

A Critical Discourse Analysis of Western Media Bias towards Tufan Al-Aqsa Operation
Asst. Lect. Hassan Khalaf Amer Hummadi

Ministry of Education, General Directorate of Education in Anbar, Iraq

nameha16@gmail.com 07823399260

Prof. Salih Mahdi Addai (PhD)

University of Babylon, College of Education for Human Science, English Department/2023

Salih_mehdi71@yahoo.com 07801422127

Abstract

One of the most popular methods of political communication worldwide, televised political interviews may still impact and reach far larger audiences than any other type of public speaking. Interviews on television give politicians the ideal opportunity to address a large audience directly. The current study investigates bias within TV interview of Piers Morgan regarding the Palestinian issue. Hidden prejudice and bias are responsible for the kind of language and vocabulary use through which the hostile hatred towards sex, race, religion, ethnicity and so forth which cannot be understood within isolated expression without relying on the context to eventually figure out the pragmatic function behind. The study is qualitative in nature, using Piers Morgan's interview with the Palestinian ambassador Husam Zomlot on October the 19th as the text of analysis by using three modals (Fairclough's (1989), Van Dijk's (2006), Brisard, Ostman, Verschueren's (2009) Pragmatic Function). The number of the utterances to be analysed are twenty (the whole speech). The results show that the speaker tends to use explicit strategy of bias in most of his speech (with 24 frequency and 65% percentage) to persuade and influence others perspectives and point of view to confess that Israel is a nation and Palestine is their homeland. Extreme explicit conscious bias is defined by overtly discriminatory behaviour, which can take the form of verbal and physical abuse or more covert tactics like exclusion and control and this what exactly happens within the interview under investigation by which Morgan intentionally uses words and expressions that demean Palestinian people and condemn

Hamas of Tufan Al-Aqsa (i.e., Al-Aqsa) which took place at the event of October, the 7th, 2023.

Keywords: Bias, Piers Morgan, Pragmatic function, Van Dijk, Fairclough, Husam Zomlot, Palestinian issue, Tufan Al-Aqsa

المستخلص

تعد المقابلات السياسية المتلفزة إحدى أكثر طرق التواصل السياسي شيوعاً في جميع أنحاء العالم، وقد لا تزال تؤثر وتصل إلى جماهير أكبر بكثير من أي نوع آخر من الخطابة. تمنح المقابلات التلفزيونية للسياسيين فرصة مثالية لمخاطبة جمهور كبير بشكل مباشر. تبحث الدراسة الحالية في لغة التحيز في المقابلة التلفزيونية مع بيرس مورغان فيما يتعلق بالقضية الفلسطينية. إن التحيز الخفي هما المسؤولان عن نوع اللغة والمفردات التي يتم من خلالها استخدام الكراهية العدائية تجاه الجنس والعرق والدين والإثنية وما إلى ذلك والتي لا يمكن فهمها ضمن تعبير معزول دون الاعتماد على السياق لمعرفة الوظيفة العملية الكامنة وراءه في نهاية المطاف. الدراسة ذات طبيعة نوعية، حيث استخدمت مقابلة بيرس مورغان مع السفير الفلسطيني حسام زملط في ١٩ تشرين الأول/أكتوبر كنص للتحليل باستخدام ثلاثة نماذج (فان ديك (٢٠٠٦)، فيركلاف (١٩٨٩)، بريسارد، أوستمان، وفيرشرين (٢٠٠٩)). وعدد الأقوال المراد تحليلها هو أربعة وثلاثون كلاماً (الخطاب كله). أظهرت النتائج أن المتحدث يميل إلى استخدام استراتيجية التحيز الصريحة في معظم خطاباته لإقناع الآخرين والتأثير عليهم في وجهات نظرهم للاعتراف بأن إسرائيل أمة وفلسطين وطنهم. يُعرف التحيز الواعي والصريح للغاية من خلال السلوك التمييزي العلني، والذي يمكن أن يأخذ شكل الإساءة اللفظية والجسدية أو تكتيكات أكثر سرية مثل الإقصاء والسيطرة، وهذا ما يحدث بالضبط خلال المقابلة قيد التحقيق والتي يستخدم فيها مورغان عمداً الكلمات والتعابير التي تحط من قدر الشعب الفلسطيني. ويدين حماس بحادثة ٧ أكتوبر. الكلمات المفتاحية: الانحياز، بيرس مورغان، الوظيفة البراغماتية، فان دايك، فيركلاف، حسام زملط، القضية الفلسطينية، طوفان الأقصى

Introduction

As one of the most popular methods of political communication worldwide, televised political interviews may still impact and reach far larger audiences than any other type of public speaking (Elliott & Bull, 1996; Ekström, 2001). Interviews on television give politicians the ideal opportunity to address a large audience directly. They provide them with the chance to demonstrate their expertise, honesty, and leadership abilities; they can also be used to criticize and confront their political rivals and to advance and clarify their positions on a variety of contemporary problems (Feldman et al., 2015). Political leaders and their advisors have understood the power of television since its inception, and they have been showing an increasing amount of worry about their on-screen image (Lawson, Lenz, Myers & Baker, 2010; Lenz & Lawson, 2011).

Although interviews can offer opportunities for greater democratic control, they are not immune to purposeful and ideological manipulation (Strömbäck & Shehata, 2007) for some reasons they may express ideas that are opponent to some controversial issues as the Palestinian issue nowadays. Thus, some TV selected TV interviews on interviewers use bias as a speaking strategy to serve some others goals. Some CNN channel by different famous interviewers using bias strategy to be analysed using the approach of critical discourse analysis by applying Van Dijk and Fairclough models. The selection for this channel and on the bases of their number of views for these interviews on different cites of some interviewers is done social media.

The goal of critical discourse analysis (henceforth, CDA) is to identify how written words and the activities of speaking, listening, writing, and reading relate to each other. As a result, this develops critical analysis skills for written material-that is, for our writing and speech. CDA is a research methodology that examines spoken or written language in connection to its social environment. It seeks to comprehend language use in everyday contexts. To put it another way, CDA is a research approach that looks at how language structures reflect social phenomena including dynamics of power, moral standards, ideologies, and identity definitions on people and social hierarchies. Ideologies are essential vehicles of power because they serve to direct the positive as well as the negative ways of how participants and groups adapted to and control their environments. Within these ideologies, there may be found different language use; bias language. Loaded bias language is one example of implicit values and presumptions that are present in texts, conversation, or social behaviours. Realists believe that ideology is the distortion of an objective reality. Some preferences that go beyond basic functioning and are supported by a given technology's affordances. According to Neil Postman, there is an ideological bias present in all media and it takes several forms: Political, social, sensory, emotional, and intellectual biases as well as content bias. Bias in speech, although apparent or hidden, is found abundantly in social media, newspapers, magazines, interviews, and Western television programs, especially those that are Jewish in origin, and especially in the recent political crisis that occurred in Palestine in the Jerusalem (*Toofan Al Aqsa Operation*), which was carried out by Hamas fighters in occupied Palestine. Bias in speech occurs in several ways, including the use of words and vocabulary that hide many facts and mitigate the severity of the event in favor of Israel, along with the use of violent and brutal vocabulary when describing Hamas fighters, which indicates ethnic bias based on the religious factor for most Western Jews because they share the same racial ideological bias.

Thus, speaker's bias attitudes are closely related to specific pre-determined purpose and it is not a result of nothing. In order to figure out these purposes standing behind the characters' bias language within *TV interviews* about *Toofan AlAqsa*, one should rely on the context of the spoken utterance, because without understanding the context of the interview and the current crisis, the hearer/reader will misunderstand why the speaker is speaking as such. Thus, the purpose of bias cannot be clarified in isolated abstracted sentences. Hidden prejudice and bias are responsible for the kind of language and vocabulary use through

which the hostile hatred towards sex, race, religion, ethnicity and so forth is revealed. Thus, the reader does not directly receive the hidden bias loaded within words, sentences, or utterances for the speaker/writer sometimes relies on using some strategies to conceal truth and reduce Jews' savage aggression through hidden bias on the one hand, and disfigures the landholders (Palestinians) on the other hand due to their bias ideology; in short they try to disguise truth on the bases of their authority and power. One area of study that deals with ideology, authority, power and language is Critical Discourse Analysis. This field helps the analyst to know what notions can reproduce these concepts in order to serve specific ends. However, the data sample has not been researched before (according to the researcher knowledge). However, The current study sets itself to answer the following: what are the strategies of bias ideologies which are conveyed linguistically through within the target TV interviews? And what is the pragmatic function of bias ideologies hidden with each bias utterance?

Examining how language use impacts social interaction is the aim of the current study. By looking at the language means, this is made clear. Therefore, in order to illustrate how an individual's social and cultural context influences how they use language, communication as reflected by social and cultural concerns is examined. Word choice and sentence structure loaded with bias for the sake of the Jews of some western media Jewish figures in communicating their intended meanings are examples of such a use, though they are not the only ones. The individual's learned social and cultural impact is a type of mental information and knowledge that is stored as a set of traditions and values that serve as thresholds to expose the intended meaning, and that is the exact ideology of Jewish to convince others that they are the right holders.

Finally, the present study is limited to apply Van Dijk's (2006) and Fairclough's (1989) models within the field of discourse analysis to analyze some chosen TV interviews, in addition to the model of Brisard et al.'s (2009) Pragmatic Function.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Fairclough's (1989) model and Van Dijk's (2006) Socio-cognitive Model

Clarifying the connections between language and power is the focus of CDA. In CDA, linguists examine language as essentially historical, political, social, and ideological, as well as how it is used. Their work focuses on investigating the ways in which diverse techniques are used by systems of power, dominance, discrimination, inequalities between genders, racism, etc. to legitimize as well as naturalize them through language (Wodak and Meyer, 2001). For Van Dijk's (2006) socio-cognitive approach, language is used by humans to accomplish specific social goals. It is a sociologically focused linguistic approach. As For Van Dijk, language has social, cultural, and relational purposes that are connected to the audience's and people's beliefs. Language is therefore influenced by social factors (Machin and Mayr, 2023).

Statham (2022) asserts that Van Dijk's socio-cognitive method necessitates a thorough analysis of media discourse at the textual, comprehension, and production levels. Because of this, the methodology is predicated on the relationship between discourse, cognition, and society (Statham, 2022). Additionally, because it links the pragmatic and cognitive perspectives of language, this method facilitates critical interpretation of language and an understanding of its social role.

Consequently, it is necessary to go into detail regarding the categories of Van Dijk's (2004) Ideological Analysis (as mentioned in Burak, 2021) after outlining significant ideas regarding his methodology. These categories are as follows:

- "Actor description: We portray the in-group favorably and characterize actors based on our views".
- Authority: Using references to authority bolsters one's position.

- Categorization is the process of grouping individuals and assigning them either positive or negative traits.
- Polarization is the process of dividing people into in-group and out-group groups and attributing positive traits to the former and negative traits to the latter.
- Vagueness is the use of words without clear referents in utterances.
- Emphasizing the negative aspects of the out-group is known as victimization (Van Dijk, 2004, as referenced in Burak, 2021, p. 258).

Given that polarization is central to Van Dijk's method, it is crucial to emphasize that it is vital to ideological analysis. Thus, the following "emphasis" forms the basis of polarization:

1. Emphasize Our good things
2. Emphasize Their bad things
3. De-emphasize Our bad things
4. De-emphasize their good things” (p. 259).

For Fairclough (1989), critical discourse analysis is a three-step process that includes textual analysis, interaction-the creation, consumption, and distribution of the text- and contextual analysis, which is the interpretation of the text in light of its social environment. The basic goal of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is to study the enactment and resistance of power in the supplied text. Fairclough (2005: 14) asserts that the understanding of a text depends on how it relates to social practices, social institutions, and other aspects of social events. Discourse is the process of social interaction in its entirety, and text is characterized as a product rather than a process (Fairclough, 1989). Fairclough's model of CDA has been used to uncover the power abused by the colonizers as well as the resistance of power by the colonized in recent political incidents. These are the models of the current study by which the researcher analyses the bias utterances with (in addition to Bisards et al. (2005) that will be mentioned afterwards). As bias is originally ethnic prejudicial habit that is closely related to the ideologies of power, colonization, and many negative aspects as appearing within most political interviews, discourse analysis in general and Van Dijk's and Fairclough's theories in specific, it is the most suitable approach to be based on for the study under investigation.

Political interviews these days are more and more aggressive; this is indicative of a cultural shift that started with the advent of electronic mass media (Emmertsen, 2007). As a result, there is now doubt about the objectivity of interviewers who are supposed to show that they are not under the influence of monetary or political pressure groups (Gnisci et al., 2013). Interviewers have become more demanding of their subjects as a result of the financial strains and intense competition that the media faces (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Lengauer, Esser & Berganza, 2012). This has resulted in interviews becoming intricate arenas of conflict.

Interviewers gain the ability to concentrate the audience, diverting their attention to look positively towards negative behaviours and formulate more difficult questions in this way (Bavelas et al., 1990). Two journalistic genres that can exhibit the greatest degree of bias to a public audience are political interviews and news reporting (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Ekström & Kroon-Lundell, 2011). According to Baum and Jamison (2006), both can influence viewers who are typically less interested in politics, yet the public is led to believe that the politicians are being watched closely (McNair, 2000). The four journalistic approaches of television news that Nimmo & Combs (1985) distinguished were popular/sensationalist, elitist/factual, ignorant/didactic, as well as pluralist (the last two treating the audience as extraordinarily heterogeneous).

2.2. Brisard, Ostman& Verschueren's (2009) Pragmatic Function

The pragmatic function, as stated by Brisard et al. (2009), is the speaker's hidden meaning s/he aims to convey behind what is communicated. The pragmatic function or what is known as 'communicated content' is defined as "the totality of what the speaker wishes to evoke in his/her communication with the addressee"(p. 106). Every piece of communication within their daily interactions is shaped by the communicative aims of its speaker to suit his/her communicative need in a given occasion. Therefore, the speaker adopts a specific strategy to convey his/her aims and satisfy his/her needs with.

When the communicator intends to speak in a bias mode, s/he retrieves the attention of the hearer towards the addressee, guiding him/her to interpret what s/he aims to convey at the first place. The pragmatic function, in short, is a reflection of one's intention. Thus, political bias can serve several pragmatic functions, although it is important to note that these functions can vary depending on the context and perspective. Here are a few potential pragmatic functions of political bias as mentioned by Basker (2007):

1. Group identity and cohesion: Political bias can help individuals align themselves with a particular group or ideology, fostering a sense of belonging and solidarity. This can be beneficial for social cohesion within a community or political party.
2. Decision-making shortcuts: Bias can act as a cognitive shortcut, allowing individuals to quickly make decisions or form opinions based on pre-existing beliefs or affiliations. This can save time and mental effort when faced with complex political issues.
3. Motivation and engagement: Bias can fuel motivation and engagement in political activities, such as voting, campaigning, or advocating for specific policies. It provides individuals with a sense of purpose and conviction in their political actions.
4. Information filtering: Political bias may lead individuals to selectively seek out information that confirms their existing beliefs while ignoring or dismissing contradictory evidence. While this may seem counterproductive to objective decision-making, it can help individuals maintain consistency in their worldview.
5. Persuasion and influence: Political bias can be used strategically to persuade others by appealing to their existing beliefs or values. By framing arguments in ways that align with the biases of the target audience, politicians and activists can increase the likelihood of gaining support for their cause.

It is important to note that while these pragmatic functions exist, they also come with potential drawbacks. Political bias can hinder critical thinking, perpetuate polarization, and limit open-mindedness. Striving for objectivity and considering multiple perspectives is crucial for a well-informed democratic society.

2.3. Bias, Politics and Ethnicity Reflected within TV Interviews

Biased language subtly implies superiority or spreads false information about people based on their age, gender, race, sex, ethnicity, religion, social status, physical or mental disability, or other traits. (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a). Bias toward ethnicity refers to the tendency to hold prejudiced attitudes or discriminatory behaviours based on a person's ethnic background. It is important to recognize that bias toward ethnicity is not only unfair but also harmful, as it perpetuates stereotypes, fosters division, and undermines equality and social cohesion. Linguistic bias is defined as a systematic asymmetry in the selection of words indicating social-category cognitions utilized by the group or individual(s) under description. Three distinct forms of biases are recognized in the research as upholding social-category cognitions and stereotypes. Biased language includes derogatory, exclusionary, discriminating, and

aggressive phrases. The televised interviews have the ability to display all of these features (Clayman and Heritage, 2002a).

Using bias in political issues refers to the intentional manipulation or distortion of information or arguments to favor a particular political ideology, party, or agenda. It involves presenting information in a way that is slanted or one-sided, often omitting relevant facts or alternative viewpoints. Bias can be used in various ways in political issues, including:

1. Selective reporting: Choosing to report only on certain aspects of an issue that align with a specific viewpoint while ignoring other relevant information.
2. Framing: Presenting an issue in a way that influences how people perceive it by emphasizing certain aspects and downplaying others.
3. Loaded language: Using emotionally charged words or phrases that evoke strong reactions and shape public opinion.
4. Cherry-picking data: Selectively using data or statistics that support a particular argument while disregarding contradictory evidence.
5. False equivalency: Treating two opposing viewpoints as equally valid, even when one has more evidence or expert consensus supporting it.
6. Propaganda techniques: Employing techniques such as repetition, fear-mongering, misinformation, or disinformation to manipulate public opinion (Hagerty, 2010).

The literature has distinguished between two categories of bias. When something is explicit or conscious, the individual is acting with purpose and is very aware of their attitudes and sentiments. At a conscious level, this kind of bias is processed neurologically as declarative, semantic, and verbal memory. Extreme conscious bias is defined by overtly discriminatory behaviour, which can take the form of verbal and physical abuse or more covert tactics like exclusion. Unconscious or implicit bias acts without the individual's knowledge and may be diametrically opposed to their professed ideals and views. Implicit bias is particularly hazardous since it immediately permeates a person's emotion or behaviour without that person's complete understanding. Implicit bias has the potential to impede clinical evaluation, decision-making, and provider-patient interactions to the detriment of both the patient's and the provider's desired health outcomes (D'Alessio and Allen, 2000).

According to the political and economic inclinations of the broadcaster in question, the televised political interview in reality demonstrates systemic disparities in deliberate, ideological methods favoring particular political parties or spaces (Strömbäck & Shehata, 2007; Gnisci, 2008). However, very few research have examined the likelihood of interviewer bias, despite the significance of such claims for public democratic freedom systems (Strömbäck & Shehata, 2007; Gnisci et al., 2013).

Politicians and the public are connected through televised political interviews (Ekström, 2001). Political interviews, which provide politicians with a question-and-answer framework to showcase their talents and capacities to address various challenges, are theoretically intended to be used to gather objective information from leaders (Clayman & Heritage, 2002; Hagerty, 2010). And this political bias is what is actually happened when commenting on the operation of Tufan Al-Aqsa that takes place recently on 7th September of 2023.

2.4. Tufan Al-Aqsa: Pinpointed

On Saturday, October 7, 2023, a Sabbath day and the day of numerous Jewish holidays, the Palestinian Islamist armed group 'Hamas' launched a series of coordinated strikes from the Gaza Strip upon neighboring areas in Israel and this operation is called Tufan Al-Aqsa. Nearly fifty years to the day after the Yom Kippur War started on October 6, 1973, the attacks, known as Black Saturday as well as the Simchat

scientifically in the current research as pragmatic function of bias.

3. Methodology

data with similar pragmatic function are analysed together for economic reasons.

4. The Analysis

Gaza''.

The speaker introduces the TV show with the ambassador's Twit in order to pave the way towards the coming information. Then he focuses upon the idea that the Palestinian Ambassador has "no doubt" that the attack was by An Israeli air strike. He uses "no doubt" to convey a contradictory meaning since the speaker believes that it was indeed not an Israeli one. He then highlights that the BBC did "an extensive investigation" to denote that the results out came from this investigation are absolutely reliable ones and there is "no doubt" that the results are completely valid. The bias is expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

2. "It was a misfire and it landed in the car park next to the hospital and they site for example the crater is tiny by comparison to the kind of crater you had seen from the conventional Israel missile and so on. What is your response to that? have you changed your absolute convection that this is an Israeli air strike?"

In this utterance, the speaker (i.e., Pierce Morgan) continues his attempt to convince the Palestinian ambassador, yet the people who are watching the show, that this is not an Israeli air strike because the crater is "tiny". He implicates that this crater is for Hamas not an Israeli one as the own "bigger " missile . The speaker shows hidden bias in order to defend Israel on the expense of Palestinian people. The speaker tries to absolve Israel from this aggressive attack. He repeats the question more than a time in various structuring and wording to convince the listener(s) that Israel has nothing to do with this attack. The bias is expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

3. "Are you still as sure as last night?...This is an Israeli air strike where is your evidence? where is it?"
Pierce Morgan repeats the question using the word "sure" to convince him that he is false and this not an Israeli air strike. Besides, this speaker in this utterance repeats the ambassador's words saying that "This is an Israeli air strike!" and then he asks him to present his evidence since he does not believe that this is an Israeli one. He wants to see "your evidence" but within his previous speech, he depends on some clues like the size of the crater to decide that it is not an Israeli air strike. His bias is more obvious in this utterance by which he tries to convince listener(s) that Israel is innocent. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

4. "You believe you will have reduced evidence Israel...?"
Morgan in his utterance aims at making the Palestinian ambassador presenting his evidence (yet he knows there is no evidence for what the ambassador is saying). He insists on using of the word "evidence" in order to embarrasses the ambassador and assure for the listeners that Hussam Zomlot is lying (he biases towards his country; to show the contrary bias). In his insistence upon the "evidence", he shows a high degree of bias since there is no earlier evidence for Israel not being guilty. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

5. "Why would the president of the United States say that his own independent investigation by his own people I am not the Intelligence given to him by the Israelis that has also established it Came From Within Gaza?"

Morgan produces his bias in this utterance by assuring that it is not an Israel air strike . He depends in his speech on "the president of the United States" and uses his speech as a reliable source of information. He repeats the utterance "independent investigation" accusing that the attack comes from Gaza, not from Israel . He shows a great bias when he produces this information. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

6. "You think he is lying president Biden?"
Morgan in this utterance greatly uses bias language when the ambassador refers the results of the "independent investigation" of the president of the United States. He then asks Hussam Zomlot that Biden is lying in his results of investigation . He uses the word "Lying" in order to show the listeners the ambassador aggressive racism that he does not accept any further accusations. The word "Lying" is used to show that Palestinians are the ones who do not accept to live with others peacefully and yet, they do not accept any further evidence that they are wrong. The bias is expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

7. "You have seen the evidence? When you see that video what do you think you are saying?"

not Israel. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

why was crater is so small?"

of the Palestinians attacks. The bias is expressed explicitly for information filtering.

9. "Have you seen the BBC verify investigation that night?"

expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

crisis I said there was''.

expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

condemnation of people dying not to be prepared to me?"

with these articles. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

12. "Are they Terrorist? The UK government has Hamas identified as a prescribed terror group do you agree with that? Do you disagree with Hamas being prescribed as terrorist group?...I think that Palestinians have lived in a very repressive. It is a repression they are oppressed by Israel of effectively keeping people attracting Gaza right and then have the ability as they have shown him the last few days to turn on offer to turn on and off food supply I think it's all wrong"

Morgan in this utterance shows a high level of bias by asking the ambassador whether Hamas is a terror group. He further based upon the decision of the UK government which classified Hamas as a terrorist, which mean that they do not have any right to attack Israel. He uses the word "terrorist" to describe the landowner despite the fact that they are actually the victim of Israel invasion. Then within the following utterance, he tries to lessen his bias, by showing some "fake" sympathy towards Palestinians people, saying they lived a very difficult repressive life and they suffer from current circumstances. The bias is expressed explicitly for information filtering.

13. "I was interested that you last night were demanding that political readers like Keir Starmer condemn a supposed Attack by Israelis on the hospital which now looks like it wasn't by Israel's and I am simply saying to you...You don't know it was an Israeli air strike?"

The speaker exposes his biased ideas within the current utterance, based upon the idea of condemnation of October 7th attack on the hospital without mentioning the side that causes his disaster. He says to the ambassador that Kier Starmer condemns the attack only, not Israel because they all do not confess that Israel is the doer. He further repeats the question again and again (insisting upon bias) that if he thinks it is an Israeli air strike. He uses the word "a supposed attack" to convey a contradictory idea that it is not Israeli one. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

14. "I am a neutral...Do you think BBC are impartial in this or not?"

When Hussam Zomlot accuses Piers Morgan of being biased, the later replies that "I am a neutral" to emphasize for the listeners that Zomlot's accusations are not true. Then Morgan attacks Zomlot with question that if he thinks that BBC is impartial in this or not as if he aims at directing the accusation towards more than one side to distract Zomlot and being a social case. He aims at evoking more critical problems to achieve his hidden intention which is absolving Israel from that attack (hidden bias). The bias is expressed implicitly for persuasion and influence.

15 "But given that last night what happened last night in your belief that it was Israeli a strike and you were forces and demanding that repeatedly. will you now take the opportunity to condemn what Hamas did in October the 7th?...I am not sure you heard my question...If you are not going to answer it Don't Demand other people condemn things and certainly do not ask me to condemn 1400 people have been slaughtered."

All three utterances expose the speaker's intentional bias by which the speaker insists on his supposed fact that Hamas is the responsible for the attack of the hospital in October, the 7th in the operation of Tufan Al-Aqsa. This shows Morgan bias ideology and how this ideology affects the way of speaking and shapes the facts according to what they want not according to the available facts. He again uses a word that describes the savage of Hamas biasly "Slaughtered", implicating that Hamas is a terror group, not have the right to defend something belongs to Israel (They are not the landowners!). Morgan wants Zomlot to confess that Hamas is a terror group as when Zomlot confesses that, it would lead to a conclusion that Hamas are not the (landowners). The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

16 "If you believe in non-violence why you are so reluctant?...I didn't say that to you I understand you are not part of Hamas".

When Zomlot defends his attitude by saying that he and all Palestinian people believe in peace and want to live in peace. Morgan asks him if he believes in nonviolence why he is so "reluctant" to condemn Hamas as the responsible for October 7th air strike on the hospital. Then Zomlot says that he is not part of Hamas and Morgan says he believes that he is not. In this utterance, the speaker tries to convince the listener(s) and second to make Zomlot confess that Hamas is the doer of the action. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

17 "I think Palestinian people are absolutely entitled to fairness and equality and human rights many of things they have been deprived of decades. I would love to see peace in the Middle East but nobody can show me how what Hamas did on October the 7th. it was done everything for Palestinian people other than set everything back and make peace even more likely...I am not a racist against Palestinian people...I have been a journalist for 30 years I have run major national newspapers I had a Daily Show at CNN for four years if you actually go back and look at what I did including for example a 2-year campaign and again the Iraqi war which I thought It was illegal invasion of the Middle Eastern country so please do not pigeonhole me as somebody that has no compassion for Palestinian people do not generalize...I have been getting Palestinians on all week I have been giving Palestinians platforms including you all week right."

When Zomlot accuses Morgan of being biased and racist against Palestinian people, Morgan says to him that he is not a racist and Palestinian people, deserve fairness and equality. He then directly follows his words with the idea of Hamas action October the 7th. He aims at accusing Hamas and to show to others that Israel is innocent. He further shows sympathy with Palestinian people for one Pragmatic function which is to show the listener(s) he is not bias towards Israel, he is a supported for middle East countries and he defends the lights of other people. The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

18 "I can guarantee you absolutely guarantee you that if the Israel's ever carried out a terror attack on the nature we saw on October the 7th. they pulled a Holocaust survivors out of their homes and keep them as hostages. They shot babies in their cribs, they burn families alive deliberately going in to get civilians...I haven't mentioned Isis but for the record I do believe there is apparel between what Hamas is done on October the 7th and Isis you don't agree?"

This utterance is the climax of the whole interview by which Morgan shows the highest degree of bias towards Israel when he says that "absolutely guarantee you" that Israel is not responsible for the air strike on the hospital on October the 7th. Then he uses the word "Holocaust" survivors "to describe Israeli people in order to make listener(s) sympathy with them because they are the victim of the "Holocaust". The speaker depicts the Jewish as a victim of many universal actions to pave the way for listeners to convince them that they deserve living peacefully in Palestine and Hamas is a terror group just like Isis which prevents them to live like so. The ideology victimization as well as bias is greatly reflected within Morgan's utterance when the deliberately mentioned the massacre of Jewish and how they suffer as if he wants to say that what Israel is doing right now for Palestinian people is something justified. He aims at showing sympathy and convincing others that Israel has the right to be in Palestine. The bias is expressed implicitly for group identity and cohesion.

19 "I don't believe that more Palestinian people support what Hamas did on October the 7th. I don't believe you do. I don't believe the Palestinian authority does. So do not think for a moment that I think you are all the same. I think Hamas is a group who committed and act of unspeakable the depravity and terrorism and they must be held accountable."

When Zomolt told Morgan that the latter believes that all Palestinian people are terrorists. Morgan replies that he does not. He expresses that he does not have any believe that all Palestinian people are just like Hamas. In fact, Morgan is in the previously analyzed data insisted on Zomolt's confession that Hamas is a terror group that responsible for the air strike on October the 7th. In the current utterance, he tries to do the opposite, especially when Zomlot accused him of being impartial and biased. His ideology is highly revealed within many utterances, and when he was exposed by Zomlot, he retreated and speaks more "neutral" words (to lessen the effect of what he says on the listener and not to show his bias publically). The bias is expressed explicitly for persuasion and influence.

20 "The question is what is an acceptable way to hold them accountable. I do not believe a full ground invasion will do anything but make this 10 times worse for the record but let me ask you this. There are 200 hundreds hostages. I think 199 hostages being kept by Hamas. Should they be released? They include children they include Holocaust survivors what is your view?...How do we get to peace from here. It seems to me after 30 years of covering this conflict. we have never been further away from peace between Israel and Palestine how do you get to peace here?"

In these two utterances, Morgan shows his bias ideology by expressing two things; the first, he reflects to the ambassador that there are 199 hostages of Israeli people that should be released (speaking with humanity) whereas there are thousands of Palestinian people within Israeli Jails nobody asked to release them. His bias is greatly shown when Zomlot replies that there are Palestinian hostages too need to be released. Morgan does not even answer Zomlot question. His words revealed that he does not care for any Palestinian hostages and their destiny. He asked just The Israeli Hostages to be released. The second: he asked ambassador for peace (to show the listeners that they and Israel all want to live peacefully but Palestinian people cannot live with them like so). When he asked for peace, he aims at revealing his fake ideology that Israel is not the terror-maker, they are not invader and Palestine is their home country). He aims at convincing listeners that Israel have a right in Palestine. The bias is expressed explicitly for group identity and cohesion.

5. Findings

The current study shows that all the utterances of Piers Morgan exposes bias whether explicitly or implicitly with different pragmatic functions; for RQ1, the results show that both strategies are used within Morgan's interview, both with different frequencies as well as percentages as it is shown in table (5.1):

No	Type of strategy	Frequency	Percentage
1	Explicit bias strategy	13	65 %
2	Implicit bias strategy	7	35 %

Table (5.1): the bias strategies within Morgan's interview

Within this table (5.1), the analysis shows that Morgan uses two bias strategies which are implicit strategy and explicit one. Within the whole speech, explicit strategy appears thirteen times as a frequency, with (65%) percentage which shows that Morgan speaks biasly most of the time, defending Israel actions and invasion of Palestine and his bias ideology is the one that controls most of Western media (Morgan is a sample for Western media). Extreme explicit conscious bias is defined by overtly discriminatory behaviour, which can take the form of verbal and physical abuse or more covert tactics like exclusion and control and this what exactly happens within the interview under investigation by which Morgan intentionally uses words and expressions that demean Palestinian people and condemn Hamas of the Tufan Al-Aqsa event of October, the 7th, 2023. On the contrary, implicit strategy of bias is frequented only seven times out of twenty utterances with 35% which denotes that the speaker sometimes resorts the hidden strategy for the things that cope with the Western humanity (not to violate their vows of peace).

For RQ2, five pragmatic functions are used within the analysis whereas actually the used ones within Morgan's interview are only three as it is revealed in table (5.2):

No.	Function	Frequency	Percentage
1.	Persuasion and influence	16	80%
2.	Information filtering	2	10%
3.	Group identity and cohesion	2	10%
4.	Motivation and engagement	0	0%
5.	Decision-making shortcuts	0	0%

Table (5.2): The pragmatic functions behind bias speech

Table (5.2) shows the functions behind bias speech of the TV journalist Piers Morgan. The highest frequency appears within the speech for the function "persuasion and influence" which is sixteen times with 80% percentage. He tries to attract the listener's attention when using such function since he believes that speakers may be adopting such way when giving a speech or to make impact on others is enormously important since nowadays it is not as easy as to make listeners understand or even pay attention to one's speech. Persuasion and influence are the strongest pragmatic functions that appeared in the text, due to their necessity at the present time, especially since Israel has been adopting this method for a long time in order to obtain the blessing of other countries in obtaining Palestine as their existing state, because it is firm in the belief that persuading others and influencing them have a great impact, just as Exercising physical strength. The second highest frequency and percentage is allotted to information filtering which appears two times with 10% whereas the third equal range with the second one is group identity and cohesion which appears

only two times with 10%. Both motivation and engagement and decision-making shortcuts do not show up at all.

6. Conclusion

The current study concludes that:

- The ideology that Palestine is the home of Israel is deeply rooted within Western culture. Ideology is directly responsible for the way we speak and act as well. The fact that Israeli Jews have been concerned with ideology for many ages greatly explains how it currently affects current events. Where the Jews initially worked to establish a specific ideology in order to obtain the approval and acceptance of all Western countries, and then proceed to control Palestine, considering that they are the ones who own the land, not the Palestinians.
- Bias is not the outcome of nothing; when journalist biased towards something, they aim at creating a false image that attracts others to believe and defend Israel as a confessed nation. The Jews relied on the principle of the large number of supporters and blessings of the project of the State of Israel in Jerusalem. Therefore, Israel exploited all parties that could enhance the building of their state, including the Western media, which always portrays Israel as a victim of the Holocaust and the heinous events that happened to them in the past, and that they, as a nation, want to live in peace in the land of Israel. They considered it their land.
- Bias took two forms in the conversation between the Western journalist Morgan and the Palestinian ambassador Hussam Zomlot: the implicit form and the apparent form. In both cases they expose a tendency towards seizing others' rights aggressively even they are wrong. Extreme explicit conscious bias is defined by overtly discriminatory behaviour, which can take the form of verbal and physical abuse or more covert tactics like exclusion and control and this what exactly happens within the interview under investigation by which Morgan intentionally uses words and expressions that demean Palestinian people and condemn Hamas of the event of October, the 7th of Tufan Al-Aqsa.
- The Western media is biased towards Israel regarding the Palestinian issue by using many expressions, including "terrorism, murder, destruction, massacre, slaughter, atrocity, etc.", while condemning Hamas for all the Tufan Al-Aqsa events that took place on October 7, 2023 whereas such expressions do not exist when describing Israeli actions.

References

- Basker, N. (2007). Partisanship and Bias in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: A Comparative Study of Four International Media Outlets. November. CC, Vol.8(12).423-426.
- Baum, M.A. & Jamison, A.S. (2006). The Oprah Effect: How Soft News Helps Inattentive Citizens Vote Consistently. *The Journal of Politics*, 68, 946--959. <http://doi.org/dv3w5t>
- Bavelas, J. B.; Black, A.; Bryson, L. & Mullett, J. (1988). Political Equivocation: A situational Explanation. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 7, 137–145. <http://doi.org/fhzgrb>
- Brisard, F.; Ostman, J. & Verschueren, J. (2009). Grammar, Meaning and Pragmatics. Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Ltd.
- Bull, P.; Elliott, J.; Palmer, D. & Walker, L. (1996). Why Politicians are Three-faced: The face Model of Political Interviews. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 267–284. <http://doi.org/bpkpn3>
- Clayman, S. & Heritage, J., (2002a). *The News Interview: Journalists and Public Figures on the Air*. Cambridge University Press. <http://doi.org/fg3xbd>
- Clayman, S. E.; Elliott, M. N.; Heritage, J. & McDonald, L. L. (2006). Historical Trends in Questioning Presidents, 1953-2000. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36(4), 561-583. <http://doi.org/d2dhkc>

- Creswell, D. (2023). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed methods Approaches*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Journal of , 'D'Alessio, D. and Allen, M. (2000) 'Media Bias in Presidential Elections: A Meta-Analysis Communication 50: 133-56
- Ekström, M. & Kroon Lundell, Å. (2011). Beyond the Broadcast Interview: Specialized forms of Interviewing in the Making of Television News. *Journalism Studies*, 12(2), 172-187. <http://doi.org/bgzj9g>
- Ekström, M. (2001). Politicians Interviewed on Television News. *Discourse & Society*, 12(5), 563-584. <http://doi.org/fvvh94>
- Emmertsen, S. (2007). Interviewers' Challenging Questions in British Debate Interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(3), 570-591. <http://doi.org/btq6t8>
- Fairclough, N. (1989). *Language and Power*, London: Longman.
- Fairclough, N. (2005) Peripheral Vision. *Discourse Analysis in Organization Studies: The Case for Critical Realism*. *Organization Studies*, 26, 915-939 <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084605054610>.
- Feldman, O.; Kinoshita, K. & Bull, P. (2015). Culture or Communicative Conflict? The Analysis of Equivocation in Broadcast Japanese Political Interviews. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 34, 65-68. <http://doi.org/f6rmf6>
- Feldman, O.; Kinoshita, K. & Bull, P. (2017). Failures in Leadership: How and Why wishy-washy Politicians Equivocate on Japanese Political Interviews. *Journal of language and politics*, 16(2), 285-312. <http://doi.org/dz7d>
- Flick, U. (2023). *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE.
- Gnisci, A. (2008). Coercive and Face-Threatening Questions to Left-Wing and Right-Wing Politicians During Two Italian Broadcasts: Conversational Indexes of Par Conditio for Democracy Systems. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38(5), 1179-1210. <http://doi.org/d5xmp8>
- Gnisci, A.; Zollo, P.; Perugini, M. & Di Conza, A. (2013). A Comparative Study of Toughness and Neutrality in Italian and English political interviews. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 50(1), 152-167. <http://doi.org/dz7f>
- Hagerty, B. (2010). TV's Political Host with the most. *British Journalism Review*, 21, 19-27. <http://doi.org/dcbnbc>
- Handford, M. & Gee, J. P. (2023). *The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis.
- Lawson, C.; Lenz, G.; Myers, M. & Baker, A. (2010). Candidate Appearance, Electability, and Political Institutions: Findings from Two Studies of Candidate Appearance. *World Politics*, 62(4), 561-93. <http://doi.org/fn6sxf>
- Lengauer, G.; Esser, F. & Berganza, R. (2012). Negativity in Political news: A Review of Concepts, Operationalizations and key Findings. *Journalism*, 13, 179-202. <http://doi.org/c2jp84>
- Machin, D. & Mayr, A. (2023). *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*. London: SAGE.
- McNair, B., (2000). Journalism and Democracy: A Millennium Audit. *Journalism Studies* 1, 197-211. <http://doi.org/cqj89j>
- Nimmo, D. D. & Combs, J. E. (1985). *Nightly Horrors: Crisis Coverage by Television Network News*. Nashville, TN: University of Tennessee Press

- Rencüs, H.: İsrail ilk defa Gazze sınırındaki kontrolü kaybetmiş durumda" [Hamide Rencüs: Israel has lost control over the Gaza border for the first time]. bianet.org (in Turkish). Archived from the original on 9 October 2023. Retrieved 8 October 2023.
- Statham, S. (2022). *Critical Discourse Analysis: A Practical Introduction to Power in Language*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Strömbäck, J. & Shehata, A., (2007). Structural biases in British and Swedish Election News Coverage. *Journalism Studies*, 8, 800-810. <http://doi.org/djkqfj>
- Van Dijk, (2004). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. London: Blackwell.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse, Context and Cognition. *Discourse Studies*. London: SAGE. Vol. 8(1): 159–177.
- Van Dijk. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, London: Sage Publication.
- Wodak, R. and Meyer, M., (2001). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Sage.