to formulate mental images about the events that happen around them”, and then it affects their opinions and shapes the public opinion towards a certain issue (Hassuona, 2015). In that time, there was nothing clear about the theory, but in 1972, a study conducted by Drs. Maxwell McCombs and Donald Shaw brought the theory. They asked about the effects of media for setting the agenda of audiences and the most important issue in media coverage during the presidential election in North Carolina in 1968. This study is considered as first one that defined and named the Agenda Setting Theory (Freeland, 2012). In the following years, many studies were conducted about this theory (Hassuona, 2015).

The concept of the AST was developed by time, and there are many definitions for the theory from other researchers. Here, the researcher will present the definition of the theory that matches to this thesis subject. According to Baran and Davis (2003), the theory states that “media does not give people the chance to think, but it tells them what to think about” (Baran & Davis, 2003). It is clear that people think about what media offers them. There is a strong relationship between what the audience receive from media and setting their agenda according to it (Baran & Davis, 2003).

AST is re-shaping events and political issues to a new form to tell about the important issues that people should think about according to the media outlets agenda and editorial policy orientations that aim to convince audience and setting their agenda to serve trends of who controlling media means (Freeland, 2012). In other words, it means to focus and highlight on some events to stir up the audience's attention to affect their opinions or to convince them to take an attitude toward an issue (Hassuona, 2015).

The most important point related to the AST is its focus on the interaction between the audience and media means. Some scholars as (Baran & Davis, 2003) mentioned that its weakness comes from the limited impact it has on certain issues, such as news, media and political campaigns or election campaigns. This is all short time effect.

There are two basic assumptions of the theory according to (University of Twente, 2012). First, the media is filtering and reshaping information and image of reality, so there is no reality in media. Secondly, media is focusing on a certain issue, which

leads the public opinion to receive it as more important issues than other according to the medium point of view (University of Twente, 2012).

The AST can work by using framing and priming method to lead the audiences to think about what media says. Framing means “focusing the media on the essence of an issue more than other issues” and the way of bringing news about it and presenting it (Framing , 2010). It also depends on the way that media and media gatekeeper want to organize and present the content of the issue, “this does not only tell the audience what to think about, but also how to think about an issue” (<http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Mass%20Media/Framing/index.html>).

Priming: the focus of media on telling the audience prior context or information about an issue to make a preface or an impression about it (Priming, 2010)¹. Media priming concentrates on the importance of a certain issue and informing the audience about the media judgment about it, such as if it is good or bad and what are the best things look like (Priming, 2010). Therefore, we can say that framing concentrates on the content of the media message in AST, but the priming focuses on giving prior context and preface the media message.

The researcher chose the Agenda Setting Theory in this thesis to examine how the Israeli media setting the agenda of Israelis during the Gaza war in 2014 by focusing on certain issues and ignoring other issues, the way that news were presented about course of war and what the issues that media told Israelis to think about. In addition,

¹ <http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Mass%20Media/Priming/index.html>

the researcher wants to understand the relationship between the Israeli media and the Israeli army, government, news sources. Moreover, the kind of the coverage reflects the image of the Israeli audience and its consistency with media.

2.9.2 Gatekeeping Theory (GKT)

The first use for the term Gatekeeping Theory (GKT) was in 1947 by the Australian psychologist Kurt Lewin when he was trying to describe how people's behavior change when they are dealing with other people. He took a sample of a wife's behavior in a house as a person who decide what were the foods kinds would be on the family dinner table (Roberts, 2005). Kurt came up with gatekeeper term that meant, from his perspective at that time, the person who can or have to decide what shall pass through the gates that he has (Onwubere, 2011, p. 136). Then he noticed that news and media channels use Gatekeeping Theory through controlling what to pass or not (Unitversity of Twente, 2010).

In 1950, the David Mann White tried to build on the Lewin's observations and apply them on journalism and communication filed because he was working in a newspaper and he observed that the gatekeeper decides what to publish or not (Onwubere, 2011). Also McCombs and Shaw in 1970 realized that gatekeepers are controlling the knowledge of community, culture, information, news, media, means then they start to think and study the impact of gatekeepers on the audience (Unitversity of Twente, 2010).

There are many definitions for GKT, and many studies were conducted by using it during the last 60 years, but the researcher adopted this definition:

“Managing the information through a process contain to move the information through gates or filters. The gatekeeping process includes

selecting, writing, editing, placing, scheduling of the information. Moreover, every person can practice gatekeeping individually in daily life for example, the information you post in the blog or the email you send” (Rodrigo, 2012).

Gatekeeping is controlling the flowing of information in communication messages from inside the media means according to the editorial policy or the aims and ideologies of the owners through few stages in its way from the sender to the receiver. Some scholars consider it as a kind of media censorship (Barzilai-Nahon, 2008) (Unitversity of Twente, 2010).

The gatekeeping became like a surname for the people who have control on information access or those who can influence the decision and actions makers, also of people who have influence on other people (Onwubere, 2011). One of the basic points or assumptions related to the GKT is that there is gatekeeper in everywhere in our life, such as institutions, media outlets, organization, in everywhere there are people or things that control the flowing of information through the gates that they have (Unitversity of Twente, 2010). Therefore, gatekeeping does not only select what information or subject will pass through media and news, but also it controls the content of the media massage (Onwubere, 2011).

There are many factors that affect the gatekeepers who control the gates of media outlets, such as the standards and values of the society that the media is directed for, the subjective criteria of the sender and his trends, provisional criteria of media outlets, and audience criteria or receivers criteria that they are receiving media messages (Rodrigo, 2012).

The GKT is considered one of the most important theories for studying and understanding the media or communication process. The researcher has chosen it in this thesis to examine the Israeli media gatekeepers who are controlling the media outlets and how they were working in the Israeli media during the Gaza war 2014. The important issue is to examine if the Israeli media practiced gatekeeping or censorship and did not publish any information contrary to the army and government narrative during the coverage of Gaza war 2014.

2.9.3 Framing Analysis Theory (FAT)

The sociologist Erving Goffman was the first scholar who set clear features and signs about the concept of the theory after he applied it and wrote an article under the title (Framing Analysis) in 1974 (Hassuona, 2015). In the beginning, the concept was about social things and the ability of individuals to gain an experience to understand and interpret what is going on around them by a frame that is considered as a primary framework and does not depend on other frameworks (Framing Theory, 2010)². Goffman defined the frame as a processes that individuals doing to classify, organize, interpret their reality that make it easy to understand the events in its context (Framing Theory, 2010).

After the eighties, the Framing Analysis Theory got clearer because there were many studies that were done to examine and develop it, especially the studies of (Entman) who conducted a comparative study in 1993 about the impact of ideologies on the framing. His case study was the falling down of two planes of Korea and Iran. The second study was in 2003 where he studied the effects of 11 September 2001 action on the war against terrorism. In addition, (Scheufele) conducted a study in 1999 and

² <http://masscommtheory.com/theory-overviews/framing-theory/>

he said that the framing is parallel to the agenda setting especially in building frame (Hassuona, 2015).

The Framing Analysis Theory assumes that frames are affecting the public opinion of people and they may take their decisions according to the frame that they follow or subject to (Framing Theory, 2010). The researchers in this filed assumes that if the media means focus on certain aspects of an issue and ignore the other aspects, meaning that to determine specific news frame about an issue and present it by certain way, then the terms and direction of the audience will use it when they want to create or shape an opinion about the same issue. They will remember what the media say about it (Chong & N. Druckman, 2007).

There are many definitions for the Framing Analysis Theory. The researcher presents the definitions that are related directly to this thesis's subject. According to (Hassuona, 2015) Framing Analysis Theory is:

“an interactive process between communication elements that aim to highlight some aspects of an issue and ignore other aspects according to the medium and owners ideology, in order to interpret the actions, determine problems, knowing courses, find solutions and present or frame it as to the editorial policy of the medium” (Hassuona, 2015).

Another definition states that framing is viewing a certain issue by different perspectives in order to interpret the values or considerations of an audience. Also its means “organizing everyday reality”, “meaning to an unfolding strip of events”, “particular definitions and interpretations of political issue” (Chong & N. Druckman, 2007). Moreover, framing means how to present an issue to the audience and influence their choices and opinions towards it (Framing Theory, 2010).

The scholars consider Framing Theory tiding closely to Agenda Setting Theory in many ways because both of them focus on affecting the public opinion in certain topics. To do that, they set the agenda and then frame the way of presenting news, information, and trends about an event (Chong & N. Druckman, 2007). By this process, the mediums use gatekeeping to organize and present the ideas that are consistent with medium's editorial policy and agenda (Hassuona, 2015). We can say that framing is a way to constructs and define any communicated piece or information that is considered unavoidable in the human communication regardless to the topic or issue (Framing Theory, 2010).

The importance of Framing Analysis Theory comes from its ability to influence the audiences through the interpretation of actions and making a sense for them from certain perspective. In addition to that, it enables the researchers to measure and study the content of the media and its role in affecting the audience's directions. Therefore, no one can deny its impact on re-shaping the reality (Hassuona, 2015).

The researcher chose this theory in his thesis to understand the features of the frame that the Israeli media used and how the Israeli media framed the press material and actions according to its ideologies and editorial policy. In addition to explaining how the Israeli media framed its coverage of Gaza war 2014 in terms of terms, pictures, and technics of written press materials such as highlighting and blocking, flattening and deepening. Therefore, by this theory the researcher will be able to study, understand, and explain the content of Israeli media massage.

Chapter 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In Chapter Two, the Literature Review, the researcher presented the historical background of the study that is important, and how media work. In this Chapter, the researcher lays down the quantitative methodology that he used to carry out the study with the needed details. This chapter has six titles about the methodology starting with the research methodology, then the research design, data collection instrument, population and sample, data collection and analysis procedures and ending with validity and reliability of the study.

3.1 Research Methodology

This study was conducted by using quantitative research methodology to analyze the Israeli Hebrew-speaking media coverage of the Gaza war 2014 and took the online version of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper as the case study. The quantitative research is a study which is based on using, collecting and analyzing numerical data by statistical and mathematical techniques which lead results to come up as percentages to answer the posed questions (ACAPS, 2012) (Binita Devi, 2009). The use of the quantitative methodology in this study has been favored for getting precise results (ACAPS, 2012).

The content analysis of quantitative research was used in this study to collect and analyze the news that the Israeli media “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper published during covering the Gaza war 2014. Content analysis is a method of studying and

analyzing written, verbal or visual content of media messages because it is objective, systematic and quantitative description (Elo & Kyngas, 2007). In addition, content analysis helps the researcher to examine theoretical issues to understand them. (Elo & Kyngas, 2007).

3.2 Research Design

This is a case study research design which takes a specific issue in a specific time as the case study. The researcher analyzed the text of 116 press releases of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper as the case study to find out how the Israeli media “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper covered the war and presented the press materials during the war.

3.3 Data Collection Instrument

The researcher wanted to explore the features of Israeli media coverage of Gaza war 2014 by analyzing the press releases text of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper. Therefore, the researcher got the press materials that he needs to analyze from the electronic website of the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper Hebrew-speaking³, specifically from the electronic archive section where all the press releases can be found. The researcher access to the news of the war for counting and downloading by the publishing date, because the archive of newspaper classified by the dates, so it is easy to find the news which published from 7 July to 26 August, and downloading the sample of study which is 116 press releases from there.

This study used the content analysis coding scheme (check list) as an instrument to analyze the data according to the categories that the researcher designed. It is the best way in content analysis to do a checklist that includes the questions that the

³ (<http://www.ynet.co.il>)

researcher is interested in and then to answer these questions from the downloaded press releases. The next step of analysis is the insertion of the collected data by a check list in the (SPSS) (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) software to get the results in percentages and numerical.

3.4 Population and Sample

The population of this research is 1221 news, which is the total number of the news that online Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper published during the war period on its online website. The news of 5 days were selected from this population as a purposive sample, which is non-random sample strategy and result cannot generalize population.

The purposive sample was 116 press releases that “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper Hebrew-speaking published on its electronic website during the Gaza war 2014. The war lasted for 51 days from 7 July 2014 to 26 August 2014. The researcher took the press releases that were published during five days distributed over the war period. These days are the 2nd, 14th, 26th, 38th, and 50th of the war.

The researcher chose these days of the war as a sample for analysis to cover all the period of the war, so he took one day every 13 days of the war. That enables him to take the toughest days during the war especially in the beginning and in the middle of the war which was the day 26. Also he took days from the truce time which was before ending the war, such as the 38 and 50 day of the war.

The researcher has chosen the coverage of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper for the Gaza war 2014 to analyze because he has following the Israeli media during the war and Yedioth Ahronoth especially, and he was interesting about its coverage. Also the

newspaper is the most widespread newspaper and popular in Israel, which make it the most effective medium. It is also a private ownership non-state and it considers itself as an independent media (Jammal, 2005). In addition to that, it is not easy to get the electronic archive of other Israeli newspaper.

3.5 Data Collection and Analysis Procedures

The content analysis was conducted in this study in the spring semester of the year 2015. The data was collected by using a check list of content analysis which was prepared and piloted first through 19 press releases. This was done in order to help the researcher in getting real results, supervisor for the clarity, and to be aware about the corrections that should be done in the check list which designed to analysis 5 days of the war that consist of 116 press releases of the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper. After that, the collected data was entered in the SPSS software for analysis.

3.6 Validity and Reliability of Data Collection of Instrument

The validity of the research makes it more truthfulness and real to reflect the actual reality (Neuman, 2006). The researcher did a pilot study to test the validity of this study. He tested the instrument of the analysis (check list) by analyzing 19 press releases from “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper, and he input data to the (SPSS) software. Then he changed the check list to the right way to be more actual and truthful.

The reliability of the research is a confidentiality of the data collection and dependability or consistency of the work (Neuman, 2006). For the reliability of this study, the researcher did “inter-rater reliability” which belongs to statistical measurements that determine the similarity of the collected data by different raters.

The rater is someone who is measuring a performance, behavior, or a skill in a human or animal behavior (Stemler, 2007). So the researcher works with another researcher to collect the data and counting the press releases that “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper published during the war, so we counted all the population of the study which is 1221 press releases during the period of the war 51 days, and he took the news of 5 days that spread over the period of the war as a sample of study.

To make the results more reliability, the researcher used Conen’s Kappa, coefficient which is a statistic measures inter-rater agreement for qualitative (categorical) items. It is generally thought to be a more robust measure than simple percent agreement calculation; Kappa measures the percentage of data values then adjusts these values for the amount of agreement that could be expected due to chance alone (Cohen, 1960).

$$\kappa = \frac{p_o - p_e}{1 - p_e},$$

The whole number of the sample of the study is 116 news, its 10% is about 12 news, the (Po)⁴ is 10 and (Pe)⁵ is 2 news. The K⁶ = (10-2) / (12-2), it become (8/10) = 0.80. The reliability of the inter-rater and the value of agreement between the two researchers which is (K) is 0.80. According to the Cohen (1960) and Fleiss (1971) the values form 0.60 to 0.80 = Good agreement (Cohen, 1960).

⁴ (Po) = The proportion of units in which the judges agreed.

⁵ (Pe) = The proportion of units for which agreement is expected by disagreement chance.

⁶ Conen’s Kappa coefficient formula.

Chapter 4

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

This chapter shows the analysis of the press materials that the Israeli newspaper Yedioth Ahronoth covered during the Gaza war in 2014. After collecting the 116 news' data, which represent the sample of the study by the checklist that the researcher designed for content analysis, the data were entered into the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) software to get the results of analysis in descriptive statistics.

The present chapter presents the descriptive analysis of the data collected for the study and consists of three main titles. The first is the frame category analysis, which analyzes the frame of press materials and contains five tables. The second is the content category analysis, which analyzes the content of the press materials, and it contains 14 tables. The last one is the findings of the news analysis title.

4.1 Framing Category

This title examines the frame that newspaper presents its press materials to make it more affective and convincing. This part consists of five tables as the following: the press material in terms of including banners, the press materials in terms of including designs and info graphics, the press material in terms of including videos, the press materials in terms of including pictures and the press materials in terms of length.

Table 1: The press materials in terms of including banners

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Includes one or more banners	93	80.2	80.2	80.2
Valid Does not include banners	23	19.8	19.8	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The banners in online news are used to draw the attention of readers both in hot and continuous events. Also it is one of the facilities that digital media gave which can shape impression about an issue in the readers' mind. It helps them to understand topics of the news, clarify it, and make it more convincing. For example, when the banner is the photo of Israeli house bombed by Palestinian rockets, it will make an impression stronger than the text. This kind of banners was used in the press materials of Yedioth Ahronoth. This makes the event easier to remember, touch the audience, and make the news more influencing.

According to Table 1, during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014, the Israeli newspaper used a large margin by 80% of press materials that published during the war is included banners. Just around 20% of the press materials did not put any banner. This was particularly in the time of truce. These percentages indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth used one of the affective ways that digital media or online newspaper used.

Table 2: The press materials in terms of including designs & Info-Graphics

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Includes two or more designs	6	5.2	5.2	5.2
Includes one design	18	15.5	15.5	20.7
Does not include designs	92	79.3	79.3	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 2 shows that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper did not focus on using the designs and info-graphics in its press material knowing that it used by 21% and nearly 5.2% of it used for more than two designs or info graphics in one press material. The majority of press materials did not include designs or info graphics by rate 79.3% of the material that Yedioth Ahronoth published during the war.

In this case, this result could be negative because the newspaper focused on its frame on the pictures and videos as we will see in the next tables, in the time that was important to see more designs or info graphics about the statistics, losses, maps and shapes about the course of the war.

Table 3: The press materials in terms of include a video

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Includes two or more videos	53	45.7	45.7	45.7
Includes one video	34	29.3	29.3	75.0
Does not include a video	29	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

In Table 3, it is shown that Yedioth Ahronoth uses the digital media features perfectly during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014 by embedding a lot of videos in the press materials. This gives the material more credibility, and makes it afflitive, and accurate. Using videos also makes the news attractive for the readers, especially in the long texts the readers prefer to watch videos and this feature does not exist in the print newspaper. In other words, videos present the readers a brief or summary of the action when we are in the era of speed.

The Table 3 shows that 75% of the press materials of the Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper was include videos and 45% of it included two or more videos. The percentage of press materials that did not include videos was 25%. It means that the newspaper was interested to include videos and focus to draw attention of readers by it. It considers an afflitive way for presenting press materials and information especially during the war. These might considers visuals would make the readers more interested instead of following boring texts.

Table 4: The press materials in terms of including pictures

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Includes two or more pictures	96	82.8	82.8	82.8
Includes one picture	18	15.5	15.5	98.3
Does not include picture	2	1.7	1.7	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The Table 4 above indicates to the percentages of the press materials of Yedioth Ahronoth that included pictures during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. The vast majority of the materials, 98% of those materials, included pictures, about 82% of which included two or more pictures. That means the newspaper was interested in embedding pictures and telling the story of materials by focusing on pictures.

One of the features of the online newspapers is that the published materials there can include more than one picture to make the story more affective, important and attractive for readers. In addition to that, pictures cannot lie. This gives the news more credibility, creates the meant impression in the minds of readers, and draws their attention. Yedioth Ahronoth used this feature in a very good way to present its information by its perspective and editorial policy.

Table 5: The press materials in terms of length

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Long (501 or more)	60	51.7	51.7	51.7
Medium (251-500)	42	36.2	36.2	87.9
Valid Short (less than 250 word)	14	12.1	12.1	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

According to the proportions that appear in Table the 5 above, it is noticeable that the majority of the press materials of Yedioth Ahronoth during the coverage of Gaza war 2014 were long materials, i.e., the press materials that included more than 501 words forms about 52% of the published materials. At the same time, the moderate materials which contain between (251-500) words formed 36.2% of the published materials, and the lowest percentage, which is 12%, was for the short materials that consist of less than 250 words.

These percentages mean that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper is interested in covering the details of the Gaza war 2014. It covered the course of the war, military operations and tried to write a completed press materials. The length of the materials indicates the importance of the actions and the war.

At the end of the frame category analysis, the researcher found that Yedioth Ahronoth covered the Gaza war 2014 by using the tools and features of the online newspapers and digital media through the embedding of banners, pictures, videos in

the majority of press materials. It used designs and info-graphics in 22.7% of the press materials. In addition to that, the majority of the materials were long texts that contain more than 500 words to mention the details of the war and to highlight the interest of the newspaper in the coverage of the war. All these things are elements that serve to present the news and information for audience by a frame or way. This matter is related to the Framing Analysis Theory that talks about the way in which the media present the information to the audiences to affect their opinion or to make the issue more important for them as mentioned in Chapter Two.

4.2 Format Category

This part of analysis shows the format category analysis that it looks deeply to the contents of press materials that Yedioth Ahronoth published during the coverage of Gaza war 2014 by details. It includes 14 tables that talk about the press materials in terms of (subjects, political subjects, military and security issues, humanitarian subjects, main news sources, providing justifications, main terms repeated, sup-terms repeated, aim of press materials, image of Israel, Emotions, direction, narrative of the war, and showing losses).

Table 6: The subjects of press materials

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Political issue	25	21.6	21.6	21.6
Military and security subjects	60	51.7	51.7	73.3
Humanitarian subjects	25	21.6	21.6	94.8
Others (economic, social, cultural, media, Judicial)	6	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 6 above presents the percentages of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials, by subjects which were divided into four sections to find out the most subjects that the newspaper focused on during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014. So, the military and security subjects were the majority of subject by proportion 51.7%. Then, the political and humanitarian subjects, with the percentage of 21.6%, and other subjects, such as economic, judicial ...etc. formed 5.2%.

These results mean that Yedioth Ahronoth sat its agenda to cover and focus on the military and security subjects firstly because they were the most important subjects during the war from Yedioth Ahronoth perspective, then the political and humanitarian subjects were in the second place in the interest of the newspaper. This refers to the Agenda Setting Theory which states that a medium can direct and set the agenda of the audience to tell them what to think about, as the researcher mentioned in Chapter Two.

Table 7: Classifications of the political subjects

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
International reactions	6	24.0	24.0	24.0
Israeli internal front reactions	8	32.0	32.0	56.0
Palestinian reactions	5	20.0	20.0	76.0
Valid Palestinian and Israeli reactions	5	20.0	20.0	96.0
Palestinian, Israeli and international reactions	1	4.0	4.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

Table 7 explains how the proportions of political subjects that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused on in its coverage of Gaza war 2014 are shown. We can notice that the highest percentage was for the materials that talked about the Israeli internal front reactions, with the percentage of 32%. Then, the focus of the newspaper turned to the international reactions about Gaza war by publishing statements and comments of the international society, the percentage of which is 24%. But the Palestinian reactions were just 20% of political subjects and it was equal with the Palestinian and Israeli reactions in one press material. The lowest percentage was for the materials that included Palestinian, Israeli and international reactions in one press material, with the percentage of 4%.

These results mean that Yedioth Ahronoth was interested in publishing what the Israelis said about the war, especially the politicians, to deliver their opinions to the audience and make the Israeli society aware about issues that the newspaper would like them to be aware about. These facts emphasize that Yedioth Ahronoth sets its agenda to focus on the Israeli internal reactions because it is an Israeli newspaper, and in the same time it ignored the Palestinian political reactions about the war and dealt with them as marginal topics. It did not mention the whole reactions in one press material in the same time like to embedded Israeli, Palestinian and international reactions in one completely press material.

Table 8: Classification of military and security subjects

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Threat Gaza	7	11.7	11.7	11.7
Shows Israeli power	14	23.3	23.3	35.0
Course of the war	19	31.7	31.7	66.7
Israeli losses and harms	16	26.7	26.7	93.3
Gaza capabilities	4	6.7	6.7	100.0
Total	60	100.0	100.0	

Table 8 above shows percentages of military and security topics that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused on during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. The press materials that focused on the course of the military and security operations during the war from the materials were considered as military and security topics. They formed the highest percentage that is 31.7% of the press materials. In the

second place, the press materials that showed the Israeli military and security losses and harms during the war and operations of Israeli military with the percentage of 26.7%. In addition to that, 23.3% of the press materials that were considered as military and security issues were talking about showing the Israeli military and security power. The military and security press materials focused on two main topics, threatening Gaza, with the percentage of 11.7%, and Gaza capabilities and preparations of Hamas, with the percentage of 6.7%.

These results emphasize that Yedioth Ahronoth was interested in and focusing on following the course of the military and security operations during the war in details. It also intended to show the Israeli military losses and the power of the Israeli army. At the same time, it was interested in sending threats to Gaza that the military command was state and tried to make the Israelis aware about the power and capabilities of Gaza. These points are very important for the audience of Yedioth Ahronoth, who are basically the Israelis.

Table 9: Classification of the humanitarian subjects

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Israeli human losses	10	40.0	40.0	40.0
Effects of war to the	6	24.0	24.0	64.0
Israelis issues				
Palestinian human losses	3	12.0	12.0	76.0
Soldier's families	6	24.0	24.0	100.0
Total	25	100.0	100.0	

The findings summarize in the Table 9 indicate that the topics that the humanitarian press materials focused on during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. 40% of the humanitarian press materials mentioned the Israeli human losses. The percentage of the press materials that were talking about the families of the Israeli soldiers, especially who were killed during the war, was equal to the percentage of the materials that were talking about the effects of the war on the Israeli topics, especially the negative impact had the percentage of 24%. The lowest proportion was for the materials that talked about the Palestinian human losses, had the percentage of 12%.

These percentages mean that Yedioth Ahronoth was interested in and focusing on covering the Israeli human losses during the war and the situation of the families of the Israeli soldiers who were killed or injured during the war. This is to portray Israel as a victim and that Gaza violated the human rights of civilians. While it talked about the effects of the war on the Israeli society that portrays Israel as a victim, which is consistent with the results of next tables. Another important point in this table is that the lowest proportion was for mentioning the Palestinian human losses, which means that the newspaper ignored them, knowing that it is doubled the Israeli human losses.

Table 10: The main news sources of press materials

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Israeli civilian source	13	11.2	11.2	11.2
Israeli military source	27	23.3	23.3	34.5
Israeli governmental source	9	7.8	7.8	42.2
Both military and governmental	10	8.6	8.6	50.9
Valid Israeli official and civilian	15	12.9	12.9	63.8
Palestinian source	2	1.7	1.7	65.5
Palestinian and Israeli sources	25	21.6	21.6	87.1
Foreign news source ,agencies, organizations	15	12.9	12.9	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

According to Table 10, the majority of the news sources of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials were Israeli military news sources, with the percentage of 23.3%. The use of the Israeli governmental sources was around 7.8%, the press materials that used both of news sources Israeli military and Israeli governmental was 8.6% in other words, 39.7% of Yedioth Ahronoth news sources are completely Israeli official sources. On the other hand, the proportion of civilian Israeli sources was 11.2% and 12.9% of press materials included Israeli official and civilian news sources. The mentioning of information from Palestinian news sources got the lowest percentage, which is 1.7%. At the same time, the press materials that used Palestinian and Israeli sources even military, governmental or civilians was 21%. There was also a kind of

dependence on foreign news sources, foreign agencies and international organizations by 12.9%.

These results imply that Yedioth Ahronoth depended on the Israeli army and governmental sources which indicate that there is a kind of soft censorship or controlling on the newspaper by pushing it to focus on what they said, and to build its narrative of the war on their statements, information and narrative. In a similar vein, the newspaper clearly ignored the Palestinian point of view by ignoring the Palestinian news sources. It tried to get more information from the foreign sources and agencies. These points lead us to say that the Israeli gatekeepers and who ran the newspaper practiced gatekeeping during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014 in an indirect way.

Table 11: Providing justifications for the Israeli army operations

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Provide justifications for the Israeli army operations	77	66.4	66.4	66.4
Contrary to the Israeli army operations	3	2.6	2.6	69.0
Neutral	36	31.0	31.0	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The researcher divided the press material that Yedioth Ahronoth published during the Gaza war 2014 in terms of providing justifications to three sections. The materials

that provided justification for the Israeli army and its military by mentioning that Gaza started to attack Israel and that what happened was a reaction for Gaza or Hamas' actions...etc. The percentage of this point: providing justifications is 66.4%. The second section is about the materials that are against the Israeli army and its operations as critical materials: had the lowest percentage by 2.6%. The last one is the neutral, that tried to be more professional and described the reality, and its proportion is 31%.

These results indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth depended on the narrative of the Israeli military for the war and military operations, and it tried to stand in the Israeli and army side due to the direct or indirect Israeli and military censorship. This also leads to legitimize the army operations against Palestinians and killing them. On the other hand, it gave the Israeli army popular and national support. So Yedioth Ahronoth was not objective in this point. These results also refer to the Gatekeeping Theory and Framing Analysis Theory to apply how the gatekeeper of the newspapers wanted to present the information and course of the war to their audience according to their believes, agenda and thoughts.

Table 12: The most repeated main terms

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Israeli army	22	19.0	19.0	19.0
Hamas, Gaza	68	58.6	58.6	77.6
Palestine, Palestinian	5	4.3	4.3	81.9
Valid Israel, Israeli	20	17.2	17.2	99.1
Neither	1	.9	.9	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 12 shows proportions of the most common terms that are related to the war sides and were repeated in Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014. The terms that are most repeated are: Hamas, Gaza, with the percentage of 58.6%. There are considered as the enemy of Israel in this war. The second place taken by the term "the Israeli army", with the percentage of 19%, and the percentage of mentioning Israel or Israelis also was 17.2%. The terms of Palestine and Palestinian are the least used terms during the war, with the percentage 4.3%. The press materials that did not include any of these terms are 9%.

These percentages of the terms indicate two the sides of the war: Hamas which leads Gaza and the Israeli army which leads Israel. Yedioth Ahronoth tried to enlarge the power of Hamas and Gaza to show the Israelis and the international society that their power is equal to the Israeli power. This leads to take an impression in the audiences' minds that Hamas means Gaza and the opposite; so if Hamas is a terrorist movement, then Gaza is a terrorist strip. It makes Hamas as the address of the war knowing that

there are numerous other movements that were fighting against Israel in this war. All these points give a justification for the Israeli army to attack everywhere in Gaza regardless of the victims are civilians or military. On the other hand, the use of the term "Israeli army" implies that Israel is proud of its army and tries to support its operations against Gaza.

Table 13: The most repeated sub-terms

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Tunnel	23	19.8	19.8	19.8
Rocket, shelling	54	46.6	46.6	66.4
Killed	20	17.2	17.2	83.6
Valid "Tsouk Eitan" (The Resistant Cliff)	13	11.2	11.2	94.8
Neither	6	5.2	5.2	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

In Table 13, the researcher classified four sub-terms that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper repeated frequently in its press materials during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014. Most of these terms are related to the course of the war and military operations. The terms of rocket, shelling were the most used during the war, with the percentage of 46.6%. The word "tunnel" comes in the second rate, which is 19.8%. The repetition of the term killed was also present by 17.2%. The last and the lowest percentage was for the term of "Tsouk Eitan" (The Resistant Cliff), with the

percentage of 11.2%. The percentage of the press materials that did not mention any of these terms was 5.2%.

These results indicate the reasons of the Gaza war that Israel announced at the beginning to stop launching rockets from Gaza to Israel, and to destroy the tunnels that fencing borders between Gaza and Israel. Also, the terms of rocket and shelling imply that the military power of Gaza is higher than it actually is. This is to make it as enemy and equal power deserves to fight. All these points indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth was interested in mentioning the terms of rocket, shelling and tunnel to turn the focus of audience to these issues and to review the achievements of the Israeli army which was trying to stop it. at the same time, the newspaper was interested in showing the human losses and numbers of who were killed and repeating the name of the operation that the Israeli army named at the beginning of the war to give impression or connect the name with this Gaza war 2014.

Table 14: The aim of press material

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Shows Israeli achievement	12	10.3	10.3	10.3
Israel is weak state	24	20.7	20.7	31.0
Mobilizing of the Israelis, inciting on Gaza.	24	20.7	20.7	51.7
justify the Israeli attitude	24	20.7	20.7	72.4
Valid Provokes emotions of sympathy	20	17.2	17.2	89.7
Others (results of war, criticism, inform, supporting Israel).	12	10.3	10.3	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The Table 14 above shows the most important aims of the press materials that Yedioth Ahronoth used during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014. According to the Table 14, three aims got the equal percentage of 20.7%, Firstly, to portray Israel as a weak state; secondly, to mobilize the Israelis toward the war and incite them to support the war against Gaza and to convince them by the perspective of the Israeli army and government, and thirdly, the press materials wanted to justify the Israeli political and military attitude from the war on Gaza. Then the press materials aimed to provoke emotions of sympathy and solidarity toward Israel and its losses in front of Israelis and international society. The aim that got the lowest percentage was

showing the Israeli achievements during the war by 10.3% and other aims such as the results of the war, criticism, informing, and supporting Israel also by 10.3%.

These percentages seem like a completed work because the newspaper tried to portray Israel as a weak state, and at the same time it mobilized Israelis and incited them against Gaza. It also justified the Israeli attitude which supported the war. To achieve these aims, the newspaper provoked the emotions of the Israelis by affecting their passion and showing the Israeli achievements during the war. Yedioth Ahronoth worked on these aims to affect the opinions of Israelis and to make them stand by the side of the official attitude of Israel, by using gatekeeping about what to publish, agenda setting by focusing on certain aims, and frame by what is the way or frame to present that.

Table 15: The image of Israel in the press materials

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Valid Portray Israel as victim	76	65.5	65.5	65.5
Portray Israel as strong state	25	21.6	21.6	87.1
Neutral	15	12.9	12.9	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 15 shows the descriptive statistics of the press materials that Yedioth Ahronoth published during the Gaza war 2014 in terms of how it portrayed Israel and what is the image of Israel that readers took. According to the table, the most press materials were portrayed and presented images of Israel as a victim and a weak state, with the

percentage of 65.5%, while just 21.6% portrayed Israel as a strong state, and 12.9% of press materials were neutral or did not mention the previous choices.

These percentages indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth tried to bring the national and international sympathy and solidarity because Israel was subjected to the terrorist attack which also portrayed Gaza and Hamas as an equal and strong side that started the war. All these points gave Israel the right to defend itself and considered as excuses to attack Gaza and legitimize its shelling to Gaza strip. At the same time the international society denied the rockets of Gaza and its attacks to Israel. This refers to the frame that Israeli gatekeeper designed to present the information of course the Gaza war 2014.

Table 16: The usage of sensational press materials

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Sensational	42	36.2	36.2	36.2
Valid Not Sensational	74	63.8	63.8	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The Table 16 indicates the proportions of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials that were sensational or included sensational terms during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. According to the above table, the highest percentage of press releases that did not sensational is 63.8%. There are 36.2% of the press materials that were sensational or included sensational terms or stories and tried to provoke, encourage and motivate the emotions of readers.

These results mean that Yedioth Ahronoth took care of presenting sensational press materials in its coverage of the war. Of course, it is not the majority but also 36% is quite enough percentage during the war that most human losses are form Palestinian side. The newspaper tried to focus on the emotions and provoking them. This portrayed Israel as the victim of the war and sought to international support.

Table 17: The direction of the press materials

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Supports the war on Gaza	85	73.3	73.3	73.3
Against the war on Gaza	8	6.9	6.9	80.2
Neutral	23	19.8	19.8	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 17 shows percentages of the directions of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials, in other words, whether they are supportive of or, against or neutral regarding the Gaza war 2014. Most of the press materials that were published during the Gaza war 73.3% supported the war. The percentage of the press materials that were neutral i.e., did not support the Gaza war was 19.8%. The last and lowest proportions of the press materials were against or refused the war were 6.9%.

These proportions indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth subjected to the Israeli governmental and military directions which took the war decision and shaped the attitude of the newspaper toward the war. So there was coordination between the political, military and media institutions during the war by the Israeli gatekeepers and

who were controlling the censorship office that is responsible for what to publish or not and in which form. This kind of coverage mobilizes and crowds the Israeli and audience to support the war and to stand by the side of the Israeli government and army. This is a natural result for a newspaper that depends on the military and governmental resources of news in its coverage.

Table 18: The narrative of the war

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Supporting official narrative	53	45.7	45.7	45.7
Contrary to official narrative	9	7.8	7.8	53.4
Supporting the Palestinian narrative	7	6.0	6.0	59.5
Valid more than one narration to support official narrative	31	26.7	26.7	86.2
Israeli civilian narrative	16	13.8	13.8	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

Table 18 shows proportions of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials in terms of the narrative of the Gaza war 2014. This was found by answering the question who narrated the course of war and by which perspective. The majority of the press materials during the war supported the Israeli official narrative of the war, with the percentage of 45.7%. 26.7% of the press materials published more than one narration to support the Israeli official narrative of the Gaza war 2014. 13.8% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials published the Israeli civilian narrative of the war in the

civilian perspective. On the other hand, only 7.8% of the press materials were contrary to the Israeli official narrative of the war and the lowest percentage was for publishing the Palestinian narrative of the war by 6%.

These results emphasize that Yedioth Ahronoth depended on the Israeli governmental and military narrative during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014. This indicates that the newspaper reflected the Israeli official perspective and promoted it by some controlling of the Israeli gatekeepers and the military censorship office on media. The newspaper also tried to publish more than one narrative to support the Israeli official narrative of the war, which means that it cares about publishing and convincing its audience by the Israeli point of view about the war.

This interpretation leads the newspaper to portray Gaza and Hamas as enemy and terrorist as the Israeli official perspective see. On the other hand, the press materials that were contrary to the Israeli official narrative were very little. This confirms what the researcher explained before. Yedioth Ahronoth also ignored the Palestinian perspective and narrative of the war, the lowest proportion was for Palestinian narrative. This considered as unnatural and non-subjective, because the Palestinians is the side of this war.

Table 19: Press materials in terms of showing losses

	Frequency	Percentage	Valid Percentage	Cumulative Percentage
Does not show losses	35	30.2	30.2	30.2
Shows Palestinian losses	13	11.2	11.2	41.4
Shows Israeli losses	46	39.7	39.7	81.0
Shows Palestinian and Israeli losses	22	19.0	19.0	100.0
Total	116	100.0	100.0	

The last table, Table 19, displays percentages of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials that showed the losses during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. The majority of press materials showed the Israeli losses, with the percentage 39.7%. In the second rate, the press materials that did not show losses with the percentage of 30.2%. While the percentage of the press materials that showed the Israeli and Palestinian losses in the one material were 19.7%. The last and lowest percentage was for showing Palestinian losses during the war by 11.2%.

These percentages indicate that Yedioth Ahronoth was interested in showing the Israeli losses with the aim of magnifying their losses. This helped Israel to appear as a victim of the war and a weak state the enemy attacks it. In a similar vein, it ignored the Palestinian losses which are more than the Israeli losses by double fold, and if it was necessary to mention it the newspaper included it in one press material that includes also Israeli losses.

4.3 Findings

In this part, the researcher shows the whole findings of the analysis of Chapter 4 after he showed the previous tables and commented on them. This part contains the major findings which the researcher found about the coverage of Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper for Gaza war 2014.

- 80.2% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 used banners, and 19.8% of the press material did not include banners. The newspaper used one of the effective ways of digital media.
- Yedioth Ahronoth did not focus on using the designs and info graphics during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014. 79.3% of the press materials did not include designs or info graphics, and only 20.7% included one or more design or info-graphic.
- 75% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials included one video or more, and 25% did not include videos. This means that the newspaper was interested in including videos.
- 98% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials included pictures, and about 82% of the press materials included two or more pictures. The newspaper was interested in telling stories by pictures.
- 52% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the coverage the Gaza war 2014 were long materials that contain more than 501 words, and the moderate

materials that contain (251-500) words formed 36.2% of the published materials, which mean that the newspaper focused on the details of the war.

- Yedioth Ahronoth covered Gaza war 2014 by using the tools and features of the online newspapers through embedded banners, pictures, and videos in most of the press materials, and it also used designs and info graphics. These points served for presenting information by an effective way that is related to the Framing Analysis Theory.
- Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014 on the military and security subjects, with the percentage of 51.7%, and then the political and humanitarian subjects with the percentage of 21.6%. There can be categorized in three points.
 1. 31.7% of the military and security topics of Yedioth Ahronoth focused on the course of military and security operations, and 26.7% focused on showing the Israeli military and security losses, and 23.3% for showing the Israeli military and security power. In addition to that, it was 11.7% about threatening Gaza and 6.7% about Gaza military capabilities.
 2. The most political subject that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on during coverage the Gaza war 2014 was the Israeli internal front and reactions, with the percentage of 32%, then the international reactions, with the percentage of 24%. The Palestinian reactions were only 20%.
 3. The majority of the humanitarian press materials that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on were about the Israeli human losses (40%), then the Israeli

soldier's family and the negative effects of the war on the Israeli topics (24% for each topic) and 12% for the Palestinian human losses.

- The most prominent news sources of Yedioth Ahronoth during the war were military sources, with the percentage of 23.3%, then the Israeli governmental sources and Israeli official sources. In addition to the Israeli civilian sources, the lowest percentage was for using Palestinian sources.
- 66.4% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 provided justifications for the Israeli army and its operation, and 2.6% was against to the army and its operations.
- The most repeated terms that are related to the war sides in Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 were (Hamas, Gaza), with the percentage 58.6%, which (Hamas, Gaza) is considered as the enemy of Israel then Israeli army, Israel and the least repeated used term was Palestine and Palestinians.
- The most repeated sub-terms that Yedioth Ahronoth repeated frequently in its coverage of the Gaza war 2014 which related to the course of the war are (rocket, shelling) with 46.6% and (tunnel) with 19.8%, then killed. The lowest used term is "Tsouk Eitan" (The Resistant Cliff) which is the name of the Israeli operation.
- The most prominent aims of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 are portraying Israel as a weak state, mobilizing Israelis toward the war and inciting them against Gaza, to justify the Israeli political and military

attitudes and operations. In addition to other aims such as provoke emotions of sympathy and solidarity by showing Israeli losses.

- Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper portrayed Israel during the Gaza war 2014 as a victim and weak state by 65.5% while just 21.6% portrayed it as a strong state.
- Yedioth Ahronoth used emotions during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014 by 36.2%, but the majority of press materials were not including emotions or emotional terms.
- The most direction of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 was supporting the war by 73.3%, and just 19.8% did not support the war, but the lowest proportion was contrary to the war.
- Yedioth Ahronoth depended on its narration of the Gaza war 2014 on the Israeli official narrative by 45.7% and 26.7% for materials included more than one narrative to support the Israeli official narrative. Then Israeli civilian narrative by 13.8% and just 6% for the Palestinian narrative.
- The most losses that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on showing were the Israeli losses by 39.7% then the Israeli and Palestinian losses in the one material by 19.7%. However, the lowest percentage was for showing Palestinian losses.

All these results will be used in Chapter 5 to answer the research questions that were presented in Chapter 1.

Chapter 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents conclusions drawn from the study about the coverage of Israeli media especially Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper to the Gaza war 2014. Consequently, this section includes a summary of the study. Then, the conclusions drawn from the study and the recommendations for further research are presented.

5.1 Summary of the Study

This study is about the coverage of Israeli media for the Gaza war 2014 which aimed to find out how the Israeli media, especially Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper covered the war. It helps to understand Israeli media, structure, how it is work, especially in the war times, agenda, sources ...etc. also to answer the 11 research questions that the researcher put forth in Chapter 1. There is dearth of research due to the language limitation. It is considered as an important and unique study because it talks about the Gaza (Palestine), which is still a hot area and the war may start aging at any time.

This study conducted by quantitative methodology and content analysis is used for data collection method. The researcher developed a checklist and piloted on other newspaper and collected the information of 5 days which were 116 press materials of the Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper during the period of the Gaza war 2014 which lasted for 51 days. Then, the data on the checklist are entered into the SPSS software.

The present study proved that Israeli media, especially Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper covered the war from Israeli perspective by Israeli official narrative and ignored the Palestinian perspective and narrative. Also, the Israeli media provided justification of the Gaza war, supporting the Israeli army and its military operations against Gaza, based on Israeli military and official sources of news, portrayed Israeli as a victim, ignored the Palestinian losses, focused in the military subjects during the war, repeated frequently the terms of; Gaza, Hamas, rocket, shelling.

It was clear that Yedioth Ahronoth supported the Gaza war 2014 against Palestinians, and its press materials in addition to what was mentioned above was aimed to mobilize the Israelis to stand behind the army and government and inciting them against Gaza. That is was presented by good digital frame of online newspapers by using banners, pictures, videos, info graphic and long text with detail.

5.2 Conclusions Drawn from the Study

The checklist and analysis that researcher conduct in Chapter Four was aimed to answer the research questions of the present study, to determine the important and major features of the Israeli media coverage for the Gaza war 2014, online Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper which is in Hebrew as the case of study. In this part, the research questions are revisited and discussed how the Israeli media apply the theoretical framework which consists of Agenda Setting Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, and Framing Analysis Theory.

RQ.1 What are the features of the coverage of “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper during the Gaza war 2014?

The most features of the Yedioth Ahronoth coverage for the Gaza war 2014, present the press materials by digital frame by videos, pictures, banners, some designs and info graphics and long text, focused on military and security subjects, based on Israeli military sources of news the official sources, provided justifications of the war on Gaza, repeated frequently the terms of; Gaza, Hamas, rocket, shelling, supporting the Israeli army, portrayed Israeli as a victim, ignored the Palestinian losses and presents the Israeli official narrative and ignored the Palestinian narrative.

RQ. 2 What are the most frequent issues that the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper focused on during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused during its coverage on the military and security issues, with the percentage of 51.7%, and then the political and humanitarian subjects with the percentage of 21.6% for each one. Also 31.7% of the military and security topics focused on the course of military and security operations, and 26.7% focused on showing the Israeli military and security losses, and 23.3% for showing the Israeli military and security power. In addition to that, it was 11.7% about threatening Gaza and 6.7% about Gaza military capabilities.

The most political subject that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on, the Israeli internal front reactions, with the percentage of 32%, then the international reactions, with the percentage of 24%. The Palestinian reactions were only 20% and also 20% for the mention the Palestinian and Israeli reactions in one press material.

The majority of the humanitarian press materials that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on were about the Israeli human losses (40%), then the Israeli soldier’s family and the

negative effects of the war on the Israeli topics (24% for each topic) then only 12% for the Palestinian human losses.

RQ. 3 What is the attitude of the “Yedioth Ahronoth” newspaper for supporting the war and the Israeli army against Gaza?

The most Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 were supporting the war by 73.3%, and just 19.8% did not support the war, the lowest proportion was for contrary to the war by 6.9%.

RQ. 4 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” ignore mentioning the Palestinian losses during the war?

The most losses that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on showing were the Israeli losses by 39.7%, then the Israeli and Palestinian losses in the one material by 19.7%. But the lowest percentage was for showing Palestinian losses by 11.2%. Thus, the answer is yes.

RQ. 5 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” provide justifications for the Israeli military operations in Gaza?

66.4% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 provided justifications for the Israeli army and its operation, and only 2.6% was against to the army and its operations and 31% was neutral. Hence the answer for this research question is positive.

RQ. 6 What are the prominent terms that “Yedioth Ahronoth” used to cover the war?

The most main repeated terms that are related to the war sides in Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 were Hamas, Gaza, with the percentage of 58.6%; then "the Israeli army", with the percentage of 19%, and the percentage of mentioning Israel or Israelis also was 17.2%. The terms of Palestine and Palestinian were the least used term during the war, with the percentage 4.3%.

The most repeated sub-terms that Yedioth Ahronoth repeated frequently in its coverage of the Gaza war 2014 which is related to the course of the war are (rocket, shelling) with 46.6% and (tunnel) with 19.8%, then (killed). The lowest term used with frequency is “Tsouk Eitan” (The Resistant Cliff) which is the name of the Israeli operation.

RQ. 7 Did “Yedioth Ahronoth” adopt the military and governmental sources of news and narrative during covering the war and did not contrary to the official narrative?

The majority of the news sources were Israeli military, with the percentage of 23.3%. The use of the Israeli governmental sources was around 7.8%, the press materials that used both of news sources Israeli military and Israeli governmental was 8.6% i.e., 39.7% of Yedioth Ahronoth news sources are completely Israeli official sources. On the other hand, the proportion of civilian Israeli sources was 11.2% and 12.9% of press materials included Israeli official and civilian news sources. The Palestinian news sources got the lowest percentage, which is 1.7%. At the same time, the press

materials that used Palestinian and Israeli sources were 21%. Therefore, the answer for this research question is, yes.

The most narrative of the Gaza war 2014 were by Israeli official narratives and supported that, with the percentage of 45.7%. 26.7% for more than one narration to support the Israeli official narrative of the Gaza war 2014. 13.8% for the Israeli civilian narrative of the war. On the other hand, only 7.8% was contrary to the Israeli official narrative and the lowest percentage was for publishing Palestinian narrative by 6%.

RQ. 8 How did “Yedioth Ahronoth” portray Israel in the Gaza war 2014?

The Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014 portrayed Israel as a victim of the war and a weak state, with the percentage of 65.5%, while just 21.6% portrayed Israel as a strong state, and 12.9% of press materials were neutral.

RQ. 9 What is the extent of using “Yedioth Ahronoth” for Palestinian sources for its news?

The Palestinian news sources had the lowest percentage, which is 1.7% of the Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the Gaza war 2014, and the press materials that used both Palestinian and Israeli sources were 21%. On the other hand, in terms of the narrative of the war the lowest percentage was for publishing Palestinian narrative by 6% which means that Yedioth Ahronoth was ignoring the Palestinian narrative, perspective and news sources of the war.

RQ. 10 Did Yedioth Ahronoth used emotions frame and provoke emotions during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

The most of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials did not use or include emotions by 63.8% and only 36.2% of the press materials that included emotional terms or stories and tried to provoke, encourage and motivate the emotions of readers.

RQ. 11 What are the main aims appeared in the press materials of the Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper during the coverage of the Gaza war 2014?

The most important aims of Yedioth Ahronoth during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014 were to portray Israel as weak state, to mobilize the Israelis by the perspective of the Israeli army and government and incite them to support the war against Gaza, and to justify the Israeli political and military attitude by 20.7% for each aim. Then attempt to provoke emotions of sympathy and solidarity by 17.2%. And the lowest percentage was for showing the Israeli achievements during the war by 10.3%.

Moreover, the theoretical frame work of the present study includes the Agenda Setting Theory, Gatekeeping Theory, and the Frame Analysis Theory. The researcher shows here how the Israeli media, especially Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper apply these theories during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014.

The Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused on its coverage on the military and security issues and made it as first agenda during the war then political and human issues, so it wanted to tell the people to think about these issues. In the military and security issues Yedioth Ahronoth focused on firstly, the course of military and

security operations, then focused on showing the Israeli military and security losses and showing the Israeli military and security power.

The most political issues Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper focused on the Israeli internal front reactions by 32%, then international reactions and Palestinian reactions. The majority of the humanitarian issues that Yedioth Ahronoth focused on were about the Israeli human losses (40%), then the Israeli soldier's family and the negative effects of the war on Israeli, and the last agenda was for the Palestinian human losses. All these points considers or indicates to the Agenda Setting Theory that trying to tell the audience what they should to think about and setting their agenda during the war, and also it ignored and did not focus on Palestinian issues, losses, and perspective.

The second theory that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper apply during its coverage is the Gatekeeping Theory which related to the gatekeeper and censorship those who order what to publish or not. Yedioth Ahronoth used mostly the military news sources, with the percentage of 23.3%, then Israeli governmental sources and Israeli official sources, which mean the newspaper was publishing what they are saying and it became like their tongue. In the same time the usage of Palestinian sources was the lowest percentage.

In addition to that, Yedioth Ahronoth depended on the Israeli official narrative of the war by 45.7% and 26.7% for materials included more than one narrative to support the Israeli official narrative. Only 7.8% of the narrative was contrary to the Israeli official narrative of the war and just 6% for the Palestinian narrative. That means the Israeli gatekeeper which it the military censorship and government was controlling to the narrative of the war and directing the newspaper what to cover and publish or

not, this also mean that Yedioth Ahronoth was subjected and applying the Gatekeeping Theory.

The third theory that the present study based on is the Framing Analysis Theory, which related to the frame that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper present the news and information to be more affective on the subjects and directions that newspaper need. So the frame of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials during the war was consists of, 80.2% banners, 20.7% included one or more design or info graphic, 75% included one video or more, 98% included pictures about 82% of it included two or more pictures, and 52% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials were long text, and the moderate materials that contain (251-500) words formed 36.2%.

In addition to that, 66.4% of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials provided justifications for the Israeli army and its operations, 65.5% of press materials portrayed Israel as a victim and weak state, 36.2% for using emotions during the coverage, 73.3% for press materials was supporting the war on Gaza. Also the frame of Yedioth Ahronoth press materials used specific main terms mostly which is (Hammas, Gaza), with the percentage 58.6%, (Israeli army) 19%, and sup-terms which is (rocket, shelling) with 46.6% and (tunnel) with 19.8%, then killed. All this points indicates to the frame that Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper used to be more affective on it audience and that what considers as a Framing Analysis Theory.

The general conclusions that researcher extract after this review of the present study that Israeli media, especially Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper was not neutral during its coverage of the Gaza war 2014 and was biased to the Israeli side.

5.3 Recommendations for Further Research

The present study is about the coverage of the Israeli media for the Gaza war 2014, Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper Hebrew-speaking as a case of study. Further research should be conducted to focus on the Israeli radio and televisions coverage of the war, and to look if there are differences between the media that cover the war by Hebrew language like a comparative study. Also further research should be conducted on the Israeli media that covered the war in English language and Arabic language as a comparative study or compare it with foreign and Palestinian media coverage.

Furthermore, further research would be conducted on investigations, such as measuring the effects of the Israeli media censorship by conducting interviews with the Israeli gatekeepers and Israelis. In addition to comparing the Israeli media coverage during the times of peace to the coverage during the times of war, examining the effects of the Israeli media ownership on the media discourse, study the Israeli propaganda, especially during the war and the inciting in the religious Israeli media.

The researcher suggests that the Palestinians should initiate a media device or medium that is specialized in the Israeli media. This medium is to respond to what the Israelis publish and censor the Israeli propaganda or fake news. It also should work on giving a good and real impression about the Palestinians to the world using Arabic, English and Hebrew languages. Also the Palestinians should be aware about the press materials that they translate and republish in Palestinian media, and

improve university courses on Israeli media to teach it in the media departments in the Palestinian and Arabic universities.

REFERENCES

About the Times of Israel. (2015). Retrieved May 2015, from The Times of Israel:

<http://www.timesofisrael.com/about/>

ACAPS. (2012). *Qualitative and Quantitative Research Techniques*. ACAPS.

Aggression on Gaza Motives and Results. (2012, November 26). Retrieved February

26, 2015, from Aljazeera.net:

<http://www.aljazeera.net/knowledgegate/opinions/2012/11/26>

Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies. (2014). *Third Gaza War: the Limits of Israeli Power and Resistance Horizon*. Doha: Al-Jazeera Centre for Studies.

Al-Madhoun, A. (2012, Desember 8). *Al-Qassam Brigades from the Stone to the*

Rocket. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from Alresala net:

<http://alresalah.ps/ar/index.php?act=post&id=64160>

Al-Mutairi, M. (2004). *Image of Saudi Arabia in the Israeli Press*. The Second Media Annual Forum, 153-178.

Al-Nakba. (2013, May 29). Retrieved February 24, 2015, from www.aljazeera.com:

<http://www.aljazeera.com/programmes/specialseries/2013/05/20135612348774619.html>

Al-Qadi, A. (2014, August 28). Numbers: Israeli Harvest Losses in the War on Gaza.

Retrieved February 28, 2015, from altagreer.com:

<http://altagreer.com/%D8%A8%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A3%D8%B1%D9%82%D8%A7%D9%85-%D8%AD%D8%B5%D8%A7%D8%AF-%D8%AE%D8%B3%D8%A7%D8%A6%D8%B1-%D8%A5%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A6%D9%8A%D9%84-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%AD%D8%B1%D8%A8-%D8%B9/>

Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations. (2014). Israeli Aggression on the Gaza Strip. Beirut: Al-Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations.

Arab Center for Research & Policy studies. (2014). The New Israeli Aggression on Gaza. Doha: Arab Center for Research & Policy studies.

Baran, S., & Davis, D. (2003). *Mass Communication Theory, Foundations, Ferment, and Future* (Third Edition ed.). Canada: Wadsworth, Thomson Learning.

Barzilai-Nahon, K. (2008). *Gatekeeping: A Critical Review*. ARIST- Annual Review of Information, 1-63.

BBC News. (2005, September 12). Israel Completes Gaza Withdrawal. Retrieved

February 25, 2015, from BBC News:

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/4235768.stm>

BBC News. (2009, January 6). Profile: Gaza Strip. Retrieved February 25, 2015, from BBC News: http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/middle_east/5122404.stm

BBC News. (2012, November 3). Palestinians Win Upgraded UN Status by Wide Margin. Retrieved February 26, 2015, from BBC News: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-20550864>

Binita Devi, N. (2009). *Understanding the Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in the Context of Content Analysis*. Mizoram University, Department of Psychology. Chania Crete Greece: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Libraries, International Conference.

British Mandate. (2011). Retrieved February 24, 2015, from Palestinian National Information Center - Wafa: Palestinian National Information Center - Wafa

Brownfeld, A. C. (1998). *Zionism at 100: The Myth of Palestine as "A Land without People"*. Retrieved February 24, 2015, from Washington Report on Middle East Affairs: <http://www.wrmea.org/1998-march/zionism-at-100-the-myth-of-palestine-as-a-land-without-people.html>

Chernofsky, E., & Abu-Qamar, H. (2013, November 14). Israel-Gaza conflict: One year on. Retrieved February 26, 2015, from BBC News: <http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-24927102>

Chong, D., & N. Druckman, J. (2007). *Framing Theory*. *Annual Reviews*. Polit. Sci, 103-126.

Cohen, J. (1960). *A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales*. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 37-46.

Elo, S., & Kyngas, H. (2007). *The Qualitative Content Analysis Process*. *Jan Research Methodology*, 107-115.

Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights. (2014, August 28). Comprehensive Outcome of the Results of the Israeli Attack on Gaza. Retrieved February 27, 2015, from Eruo-mid Observer for Human Rights: <http://www.euromid.org/ar/article/609/%D8%AD%D8%B5%D9%8A%D9%84%D8%A9-%D8%B4%D8%A7%D9%85%D9%84%D8%A9-%D9%84%D9%86%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%A6%D8%AC-%D8%A7%D9%84%D9%87%D8%AC%D9%88%D9%85-%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A6%D9%8A%D9%84%D9%8A-%D8%B9%D9%84%D9%89-%>

Framing . (2010, September 7). Retrieved May 5, 2015, from University of Twente: <http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Mass%20Media/Framing/index.html>

Framing Theory. (2010). Retrieved May 7, 2015, from Mass Communication Theory: <http://masscommtheory.com/theory-overviews/framing-theory/>

Freeland, A. (2012, November 12). *An Overview of Agenda Setting Theory in Mass Communications*. University of North Texas, 1-9.

Hajjar, L., & Beinin, J. (2014). *Palestine, Israel and the Arab-Israeli Conflict A Primer*. Middle East Research & Information Project, 1-16.

Hassouna, N. (2014, November 4). *Israeli Media: Structure, Goals, Characteristics*. Retrieved February 28, 2015, from Alukah.Net: <http://www.alukah.net/library/0/78051/>

Hassouana, N. (2015). *Media and Communication Theories*. AL-Alukah Network, 49.

Hijazi, A. (2014, August). *The Israeli Media: So it is and Thus Covered the War*. Retrieved February 28, 2015, from Palestine.Assafir.Com: <http://palestine.assafir.com/Article.aspx?ArticleID=3007>

Jabari, T. (2014, August 28). *How Israeli media obscures Palestinian humanity*. Retrieved March 2, 2015, from +972 Blog: <http://972mag.com/how-israeli-media-obscures-palestinian-humanity/96173/>

Jammal, A. (2005). *Press and Media in Israel*. Ramalla : The Palestinian Forum for Israeli Studies (MADAR).

Middle East Studies Center. (2006). *Results of the Second Palestinian Legislative Elections*. Amman: Middle East Studies Center.

Mozes, M. (2005, May 5). *About Ynetnews*. Retrieved March 1, 2015, from Ynetnews: <http://www.ynetnews.com/articles/0,7340,L-3028645,00.html>

Nairab, B. (2010). *Israeli Media, the Executioner Arm (Arabic)*. AL-Riad: King Fahd National Library.

Neuman, L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. US: Pearson Education, Retrieved April 2014,.

Odwan, A. (2012). *The Israeli Press Coverage of War on Gaza 2008-2009*. Al-Azhar University, 1-128.

Onwubere, C. (2011). *Theories of Mass Communication*. Abuja: National Open University of Nigeria.

Our-Vision. (2011). Retrieved May 2, 2015, from Israel Media Ministries: <http://israelmediaministries.org/about-us/our-vision/>

Philo, G., & Berry, M. (2011). *More Bad News from Israel*. London: Pluto Press.

Population. (2011). Retrieved February 26, 2015, from Palestinian National Information Center - Wafa: <http://www.wafainfo.ps/atemplate.aspx?id=2357#>

Priming. (2010, September 7). Retrieved May 5, 2015, from University of Twente: <http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Mass%20Media/Priming/index.html>

Rachel Corrie Palestinian Center for Human Rights and Follow-up of International Justice. (2013, December 27). Fifth Anniversary of the War "Furqan" Aggression on Gaza 2008-2009. Retrieved February 26, 2015, from Rachel Corrie Palestinian Center for Human Rights and Follow-up of International Justice: <http://rachelcenter.ps/news.php?action=view&id=11191>

Ramadan, N. (2005, September 14). The press and the Media in Israel. Retrieved March 1, 2015, from aljazeera.net:
<http://www.aljazeera.net/knowledgegate/books/2005/9/14/%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%B5%D8%AD%D8%A7%D9%81%D8%A9-%D9%88%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A5%D8%B9%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%85-%D9%81%D9%8A-%D8%A5%D8%B3%D8%B1%D8%A7%D8%A6%D9%8A%D9%84>

Roberts, C. (2005). *Gatekeeping Theory: An Evolution*. The University of South Carolina, 1-17.

Rodrigo. (2012, December 5). *The Gatekeeping Process*. Retrieved May 6, 2015, from The WritePass Journal: <http://writepass.com/journal/2012/12/the-gatekeeping-process-includes-selecting-writing-editing-placing-scheduling-and-ect/>

Sahli, N. (2008, December 31). Gaza's history of Occupations and Steadfastness. Retrieved February 26, 2015, from Aljazeera.net:
<http://www.aljazeera.net/knowledgegate/opinions/2008/12/31/%D8%BA%D8%B2%D8%A9-%D8%AA%D8%A7%D8%B1%D9%8A%D8%AE->

%D8%A7%D8%AD%D8%AA%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D
8%AA-%D9%88%D8%B5%D9%85%D9%88%D8%AF

Saleh, M. (2012). *The Palestinian Issue: Historical Background and Contemporary Developments*. Beirut: Zaytuna Center for Studies and Consultations.

Seyoury, N. (2014). *Media Coverage of UN Membership Request of Palestine: An Analysis on New York Times*. Gazimağusa: Eastern Mediterranean University.

Spiegel Online. (2010, April 23). Interview with Israel's Chief Censor: 'I Will Censor Anything That Will Be Useful to the Enemy'. Retrieved April 26, 2015, from Spiegel Online International:
<http://www.spiegel.de/international/world/interview-with-israel-s-chief-censor-i-will-censor-anything-that-will-be-useful-to-the-enemy-a-690811.html>

Stemler, S. (2007). *Interrater Reliability*. Retrieved May 15, 2015, from SAGA Researchg Methods: <http://srmo.sagepub.com/view/encyclopedia-of-measurement-and-statistics/eq550.xml>

Top Sites in Israel. (2015). Retrieved May 1, 2015, from Alexa.com:
<http://www.alexa.com/topsites/countries/IL>

University of Twente. (2010, September 7). Gatekeeping. Retrieved May 5, 2015, from Unitversity of Twente:

<http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Media,%20Culture%20and%20Society/gatekeeping/>

University of Twente. (2012, November 10). Agenda Setting Theory. Retrieved May 5, 2015, from University of Twente: http://www.utwente.nl/cw/theorieenoverzicht/Theory%20Clusters/Mass%20Media/Agenda-Setting_Theory/

Wafa. (2011). The Israeli Media: Structure, Tools, Work Methods. Retrieved March 2, 2015, from Palestinian National Information Center - Wafa: <http://www.wafainfo.ps/atemplate.aspx?id=8788>

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Content analysis chick list, the frame category

Content Category													
Includes banners		Includes designs & Info-Graphics			Includes videos			Includes Pictures			Length of the press material		
Includes one or more banners	Does not include banners	Includes two or more	Includes one	Does not Include	Includes two or more videos	Includes one video	Does not include video	Includes two or more	Includes one picture	Does not include picture	Long (501 or more)	Medium (251-500)	Short length less than 250 word

Appendix B: Content analysis chick list, the content category

Format Category	Subject of press material	Political issue	
		Military security issues	
		Humanitarian subjects	
		Others (economic, social, cultural, media, Judicial.	
	Political subjects	International reactions	
		Israeli internal front reactions	
		Palestinian reactions	
		Palestinian and Israeli reactions	
		Palestinian, Israeli and international reactions	
	Military security issues	Threat Gaza	
		Shows Israeli power	
		Course of the war	
		Shows the Israeli losses and harms	
		Gaza capabilities	
	Humanitarian subjects	Israeli human losses	
		Effects of war to the Israelis issues	
		Palestinian human losses	
		Soldier's families	
	The main news source	Israeli civilian source	
		Israeli military source	
		Israeli governmental source	
		Both Israeli military and governmental source	
		Israeli official and civilian	
		Palestinian source	
		Palestinian and Israeli sources	
		Foreign agencies, international organizations	

Format Category			
Providing justifications for Israeli army		Provide justifications for the Israeli army	
		Contrary to the Israeli army and military operations	
		Neutral	
Most main terms repeated		Israeli army	
		Hamas, Gaza	
		Palestine, Palestinian	
		Israel, Israeli	
		Neither	
Most sup-terms repeated		Tunnel	
		Rocket, shelling	
		Killed	
		“Tsouk Eitan” (The Resistant Cliff)	
		Nether	
The aim of the press material		Shows Israeli achievements	
		Israel is weak state	
		Mobilizing of the Israelis, inciting on Gaza	
		justify the Israeli attitude	
		Provokes emotions of sympathy	
		Others (results of war, criticism, inform, supporting Israel)	
The image of Israel		Portray Israel as victim	
		Strong state	
		Neutral	
Sensational news		Sensational	
		Not sensational	
The direction of the material		Supports the war on Gaza	
		Against the war on Gaza	
		Neutral	

Format Category	Narrative of the war	Supporting the Israeli official narrative	
		Contrary to the Israeli official narrative	
		Supporting the Palestinian narrative	
		Publishing more than one narration to support the Israeli official narrative	
		Israeli civilian narrative	
	Showing losses	Does not show losses	
		Shows Palestinian losses	
		Shows Israeli losses	
		Shows Palestinian and Israeli losses	

Appendix C: Sample from Yedioth Ahronoth online newspaper news

This is one of the Yedioth Ahronoth newspaper news that was published during the Gaza war 2014. It included a banner, a picture, a video, and titled (Tel Aviv opening shelters, Evacuation areas in "Rishon Letzion"). The news justified that because the Palestinians rocket Israel from Gaza. In the video, the Israeli defense minister is talking about the Israeli internal front.



תל אביב פותחת מקלטים, חופי ראשל"צ פונו

הסלמה

על רקע איומי חמאס על הרחבת טווח הירי מעריכים בישראל שיישובי המרכז יספגו רקטות כבר הערב. שר הביטחון: "הנחיתי את ראשי הרשויות במרכז להתכונן". גורם ביטחוני בכיר: "אין ספק שחמאס יירה את רקטות ה-80 ק"מ שלו". היערכות גם בר"ג ובגבעתיים. אלפי חיילי מילואים קיבלו צווי 8

יואב זיתון וגלעד מורג | עדכון אחרון: 08.07.14, 18:35

המערכה במסגרת מבצע "צוק איתן" צפויה להתרחב גם לגוש דן. עיריית תל אביב, ראשון לציון ורמת גן פתחו לפנות ערב (יום ג') את מרבית המקלטים הציבוריים. בתוך כך פונו מתרחצים מחופי הים בראשל"צ. קודם לכן גילה שר הביטחון **משה (מבוג) יעלון** שהנחה ראשי רשויות במרכז הארץ להתכונן לירי רקטות מרצועת עזה. על המבצע הוא הוסיף: "המטרה היא להביא לאפס שיגורים ופיגועים מהרצועה".

בינתיים החל **גוס אלפי** חייל מילואים מפקוד מרכז ופיקוד הצפון שקיבלו צווי 8 במטרה להחליף את החטיבות הסדירות. מהבוקר ועד 18:30 נורו מרצועת עזה לישראל יותר מ-50 רקטות ופצצות מרגמה. אחר הצהריים נשמעה אזעקה בגדרה, ובוצע ירוט מעל היישוב. שדה דב נסגר להמראות.

מקום התקיפה בחאן יונס

- שחקי בפייסבוק
- הדפסה
- שלח כתבה
- הרשמה לדיוור
- תגובה לכתבה
- עשו ממי לעיתון

ynet ספיישל

Local \$7 ללא הגבלה
רק \$7 לחודש ללא הגבלה בשיחות לישראל
Local03.com

