

The Iraq War on *Al-Jazeera* Websites: Did the English- and Arabic-language users experience different online coverage?

By Mohammed Al-Emad
School of Journalism
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, IL 62901-6601
mohammed_alemad@yahoo.com

&

By Shahira Fahmy, Ph.D.
Department of Journalism
University of Arizona
Tucson, AZ
shahira.f@gmail.com

** Paper presented at the International Communication Division at the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Chicago, IL, August 2008.

** Al-Emad is a doctoral student at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale and Fahmy is an associate professor of journalism at the University of Arizona.

The Iraq War on *Al-Jazeera* Websites: Did the English- and Arabic-language users experience different online coverage?

Abstract / This study examined the online coverage of the Iraq War in the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites. By content analyzing prominence of news stories, use of sources, and tone of coverage, this study tested whether *Al-Jazeera* news websites significantly differed in covering the conflict. Results showed a significant difference regarding the proportion of Iraqi news stories between the two websites. By and large, however, our analysis suggested no differences between the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites. Furthermore, the reporting in both sites relied heavily on U.S. sources and Iraqi sources in covering the conflict.

The Iraq War on *Al-Jazeera* Websites: Did the English- and Arabic-language users experience similar online coverage?

In March 2003, the United States and coalition countries invaded Iraq. Even though television made the 1991 Gulf War a “television war”, where audiences from over the world were able to watch the war live; during the 2003 Iraq War -with online reporting - the news media around the globe experienced a more dramatic revolution in war coverage. One of these media that closely covered this war online is *Al-Jazeera* network, the first twenty-four-hour all-news network in the Arab world.

Like many traditional media, *Al-Jazeera* news network launched its own news website from which it dispensed the news (Severin & Tankard, 2001). On January 1, 2001 *Al-Jazeera* launched its Arabic-language website (Salem, 2003). In an attempt to reach English-language viewers, the network later launched its English-language website on September 1, 2003.

Al-Jazeera websites have been important news sources about the Iraq War. They allowed more viewers to follow closely the recent conflict in the Middle East. According to Nielson/NetRatings, during the month of March 2003 (the month in which the war started), a wide range of online news sources experienced surges in traffics (*See Appendix A*). The Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website (*Al-Jazeera.net*), for example, was the fastest growing online news source during that month. It attracted more than one million unique visitors. By the end of March 2003, the Arabic-language website was ranked the 45th most visited new source worldwide.

Current literature, however, suggests that users of the two *Al-Jazeera* websites differ. A survey posted on the English-language *Al-Jazeera* website revealed that most

users of the English-language news site were from the United States, Canada, Australia and the United Kingdom (Johnson & Fahmy, 2006). On the other hand, another survey posted on the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website revealed that the vast majority of the users of the Arabic-language news website were from Arab countries (Fahmy & Johnson, 2007b).

Furthermore, by and large Arabic news websites have been accused of sanitizing Arabic hate terminology in their English-language media outlets. As one critic noted, “The Arabic version included the language of terror organization, while the English was cleaned with changes and omissions, including changes to the language of direct quotes” (HaLevi, 2007). *Al-Jazeera’s* Arabic-language coverage of recent conflicts in the Middle East, for example, has been accused of reporting the news solely from a biased Arabic perspective. However, one recent study compared the coverage of the U.S./*Al-Qaeda* conflict on the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites (See Al-Emad & Fahmy, 2007). The researchers found limited differences in coverage between the two websites. The results suggested *Al-Jazeera* produced similar news coverage of U.S./*Al-Qaeda* events to Arabic-and English-speaking audiences. No study could be found that has compared coverage of the recent Iraq War in English-and-Arabic language websites, however. Also, few studies have gone beyond examining a single-language media to compare coverage in a single news network that administers multiple-language websites, specifically media targeting audiences in the Middle East.

The present study will, thus, test whether the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites, targeting different audiences, differed in their coverage of 2003 Iraq War, a war that involved the invasion of an Arab country by the United States and its

allies. It will examine the use of framing devices in these two news websites. Specifically, it will test differences in prominence (frequency and placement) of news stories, sources of information used in reporting the war, and tone of coverage.

The Rise of *Al-Jazeera* Network

Al-Jazeera, the Qatar-based network, was established in 1996. As part of his move to introduce democratization to his state, Sheikh Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani planned for the network to be an independent satellite TV network free from government control and manipulation (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002). The network grew out of the termination of a contract between the Rome-based and the Saudi-owned Orbit Radio and Television Service and the Arabic TV division of BBC news Service. When *Al-Jazeera* executives were still in the process of structuring the new news network, the BBC's Arabic TV network collapsed, leaving 20 Arabic language media professionals without a job. The founders of *Al-Jazeera* decided to recruit the majority of the BBC's Arabic TV Service editorial staff. By 2001, *Al-Jazeera* housed a staff of some 350 journalists and 50 foreign correspondents working in 31 countries, including the United States. *Al-Jazeera's* staff, of editors, reporters, and producers of various Arab nationalities, was trained in the Western journalistic tradition, wielding the expert knowledge and understanding of Arab politics and audience (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2002).

Although it was launched slightly more than a decade ago, *Al-Jazeera* network is considered the region's most-viewed and most credible news network (El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2003; Johnson & Fahmy, In press). In a recent study, while *Al-Jazeera* viewers rated CNN and BBC high on expertise and low on trustworthiness and other credibility

measures, they ranked *Al-Jazeera* as highly credible on all measures. Local Arab media were ranked the lowest on all credibility measures (Johnson & Fahmy, In press).

Furthermore, the literature indicates that *Al-Jazeera* provides a unique source of visual communication. When compared to Western media *Al-Jazeera* viewers explained the network provides realistic depictions of wars and military conflicts in the Middle East. Western media on the other hand, they complained sanitize the coverage (See Fahmy & Johnson, 2007a).

Moreover, the literature suggests that *Al-Jazeera* has acted as a contributor toward freedom of the press in the Arab world. The network is said to have encouraged a more independent role of the media by supporting lifting government controls on the press in the region overall (Fahmy & Johnson, 2007b).

However, views toward *Al-Jazeera* vary. While some argue that it is the sole voice of journalistic objectivity in the Arab world (Zednik, 2002), the Arab network has been subjected to much criticism. Critics have accused *Al-Jazeera* of providing a forum for supporters of Saddam Hussein and supporters of *Al-Qaeda* to express their views (Hanley, 2004). Some Arab regimes have even criticized the network for being an avenue for dissident voices of anti-government movements (Negus, 2001) and of working for the *CIA*, and the *Mosad* (Israeli intelligence) (Zednik, 2002). Furthermore, *Al-Jazeera* has been repeatedly accused by the Bush administration of being biased in reporting conflicts in the Middle East. For example, U.S. officials complained that *Al-Jazeera* provides airtime to experts hostile to U.S. policy in the region (Mekay, 2004). More recently, the network has been accused of framing the Middle Eastern and world events in a way that

ignites Muslim and Arab anger against the United States, its military campaigns, and its foreign policy (See El-Nawawy & Iskandar, 2003; Zednik, 2002; Salem, 2003).

Media Framing & the 2003 Iraq War

Because any war involves at least two parties, a conflict can be looked at from more than one perspective, making the framing of war coverage crucial in portraying and explaining the violent news events to the audience (See for example Entman, 2003).

Entman (1993) explained news framing is “to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them salient” (p.52). Indeed, framing has been repeatedly identified as one in which the media emphasize certain aspects of a news event and downplay others. Past studies have continuously shown that the media frame news events in a way that selects and emphasizes certain issues, suggesting that news content is not an independent reality.

The U.S. Administration & Media Coverage: Researchers have studied how the U.S. administration used media in the 2003 Iraq War. Hiebert (2003), for example, examined the techniques of public relations and propaganda used by the U.S. administration in the recent Iraq War. Results showed the administration framed the issues, story lines, and slogans to serve its purposes. Techniques used included: the embedding of journalists, and staging showy briefings.

Similarly, Christie (2006) examined the U.S. rationale for going to war in Iraq. During two distinct periods of high and low support for the war, he examined White House briefings, two major newspapers, and a major television network’s news coverage. Results showed that during the period of high public support, there was a relationship

between the White House and media agendas on central issues of the conflict, such as terrorism, weapons of mass destruction and assembly of coalition to prosecute the war.

In a more recent study Fahmy and associates (2007) combined the agenda-building with second-level agenda setting approaches. They examined Bush's five most prominent rationales for invading Iraq (the 'war on terror', the desire to prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, the lack of weapons inspections, the desire to remove the Saddam Hussein regime, and the fact that Saddam Hussein was an evil dictator) to examine the three-way reciprocal relationship among the media, the public and the president on attributes related to the pre-emptive strike on Iraq. The study found evidence of the information subsidies approach, as President Bush influenced media coverage of the Iraq War. The findings also found more evidence of a linear model of agenda building.

In another study, Luther and Miller (2005) examined the U.S. press coverage of pro-and anti-war demonstrations before and during the 2003 Iraq War. They found partisan master frames in texts by pro-and-anti war groups. News articles about each group reflected the group being covered more than the opposing groups' frames. However, frames provided by anti-war groups were more apparent in news articles than frames provided by pro-war groups. Results also revealed the existence of delegitimization in anti-war articles more than in pro-war articles.

From a visual perspective, Schwalbe (2006) examined the coverage of the War in 26 U.S. news media. She found five frames the U.S. media used to reinforce the patriotic and government-friendly war narrative. These were: Conflict; Conquest; Rescue; Victory; and Control.

Finally, other researchers have examined embedded reporting during the Iraq War and how the process influenced the frames and tone of war reporting. Embedded news coverage, for example, was found more favourable in tone toward the U.S. military and in the depiction of individual troops (Pfau et al., 2004; Pfau et al., 2005a; Pfau et al., 2005b).

International Reporting & Media Coverage: A review of the literature shows several studies that have examined how international media framed the coverage of the recent 2003 Iraq War. Maslog, Lee, and Kim (2006), for example, examined the coverage of the conflict in five Asian countries: India, Sri Lanka, Indonesia, the Philippine, and Pakistan. They content analyzed 442 stories in 8 newspapers and found religion and sourcing shaped support for the war and for the protagonists involved in the conflict. Results showed that newspapers from non-Muslim countries and wire services were more supportive of the war and had a stronger war journalism framing than those newspapers from Muslim countries and stories reported by local correspondents.

Other studies compared U.S. media coverage of the war to international media. Dimitrova and Stromback (2005), for example, compared the coverage of the conflict in two newspapers in Sweden to coverage in U.S. newspapers. Their findings revealed while the U.S. newspaper coverage often used the military conflict frame, the responsibility and anti-war protest frames were common in Swedish reporting. Further, the U.S. reporting relied heavily on government and military sources while the Swedish coverage was more negative toward the war than its U.S. counterpart.

From the visual perspective, Fahmy (2007) conducted a cross-national visual research examining the visual framing of the toppling of Saddam Hussein statue. She

explored the influences of competing contextual variables and newspaper attributes on frequency and overall tone of photographs. In examining the coverage in 43 newspapers of 30 countries, findings indicated U.S. newspapers overall ran more visuals depicting a victory/liberation frame than newspapers from coalition and non-coalition countries.

Arab Media and Framing War Coverage: The fact that the 2003 Iraq War was against an Arab country has raised the question of whether Arab media, in general, framed the war from an Arab perspective. Several studies, have thus, explored *Al-Jazeera's* coverage of the war using different approaches (See for example Zayani & Ayish, 2006; Youssef, 2004; Wick & Wick, 2004; Any, Livingston & Hebert, 2005).

Zayani and Ayish (2006) examined how Arab media reported the fall of Baghdad and the collapse of the Saddam Hussein regime. The researchers qualitatively analyzed how three pan-Arab satellite news channels: *Al-Jazeera*, *Al-Arabiya* and *Abu Dhabi TV* handled war reporting from a narrative and a visual perspective. They found that, for Arab journalists, in reporting the fall of Baghdad, objectivity was in many ways bound to the attitude of the journalist toward the issue at hand and toward the people involved in it. Their analysis suggested that, while driven by professional consideration, the news values of the Arab satellite channels examined were tainted with cultural, political and historical considerations.

Youssef (2004) examined how American and Arab media propagandized their audience through the reporting of Iraqi civilians casualties. By analyzing the content of online news in CNN and *Al-Jazeera* websites, she found both news outlets disseminated propagandistic messages as they downplayed casualties based on the 2003 invasion of

Iraq. She concluded that news reports in both CNN and *Al-Jazeera* exhibited with accepted values within each culture.

In other comparative studies, Wicks and Wicks (2004) analyzed the coverage of the fall of Baghdad in *Al-Jazeera*, CNN and Fox News. They found that *Al-Jazeera* and CNN employed action and normative frames to communication information, while *Fox News* relied most heavily on dichotomizing strategies that pitted American forces against the evil enemy. Similarly, Aday, Livingston and Hebert (2005) found that most of the Iraq War coverage on CNN, ABC, CBS and *Al-Jazeera* was objective and balanced. However, they reported that the coverage of the War on *Fox News* was very biased, in support of the war.

Hypotheses

As mentioned earlier, because Arab news websites have been largely accused of sanitizing Arabic hate terminology in their English-language counterparts (i.e. (HaLevi, 2007), and because the conflict involved the invasion of an Arab country by the United States and its allies, the following hypotheses related to the Iraq War were formulated:

Hs: The Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website was more likely than the English-language *Al-Jazeera* website to differ in reporting the Iraq War in terms of 1) prominence (frequency and placement), 2) attributed sources, and 3) tone of coverage.

Method

Two data sets were collected during the month of March 2004. The first data set is from the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website. The second data set is from the English-

language *Al-Jazeera* website. The whole month of March 2004 was selected for a couple of reasons: First, it was the first-year anniversary since the United States and its allies invaded Iraq on March 21, 2003. Second, the U.S./Iraq conflict worsened and the numbers of U.S. casualties notably increased during March 2004.

All news stories covering the Iraq War, including headlines that led to stories appearing on the homepages of both *Al-Jazeera* websites were analyzed. Since the online content continuously changes and as Massey and Levy (1999) suggested, online newspapers need to be visited twice within 24 hours. Therefore, taking into consideration the 8 to 11-hour time-zone difference between the United States and the Middle East, the initial visit was between 12:00 p.m. and 2:00 p.m. in New York (which was between 8:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. in the Middle East). The second visit was 12 hours later between 12:00 a.m. and 2:00 a.m. in New York (which was between 8:00 a.m. and 10:00 a.m. in the Middle East). Sometimes the same news stories were updated, thus, a news story was considered a new different story and was analyzed if the headline and the lead stories changed. For the purpose of this study, all content was analyzed based on the following three variables:

Prominence: To test whether *Al-Jazeera* websites differed in reporting the Iraq War in terms of prominence, the frequency and placement of war stories on the homepages of the two sites were coded. The placement coding was based on three categories: a) Lead story, which is considered to be the most important news item, b) Top news story, which is the next most important story, c) Other homepage story, which is least important.

Attributed Sources: To test whether the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website differed than the English- language *Al-Jazeera* website in using sources of information in

reporting the Iraq War, quoted and paraphrased statements attributed to sources of news were coded. The sources were coded based on five categories: a) U.S. sources, b) Coalition sources -- which were the sources of coalition countries participating in the war, c) Iraqi sources, e) International sources -- which were the sources of any country other than the coalition countries, and f) *Al-Jazeera* sources. (*For details on coding sources see Appendix B*). If a source was quoted or paraphrased more than once, it was coded as one source.

Tone of Coverage: To examine whether *Al-Jazeera* websites differed in reporting the Iraq War in terms of tone of reporting, tone was analyzed using Wall's (1997) concept of agency. The term agent is defined as a particular reference to an actor who is perceived to have done something negative, positive, or neutral and therefore is an *agent* of action. The particular agents chosen for coding were the combatants of the conflict (United States, Coalition countries, and Iraq), or the people, groups, organizations or actions that represented them or reported to represent them. Agents were coded as positive, negative or neutral based on the qualities and attributes assigned to them. Each news story had only one agent. Based on a pilot sample of news stories, the headline and at least the first three paragraphs of the news story needed to be read in order to identify the agent. When the agent was not clear in the headline, the lead, and the first three paragraphs of the news story, the agent was coded as 'no agent' (*For details on coding agents see Appendix C*).

Guidelines were used to provide a systematic way in which all content was dealt with. Intercoder reliability was checked for 30 Iraq War stories (10.2% of total). The data reflected an overall intercoder reliability of 96 percent, based on Holsti's formula. Reliability estimates for each category were calculated by Scott's pi as follows:

Prominence (frequency and placement) 100%; Attributed sources 92%; and Tone of coverage 91%.

Findings

Overall, a total of 1760 news stories were content analyzed: 296 online stories covered the Iraq War and 1464 online stories covered other topics. Out of the 296 stories that focused on the war, 164 (15%) were from the Arabic-language website and 132 (19.8%) stories were from the English-language website. In terms of location of the news reports on the homepages, the majority of stories examined (84.1%), did not appear in the lead. Only 15.9% of them were listed in the 'lead story' category, and the rest of news stories were almost equally scattered between the 'top story' (43%) and the 'other' (41.1%) categories. Regarding sources of information, 586 sources were identified in the 296 news stories that focused on the conflict: 318 sources were used in the Arabic-language reports, and 268 sources were used in the English-language reports. On average, each news story listed two sources. Regarding the tone of coverage, after removing the neutral category, a total of 239 agents were identified and coded: 83 agents were from the United States, 31 agents were from coalition countries, and 125 agents represented Iraq.

Hypothesis 1 predicted the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website was more likely than its English-language counterpart to differ in reporting the Iraq War in terms of prominence (frequency and placement). This hypothesis was partially supported.

Table 1 shows frequencies and percentages of topics in the two websites. A chi-square test suggested significant differences (6.907, $p < .01$). In the English-language website, 19.8% percent of the news stories covered the Iraq War, versus a lower

proportion (15%) of the news stories reporting the conflict in the Arabic-language website.

Regarding the placement of news stories, the chi-square test showed no significant difference between the two websites, however. As shown in table 2, the English-language website placed 17% of the Iraq War stories as 'lead stories', and almost half (42.5%) were placed as 'top stories.' About 4 in 10 (40.5%) were placed in less prominent locations on the homepage. In the case of the Arabic-language website, 15.2% of the Iraq War reports were placed as 'lead stories', and similar to the English-language counterpart, it presented almost half (43.3%) of its Iraq War reports as 'top stories,' and about 4 in 10 (41.5%) were placed in less prominent locations on the homepage. This finding, thus, suggests only partial support for hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 2 predicted the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website was more likely than its English-language counterpart to differ in reporting the Iraq War in terms use of information sources. This hypothesis was not supported.

As shown in Table 3, a chi-square test revealed no significant differences between the two sites (6.550, $p > .05$). For example, results showed the reporting in both the English-and Arabic-language news sites similarly relied most heavily on U.S. sources (32.1 vs. 24.5%) and Iraqi sources (32.1% vs. 35.9%) in covering the conflict.

Hypothesis 3 that predicted the Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* website was more likely than its English-language counterpart to differ in reporting the Iraq War in terms tone of coverage was also not supported.

After removing the neutral category from the analysis, as shown in table 4, a chi-square test revealed no significant differences (U.S. agents 1.523, $p > .05$; Coalition agents

0.334, $p > .05$; and Iraq agents 3.390, $p > .05$). However, it is worth noting that our analysis revealed a trend of negative coverage regarding all of the agents involved in reporting the Iraq War. Specifically, U.S. agents were overall portrayed more negatively (75.9%) than any other party involved in the conflict in both websites.

Discussion

Few researchers have examined how *Al-Jazeera* network covered the Iraq War (i.e. Ayish, 2006; Youssef, 2004). These researchers, however, examined *Al-Jazeera* online as a single voice. In other words, they did not go beyond examining the coverage in a single language. Indeed, no study could be found that compared coverage of the recent Iraq War in English-and-Arabic language websites that belong to a single news source, to test whether the information presented to Arab audiences differs from messages presented to English-speaking audiences.

This study that was conducted on the first-year anniversary of the Iraqi ground war, examined whether the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites, targeting different audiences, differed in their coverage of the 2003 Iraq War -- a war that involved the invasion of an Arab country by the United States and its allies. This research tested the use of three main framing devices in *Al-Jazeera's* two news websites. Specifically, it tested the use of prominence (frequency and placement) of news stories, attributed sources, and tone of the coverage regarding the three main agents involved in the conflict: The United States, its allies and Iraq.

Findings indicated full support for two of the hypotheses tested (hypotheses 2 and 3). Overall, results showed no significant differences between the two websites in terms of: use of sources, and tone of coverage. Only hypothesis 1 was partially supported. This study found a larger proportion of news stories covering the Iraq War present in the English-language website, versus a lower proportion of similar news stories in the Arabic-language website. Regarding the placement of news stories, however, the chi-square test showed no significant difference in placement of news between the two websites.

Clearly, this study cannot assess any motivations for this coverage pattern, but it can speculate about possible influences on *Al-Jazeera* war coverage. *Al-Jazeera* (2007) has pledged that it will give voice to untold stories and will promote debate through objective reporting. Indeed, this study supports previous works that have found that the two websites used a variety of sources to tell the story of the Iraq War by relying heavily on both U.S. sources and Iraqi sources of information (Al-Emad & Fahmy, 2007; Ayish, 2006). As shown, both websites relied primarily on U.S. and Iraqi sources, followed by coalition sources and international sources.

Past studies have suggested that *Al-Jazeera*, as a single voice, has criticized the United States in its war coverage (See Ayish, 2006). In this study, it is worth noting that U.S. agents were overall portrayed more negatively (75.9%) than any other agent involved in the conflict. The tone of coverage for the United States for example was overwhelmingly negative for both the English-and Arabic-language websites (70.5% vs.

82.1%). This finding support several studies that have claim *Al-Jazeera*'s coverage of the United States has been unfailingly negative (See Al-Emad & Fahmy, 2007; Youssef, 2004) -- although Aday and associated (2005) suggested that *Al-Jazeera*'s coverage of the United States has been neutral.

Coverage of the Iraq War often focused on Iraqi civilian casualties, putting a human face on the war and portraying Iraqis as victims of an unjust war (Ayish, 2006). However, in this study it is worth noting that the majority of Iraqi agents in both the English-and Arabic-language websites were negatively portrayed (78.2% vs. 62.9%). Again this finding is in line with the earlier study by Al-Emad and Fahmy (2007) who found coverage of both *Al-Qaeda* and the United States was overwhelmingly negative in both *Al-Jazeera* websites. The authors argued that this finding demonstrated that *Al-Jazeera* was not a tool of U.S. opponents, but a network that was willing to be equally critical of both sides.

Limitations

This study examined war coverage in the English-and Arabic-language *Al-Jazeera* websites. However, patterns of coverage cannot be generalized to other Arab media outlets. Furthermore, this study was conducted in March 2004, one year after the United States and its allies invaded Iraq. Future studies should examine whether patterns of coverage have continued as sectarian violence and criticism of the U.S. war efforts

have increased and support for the war has declined. This study also only tested prominence, sources of information and tone of coverage. Future studies should include other framing devices, most importantly they should examine topics and themes presented in the two websites to get a clearer sense of whether the Arabic-language and English-language *Al-Jazeera* websites frame the conflicts similarly.

REFERENCES

- About *Al-Jazeera* (2003). *Al-Jazeera*. Available: <http://www.aljazeera.net> (accessed November 30, 2007).
- Al-Emad, M. & Fahmy, S. (2007, August). *Do they frame it differently: Examining the coverage of the U.S./Al Qaeda conflict in the English-and the Arabic-language websites*. Paper presented at the conference for Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, U.S., Washington D.C.
- Aday, S., Livingston, S., & Hebert, M. (2005). Embedding the truth: A cross-cultural analysis of objectivity and television coverage of the Iraq War. *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 10 (1), 3-21.
- Christie, T. B. (2006). Framing Rationale for the Iraq War: The Interaction of Public Support with Mass Media and Public Policy Agendas. *The International Communication Gazette*, 68 (5-6), 519-32.
- Dimitrova, D. V. & Stromback, J. (2005). Mission accomplished? Framing of the Iraq War in the elite newspapers in Sweden and the United States. *The International Communication Gazette*, 67(5), 399-417.
- Elliott, M. (2004, April). The people who shape our world. *Time magazine*.
- El-Nawawy, M., & Iskandar, A. (2003). *Al-Jazeera: The story of the network that is rattling governments and redefining modern journalism*. Cambridge, MA: Westview Press.

- Entman, R.M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43(4), 52-66.
- Fahmy, S. (2007). 'They took it down': Exploring determinants of visual reporting in the toppling of the Saddam Hussein statue in national and international newspapers. *Mass Communication & Society*, 10(2), 143-170.
- Fahmy, S. & Johnson, T. (2007a). Show the truth and let the audience decide: A web-based survey showing support for use of graphic imagery among viewers of Al-Jazeera. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic media*, 51(2), 245-264.
- Fahmy, S. & Johnson, T. (2007b). The caged bird sings: How Reliance on *Al-Jazeera* affects views regarding press freedom in the Arab World. In Philip Seib, (Ed.) *New Media and the New Middle East* (pp. 81-100). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fahmy, S., Johnson, T.J., Zhang, J., Wanta, W. (2007, August). *The path to war: A second-level agenda-building analysis examining the relationship among the media, the public and the president*. Paper presented at the conference for Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington D.C.
- HaLevi, E. (2007). *Arabic news service sanitizes English translations*. Available at: <http://www.israelnationalnews.com/News/News.aspx/121712> (accessed March 31, 2007).
- Hanley, D.C. (2004, October). *Al-Jazeera World Forum Takes a Hard Look at Freedom of the Press*, *Washington Report on Middle East Affairs*, 23, 14-15.
- Hiebert, R. E. (2003). Public relations and propaganda in framing the Iraq War: A preliminary review. *Public Relations Review*, 29(3), 243-255.
- Johnson, T. & Fahmy, S. (In press) The CNN of the Arab World or a shill for terrorists? How support for press freedom and political ideology predict credibility of *Al-Jazeera* among its audience. *International Communication Gazette*.
- Johnson, T. & Fahmy, S. (2006, June). *See no evil, hear no evil, judge as evil?: Examining the degree to which users of Al-Jazeera English-language website transfer credibility views to its satellite network counterpart*. Paper presented at the ICA annual conference. Dresden, Germany.
- Luther, C. A. & Miller, M. M. (2005). Framing of the 2003 U.S.-Iraq War demonstrations: An analysis of news and partisan texts. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 82(1), 78-96.

- Maslog, C. C., Lee, S. T. & Kim, H. S. (2006). Framing analysis of a conflict: How newspapers in five Asian countries covered the Iraq War. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16(1), 19-39.
- Mekay, E. (2004, May 26). *Washington urges media freedom—But not for Al-Jazeera*. *Inter Press Service*. Available: <http://www.commondreams.org/headlines04/0526-06.htm> (accessed July 22, 2007).
- Negus, S (2001). Letter from Cairo – Egypt’s political agenda is increasingly set by the viewpoints aired on *Al-Jazeera*. *The Nation*, 273(16), 17-18.
- Pfau, M., Haigh, M., Gettle, M. Donnelly, M., Scott, G., Warr, D., & Wittenberg, E. (2004). Embedded journalists in military combat units: Impact on newspaper story frames and tone. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(1), 74-88.
- Pfau, M., Haigh, M.M., Logsdon, L., Perrine, C. Baldwin, J.P., Breitenfeldt, R.E. , Cesar, J., Dearden, D., Kuntz, G. Edgar Montalvo, E., Roberts, D. & Romero, R. (2005a). Embedded reporting during the invasion and occupation of Iraq: How the embedding of journalists affected news reports. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 49 (4), 468-487.
- Pfau, M. Wittenberg, E. M., Jacson, C. Mehringer, P., Lanier, R., Hatfield, M., & Brockman, K. (2005b). Embedding journalists in military combat units: How embedding alters television news stories. *Mass Communication & Society*, 8(3), 179-195.
- Schwalbe, C. B. (2006). Remembering our shared past: Visually framing the Iraq war on U.S. news websites. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(1).
- Severin, W. J. & Tankard, J. W. (2001). *Communication theories: Origins, methods, and uses in the mass media*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing.
- Wall, M. A. (1997). A pernicious new strain of the old Nazi virus and an orgy of tribal slaughter: A comparison of US news magazine coverage of the crisis in Bosnia and Rwanda. *Gazette*, 59(6), 411-428.
- Wicks, R. & Wicks, J. L. (2004, May). *Televised coverage of the war in Iraq on Al-Jazeera, CNN and Fox News*. Paper presented at the conference for International Communication Association, New Orleans, Louisiana.
- Youssef, M. (2004, August). *Their word against ours: News discourse of the 2003 Gulf War civilian casualties in CNN and Al-Jazeera*. Paper presented at the conference for Association of Educators in Journalism and Mass Communication, Toronto, Canada.

Zayani, M. & Ayish, M. (2006). Arab satellite television and crisis reporting: Covering the fall of Baghdad. *The International Communication Gazette*, 68(5-6), 473-497.

Zednik, R (2002). Perspectives on war- inside *Al-Jazeera*. *Columbia Journalism Review*, 40(6), 44-47.

Table 1: Frequency and Percentages of news stories about the Iraq War in *Al-Jazeera* Arabic-and English-language websites ($N=1760$).

TOPIC	<i>Arabic-language website</i>	<i>English-language website</i>	Total
U.S./Iraq Conflict	164 (15.0%)	132(19.8%)	296 (16.8%)
Other Topics	930 (85.0%)	534 (80.2%)	1464 (83.2%)
Total	1094 (100%)	666 (100%)	1760 (100%)

Chi-square = 6.907, $p < .01$

Table 2: Placement of news stories about the Iraq War in *Al-Jazeera* Arabic-and English-language websites ($N=270$).

<i>U.S./Iraq Conflict</i>	<i>Arabic-language website</i>	<i>English-language website</i>	Total
Lead News Stories	25 (15.2%)	18 (17.0%)	43 (15.9%)
Top News Stories	71 (43.3%)	45 (42.5%)	116 (43.0%)
Other News Stories	68 (41.5%)	43 (40.5%)	111 (41.1%)
Total	164 (100%)	106 (100%)	270 (100%)

Chi-square = 0.141, $p > .05$

Table 3: Frequency and percentages of attributed sources used in reporting the Iraq War in the English-and-Arabic-Language *Al-Jazeera* websites ($N=586$).

<i>Sources</i>	<i>English-Language Website</i>	<i>Arabic-Language Website</i>	<i>Total</i>
U.S. Sources	86 (32.1%)	78 (24.5%)	164 (28.0%)
Coalition Sources	43 (16.0%)	56 (17.6%)	99 (16.9%)
Iraqi Sources	86 (32.1%)	114 (35.9%)	200 (34.1%)
International Sources	43 (16.0%)	48 (15.1%)	91 (15.5%)
<i>Al-Jazeera</i> Sources	10 (3.8%)	22 (6.9%)	32 (5.5%)
Total	268 (100%)	318 (100%)	586 (100%)

Chi-square = 6.550, $p > .05$

Table 4: Frequency and percentages of tone of coverage in reporting the Iraq War in the English-and-Arabic-Language *Al-Jazeera* websites ($N=239$).

		<i>English-Language Website</i>	<i>Arabic-Language Website</i>	Total
US Agent	Positive	7 (17.9%)	13 (29.5%)	20 (24.1%)
	Negative	32 (82.1%)	31 (70.5%)	63 (75.9%)
Total		39 (100%)	44 (100%)	83(100%)
Coalition Agent	Positive	6 (42.9%)	9 (52.9%)	15 (48.4%)
	Negative	8 (57.1%)	8 (47.1%)	16 (51.6%)
Total		14 (100%)	17 (100%)	31 (100%)
Iraq Agent	Positive	12 (21.8%)	26 (37.1%)	38 (30.4%)
	Negative	43 (78.2%)	44 (62.9%)	87 (69.6%)
Total		55 (100%)	70 (100%)	125 (100%)

Chi-square for U.S. Agents = 1.523, $p>.05$

Chi-square for Coalition Agents = 0.334, $p>.05$

Chi-square for Iraq Agents = 3.390, $p>.05$

Note: There were 30 agents coded as “Neutral.” For the purpose of this analysis, agents coded as Neutral were later coded as missing.

APPENDIX A

Ranking and Percentages of the Fastest Growing Online News Sources in March 2003.

Online News Source	February 2003	March 2003	%Growth
Aljazeera.net	79	1,037	1208%
BBC World Services	2,053	5,295	158%
Reuters	1,223	2,103	72%
NewsMax.com	1,203	1,820	51%
Fox News	4,343	6,216	43%
Drudgereport.com	1,777	2,529	42%
News International	1,774	2,470	39%
Google News	1,910	2,609	37%
NPR Online	1,376	1,771	29%
NYP Holdings	2,115	2,663	26%
MSNBC	19,640	24,333	24%
CNN	21,376	26,249	23%
The Boston Globe	2,414	2,812	16%
Yahoo! News	16,214	18,724	15%
NYTimes.com	8,349	9,546	14%

Source: Nielsen/Net Rankings

APPENDIX B

Sources

U.S. Sources:

Official Sources: A U.S. government or military official (President Bush, Senator, Ramsfield, a U.S. general, a U.S. official, a U.S. officer, U.S. military, pentagon, U.S. military spokesman)

Non-official Sources: A U.S. person without a political or military rank (Examples: U.S. witnesses; residents, or people in the street; experts or analysts). A U.S. medium or representative of a U.S. medium (Examples: U.S. Journalist, correspondent, U.S. medium)

Coalition Sources:

Official Sources: a government or military official from one of the allies countries (Examples: prime minister Blair, minister, a general, U.K. official, an officer, an official, U.K. military spokesman, spokesman of British Government, spokesman of the Polish contingent)

Non-official Sources: A person from one of the allies' countries without a political or military rank (Examples: witnesses, residents, and people in the street, experts, or analysts). A medium or representative of medium from one of the allies' countries (Journalist, correspondent, medium)

Iraqi sources:

Official Sources: An Iraqi government official or police officer (Examples: member of the council, minister, ambassador, Iraqi police officer, Iraqi official)

Non-official Sources: An Iraqi person without political or police rank OR Iraqi medium or a representative of an Iraqi medium (Examples: Iraqi witnesses, residents and people in the street; Iraqi experts or analysts; Iraqi network, magazine, or newspaper)

International sources:

Note: We did not include military members or military officials and generals, because there was no Iraqi military at that point in time. There was not even a president (it was a council).

A representative of an international institution OR a government official, military officer, or an ordinary person from a country other than the U.S., U.S. allies or Al-Qaeda. International media or representatives of an international media were coded as international sources as well. (Examples: Kofi Annan, United Nations, NATO, ordinary Egyptian person, human rights groups, Agencies, Reuters)

***Al-Jazeera* sources:**

A person who works for *Al-Jazeera* network (Examples: A person working for *Al-Jazeera* network, *Al-Jazeera.net*, or *Al-Jazeera's* correspondent)

APPENDIX C

Agency

Agent:

An actor is a party of the conflict (U.S., U.S. Allies, Al-Qaeda) and individuals, groups, organization or actions that represent any of them.

Positive agent:

A positive action/attitude is expressed through words and expressions carrying positive meaning for the agent. The agent afflicts positive change, acts to alleviate a problem, shows interest/concern for a problem, tries to find a resolution. Examples of words related to a positive agent are like: help, promote peace, relief effort, willing to negotiate, alleviate, humanitarian, build, construct, free, release, cooperate.

Negative agent:

A negative action/attitude is expressed through words and expressions carrying negative meaning for the agent. A negative agent creates or worsens a problem with its actions or is attributed negative qualities. Examples of words related to a negative agent are like: destroy, unwilling to cooperate, bomb, kill, torture, acting irrationally, resisting positive influence, slaughter, afflicting people negatively.

Neutral agent:

Coders coded the agent as “neutral” when there was neither a negative nor a positive action/attitude expressed through any words or expressions to carry any negative or positive meaning for the agent. In other words, when a news story tells what happens without assigning any qualities to the agent.

No agent:

Coders coded it as “no agency” in two cases: 1. When there was no identified or implied agent in the headline of the news story, the lead, or the following paragraphs until the

next sub-head. 2. When the agent was a party other than the parties of the conflict or what represented them.