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Abstract—One news event may be represented differently by different news organizations. Research in news representation remains sparse in Arabic. This article investigates some of the linguistic and textual devices used in journalistic texts. It looks at the way these devices are used to influence public opinion. This gives rise to significance of conducting this research. This study uses these devices within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). For the purpose of this study, four news articles produced by Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya were examined under CDA in order to show how journalists structure their news stories to imply an ideological stance. The analysis showed that Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya represented the people and the police differently, each according to their ideological and political leanings. This resulted in the public having different opinions of the event.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Textual devices such as modality, transitivity, presupposition along with their linguistic counterparts represented in nominalization and thematization are considered key devices for journalists when producing news stories serving a particular ideology or belief. The way these devices are used by journalists could influence and shape the public opinion. As a matter of fact, such an area of investigation has been of interest to many scholars such as Bell (1991), Fowler (1991), Fairclough (1995), and Richardson (2007).

This article intends to contribute to the field of discourse analysis by showing, firstly, that news story writers use the same linguistic devices differently and these devices will lead readers to infer dissimilar conclusions about the same event. Secondly, it illustrates the role of lexical cohesion in framing news stories. The lexical choices of journalists appear to play a pivotal role in constructing and directing a news story to a particular end. In this article, four news articles covering the same event have been analyzed using Critical Discourse Analysis. Two of these articles were produced by Aljazeera – one in Arabic and one in English, and the other two produced by Al-Arabiya – one in Arabic and one in English. The linguistic and textual devices were used differently and, thus, led to divergent results. Consequently, the public is more likely to form disparate opinions about it.

The following example of two online news media texts shows how these two (Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya) media outlets represent the same news event to the public. The story is that an Egyptian Salafist Front, known for their opposition to President Abdulfateh al-Sisi’s regime, called for protests across Egypt against the rule of what they think about the ‘military coup’ that toppled the Islamist President Mohamed Morsi. The Front is known for its support of the Islamist movement the Muslim Brotherhood. The protest took place on Friday 28 November 2014.

Both media outlets have Arabic and English websites. In using Fairclough’s (1995) CDA framework in analyzing the media discourse, these news articles are analyzed under the text representation elements embodied in thematization, presupposition, transitivity, and coherences and cohesion. Table I below shows the headlines of the same news story in both media organizations:

1 The way ideology affects news representation could be a topic of interest in translation research (see Mahdiyan, Rahbar & Hosseini-Maasoum, (2013); Youssefi, Kanoni & Shojaei, (2013); Alghamdi, (2014)).
Before starting an analysis of these headlines along with their news texts, it is necessary to consider the concepts of news discourse and its relation to language as well as discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis.

A. Language and News Discourse

In bringing the subject of media, mass communication or media discourse into discussion, the focus can vary as it inextricably intertwines with other disciplines such as sociology, semiotics, psychology, anthropology and, of course, linguistics. Language is always present and could also be the main topic for text and discourse analysis (Cremades 2007). In this respect, the interest of linguists may lie in the grammatical and syntactical structures of news texts. News texts could be analyzed for the distinctive grammatical features of their headlines. Sociolinguists, on the other hand, may investigate a media text from the sociocultural point of view, to look at cultural aspects within a social context. This tendency is also explored by Fairclough’s (1995) dimension of the sociocultural practices of news. According to Fairclough (1995), this dimension entails three facets: economic (deals with the economics of the media), political (analysing issues of power and the ideology of the media) and cultural (deals with issues of values in a society and the culture of a given text). In terms of semiotics, news media texts and articles are characterized by the use of images, a feature that made an appealing point of analysis in semiotics. Semiotic analysis is typically concerned with the analysis of ideological patterns that are embedded in media texts (Paniagua 2007). However, this argument is only brought to the fore for reference reasons, as this article does not intend to investigate the semiotic aspect of discourse. Nonetheless, it remains a required area for investigation.

Linguists, as a matter of fact, are increasingly addressing this topic of news discourse. To be more specific, one approach that was generated from Critical Linguistics is Critical Discourse Analysis (ibid). According to Cremades (2007), CDA “studies and analyses written and spoken texts to reveal the discursive sources of power, dominance, inequality and bias” (p.17). This bias of news institutions towards their ideological orientations and political leanings is usually reflected on in their news products. The news texts investigated in this study are an example of this act of journalistic work. It goes without saying that the way news is structured is through the use of language. Fowler (1991) argues that events represented in news articles are not communicated naturally and their structure is not natural. That is, events in news are sites for representing the news organisation’s values and interests. News gets transferred through to readers with the use of structural features. These features, nonetheless, are impregnated with the news organisation’s ideologies and beliefs or values regarding an event. The Critical Discourse Analysis in section 4 of this article sheds more light on these features.

The headlines above can show a telling example of how news headlines are structured. They can reveal an agglomeration of ideological implications as they are opposing each other in the ways the event is represented. Richardson (2007) states that analysis of word choices in most cases is the first stage of discourse analysis. Therefore, if one can only speculate on the lexical choices of Aljazeera and AlArabiya, one can reach this interpretation. Aljazeera’s English article describes the events as ‘anti-government’ which does not give any background or knowledge about the protesters – the inference here is a normal protest that occurs every now and then worldwide. However, the “four dead” phrase gives the impression that the government was fierce, tough and perhaps, arguably, totalitarian in killing protesters, although it is still unclear who did the killing. Al-Arabiya’s English headline, on the other hand, would indicate that the protests could be ‘Islamists’. This term would usually connote with killing, bombs, violence, and that these people could be perceived as ‘Jihadists’ and/or ‘Terrorists’ whom the whole world is in confrontation with. These ‘Islamists’, according to Al-Arabiya, are not protesting - there is no demonstration. Further, the word ‘police’, makes the situation grave, as if the Egyptian police are in a fight with ‘Islamists’. Such lexical choices by journalists indicate that the protestors, although it is still unclear who did the killing. Al-
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thousands rally in Cairo heading to call by Salafist Front, as three military officers are killed by unknown gunmen.</td>
<td>مراسل</td>
<td>Four dead in Egypt anti-government protest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four killed in Egypt anti government protest.</td>
<td>مصرية</td>
<td>Egypt: Four killed as Islamists clash with police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subheading</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thousands rally in Cairo heading to call by Salafist Front, as three military officers are killed by unknown gunmen.</td>
<td>مراسل</td>
<td>Four dead in Egypt anti-government protest.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four killed in Egypt anti government protest.</td>
<td>مصرية</td>
<td>Egypt: Four killed as Islamists clash with police.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For a recent study in employing particular linguistic (modality) tools for participant to position themselves in a particular news discourse, see Persson (2015).
B. Discourse Analysis

Discourse, as Richardson (2007: 22-25) puts it, has been defined as a unit which is above or larger than a sentence. Discourse looks at structure and organization patterns in units. According to the formalist and structuralist definition of discourse, it should be unified and meaningful. Discourse is featured with a sentence link and connection rather than non-connected sentences. Otherwise they are not discourse. In her book Working with Spoken Discourse, Cameron (2001) offers this simple example, which shows elements of discourse.

_The baby cried._
_The mommy picked it up._

The word ‘it’ in the second sentence is a cohesive marker. Cameron explains that discourse is signalled with four features: cohesion, narrative, causality and motivation. In addition to cohesion, the ‘narrative’ feature exits the sequentially chronological narrative structure of the event or story. Causality is a third feature that can be inferred for the sequence of the above example. So we can infer that the mum picked him/her up because he/she cried. Motivation is also embedded in the event. The reader will infer that the baby was picked up by its own mother and not a mother of some other baby. This example explains that people usually figure out discourse by guessing the common-sense of the story or event. Such a guess is usually made subconsciously by knowledge of social acts in a society.

Therefore, the discourse definition which is a unit above a sentence is somehow inadequate as it lacks the social concepts that people know about their own society (Richardson 2007). The functionalist definition of discourse looks at the term beyond sentence level and investigates it as ‘language in use’. Brown and Yule (1983) cited in Richardson (2007) state that “the analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use” (p.24). According to this view, the concern of researchers is how language communicates functionally and contextually. Languages are used to “mean something and to do something” (Richardson, 2007, p. 24) (emphasis in original). Therefore, in discourse analysis it is important to take into account the context of the usage of the discourse rather than just looking into the cohesive and coherent devices above the sentence level. Let us take this example from a news translation point of view.

**Source Text:** Egypt interim PM backs army chief for president

**Target Text:** الـبيبـليو يشـيد بالـسيسي وـيـقـبـل لـرئـاسـة

**Back Translation:** el-Beblawi praises Sisi and backs his running for office

The source text was produced by Reuters on 23 January 2014 and was translated by Aljazeera on the same day. Egypt at that time was facing a political conflict. The political situation was not stable and the cabinet got shuffled frequently, so was the presidential position. Having this background in mind, let us see how the above example works. Reuters adapts a functionalization strategy, whereas Aljazeera goes for a nomination strategy. Nomination in news texts used to refer to people as who they are, focusing on personal qualities, while functionalisation is used to indicate what participants do, i.e. much more assertion to their function. Such different uses will consequently have different effects. Machin and Mayr (2012) state that the functionalisation strategy has more official status, connoting legitimacy and representing people’s occupation. Van Leeuwen (1996) states the nomination is usually realised by the use of proper nouns – whether formal or informal. Therefore, it could be argued that Aljazeera’s realization of the fact that el-Beblawi and Sisi are well-known to the Arab audience made it render their names directly, while Reuters goes for functionalization as these names are arguably still not well-known worldwide due to political turmoil in Egypt. This example stresses the importance of the context in discourse analysis. In a similar vein, Munday (2012) argues that unlike text analysis which examines cohesion, structure, organization of above sentence level, discourse analysis looks at how “language communicates meaning and social and power relations” (p.137). This aspect of socio-cultural practices has been discussed in critical discourse analysis, which is the politics of the media. Although the media are meant to be objective, impartial and neutral in their coverage of news stories and to provide even social and political views to the audience, Fairclough (1995) argues that they tend to work ideologically. He further says that media analysis has shown that some of the media output is ideologically shaped for the benefit of the powerful. The concepts of CDA have been discussed in the sections to follow.

C. Critical Discourse Analysis

Critical Discourse Analysis is a field which finds its roots in the Hallidayan Functionalist Linguistic Theory. CDA addresses the role of the audience in the analysis of texts as well as extends the analysis beyond the textual analysis into intertextual and contextual analysis. CDA is said to aim “to isolate ideology in discourse” (Fowler et al 1979; Fowler and Kress 1979) cited in (Cremades 2007, p. 17). News discourse is one of the main areas that CDA concerns itself with. In this respect, van Dijk (1995) argues that the formulaic nature of news texts cannot be investigated and analysed with negligence of the surrounding social context. He continues that the process of media text production that involves text structure and comprehension with its social and contextual frameworks is analysed in correlation with two identifiable levels. The first one is the microstructure level. It examines the semantic relations of the text, the syntax, lexis and cohesion and coherence. The second level is macrostructure which deals with the general thematic/topic structure and organization of news stories. News texts are characterized in terms of themes and topics usually narratively presented in the manner of a headline, lead paragraph(s) and superstructure. This manner is pedagogically unpacked in the summary, story and the consequences.
Fairclough (1995), on the other hand, notes that the focus in the representation of a text lies in the way “events, situations, relationships, people, and so forth are represented” (p.103). He goes on to argue that the way the media represent texts which may include a description of a particular event, or discuss a relationship between two or more people or institutions or infer a conclusion from people, say, politicians or economists, does not actually ‘mirror realities’ as some may ‘naively’ assume. Media texts, according to Fairclough, represent realities in different forms to match their own interests and objectives. The headline examples in the introduction above offer a good example of these media practices where Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya steer the reader’s attention to a particular point. According to Fairclough (1995), CDA analyzes media texts within not only their textual and structural frameworks but also by analysing and explaining three levels of texts: structure, production and comprehension. In this article, the level of text will be used in the analysis as it encompasses the elements needed for the analysis framework. However, the institutional settings and practices have also been brought into the discussion. This concept of institution setting is stressed by Wodjak (1996). She states that it is important, for example, to consider the setting of institutions where an interaction is taking place, i.e. hospital, school, police station, etc. Furthermore, this view has also been adopted by Richardson (2007) who mentions that CDA has been used to make a connection between linguistic analysis and social analysis. In this sense, social analysis means the settings in which the interaction takes place.

A more important ideological point of view that should be addressed here is the notion that some ideological practices may become background knowledge as a result of a naturalization process in a society (Fairclough 1995). To elaborate, it is a fact that the public rarely look at news critically. They take it for granted as facts. Further, Fowler (1991) asserts that first, readers of news are generally not trained to read critically. Second, audiences in general interpret news texts as per their background knowledge and information that they previously consumed regarding a topic in question (van Dijk 1993). Interestingly, and as van Dijk (ibid) puts it “… the news media are the main source of information and beliefs used to form an interpretation framework” (p. 242), for social or political events. In other words, audiences count on news to understand political or economic events which in turn shape the way they think or understand some social events. This background knowledge is then used to interpret further news texts, which makes such an interpretation unreliable as after all they are not trained to read or analyse critically.

Consequently, critical discourse analysis is needed to assist researchers of media texts to make assumptions and to analyse the impact of media ideology on audiences (Cremades 2007). Journalists produce news stories in a biased way, which may shape their negative attitude towards an event which is then taken in by the public who seem to trust it as fact (van Dijk 1995). That said, society is a key element in CDA, as it is the environment where people acquire social habits and culture. As a result, media institutions find discourse an inevitable place to imply ideological elements and that led Van Dijk (1995) to see discourse analysis as ideological analysis. Notwithstanding, with the arrival of the Internet and technology nowadays, media text readers can immediately leave their impact at the end of the news text as many websites provide space for viewers and readers to have their say about what they have read. In addition, some online media texts are free of charge and the comment domain at the end of each news article is an interactive virtual sphere that gives people the chance to discuss and debate their opinion which reflects the impact of the news on the audience and their comprehension of the text.

It could be argued that researchers of CDA have not adequately approached the news representation in the Arabic domain. As a matter of fact, previously published studies on the effect Arab news organisations failed to address the influence of a given news provider on its news story production. In other words, studies such as Al-Saggaf (2006), El-Nawawy & Powers (2008), and Johnson & Fahmy (2008) has not looked at the power of lexis and linguistic shifts in manipulating news events. In addition to this, one would find it difficult to locate a study investigating the linguistic devices mentioned above used in a contrastive manner in the Arabic literature. This was the motive for conducting this research and to open the door for more similar studies using other CDA devices and media outlets in the Arab world.

II. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Language could be a powerful tool when it is purposefully geared towards ideological ends. To investigate how language can be used influentially, this research attempts to answer the following two research questions: (1) to what extent could linguistic and textual devices used by journalists in producing news stories alter meanings? (2) how can some linguistic and textual devices be used by journalists to influence public opinions?

III. METHODOLOGY OF STUDY

This study uses four news articles, which were published online on the Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya webpages. Two of these articles were in English and the other two in Arabic. The Arabic ones were from the Arabic websites of Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya and the English ones were from the English websites of Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya. The four news articles tackle the same event which is protesters on the streets of Egypt. It seems that the protesters became violent and were confronted by the police. The narratives of Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya of the protests seemed to be contrasting.

The protests took place on 27-28 November 2014. These protests were preceded and followed by a huge number of other protests, demonstrations and violence in Egypt. This is because the country was facing a political conflict and turbulence. It is well-known that Egypt witnessed a revolution in 2011. A transitional period took place and then votes
were cast. The Islamist parties including the Muslim Brotherhood won most of the parliament seats and the presidency. Anti-Islamist forces began to mobilize to act against President Mohamed Morsi and his government (AP, 2013). A date was set for 30 June 2013 to topple the rule of the Muslim Brotherhood. Since this date, protests have been taking place frequently.

In this paper, the data was selected from Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya - as it could be argued that most of the articles published on the Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya webpages would have a similar degree of contrastive narratives with regards to Egypt. However, many different news headlines could have been used as data to show similar contrast. It is also argued, in this paper, that the analysis and results of this study are representative of the way Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya represent news on Egypt’s current political status. The sample data is a demonstration of the approaches of CDA, which have been applied to the Arabic and English news texts. The analysis in the following sections demonstrates how news organizations use linguistic and textual elements in their discourses to influence the public to believe an event is happening as they narrate it.

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA

This section examines the CDA linguistic and textual devices that journalists use in their writing of news texts. Those devices arguably go unnoticed by the public and influence them perniciously. These devices are thematization, presupposition, transitivity, and coherence and cohesion. Although each of these devices serve a particular purpose in arguing a news agency’s point of view through, they fall under the social practices of CDA which is used to promote a particular discourse a news organization adopts.

A. Thematization

The theme is the topic of a clause which forms the point of departure. It usually occupies a prominent position at the start of a sentence. In other words, it foregrounds the information for focus, attention and importance (Fairclough 1995). Although Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya foregrounded the killing of two/four, there seems to be a striking difference. Aljazeera’s English article began the clause with At least four protesters have been killed and Al-Arabiya with Four people, including two soldiers, were killed. In the following paragraphs, Aljazeera maintains the focus of the thematic clause with the use of ‘protesters’ and ‘protests’ at the start of the consecutive paragraphs. Al-Arabiya, on the other hand, puts more focus on the ‘officers’ and ‘soldiers’ killed by ‘not clear’ assailants, as it says. However, it elaborates, with a local coherence relation clause unknown as extension using adversative (but), and continues to say that but militants have killed scores of policemen and soldiers since the army overthrew Islamist president Mohammed Mursi. This is quite a shifting point in Al-Arabiya’s narrative where it starts to intertextualize the infamous actions of the Islamists and the Muslim Brotherhood.

Aljazeera’s Arabic version is not different from its English one; it also thematized the protests, those killed by the police. However, it added an external power embodied in the USA that condemned the ‘attack’ and ‘violence’ on protesters. Table II shows how Aljazeera began the clauses of each paragraph in its Arabic version with translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ارتفاعت أكثر من عشر مسيرات.</td>
<td>More than ten demonstrations took to the streets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There was a rally as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>نشط في الشارع.</td>
<td>There were casualties when police started shooting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five protesters killed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>القاهرة صادرة عن الحكومةamerican foreign secretary &quot;strongly&quot; condemned.</td>
<td>Washington offers condolences to families who lost beloved ones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>وقع الهجوم رغم قوات الأمن.</td>
<td>The attack took place as army patrol secures…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attack took place as army patrol secures…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There were shootings in military camps.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armed men in a car opened fire on army officers and soldiers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Al-Arabiya's Arabic version, on the contrary, began paragraph clauses by focusing on the killing of the officers. The clause of the first paragraph starts with قتل ضابط في الجيش (an army officer was killed). The other paragraphs' starting points revolve around the same concept. Table III shows how Al-Arabiya began the clauses of each paragraph in its Arabic version with translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>أن هجوم في سيارة فتحا النار على ضابط جيش وجنود</td>
<td>The attack took place as army patrol secures…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A group called &quot;Supporters of Jerusalem&quot; adopted the …</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>مسلحون في سيارة فتحو النار على ضابط جيش وجنود</td>
<td>Armed men in a car opened fire on army officers and soldiers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The attack took place as army patrol secures…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The thematization of Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya, as can be noticed, are dissimilar, as each media outlet focuses on a particular aspect of the process. Aljazeera makes protesters the patient of the process and the Police/Army the actor, while Al-Arabiya introduces the Army as a patient and implicitly indicates that the actors are Islamists. When a news article is thematizing a particular agent in the story, it means they put it in a place of focus. Then, the story will revolve...
around it. In this way, it will be at the news institution’s disposal to present it negatively and positively. When themes are not the essential focus of a clause, this means clauses are rhematized – not being the focus of the text.

B. Presupposition

Media texts contain hidden or presupposed meanings. Fairclough (1995) stresses that elements that are absent from a news story weighs similar effect as those present in a news story. He further argues that some elements might seem to be present in a text, but in fact they are not. In this sense, Richardson (2007) unpacks that the focus of the presupposed meaning in text is the relations between what is written to the way it is written. Presupposition is used by journalists to position readers/listeners in a way that allows them to make commonsensical assumptions. Aljazeera’s English article presupposes that supporters of the toppled President Mohammed Mursi were not allowed to protest by using The protests are the first attempt in months. It also presupposes that Christians and Muslims are standing together in those protests and it is not for the supporters of the Islamists but indistinguishably for all Egyptians. This presupposition gives a sign that the existing regime is undesirable. Another presupposition was the use of the phrase the absence of a true political solution, which assumes that there is a real ordeal in the country and all solutions presented were not true and, thus, violence will continue. Aljazeera’s Arabic version also used presupposition. For example, it says تراجع Failed revolution has the face of the process and then the actor (gunmen). This occurs by shifting the roles of the actors and goals, where the
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ty to speak, say, tell, shout), second, mental processes (think, decide), third, relational processes, which contain only an agent such as using (have, seem, be) and fourth, material processes, which are processes of doing and, in turn, are divided into transitive action, i.e. (the police killed the attackers) or intransitive action, i.e. (the attackers drove away) (Richardson 2007).

Transitivity also contributes to the ideologically driven choices of the structure of clauses by journalists. Aljazeera chooses active clause by saying two soldiers were shot dead by unknown gunmen. It begins with the goal (two soldiers) and process and then the actor (gunmen). According to Fowler (1991), transitivity contributes to the positive/negative evaluation of participants. Aljazeera portrays the police as the actor, whereas Al-Arabiya depicts them as the goal of the process. This means that transitivity can lead to negative or positive comprehension of the same newspaper story, i.e. making the readers of the news article offer a dissimilar assessment of the story. In this manner, Fowler (1991) argues that transitivity “has the facility to analyze the same event in different ways” (p. 71). This occurs by shifting the roles of the actors and goals, where the
actors are the powerful and the goals are the powerless. If the focus of the story exchanges these roles, this will result in a different assimilation of the story by the public.

**D. Coherence and Cohesion**

Coherence refers to connecting the ideas of a text in order to create meaning for the audience (Douglas et al. 2007). Local coherence relations of text representation, according to Fairclough (1995), are shown in a number of devices including elaboration, extension and enhancement within clauses and complex sentences. The following example from the Aljazeera English version illustrates the local coherence relations:

Meanwhile, three senior army officers were killed in separate shooting incidents by unidentified assailants. Two were shot dead in Cairo, while a navy officer was killed in Alexandria.

The paragraph began with a sequential linking adverbial “meanwhile” to indicate that this item is not directly related to the preceding item in the above paragraph, but the overall idea is related to it, however, indirectly. Furthermore, the second sentence is an enhancement of the first which indicates the place of the separate shootings that resulted in the death of three officers.

Cohesion, on the other hand, refers to the relations of meaning within the text. It occurs in a text when some elements of discourse rely on one another (Halliday and Hasan 1976). In other words, the surface components of the text are connected in some kind of a sequence – those components are the actual words we see (Hatim and Mason 1990). In the examples taken from the news articles data, a number of these cohesive devices are discussed below to show how they impact on readers and are used ideologically by news providers. These devices include lexical reiteration, ellipsis, references, substitution, conjunction and the use of lexical repetition. Consequently, they can be used to evaluate a text, as maintained by Hunston and Thompson (2001). Table IV below shows the examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cohesive device</th>
<th>Website</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Al-Arabiya English text</td>
<td>The ministry also announced that … . It said the group members were …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Aljazeera English text</td>
<td>At least four protesters have been killed and scores of others injured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>Aljazeera Arabic Text</td>
<td>اعترفت وزارة الداخلية المصرية اعتقال كما أبطلت مفعول عشر عبوات متفجرة. The Egyptian Interior Ministry announced the detention of … and (the Ministry) deactivated improvised explosive devices. Notice the words “the Ministry” are deleted from the second part of the sentence. So, it is presumed that the deactivation is conducted by the Ministry without mentioning it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Al-Arabiya English text</td>
<td>These words were dominant in Al-Arabiya: killed (repeated five times), shot dead, bomb (repeated twice), open fire, attacks (repeated three times), terror operations, unrest. These processes were conducted by: Islamists (repeated five times), Muslim Brotherhood (repeated twice), terrorists, and militants. These are presented as the doer, the agent. However, the following words: military (repeated four times), army (repeated five times), security forces and police (men) (repeated three times), soldiers, and officers are represented as the targets of the attacks by the doers or the protectors of the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical cohesion</td>
<td>Al-Arabiya English text</td>
<td>The identity of the assailants was not clear, but militants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al-Arabiya Arabic text</td>
<td>هجوم (attack) (repeated four times), قتلى (killed) (repeated three times), ضباط (soldiers) (repeated twice) andjin (army) (repeated four times). On the other hand, هاتفون (officers) and منها (among) (repeated three times). The choice of vocabulary in Al-Arabiya’s Arabic stresses the same importance as the English vocabulary, which is the police under attack by Islamists.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aljazeera English text</td>
<td>Aljazeera repeats the words: killed (four times), attacks (three times), violence (twice), shooting, open fire, and shot dead. Those words were used in two different senses. For example, in Aljazeera’s story the police &quot;opened fire&quot;, whereas in Al-Arabiya the attackers &quot;opened fire&quot;. Aljazeera reiterates that the police, army and security forces (repeated twice) killed and arrested protesters. And in seeking objectivity, it says that army officers/police officers were killed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aljazeera Arabic text</td>
<td>Aljazeera uses the words: killed, arrest (four times), violence (three times), shoot, torture, oppression, and attacks (twice) as these actions are carried out by police (used four times), security forces (five times), army (twice). Aljazeera included the words: military coup (four times), Muslim Brotherhood (three times) and the Salafist Front (four times). According to Aljazeera’s narrative, the police killed and arrested protesters who rejected the military coup.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The use of coherence and cohesive devices are significant elements in text representation. They are evaluative tools that show the ideological stance of a media outlet towards both the event and the participants taking part. On the other hand, lexical reiteration as demonstrated in the foregoing comparison illustrates that it allows media professionals to reiterate different vocabulary to frame the same news story differently. It can be seen that a number of words are frequently used for the purposes of creating a particular effect for the reader. The overall representations of Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya can be seen in Table V below:
E. Conclusion

This article investigated some of the linguistic and textual devices that were used in news articles. These devices are frequently used by journalists for the purpose of making the public form an opinion about a phenomenon. This opinion is, of course, intended to meet the political and ideological stance of the media institution at hand. Thus, four news articles published online on Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya covering protests in Egypt have been examined. These articles were presented in a way that led readers to draw a different conclusion with regards to the same event.

In revisiting the research questions in II above, the CDA devices (thematization, presupposition, transitivity, and coherence and cohesion) represented the participants in the protests differently. Meaning of lexis or the overall image of the news text participants seemed to be altered dramatically. This would consequently affect the audience’s judgement about whether the police or the people are to blame. Table V represents a conclusion inferred from the use of CDA in this study.

Thematization, for instance, showed that while Aljazeera was thematizing protests to make them the focus of the text, Al-Arabiya thematized the officers and soldiers who were killed. This seemed also true with regard to presupposition which showed that journalists use this device to make readers subconsciously come to a commonsensical conclusion, mostly in favour of the news organisation. Al-Arabiya made a number of presuppositions about the Islamists’ role in the protests. These were completely absent from Aljazeera’s narrative. This would offer help answering the implications in second research questions that public opinion could be influenced.

Participants of a news text can be negatively evaluated when they are represented as the powerful, meaning that they have power and exercise it over others. Aljazeera portrays the police as the actor – they have power and use it. In this account, the police are evaluated negatively as shooting the protesters dead. On the contrary, Al-Arabiya depicts the police as the target. They were shot dead by assailants. This could be reached by manipulating transitivity as in section C above.

The coherence and cohesion devices exhibited that journalists use these devices to influence the public opinion. These devices have been examined in terms of lexical reiteration, ellipsis, references, substitution and conjunction. Although the four articles were presenting the same event, the lexis used seemed to be different. Both Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya were repeating different words as shown in Table IV, each hammering home their own message. Each of the CDA devices serves a particular purpose in representing an ideological viewpoint. However, they share a common purpose which is promoting the discourse of their news institution.

The sample size of the study was limited to four news articles reporting one event. This was done due to the purpose of this research to shed light on the way linguistic devices used by journalists differently. However, this sample could be expanded by investigating a series of reports on one event. Further, this study could be enhanced by applying the same linguistic devices on news regarding other countries by Aljazeera and Al-Arabiya. This can also be approached from CDA Multimodality by focusing on image representation in news (see Hart, 2016). Finally, this study could be furthered by examining other elements and devices of CDA in other news texts. These could include the socio-cultural and socio-political dimensions of discourse including intertextuality, which has a historical reference according to Wodak (1996).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Represented</th>
<th>Targets</th>
<th>Represented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td>Positively</td>
<td>Protesters</td>
<td>Negatively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army/Police</td>
<td>Negatively</td>
<td>Army/Police</td>
<td>Positively</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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