Granting Voice to Civil Society: Testing the Indexing Hypothesis in American, Israeli, and Lebanese Newspaper Coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

Lauren Weinberger

Duke University

Professor Kristin Goss
Professor Ken Rogerson
Public Policy Honors Seminar
December 10, 2010

Table of Contents

Introduction……..3
The Media, Civil Society and Working Towards Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict……...4
Data and Methods……....9
Hypotheses……14
Comments on the Analysis and Coding of Newspaper Articles…….....16
Empirical Section……...19
News Articles……..….19
Op-Eds…….....27
Editorials……..36
Addressing Hypotheses……..38
Explaining Why: Findings from Interviews with NGOs and Reporters……40
Concluding Discussion……..48
Works Cited……...50
Acknowledgements……52
Appendices……53
Appendix 1: Source Type within News Articles…….....53
Appendix 2: List of NGOs Cited in News Articles Across All Three Newspapers.....56
Appendix 3: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources within News Articles……...58
Appendix 4: Source Type in News Articles During the Policy Proposal & Adoption Stage..59
Appendix 5: Source Type in News Articles During the Policy Implementation Stage……...62
Appendix 6: Source Type Within Op-Ed Pieces…….……65
Appendix 7: Op-Ed Authors…….....68
Appendix 8: Source Type within Op-Eds Written by Non-Elites…….…..69
Appendix 9: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources within Op-Eds…….....70
Appendix 10: Source Type within Editorials……...71
Appendix 11: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources within Editorials……74
Appendix 12: Length of Articles for Each Newspaper……...……75
Appendix 13: Sample Interview Questions for Non-Governmental Organizations……76
Appendix 14: Sample Interview Questions for Reporters……...77

Introduction

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict has been an ongoing, long entrenched dispute, engendering an abundance of literature and discussion regarding how to best move towards a lasting peace. Existing academic literature highlights the need for both top-level policy changes and grassroots efforts at creating a culture of peace and co-existence.

Media has potential to influence the contemporary policy agenda, as Maxwell McCombs (2005) notes, "The press plays a major role in public life…providing many of the facts and opinions that shape perspectives on the topic of the day" (McCombs 156). Given theories that stress the importance of efforts by both government officials *and* civil society (Hemmer el al. 129), it is pertinent to consider whether the international media give ample attention to both of these necessary parties when covering the peace process. Do all of the important actors in this conflict (ranging from the average citizen to the prime minister) have a voice in the media's coverage of this conflict? Indeed the very purpose and role of the press lies in its ability to present multiple perspectives. As Blake Morant (2004) notes, "If media function to secure democratic processes, then its robust nature must include both the sacrosanct right to expressive freedom *and* the duty to report the variety of viewpoints and perspectives that appeal to a diverse society" (Morant 944). To what extent are the media fulfilling this duty by representing a variety of voices in their coverage of the Mideast?

W. Lance Bennett (1990) has proposed the indexing hypothesis, which describes a bias towards citing members of the government while de-emphasizing voices of other individuals (Bennett 106). Bennett developed his work based on American media, causing academics to debate the extent to which coverage in other countries follows a similar bias.

The following study analyzed sourcing within prominent English-language American, Israeli, and Arab newspapers regarding coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, comparing the extent to which each of these countries' news coverage aligns with Bennett's indexing hypothesis. Of interest is the extent to which non-government views are aired, with particular attention paid to the presence of civil society organizations in media coverage. This issue was examined within a specific case study, Israel's disengagement from the Gaza Strip, to address how English-language Arab, Israeli, and American print media differ in the extent to which they give voice to non-governmental sources in their coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and why.

The Media, Civil Society and Working Towards Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The literature on how to create peace between Palestinians and Israelis and the extent to which the media cover all of the identified actors necessary for establishing long-lasting peace provide the context and basis for this research study. Numerous scholars such as Bar Tal (2010) and Hemmer et al. (2006) argue the need for peace to be created at the grassroots level and not just among top-level government officials. If true, civil society actors are of particular interest due to their potential role in creating what Bar Tal calls a lasting "peace culture" (Bar Tal 2). The media's agenda setting power has been noted by many, Maxwell McCombs (2005) among them. Accordingly, the media is of central importance in the peace process. W. Lance Bennett's indexing hypothesis posits a tendency of the American press to over-emphasize government voices, creating a potential for civil society organizations' positions to be minimally publicized.

When not given as much press as government officials, those working at the grassroots level may be overlooked—despite their centrality in the peace process according to some.

How to Reach Lasting Peace in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

There have been numerous theories on how to achieve peace in the Middle East. Elizabeth Stanley (2009) argues that to reach a peaceful end to a longstanding conflict, a coalition shift among top-level government officials is necessary. She explains, "A coalition shift allows different political actors—with different political interests, assessments of the war and constituencies—to take power. This, in turn, can lead to a shift in war policy, from continuing it to ending it" (Stanley 61).

Others argue that in such wars, efforts to achieve peace must occur at the grassroots level in order to change the view of the average citizen on the ground; without such change, long-lasting peace will not be achieved. Daniel Bar-Tal (2010) argues that there is a need to establish a culture of peace—that is a new culture, in place of the current dominant one of conflict, if relations between Israelis and Palestinians are to improve (Bar-Tal 2). Bar-Tal warns that without development of peace education, any peace process would ultimately fail and result instead in an extension, rather than an abatement, of conflict (Bar-Tal 14).

While the foregoing sources have differing emphases on top-level vs. bottom-level steps towards peace, they are not necessarily in tension with each other when considering the possibility for simultaneous peace efforts among government officials and members of civil society. Bruce Hemmer et al. (2006) explain, "Citizen peacebuilders create the democratic, social, cultural, and human capital necessary to effectively engage national level politics by first building peace and democracy at the grassroots level and in local politics" (Hemmer et al. 129).

Civil Society in the United States, Israel, and Lebanon

Given the important role of civil society, as recognized in academic literature, in resolving this conflict, the extent to which each of these countries (the United States, Lebanon, and Israel) contain robust civil societies becomes increasingly relevant. Although Israel is considered to have a large civil society with a multitude of organizations, Gideon Doron (1996) argues that Israel in fact has two distinguishable civil societies, a Jewish-Israeli civil society and an Arab-Israeli civil society. While within Israel there are peace building organizations that include both Israelis and Arabs, Doron maintains that the norm is substantially different, resulting in "two distinct civilly defined networks of organizations" (Doron 206). In Lebanon, a "culture of autonomy emerged in the country, whereby civil organizations or private entrepreneurship, legal or not, replaced inefficient, and sometimes absent government services" (Kraidy 396). In the United States, there is a strong, diverse civil society.

Media Sourcing and its Implications

Despite the recognized, important role of government as well as ordinary citizens in creating progress towards peace, many scholars have questioned the extent to which the media give the latter adequate attention. In developing his indexing hypothesis, W. Lance Bennett (1990) claimed that "Mass media news professionals, from the boardroom to the beat, tend to 'index' the range of voices and viewpoints in both news and editorials according to the range of views expressed in mainstream government debate about a given topic" (Bennett 106). According to this theory, there is extensive sourcing of government officials. Implied is a contrasting lack of emphasis on non-government, civil society sources in media coverage.

Bennett's work generates concern that coverage is skewed to overly reflect the government's sentiments, which runs counter to the acknowledged as well as self-proclaimed

goal of the press to provide a voice to members of society. The press serves as the mainstream forum for public discourse on important issues. Unfortunately, as Bennett laments, "The press in this system might be seen to have settled for a comfortable role as 'keeper of the official record' while abdicating its traditional mandate to raise an independent 'voice of the people' under appropriate circumstances" (Bennett 106). The extent to which the press no longer serves as the voice of the people could be particularly problematic in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, where the actions and opinions of grassroots peace building organizations are of great importance in the move towards lasting peace, at least according to scholars like Daniel Bar-Tal, who effectively argues for the need to create a grassroots "peace culture" (which civil society can facilitate) if long-term peace is to be established (Bar-Tal 2).

Numerous causes have been suggested for this alleged overemphasis on government sources. Leon V. Sigal (1986) reasons that such sourcing tendencies are due to "the need for news stories everyday, the scarcity of money and staff, and the readiness of government agencies to put out information in a form ready for transcription" (Sigal 17). Thus, the relative ease with which the press can access government sources offers a possible explanation for the potentially problematic trend that Bennett identified.

Who the media are sourcing is of utmost importance in a given policy debate. As Sigal explains, "People who are routine sources for the press are also more likely to be favorably portrayed in the news." (Sigal 28). This potential for bias due to sourcing decisions is especially relevant in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which is a complex, controversial issue in which accusations of bias are frequently hurled by both sides, including numerous media-monitoring groups.

Indeed, actors in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have often voiced these concerns regarding the media's bias towards government sources. Civil society organizations have formed in attempts to counteract the media's perceived underrepresentation of civil society and the average citizen. One example of such an organization is *Just Vision*, which "emerged in response to the lack of media coverage of Palestinian and Israeli civilians working to end the conflict…This prevents the discourse on nonviolent conflict resolution among Israelis and Palestinians from emerging in the public sphere" ("About Just Vision"). This organization aims to raise awareness about civil society's efforts towards peace in light of the perception among many that the media are not giving voice to the average peace-loving Palestinian and Israeli, or reporting those of their actions that help move towards creating lasting peace.

Testing the Indexing Hypothesis in the American and Foreign Press

Because Bennett's indexing hypothesis was developed in the context of the American media, there has been debate within academic literature regarding the extent to which this hypothesis is applicable to the foreign press. Cristina Archetti (2008) argues:

> Current conceptualizations of the media-foreign policy relation are not able to account for differences at the cross-national level…The indexing hypothesis…*cannot* apply to foreign cases not only because it is a description of the interaction and the media at a domestic level. It cannot apply because it comes with a normative baggage, which is rooted into the Anglo Saxon journalistic model…The fact is that journalists' role is different in other parts of the world. (Archetti 20)

This study of American, Israeli, and Lebanese newspapers tested the extent to which the indexing hypothesis is—or is not—applicable to non-American news organizations. Considering the possible implications of the indexing hypothesis in underrepresenting the views of civil society and the general populace (crucial actors in the movement towards peace), it is important to test the extent to which this hypothesis holds true in each of these media sources. Thus, to

reiterate my research question, I will be examining: How do English-language Arab, Israeli, and American print media differ in the extent to which they give voice to non-governmental sources in their coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and why?

Data and Methods

Case Study: Israel's Disengagement from the Gaza Strip

The coverage of these three newspapers was examined within the context of a specific case study, Israel's disengagement plan, whereby all settlers in the Gaza Strip and four West Bank settlements were evacuated. Israeli Prime Minister Ariel Sharon first announced this plan on December 18, 2003. It was adopted on June 6, 2004, implemented in August 2005, and completed on September 12, 2005. Coverage was analyzed from December 18, 2003, when Prime Minster Ariel Sharon announced his plan, until September 12, 2005, when the Israelis completed the disengagement.

This case study was chosen for a multitude of reasons. First, this issue involves both high-level policy negotiation and adoption (in Ariel Sharon's cabinet and the Israeli Knesset), as well as-on-the ground implications for both Israeli and Palestinian civilians during its implementation. While Israeli settlers were forced to leave their homes, Palestinians witnessed a removal of Israeli civilians and military presence in territory that some hope will become part of an eventual Palestinian state. Thus, over the course of the given time period (from policy proposal to implementation), I was able to test whether or not more of a voice was given to government officials during the top-level debate and more of a voice was given to citizens during the policy implementation stage. This case is of particular interest with regard to the Palestinian-

Israeli peace process, as it served as a major Israeli gesture towards greater Palestinian autonomy and a possible future Palestinian state.

Choosing Newspapers and Freedom of the Press in Each Country

In comparing Israeli, Arab, and American news coverage, I looked at three major English-language newspapers: *The New York Times* (USA), *The Jerusalem Post* (Israel), and the *Daily Star* (Lebanon). All three of these newspapers are printed in English (i.e. *not* translations of foreign language press). Additionally, all three of these sources are well established, with the youngest newspaper of the three being the *Daily Star*, which was founded in 1952. Articles from these three newspapers were accessed through the database *Factiva*, which provides full coverage of full text articles from all three of these sources dating back at least a decade for each newspaper. The *Daily Star* was the only English-language Arab newspaper for which *Factiva* offered full coverage of full text articles for the entire time period analyzed, another reason for its selection.

The extent to which freedom of the press exists in each country is also relevant when considering the importance of the media, for the media have a strong influence and agenda setting power. As Maxwell McCombs (2005) notes, "The press plays a major role in public life, influencing citizens' focus of attention and providing many of the facts and opinions that shape perspectives on the topic of the day" (McCombs 156). Considering the power of the media in influencing public opinion and attention on controversial issues, the potential possibility of censored or biased coverage in a country lacking free press is particularly problematic.

America's respect for freedom of the press (as evidenced by the First Amendment) is well documented. In Israel, according to the US State Department, law "provides for freedom of speech and of the press, and the government generally respected these rights in practice, subject

to restrictions concerning security issues" (Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor). However, Israel's restrictions on the media during its war in the Gaza Strip in the winter of 2008-2009 drew much criticism regarding the extent to which Israel does in fact offer adequate freedom of the press (Eizkovitch).

The Lebanese press has historically "enjoyed relatively high levels of freedom and reflected the countries' pluralistic character" (Kraidy 389). Beirut has served as "a safe haven for Arab dissidents who freely attacked Arab regimes in its newspapers" (Kraidy 389). The longstanding presence of civil society and freedom of the press makes Lebanon an apt candidate for studying an Arab country's media coverage and the extent to which it gives voice to civil society. Lebanon's diversity and freedoms might allow the *Daily Star's* coverage to better reflect the views of the people and of civil society than other Arab news sources, which might face greater censorship.

Compiling A Set of Articles

In order to put together a set of articles to examine in this case study, I input specific search terms into the database *Factiva* to ensure that I was compiling the population of articles that cover the Israeli disengagement from the Gaza strip. I looked at articles in the date range of December 18, 2003 (the date that Ariel Sharon first proposed this plan in a public speech) to September 12, 2005 (when Israel officially left the Gaza Strip). The articles in my search were specified to include all of the following words: "Israel*[1]" and "Gaza". My search also restricted the population of articles to those that included at least one of the following words: "disengage*", "pullout," or "withdraw." Between the three newspapers that I examined, these search specifications gave me a total of 4,936 articles. 3,240 articles were from *The Jerusalem*

[1] This asterisk was used so that any variation on "Israel" would also turn up in the search, such as "Israeli" or "Israelis."

Post, 1,009 articles were from the *Daily Star*, and 687 articles were from *The New York Times.* As the smallest number of articles was from *The New York Times*, I took a random sample of 300 dates on which *New York Times* articles on the disengagement were published, and then randomly selected one article per date from this paper. I wanted to match up the events covered within these articles with the other newspapers' coverage of those same events. Thus, I used those 300 dates to take a random sample of articles from the *Daily Star* and *The Jerusalem Post*. I randomly selected one article from each of these two other newspapers that were written within one day of *The New York Times* article, which allowed me to better account for time differences between the Middle East and New York. However, if among these 300 dates were ones that fell in a row, I needed to take a random sample in such a way as to avoid having overlapping populations to sample from. The solution is exemplified in the case of the two consecutive dates January 1, 2004 and January 2, 2004. In this case, for the date January 1, I randomly selected one article from each of the other two papers written on either December 31, 2003 or January 1, 2004. For January 2, I randomly selected one article written on either January 2 or January 3 from each newspaper.

Because *The Jerusalem Post* and the *Daily Star* did not always necessarily publish a newspaper article on the Israeli disengagement within a day of *The New York Times*, I analyzed 282 articles from *The Jerusalem Post* and 256 from the *Daily Star*. Thus, in total I examined 838 randomly selected articles.

Research Design: Content Analysis

In conducting a content analysis of the newspaper articles with regards to this policy issue, I categorized the sources of each article. Loosely based on categories presented in a study by Jonathan Mermin that also tested the indexing hypothesis, I developed specific categories for

the sources of news coverage (Mermin 31).[2] Thus, in coding these articles, I noted the following categories for analysis:

Table 1: Categories for Analysis of Articles

Article Information	**Kind of Article**	**Source's Nationality/Ethnic Origin**
Date	News Piece	Arab
News Source		Israeli
Headline	Opinion Signed	Both Arab and Israeli
Byline (Author)	Opinion Unsigned (Editorial)	Neither Arab nor Israeli
Word Count		Unknown

Source Type	
Named Current Government Official	Government Officials
Named Former Government Official	
Unnamed Current Government Official	
Unnamed Former Government Official	
Journalist	Non-Government Officials
University Academic	
Business	
Think Tank	
Multinational Organization	
Religious Leader	
NGO	
Violent Extremist Organization	
Ordinary Citizen	
Opinion Poll	
Other	

This approach to content analysis enabled me to assess whom the media gave voice to in this specific policy debate and its implementation, which is a key motivating question behind this research study.

[2] While drawing from Mermin's study of guests on *MacNeil/Lehrer Newshour*, I have altered his categories to fit the objectives of my study. The categories in Mermin's research were: Former government official, Journalist, United States government, Foreign, Washington think tank, Ordinary person/participant, University academic, Business, other, and public-interest organization. There are few studies that test the indexing hypothesis on which to base my own research methods. This study's framework seemed most applicable to the categories of sources that would appear in coverage of the Israeli disengagement.

Assessing the Findings

To understand the findings of this study, I utilized four techniques: 1) Relying on existing literature to explain any phenomenon, 2) Looking for logical explanations for why these differences may exist, 3) Interviewing news journalists regarding my findings to garner qualitative information on why contrasts in coverage may be present, and 4) Interviewing non-governmental organizations about what they make of my findings and their experience interacting with the media. These interviews provided supplemental explanations for the findings.

Hypotheses

Through my content analysis of newspaper coverage, I examined four sources of variation, each of which carried its own hypothesis based on the available academic literature:

Hypothesis 1: Favoring of Government Sources Over Civil Society

The first source of variation that I examined is across categories of sources cited in articles; what I expected to find was grounded in W. Lance Bennett's indexing hypothesis, which suggests that newspaper coverage will have a bias towards providing government sources over all others. If this held true in all three countries (America, Israel, and Lebanon), one would expect to see *The New York Times, The Jerusalem Post,* and the *Daily Star* all exhibit more government sources in their articles on the disengagement than non-government sources.

Hypothesis 2: Relatively More Government Sources in The New York Times than in The Jerusalem Post or the Daily Star

Another important source of variation is across the three newspapers. Scholar Cristina Archetti (2008) argues that the indexing hypothesis is not applicable outside of the framework of

the United States. Thus, Archetti's reasoning would predict that *The New York Times* would rely more heavily on government sources than *The Jerusalem Post* or the *Daily Star*, as *The New York Times* is the only American newspaper assessed in this study and thus, according to Archetti, the only newspaper that presumably would conform to the indexing hypothesis.

Hypothesis 3: Relatively More Voice to Civil Society During the Policy Implementation Stage

Because this study examined disengagement from the Gaza Strip over an extended time period, there existed the opportunity to test the variation of sourcing at different stages of this policy, from its proposal to its implementation. During the time period that involved top-level negotiations, one might logically expect to see a greater number of government voices in the media given the proximity to the events that were being covered. On the other hand, during the policy implementation stage, it was average citizens who were being directly affected by the events that were taking place, as the Israelis were forcibly removing settlers from their homes. Thus, during this time period of policy implementation, one might have predicted that the media would grant relatively more voice to civil society and average citizens.

Hypothesis 4: The New York Times and The Jerusalem Post coverage will have more Israeli sources, while the Daily Star will source more Arab voices

I also considered variation regarding the nationality of sources. After all, a distinction is to be made between quoting a Palestinian government official or an Israeli one, as this factor has a large effect on the overall media coverage that is presented. One might logically assume that as an Israeli newspaper, *The Jerusalem Post* would feature relatively more Israeli sources, while conversely the *Daily Star,* an Arab newspaper, might be expected to feature comparatively more Arabs voices.

However, in regards to an American newspaper like *The New York Times*, the prediction of who is a more likely source is connected to which side its coverage might be biased towards. As Leon Sigal (1986) explained, people who are often used as sources in the press are also often shown in a more favorable light (Sigal 28). There is a great deal of literature on the presence of bias in Western media coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The charge that the American media are biased towards the Israeli side has appeared in both public discourse and academic literature, as has the opposite complaint that media are biased towards the Palestinians. Marda Dunksy (2008) claims that numerous "academic studies indicate that…reporting produced by specific media outlets either exhibited various types of biases favoring Israel or achieved an overall balance between representing Israeli and Palestinian points of view. None of the four studies found patterns of coverage indicating a pro-Palestinian bias" (Dunsky 286). This literature likely predicts that *The New York Times* would give voice to more Israeli representatives than Arab ones if it indeed is biased towards the Israeli point of view. If the paper exhibits relatively balanced coverage, one would expect it to equally feature Israeli and Arab sources. Regardless, based on this literature, one would predict that *The Times* features comparatively fewer Arab sources than the *Daily Star*.

Comments on the Analysis and Coding of Newspaper Articles

The random sample of articles produced a total of 838 articles for analysis, each of which was retrieved from the database *Factiva*. Excluded from the data set were news summaries, corrections to articles from previous days, a quote of the day, letters to the editor, book reviews, and two articles that were simply unrelated to the disengagement from the Gaza Strip. All of the

articles that were excluded seemed irrelevant for answering the question at hand regarding sourcing within news coverage of the disengagement from the Gaza Strip.

Named government officials were generally a simple category to code. However, it is important to note how I handled a situation in which an official's words were cited from another source. For example, an article might say, "As Ariel Sharon told *Haaretz*…" and then quote a lengthy statement by Sharon. The source of this quote could be considered *Haaretz*, as that is where the journalist writing this news piece is getting his information. However, my research focused on the extent to which different actors were given voice in the policy debate over disengagement. In context, the article was coded as giving voice to the government official by quoting a lengthy statement by him, as it is not giving voice to the newspaper in a meaningful way. Thus, this case was coded as a named government official.

In categorizing non-government officials, there were often vague references to "officials" without any indication of how many officials this might be. Because these "officials" were regarded as one collective voice and conceivably could be referring to only one official, this referent was counted as one source. Reference to a general government entity—e.g. "the Defense Department said in a statement…"—was also counted as an unnamed government official, as it was unclear which specific, individual official was the source of the quote provided.

Because Hamas has both a political and a militant wing, its representatives were categorized as a government official *or* as belonging to a violent extremist group, depending on the context within the article. If Hamas was explicitly described as "militant" or as speaking of violence against Israel (either taking credit for an act of violence or advocating violence), it was counted as a violent extremist organization in the data set. If it was speaking of participating in

the upcoming elections, negotiating with Israelis or other Palestinians, or speaking in any other non-violent capacity, its members were counted as government officials.

"Witnesses" in the situation of violent attacks were considered to be "ordinary citizens." "Witnesses" made up a large number of what were considered ordinary citizens in much of the data set. In any other instance in which the source was not specified regarding any characteristic beyond someone living in a given area (e.g. Israel, a settlement, etc.), they were also counted as an average citizen. Paramedics and hospital staff who spoke of the condition of people injured in terrorist attacks were also considered to be ordinary citizens for the purposes of this analysis.

Multinational organizations constituted entities like the United Nations, the European Union, the Arab League, and the World Bank. Academics specifically referred to people who were identified as professors affiliated with a university.

The decision was made to include "opinion polls" as a separate category of sources for a couple reasons. First, numerous articles included the phrase "according to a recent opinion poll…" and cited specific numbers, without indicating who had conducted this poll (e.g. a newspaper, think tank, etc.). These sources could not be completely ignored given that citing opinion polls, in some respects, offers voice to common people to discuss their feelings about the disengagement. Given that this study seeks to examine the extent to which non-elites have voice in newspaper coverage, considering opinion polls as a source was pertinent to its purpose.

Any source that did not fit neatly into the outlined categories was counted as "other." In the large majority of cases, it was marked as "other" because the discussion of the source was extremely vague, such as "Palestinians," "a source close to the case," "a report," or "analysts." Other sources that were placed in the "other" category included "researchers" and "authors."

In coding for the nationality or ethnic origin of a source, this information about a source was often explicitly conveyed. Other times it was obvious given who the person was (e.g. President Bush, Ariel Sharon, etc.) or the context.

Empirical Section

In reviewing the findings from this study, news articles (non-opinion pieces), op-eds, and editorials are all considered separately due to the differing nature of each type of piece as well as their differing authorship. Below are the findings related to each of these categories (news articles, op-eds, and editorials) in their sourcing of government and non-government officials, with particular focus on their coverage of NGOs. Variation across time periods, within the three papers, and in the inclusion of sources of various ethnicities and nationalities were also considered for each category of article.

News Articles

Favoring of Government Sources in All Three Newspapers' Non-Opinion Pieces

In the coverage of the disengagement from the Gaza Strip (across all three newspapers), it was found that in news articles, government sources were cited at a much higher rate than non-government sources. Among the 571 news articles analyzed within the *Daily Star, The Jerusalem Post*, and *The New York Times*, 68% of the total sources were government officials, while 32% of sources were non-governmental.

Types of Government Sources Cited in News Articles

In considering the types of government sources that were cited, the breakdown is as follows:

Table 2: Types of Government Sources within News Articles (2389 Total Government Sources)

Types of Government Sources	**Percent of Total Government Sources**
Named Current Government Official	60%
Named Former Government Official	2%
Unnamed Current Government Official	36%
Unnamed Former Government Official	< 0.5%
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	2%

This table shows that in terms of the coverage of all three papers, 60% of their government sources were named current officials. 36% of government sources were unnamed current officials, although this may be a low estimate given that a collective anonymous citation of "officials said…" was counted as one source. The reliance on former officials as sources was very small.

Meanwhile, non-government sources within the three paper's news articles can be broken down as follows:

Table 3: Types of Non-Government Sources within News Articles (1102 Total Non-Government Sources)

Types of Non-Government Sources	**Percent of Total Non-Government Sources**
Journalists	15%
Academics	4%
Businesses	3%
Think Tanks	2%
Ordinary Citizens	28%
Violent Extremist Organizations	6%
Hamas (Acting/Described as a Violent Extremist Organization)	4%
Multinational Organizations	7%
NGOs	9%
Religious Leaders	2%
Opinion Polls	2%
Other	17%

The highest percentage of non-government sources across the three newspapers involves ordinary citizens, at 28% of the total non-government sources. The next highest did not fit into a

category and was designated "other." The third highest percent of non-government sources constituted journalists.

NGOs as a Source in News Articles

In assessing the extent to which civil society organizations are used as sources in news articles, it is immediately clear that in all three newspapers, NGOs are cited relatively rarely. Across all three newspapers, NGOs constitute 3% of sources, although there is some variation within the three. The newspapers' sourcing of NGOs was as follows:

Table 4: NGOs as Sources within News Articles

	NGOs as % of Total Sources	NGOs as % of Non-Government Sources
The Jerusalem Post	5%	17%
Daily Star	1%	5%
The New York Times	2%	8%

This table demonstrates that relatively speaking, *The Jerusalem Post* gives voice to civil society organizations the most. When considering each paper's non-governmental sources, NGOs made up 17% of *The Post*'s non-governmental sources, which is more than twice the frequency found in the other two papers.

However, in many of these cases, *The Post* was citing the Yesha Council, an organization that represents settlers' interests, and not the types of peacebuilding organizations that the literature has described as crucial actors in the peace process. Furthermore, the Yesha Council, as an umbrella organization for settlers, is not a grassroots NGO whose membership constitutes average settlers; instead its members are drawn from the elite classes of the settlement community—including public officials, rabbis, and academics ("Leadership").

The Yesha Council served as an interest group in the policy debate over the disengagement and was thus counted as an NGO in this analysis, although the Council, the most

frequently cited NGO in the newspaper coverage, is itself not a low-level grassroots organization, nor is it divorced from government officials. The kinds of statements that might be quoted from the Yesha Council are exemplified in a *Jerusalem Post* article from February 2004 in which a Yesha Council representative states, "We intend to travel to Washington and lobby Congress to pressure President [George W.] Bush into not accepting this plan."[3]

Peace building organizations that try to bridge the gap between Israelis and Palestinians are largely absent from the news coverage within all three papers. Of the news articles studied, 27 articles cited the Yesha Council; this is three times as many as for the next highest organization, Peace Now (which was cited in 9 articles). Peace Now, a left-wing organization, was quoted in the press as making statements like, "We will not continue to sacrifice our sons for the sake of the settlers."[4] On other occasions, the press turned to Peace Now for information, such as a January 4, 2005 *New York Times* article in which journalist Greg Myre quoted the NGO so as to provide a perspective different from the government's, explaining, "Peace Now…says there are 50 or more [unauthorized Israeli] outposts that should be removed under the [Middle East] peace plan, while the Israeli government has put the number at fewer than 30."[5]

All other non-governmental organizations, peace building or otherwise, were cited in only one or two articles.[6] The contexts in which these other organizations were cited differed substantially given the specific issue and type of organization. Some voiced opposition to the

---

[3] Matthew Gutman, "Settler movement despairs of premier," *The Jerusalem Post*, February 3, 2004.
[4] Matthew Gutman, "150,000 demand Gaza Withdrawal," *The Jerusalem Post*, May 16, 2004.
[5] Greg Myre, "Jewish Settlers Stage New Protests Against Planned Gaza Removal," *The New York Times*, January 4, 2005.
[6] See Appendix 2 for a complete list of NGOs cited within the news articles studied and the number of articles in which they were used as sources.

disengagement, such as the president of the Zionist Organization of America, who said, "Every military expert we hear from shows us that the danger will only increase" as a result of the disengagement.[7] Meanwhile, other stories covered more narrow topics and thus cited NGOs in other capacities. For example, a *Jerusalem Post* article from February 2005 explains how the disengagement might affect the 2005 gay pride parade in Jerusalem, citing the executive director of Jerusalem's Gay and Lesbian Center who insists that they "are confident that the world pride events will take place as planned this August in Jerusalem."[8] Other times the newspapers turned to these other organizations for factual information, such as a January 2005 article in *The New York Times* which reports, "According to a survey last year by Human Rights Watch…the Israeli military has destroyed or rendered uninhabitable some 1,500 Palestinian homes in Rafah."[9]

Variation of Sources Within Newspapers' Non-Opinion Pieces

When considering variation between the three newspapers that were studied, it is clear that all three newspapers cited government officials in news articles at a similar rate:[10]

Table 5: Comparing the Use of Governments Sources Within the Three Newspapers' Non-Opinion Pieces

	Government Officials	Non-Government Officials
The New York Times	69%	31%
The Jerusalem Post	68%	32%
Daily Star	69%	31%

[7] Yaakov Katz, "Anti-pullout group from US receives heroes' welcome," *The Jerusalem Post*, April 8, 2005.
[8] Etgar Lefkovits, "Disengagement puts capital's gay pride parade in limbo—police," *The Jerusalem Post*, February 24, 2005.
[9] Greg Myre, "Homes of Israeli Settlers Pose a New Set of Anxieties," *The New York Times*, January 2005.
[10] See Appendix 1 for further details on variation of source type within news articles across the three newspapers.

Variation in Sourcing During Various Stages of the Policy

The study found that there was only slight variation in the ratio of government to non-government sources in news articles over the course of the policy from its proposal to its implementation. During the policy proposal and adoption stage (December 18, 2003-August 14, 2005), government officials constituted 69% of the sources while non-government sources were 31% (when considering the coverage within all three newspapers). During the policy implementation stage (August 15, 2005-September 12, 2005), during which settlers were forced to leave their homes in Gaza, the use of non-governmental sources in news articles was slightly higher, at 35% of total sources during that time period.

However, when looking at variation within the three newspapers' coverage, one sees substantial differences in the three newspapers' sources:

Table 6: Variation in the Use of Government Sources within the Three Papers During Different Policy Stages

	Policy Proposal and Adoption (12/18/03-8/14/2005)	
	Government Officials	Non-Government Officials
Daily Star	69%	31%
Jerusalem Post	67%	33%
New York Times	70%	30%
	Policy Implementation (8/15/2005-9/12/2005)	
	Government Officials	Non-Government Officials
Daily Star	77%	23%
Jerusalem Post	77%	23%
New York Times	53%	47%

In comparing the three newspapers' coverage during the various stages of the proposal, it is clear that both the *Daily Star* and *The Jerusalem Post* cite government officials more frequently during the implementation stage (with both citing government officials at a rate of 77%), whereas *The New York Times* cites many more non-governmental sources during the implementation stage.

Of these non-governmental sources cited by *The New York Times* during the implementation stage, the highest percentage of them (18% of total sources and 39% of non-government sources) involved ordinary citizens. These sources were mostly settlers who were being removed from their homes, as well as Palestinians who provided their contrasting perspectives. For example, an August 28, 2005 article in *The New York Times* covered a Hamas march "to celebrate the supposed victory of Hamas in driving Israel out of Gaza," with the article quoting marchers (including a mother, a teenager, and an elderly woman).[11] Meanwhile, a *New York Times* article on August 17, 2005 quotes Israeli settlers expressing sadness over leaving their homes.[12] Such coverage of average citizens' reactions to the implementation is particularly characteristic of *The New York Times'* coverage of the disengagement process. Such perspectives were much less represented among the other two papers, as the numbers indicate.

The general rate at which NGOs were cited did not differ substantially between the two time periods. During the policy proposal and adoption stage, they were used as sources at a rate of 3%, while during the policy implementation NGOs were cited at a rate of 2%. The table below illustrates variation within the three paper's coverage of NGOs:

Table 7: Variation in the New Articles' Sourcing of NGOs Across Time Periods and Within Newspapers

	Policy Proposal and Adoption (12/18/03-8/14/2005)
	NGOs at % of Total Sources
Daily Star	1%
Jerusalem Post	6%
New York Times	2%
	Policy Implementation (8/15/2005-9/12/2005)
	NGOs as % of Total Sources
Daily Star	2%
Jerusalem Post	1%

[11] Steven Erlanger, "Shadowy Hamas Leader Issues Threat to Israel and Cautions Abbas Not to Seize Guns," *The New York Times*, August 28, 2005.
[12] Steven Erlanger, "In Rafiah Yam, Tearful Farewells and a Slow Exit Procession" *The New York Times*, August 17, 2005.

New York Times	3%

The citing of NGOs as sources is not substantially different for the *Daily Star* or *The New York Times*, although of note is the fact that the *Jerusalem Post*'s use of NGOs as sources actually fell 5% during the implementation stage.

Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in News Articles

The three newspapers varied substantially regarding the nationality and ethnic origin of the sources they used:

Table 8: Variation in the Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in News Articles Within the Three Newspapers

	Arab	Israeli	Both Arab/Israeli	Neither Arab/Israeli	Unknown
Daily Star	45%	36%	<0.5%	13%	5%
Jerusalem Post	23%	62%	<0.5%	12%	3%
New York Times	30%	48%	<0.5%	19%	2%

The Jerusalem Post used Israeli sources at the highest rate, while the *Daily Star* used Arab sources at the highest rate, as might be expected. *The New York Times* was more likely to give voice to an Israeli source than an Arab one at a rate of 48% to 30%, although it did not rely as heavily on Israeli sources as *The Jerusalem Post*. *The New York Times* also used sources that were neither Arab nor Israeli at a rate higher than the other two papers (19%), as might be expected considering its greater utilization of American sources than the other two.

Of note is the fact that for all three newspapers, Arab-Israeli sources were less than 0.5% of the total sources. Thus the Arab-Israeli population of Israel, which constitutes about 20% of the country's population, was severely underrepresented in news coverage across the board. Most of the few articles that did cite Arab-Israelis quoted Bedouins, a specific minority subset of the Arab-Israeli population.

Op-Eds

Less Favoring of Government Sources in Op-Eds than News Articles

In signed opinion columns, there was less clear favoring of government sources, with more variation of sourcing between the three newspapers. Overall across all three papers, within op-ed pieces (the data set for which included 156 articles), 51% of sources were government officials while 49% of sources were non-governmental. This marks a sharp contrast from news pieces, where the ratio of government to non-governmental sources was close to 2-to-1, while here it was almost 1-to-1. The types of government sources cited in op-eds breaks down as follows:

Table 9: Types of Government Sources Within Op-Ed Pieces for All Three Papers (139 Total Government Sources)

Types of Government Sources	**Percent of Total Government Sources**
Named Current Government Official	62%
Named Former Government Official	13%
Unnamed Current Government Official	24%
Unnamed Former Government Official	1%
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	1%

When considering kinds of government sources within op-eds, one sees a heavier reliance on named former government officials (13% of government sources compared to 2% in news articles). Furthermore, in op-eds, there is less reliance on unnamed current government officials, with 24% of government sources falling into that category for op-eds, while 36% fall in that category for news articles.

When considering the non-government sources used in op-ed pieces in all three newspapers, the breakdown is as follows:

Table 10: Types of Non-Government Sources Within Op-Ed Pieces for All Three Papers (132 Total Non-Government Sources)

Types of Non-Government Sources	**Percent of Total Non-Government Sources**
Journalists	26%

Academics	11%
Businesses	1%
Think Tanks	7%
Ordinary Citizens	7%
Violent Extremist Organizations	2%
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	2%
Multinational Organizations	7%
NGOs	3%
Religious Leaders	4%
Opinion Polls	8%
Other	22%

Within op-eds, it is journalists who make up the highest percentage of non-government sources. Journalists constituted 13% of total sources in op-eds, compared to 5% of total sources in news articles (when considering the coverage within all three newspapers). When considering journalists as a percent of non-government sources, the rate at which journalists are cited nearly doubles. In non-opinion pieces, journalists constitute 15% of non-government sources, while in op-eds they are 26% of non-government sources.

When considering the rate of other categories as a percentage of non-government sources, the rates differ dramatically in some cases between op-eds and news pieces. The rate of using academics as non-government sources rises from 4% (in news pieces) to 11% (in op-eds). Think tanks' rate as a percentage of non-government sources rise from 2% (in news articles) to 7% (in op-eds). However, the rate of citing ordinary citizens and NGOs both drop when comparing op-eds to news pieces. In news pieces, ordinary citizens constitute 28% of non-government sources, while in op-eds they constitute 7%. Furthermore, NGOs constitute 9% of non-government sources in news articles and 3% in op-eds.

Variation in Government Sourcing within the Three Newspapers' Op-Eds

Across the three newspapers, there is more variation in the rate at which government officials are cited than for non-opinion pieces:

Table 11: Variation in Government Sourcing within the Three Newspapers' Op-Eds

	Government Officials	Non-Government Officials
New York Times	45%	55%
Jerusalem Post	47%	53%
Daily Star	59%	41%

Thus, both *The Jerusalem Post* and *The New York Times*' op-ed columns actually cite government sources at a *lower* rate than non-government sources, while the *Daily Star* cites government sources more than non-government in its op-eds. When looking at all three newspapers, it was determined that government sources were used at a slightly higher rate because a large percentage of the total op-ed articles analyzed (72 of 156) were from *The Daily Star*.

Nationality/Ethnicity of Sources Within Op-Eds

Within the three newspapers' op-ed columns, sourcing in regards to nationality also differed significantly from sourcing in news articles:

Table 12: Nationality/Ethnicity of Sources within Op-Eds Between the Three Newspapers

	Arab	Israeli	Both Arab/Israeli	Neither Arab/Israeli	Unknown
Daily Star	24%	30%	1%	41%	5%
Jerusalem Post	12%	51%	0%	34%	3%
New York Times	24%	24%	0%	46%	6%

Within opinion pieces, the *Daily Star* cited Israeli sources at a higher rate than Arab ones, while citing Arab sources at approximately the same rate as *The New York Times*. *The Jerusalem Post*'s emphasis on Israeli sources in news articles was also apparent in op-ed pieces.

Meanwhile, while in news articles the *New York Times* favored Israeli sources, in op-ed pieces the *New York Times* cited Israeli and Arab sources at the same rate.

Authors of Op-ed Pieces

Sourcing in news pieces clearly differed substantially from sourcing in op-ed pieces. This was likely a reflection of who was writing op-ed pieces, which vary in authorship beyond just journalists. The authors of the opinion pieces included in this analysis were as follows:

Table 13: Authors of Signed Opinion Pieces (For All Three Newspapers)

Author Type	**Percent of Total**
Current Named Official	4%
Former Named Official	6%
Journalist	49%
Academic	15%
Think Tank	8%
NGO	12%
Ordinary Citizen	2%
Multinational Organization	1%
Other[13]	3%

While journalists constituted the largest percentage of authors at 49%, academics authored op-eds at the next highest rate of 15%, while multinational organizations wrote the fewest number, drafting just 1% of the op-eds analyzed.

NGOs and Op-Eds

As noted above, NGOs representatives made up 12% of the authors of op-ed columns. Thus, although NGOs were given relatively little voice in news coverage, writing an op-ed provided a venue in which they could occasionally have their voices heard. Below is a list of the NGOs that wrote op-ed columns that were included in the study's data set:

Table 14: List of NGOs that Wrote Op-Ed Columns

American Task Force on Palestine*
Peres Center for Peace*

[13] Here other includes: A freelance writer, a "social scientist," and two "analysts"

Seeds of Peace
Foundation for Middle East Peace*
Americans for Peace Now
Israel's Media Watch
Bitterlemons.org*
Common Ground News Service
International Crisis Group*
Arab Media Watch
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
New Israel Fund
Edah

**Wrote more than one op-ed piece over the course of the time period analyzed*

All of these NGOs' pieces were included in the *Daily Star* or *The Jerusalem Post*. *The New York Times* published no op-eds written by NGOs included in the data set.[14]

Perspectives of NGOs that Wrote Op-eds

Given how infrequently NGOs were cited in both news articles and opinion pieces, it is important to look at what perspectives they brought in the op-ed pieces they authored, as perhaps the op-eds they wrote might be representative of the types of views that would have been included in news coverage had NGOs been cited more often. Within the data set analyzed, there were 18 op-ed pieces written by NGOs across all the newspapers, constituting 12% of the total op-eds. Given that a number of organizations wrote more than one opinion piece, the opinions of 13 different NGOs were represented in newspapers' op-eds.

The views expressed by opinion pieces written by NGOs differed substantially. Two articles offered general opinion on the disengagement, with Sharif Hikmat Nashashibi of Arab Media Watch explaining, "Sharon's disengagement plan is a withdrawal from [the] peace

[14] The *New York Times* did publish four letters to the editor written by NGOs that were included in the preliminary data set. Two were written by the Yesha Council, one was written by the Israeli human rights group B'Tselem, and one was written by the Anti-Defamation League. However, all letters to the editor were excluded from the final data set.

process."[15] Meanwhile, David Saperstein of the Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism offered a different perspective, proclaiming, "The Reform movement challenges the idea that the disengagement is an alternative to negotiations."[16]

Two articles, written by authors associated with the Foundation for Middle East Peace and Common Ground News Service, advocated that Israel embark on a "total withdrawal" from all Palestinian territories, not just Gaza.[17] Two articles, both authored by the International Crisis Group, identified a "political crisis of the Palestinians"[18] and Palestinians' need to develop a coherent response to the proposed disengagement plan. One article written by Uri Savir of the Peres Center for Peace advocated that more be done in the entire region of the Middle East beyond the disengagement. He asserted, "While the Gaza disengagement is an important step forward, an attempt must be made to create a peaceful environment in the whole region."[19]

Three of the op-ed pieces discussed what needs to happen after the disengagement is completed. Geoffrey Aronson of the Foundation for Middle East Peace discussed the need to engage with Hamas, for "Hamas has established itself as an authentic political movement representing a large segment of Palestinians."[20] Another article by the president of Seeds of Peace recommended that after the disengagement is finished, "the [Bush] administration must

---

[15] Sharif Hikmat Nashashibi, "Sharon's disengagement plan is a withdrawal from peace process," *Daily Star*, November 4, 2004.
[16] David Saperstein, "We support reengagement," *Jerusalem Post*, August 25, 2004.
[17] Geoffrey Aronson, "The dead end of regional occupations," *Daily Star*, June 22, 2004, & Elias Tuma, "If Israelis want peace, only a total withdrawal will do," *Daily Star*, August 20, 2004.
[18] Robert Malley, "Save the collapsing Palestinian system," *Daily Star*, October 8, 2004 & International Crisis Group, "PA is besieged from without and divided within; Power struggles, militias run rampant in fatah," *Daily Star*, September 30, 2004.
[19] Uri Savir, "Creating a Mediterranean ecology of peace," *Jerusalem Post*, May 25, 2005.
[20] Geoffrey Aronson, "Hold your nose, but deal with Hamas," *Daily Star*, August 5, 2005.

recalibrate its role," as "lawyering for Israel alone will not bring regional peace."[21] An op-ed by the director general of the Peres Center for Peace predicted, "The day after the withdrawal from Gaza, progress will become the name of the game."[22]

Other op-eds written by NGOs offered commentary on US or international policy related to the disengagement. An article by bitterlemons.org's Ghassan Khatib critiqued US policy towards the disengagement as "the most obvious example of deviation from accepted international standards."[23] Raafat Dajani of the American Task Force on Palestine praised the Senate Foreign Relations Committee for "put[ting] equal emphasis on Israeli actions" and recognizing the need to "[avoid] that the Gaza withdrawal become a quit pro quo for retaining significant parts of the West Bank."[24] An article by bitterlemons.org's Yossi Alpher enumerated the ways American policy in Iraq has benefited Israel, offering context and predictions for the U.S.-Israel relationship, which included a discussion of President Bush's support for Sharon's disengagement plan.[25] Another article by Larry Garber of the New Israel Fund touched upon the policy of the 'Quartet' in relation to the disengagement, as well as the need for the Quartet to push the Palestinian Authority to "bring security reform back under its control."[26]

An article by Ziad Asali of the American Task Force on Palestine discussed the role he envisioned for Abbas in relation to the disengagement, explaining, "Empowered by Bush's

---

[21] Aaron David Miller, "Lawyering for Israel alone will not bring regional peace," *Daily Star*, May 31, 2005.
[22] Ron Pundak, "A mediocre deal but the only one now available," *Daily Star*, February 11, 2005.
[23] Ghassan Khatib, "Washington should pause and consider the lessons of the last 4 years; New term need not necessarily continue a flawed Middle East Policy," *Daily Star*, November 11, 2004.
[24] Raafat Dajani, "Profit from the U.S. shift on Palestine," *Daily Star*, July 23, 2005.
[25] Yossi Alpher, "Israel gains from US actions, but trouble may be near," *Daily Star*, May 5, 2004.
[26] Larry Garber, "Bring Palestinian security reform under PA control," *Daily Star*, February 18, 2005.

political support and cooperation from Sharon…he will oversee a peaceful disengagement coordinated with Israel and monitored by the 'Quartet.'"[27]

In other articles, the disengagement was mentioned in op-eds that were primarily focused on other topics. Americans for Peace Now wrote a piece on poll numbers that demonstrated a lack of common ground between Palestinians and Israelis; the disengagement was used as an example of this lack of common ground: "Most Palestinians think Israeli motivation for disengagement is to incite Palestinian civil war." [28] Israel's Media Watch wrote an op-ed in *The Jerusalem Post* that claimed that Israeli media coverage had improved at presenting both sides of issues and cited a poll by Israeli radio that found 68% of people agreed that "the Israeli media [enables] reasonable expression to both supporters and opponents of the disengagement plan."[29] Chaim Steinmetz, a member of Edah, wrote an op-ed on Hurricane Katrina and explained why he disagreed with a rabbi's assertion that Hurricane Katrina was punishment for American support for the disengagement.[30]

The opinions presented in these eighteen op-eds written by NGOs might be considered to exemplify the kinds of opinions that NGOs might have contributed to news articles had they been cited more often. These op-eds provided context, depth, and understanding to the disengagement, while offering a wide variety of views on the policy, its rightfulness, and its implications.

---

[27] Ziad Asali, "Abbas has accepted the finality of 1948," *Daily Star*, May 24, 2005.
[28] Lewis Roth, "Polls: Israelis, Palestinians misperceive each other Common ground rare, except on support for a 2-state solution," *Daily Star*, March 30, 2004.
[29] Eli Pollak and Yisrael Medad, "A Maturing Media?" *Jerusalem Post*, May 2, 2004.
[30] Chaim Steinmetz, "Katrina through Jewish eyes," *Jerusalem Post*, September 5, 2005.

NGOs as Sources within Op-eds

While non-governmental sources were found more frequently in op-ed pieces than in news stories, that was not the case for NGOs as sources within op-eds. Overall, NGOs were cited as sources within op-eds 1% of the time, while within news stories they were used as sources at a rate of 3% when looking at the coverage of all three newspapers. This difference becomes more stark when looking at NGOs as a percentage of non-government sources, which was 9% in new articles but 3% in op-eds.

Across all three newspapers, which had 156 op-eds in total, there were only four articles that cited NGOs as sources—two in the *Daily Star,* and one each in *The New York Times* and *The Jerusalem Post*. Two of these articles were written by another NGO, one was written by a journalist, and the fourth was written by a freelance writer.

The NGOs that were used as sources in op-eds were: Human Rights Watch, Freedom House, Center on Housing Rights and Evictions, and Repentance America. The first three are human rights organizations that offered a human rights perspective within the opinion piece. Meanwhile, Repentance America is a group that was cited in an op-ed by Chaim Steinmetz (of the organization Edah) in a September 2005 piece in which he discussed the catastrophe of hurricane Katrina and disagreed with "a popular Israeli rabbi [who] is sure that this catastrophe is retribution for American support for the disengagement in Gaza." Steinmetz referenced Repentance America when he disagreed with this organization's view that "it was God's retribution for New Orleans being a 'sin city.'"[31]

[31] Chaim Steinmetz, "Katrina through Jewish eyes," *Jerusalem Post*, September 5, 2005.

Sources within Op-Eds Written by Non-Elites

When examining op-eds written by non-elites, that is, non-government officials and non-journalists (i.e. academics, think tanks, NGOs, ordinary citizens, multinational organizations, and "other"), one can observe that their use of various types of sources did not differ substantially from the overall numbers. Among the op-eds written by non-elites, 49% of sources were government officials, while 51% were non-government sources. Compare this to the overall numbers for all op-eds in which 51% of sources were government officials and 49% were non-government. Thus, there is only a 2% difference in the rate of sourcing government officials within op-eds written by non-elites. Furthermore, among op-eds written by non-elites, about 4% of sources were NGOs. Among all op-eds of the three papers, NGOs were cited at a rate of 2%. Here too one sees only a two percent difference. Thus, sources within op-eds written by non-elites did not differ substantially from the full set of op-eds in the data set in the frequency with which they used government sources or NGOs.

Editorials

Government Sources within Editorials

Of the total unsigned opinion pieces that were written on the disengagement in the three newspapers, 75% of sources were government officials, which is a higher rate than was found in either news articles or op-ed pieces. When examining the type of government sources used, 76% were named current officials, while 24% were unnamed current government officials. Of the 7 non-government sources, there was one journalist, four ordinary citizens, one opinion poll, and one "other." No NGOs were cited in editorials on the disengagement from the Gaza Strip.

Variation in Government Sourcing Across the Three Newspapers' Editorials

Variation in sourcing in the three newspapers is illustrated in the table below:

Table 15: Government Sourcing within Each Newspaper's Editorials

	Government Sources		**Non-Government Sources**	
	Sum	Percent of Total	Sum	Percent of Total
Jerusalem Post (10 articles)	11	79%	3	21%
Daily Star (6 articles)	1	50%	1	50%
New York Times (5 articles)	9	75%	3	25%

While government sources were 79% of total sources in *The Jerusalem Post* and 75% in *The New York Times*, in the *Daily Star* the rate was 50%. However, the sample size is very small for the analysis of editorials, both because the total number of articles was small (21 from all three papers), and because on average there were fewer sources per article in editorials than in news articles or op-eds.

Nationalities of Sources within Editorials

In considering the nationalities of sources across the three newspapers, this study found that the *Daily Star* cited only Arab sources (although, in looking at Table 15, one notes that there were only two sources cited in the *Daily Star's* 6 editorials, so the sample size is too small for this number to hold true significance). Both *The Jerusalem Post* and *The New York Times* cited Israeli sources at a much higher rate than Arab sources, although *The Jerusalem Post* cited Israeli sources at a higher rate than *The New York Times*. The full breakdown of the findings with respect to editorials and sources' nationalities are below:

Table 16: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources within Each Newspaper's Editorials

	Arab	Israeli	Both Arab/Israeli	Neither Arab/Israeli	Unknown
Daily Star	100%	0	0	0	0
Jerusalem Post	21%	64%	0	14%	0
New York Times	8%	50%	0	42%	0

Addressing Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: Favoring of Government Sources Over Civil Society

News articles that covered the disengagement from the Gaza Strip certainly seemed to follow Bennett's indexing hypothesis, with government sources favored at an overall rate of 68%. In op-eds, government sources were only slightly favored, at a rate of 51% of total sources. In contrast, editorials relied on government sources at a higher rate (75%). Thus, in all three instances, there was a favoring of government sources over civil society, confirming the first hypothesis.

Hypothesis 2: Relatively More Government Sources in The New York Times than in The Jerusalem Post or the Daily Star

When assessing news articles, the study found that government sources were cited at very similar rates across all three newspapers. A chi-squared test assessing variation of government vs. non-government sources within the three newspapers indicated no significant difference, X^2 (2, N =3491) = .43, p =.8066. Thus, this hypothesis was not supported with respect to news articles.

Within op-ed pieces, the *Daily Star* cited government officials at the highest rate (59%), while *The New York Times*' op-eds actually cited government officials at the lowest rate of the three papers (45%). Meanwhile, in editorials, *The Jerusalem Post* cited government officials at the highest rate (79%). Thus, within opinion pieces, the hypothesis that *The New York Times* would cite government sources more frequently than the other papers proved false as well.

Hypothesis 3: Relatively More Voice to Civil Society During the Policy Implementation Stage

In analyzing news articles during the various policy stages, there was only a slight difference in the rate at which government officials were cited. During the policy proposal and

adoption stage, government sources were used 69% of the time across all three papers, while during the policy implementation stage (when all settlers were physically removed from the Gaza Strip), government sources were slightly lower at 65%. In comparing the use of government vs. non-government sources between the two time periods, a chi-squared test did not reveal a statistically significant difference across the two time periods, X^2 (1, $N=3491$) = 1.20, p=.2742, thus disproving the third hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4: The New York Times and The Jerusalem Post coverage will have more Israeli sources, while the Daily Star will source more Arab voices

The data indicates that the fourth hypothesis is true for news articles and editorials. However, op-eds did not follow the same trend, as the *Daily Star* cited Israeli sources at a relatively higher rate (30%) than *The New York Times* (24%).

In conducting a chi-squared test with respect to the variation within the three newspapers in the ethnicity of sources in news articles, this variation was found to be statistically significant. Comparing all three newspapers, the chi-squared test statistic was highly significant, with X^2 (8, N =3491) = 186.65, p <.0001.

In comparing each pair of newspapers' news articles, there were statistically significant differences for each test. In comparing the ethnicity of sources in *The New York Times* and *The Jerusalem Post*, X^2 (4, N =2495) = 53.81, p <.0001. When comparing *The Jerusalem Post* and the *Daily Star*, X^2 (4, N =2001) = 143.75, p <.0001. When looking at the *Daily Star* and *The New York Times*, X^2 (4, N =2486) = 84.97, p <.0001. Thus, in each of these tests, which found p-values below .0001, one sees that there is statistically significant variation in the ethnicity of sources in news articles between each pair of newspapers.

Explaining Why: Findings from Interviews with NGOs and Reporters

In an effort to explain the major findings of this study, interviews were conducted with six individuals. Four were representatives of NGOs that do work related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, one was a reporter from *The Jerusalem Post*, and another used to be a reporter for an American paper (in which capacity he covered the disengagement) but now serves as a spokesperson for an American NGO. Interviewees offered a multitude of thoughts and explanations regarding the findings presented.

Why Are Government Sources Cited More Frequently than Non-Governmental Sources?

Mainstream Media Avoid Controversial Views and Are Influenced by Business Concerns

Philip Wilcox, Jr., President of the American NGO the Foundation for Middle East Peace, explained, "There is a reticence on the part of the mainstream media to talk to non-government sources, especially groups like ours." He elaborated, "We want to be objective and candid in our commentary and analysis. Sometimes that analysis is very critical of the US and Israeli government." Furthermore, "the major media are by experience cautious about airing unconventional or critical views on this topic because their TV broadcasts and print productions are monitored in minute detail by groups whose function is to discourage criticism of Israel." However, Wilcox did explain that he is contacted fairly regularly by foreign TV networks such as the BBC and Al Jazeera English, as well as by "non-mainstream media" within the United States.

Wilcox went on to state, "There papers are business enterprises" that "cannot ignore heavy protests from subscribers." W. Lance Bennett (1990) also described a similar idea

regarding the role of business interests in the over-sourcing of government officials: "One explanation is that granting public officials a virtual news monopoly restricts diversity in the politically volatile 'marketplace of ideas,' thereby safeguarding the business climate in which media conglomerates operate" (Bennett 103).

Those Who Have Power Are Given Voice

Yisrael Medad, Vice Chairman of the Board of Israel's Media Watch, offered a different perspective. He explained, "The story, as is usual in Israel, is first framed as a reflection of power…[Government] officials represent power." "Journalists fawn over politicians, seek them out, need their contacts for leaks, etc. Who needs non-establishment figures except as 'icing?'"

Government Officials Have More Resources

Sharif Nashashibi, Co-Founder and Vice Chairman of Arab Media Watch, explained, "It doesn't surprise me that government officials are quoted more often…Most of the time, they have far better resources than NGOs in getting their message out there." According to Nashashibi, government officials have the resources to be more available and to do things like organize press conferences. Thus, "for the sake of convenience, they are falling back on government officials."

An Israeli NGO representative echoed similar sentiments, explaining that government sources are anxious to push their point of view onto the public, and when journalists are confronted by people giving their point of view, they are going to use it. "Government institutions have spokesmen whose job is to make sure the press gets this information." Thus, "It is a matter of convenience for the press," according to this NGO representative. He explained that journalists are often under tight time pressure to make deadlines, and added, "I'm frequently approached by the press, and if I say 'I am busy; get back to me in an hour,' they never get back

to me"—they just go down their list of sources. The *Jerusalem Post* reporter confirmed these sentiments, explaining, "Government and non-government sources realize they need to be quick on the draw and must respond quickly if they want to be mentioned in any news story."

The Importance of Personal Contacts Between Reporters and Sources

One individual interviewed, who used to be a reporter for an American paper but now works at an American NGO, explained the importance of personal contacts and how he uses the ones he has developed to get the voice of his organization heard. He explained, "As a former journalist, I use my personal contacts with reporters and editors to advance our point of view." Another NGO representative offered similar sentiments, explaining, "A lot of it is just a matter of relationships with individual journalists…Some people cultivate them because they like to be quoted."

W. Lance Bennett (1990) also mentioned the importance of these relations between the journalist and his source, explaining that perhaps "the dominance of official voices in the news [is] a result of 'transactional' or 'symbolic' relations between journalists and officials," where news reporters look for "well-produced material" for their stories and government officials look to " hone [their] news-making edge" (Bennett 103). Meanwhile, the *Jerusalem Post* reporter described the relationship between NGOs and reporters with these words: "Reporters tend to adopt an attitude of they need us more than we need them." Thus, while Bennett discusses a potentially mutually beneficial relationship between government officials and journalists, the *Post* reporter describes an uneven relationship between NGOs and the media.

The Importance of Considering the Specifics of the Case Study (the Disengagement)

One representative of an NGO emphasized the specifics of the disengagement case study in explaining the findings of this study. He explained, "This was a policy story par-excellence, and that kind of story calls for government sources. It's just the nature of the story."

Meanwhile, the *Jerusalem Post* reporter who wrote stories on the disengagement explained, "If reporting on a government related story [then] it is only expected that one will seek out a response from a government source and not a non-government source. Using NGOs depends on the content of the story, and whether such a source needs to be added."

Another NGO representative speculated that in other kinds of stories, one would find many more non-government sources, citing an example from today's current events. He described how the Israeli government is reviewing the handling of people who cross into the country illegally looking for work or fleeing unfavorable conditions. He explained that "there is an active NGO sector that lobbies for humane treatment for these people, so they are being interviewed in the press constantly." "The Israeli press, most of it has a left-wing bias," and "is sympathetic to these people." Thus, "the NGO sector is getting full play on this issue." Perhaps if a different case study had been chosen, the findings would have come out differently.

The Importance of the Internet and Non-Mainstream Media

Numerous interviewees noted a limitation of this study, which is that it examined only mainstream news organizations, while they consider the news coverage on the Internet, in mediums like blogs, to be very important. Philip Wilcox, Jr. of the Foundation for Middle East Peace stated that there is "objective, lively reporting on the Internet, because the mainstream media has shied away from this," and "a great deal of useful commentary is found in various

blogs." He continued, "Experts in the field are looking increasingly towards non-mainstream media."

Another NGO representative stressed, "Do not forget about the web," as there are a "whole variety of websites to get information from non-government sources." He pointed out that members of the public can explore whatever view they are interested in. Yet another representative revealed that his organization, "in recent years, has been engaging with bloggers to try to influence their writing, with quite a bit of success."

Meanwhile, the reporter from *The Jerusalem Post* stressed the importance of the Internet for mainstream news organizations as well, explaining, "In general, the coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has improved with time, perhaps because the internet has become such an important and 'instant' tool that allows stories to appear minutes after they break all over the world…In such an environment, journalists are forced constantly to seek new takes and develop new sources in order to remain ahead."

NGO Footprint Greater Than It Seems

The NGO representative who used to be a reporter stressed that NGOs influence reporters and media coverage more than it appears initially. He admitted that when it comes to his organization, "Most of the time, when our voice is heard in the media…it appears in an unattributed form. Often, long conversations that I have with columnists and editorial writers will significantly impact their articles. Obviously, they will not mention me or my organization as a source." He went on to describe a "tendency of the [US] media to rely heavily on NGO sources for background and analysis but not for quotes," explaining, "US officials are very tight lipped with the media when it comes to Israel-related policy. Journalists therefore often use secondary sources to learn about the administration's policy or about Israeli policies and political

trends. NGOs…are typically well versed in the issues. So they are good sources on the substance, and typically helpful with analysis."

Yet, this representative explained why NGOs are often not cited by name, as "they are perceived as 'tainted,' 'biased,' satellites of the policy community, and therefore not appropriate as named sources. As a result, NGOs have a much more thorough impact on the coverage of the issues than their visible footprint in the media." This explanation for the study's findings offers an important caveat, as perhaps NGOs are being given greater voice in the press than this study (or the general public) is able to perceive.

Why are there such differences in the nationality/ethnicity of sources across the three newspapers?

Sympathies of the Newspapers

In speculating why *The New York Times* cited Israelis more often than Arabs, Sharif Nashashibi of Arab Media Watch expressed the view that "the US media is generally sympathetic to the Israeli line." In considering this study's findings with respect to the Israeli press, numerous interviewees were quick to point out that *The Jerusalem Post* is considered to have a right-wing bent. Philip Wilcox, Jr. of the Foundation for Middle East Peace explained that *The Jerusalem Post* has a pro-Israeli government editorial policy, while "*Haaretz* is the paper of the Israeli progressive community."[32] Another NGO representative went further, stressing that one should, "Bear in mind that the *Jerusalem Post* is a right-wing paper." He hypothesized that if *Haaretz*'s coverage were analyzed, one might see more Arab sources.

[32] This study focuses exclusively on English-language newspapers, while *Haaretz* is most widely read as a Hebrew paper (although it does publish an English language version as well).

The *Jerusalem Post* reporter explained that in reporting for the paper, "I was required to report on the Israeli side—settlers, army, security, etc. I think you would find that if you were to check overall coverage in general of daily news in Israel, you would find the statistics differed and did not sway more towards Israel as they did in your findings."

Israelis Have Greater Resources

In explaining why *The New York Times* was found to cite Israelis at a higher rate, Nashashibi asserted, "The Israeli PR machine is able to field Israelis more widely to the media," while "Palestinians just don't have those resources." He believed that journalists will talk to whoever is available, and Israelis are generally more available. According to Nashashibi, it is "often an issue of accessibility."

Lebanese Law

One Israeli NGO representative asserted that the lower rate in which Israelis were cited within the *Daily Star* was due to Lebanese law. He explained that there are laws that restrict the contact between Lebanese and Israelis. Thus, the *Daily Star* cites Israeli opinions that have been published elsewhere first. For example, it has re-published some of the op-eds he has written that were initially published in other mediums.

The Specifics of the Disengagement

The former reporter and current NGO representative asserted, "The disengagement was an Israeli story, first and foremost…It was all about Israel making a bold move unilaterally. Arabs played a secondary role. I am actually surprised that the percentage of Arab sources quoted by the *Jerusalem Post* (a quarter) and by [*The New York Times*] (a third) is so high."

A Cautionary Note on Interpreting the Ethnicity Findings

Philip Wilcox, Jr. of the Foundation for Middle East Peace cautioned, "Citing Israeli views is not necessarily a sign of bias or ignorance," as "some of the most sophisticated and refined" commentary and criticism on "Israeli government policies comes from the Israelis who live there." This is also a necessary caveat to the interpretation of this study's findings.

Placing Op-eds in Newspapers

NGO representatives offered a variety of viewpoints on the ease with which their organization can get op-eds published in various news outlets. Philip Wilcox said that it can often be difficult to get op-eds placed, as "they receive hundreds of thousands and pick and choose…Some of ours have been chosen." On the other hand, a representative of another American NGO explained, "Placing op-eds is…relatively easy. Not in major publications like the [*New York Times*] or *Washington Post*, but second-tier and third tier publications are typically responsive."

Insights into Why NGOs Perhaps Should Be Cited More

NGO representatives offered their thoughts as to why non-government sources should be cited more frequently. The reporter turned NGO representative argued, "NGOs…are important players in the policy game in Washington. They have important input on policymaking (which is a good, democratic phenomenon). And for the sake of transparency, that deserves to be reflected in reporting on the issues."

Sharif Nashashibi of Arab Media Watch stressed the importance of representing NGOs in media coverage, because "NGOs serve as an important check on the government." He

maintained that government officials push the government line, while NGOs often point out when the government line is not necessarily true. He believed that when NGOs are underrepresented in media coverage, we are "not getting enough of a counterview."

Meanwhile, the *Jerusalem Post* reporter argued that using NGOs as sources is desirable in certain situations, explaining, "Using [non-governmental] organizations as sources is good if you are writing an opinion or research report and need responses from a number of different sources for the story. In the past, I have used NGOs, but far more for analysis of situations than straight news stories, unless, of course, it was a story on the specific organization."

Concluding Discussion

The newspaper coverage of the disengagement from the Gaza Strip seemed to heavily favor government officials over other voices, particularly in news articles (non-opinion pieces). The findings of this study indicate that Bennett's hypothesis is applicable to Arab, Israeli, and American newspapers, at least within this case study of the disengagement from the Gaza Strip. However, one caveat is that only English language newspapers were studied. Perhaps the fact that these papers tend to write for somewhat similar, international audiences affected the results and similarities in coverage. Foreign language papers address different audiences and readers, so it is possible that had Arab-language, Hebrew-language, and English-language newspapers been compared, different results would have been obtained. Thus, while the study's findings contradict Crtistina Archetti's arguments, it is possible that her assertions would have been substantiated had newspapers written for more localized populations been compared.

W. Lance Bennett offers some sobering thoughts on the implications of the study's findings. He worries that "barring the unlikely event of major power holders criticizing the

system that keeps them in power, indexed news stories of even the most investigative and adversarial sort will end with the conclusion that 'the system works'" (Bennett 123). Given the controversy surrounding Israeli unilateral policy towards the Palestinians and the disengagement, such little attention to those outside of government (who might argue that the 'system does not work') would seem problematic.

The grassroots peace building organizations regarded in the academic literature as necessary actors in the peace process were nearly completely absent from the debate. While on occasion such organizations can and did write opinion pieces in newspapers, such articles were few in number. When an NGO was cited in a news article, it was usually the Yesha Council, which is not a peace building organization, nor is its membership made up of the non-elite.

During the few occasions when average citizens did have a voice, it was generally in the context of having been witness to an act of violence (by a suicide bomber or the Israeli army). Thus, average citizens' voices were mostly heard in the context of reacting to events, not in the context of reviewing a given policy. There were a few occasions when individual settlers were interviewed, but these interviews were scarce relative to the number of government officials that were cited. Representation of the general public's viewpoint was largely in the form of citing opinion polls, which constituted only 1% of the sources within news articles. Furthermore, these opinion polls were rarely substantiated with any information as to who had conducted the polls or how their validity could be proved. With such an overemphasis of governmental viewpoints and a marginalization of others in the articles of this study, it appears that the mainstream press has indeed, as Bennett described, "settled for a comfortable role as 'keeper of the official record' while abdicating its traditional mandate to raise an independent 'voice of the people'" (Bennett 106).

Works Cited

"About Just Vision." *justvision.org*. April 15, 2010. <http://www.justvision.org/en/about-just-vision>.

Archetti, Cristina. '"Unamerican Views': why US-developed models of press-state relations do not apply to the rest of the world." *Westminster Papers in Communiciation and Culture*. Vol. 5.3 (2008): 4-26.

Bar-Tal, Daniel. "Challenges for Constructing Peace Culture and Peace Education." The Israeli Palestinian Conflict: Parallel Discourses. Elizabeth Matthews, ed. London: Rutledge, 2010.

Bennett, W. Lance. "Towards a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States." *Journal of Communication*. Vol 40.2 (Spring 1990): 103-125.

Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights, and Labor, "Israel and the occupied territories," *U.S. Department of State*, March 6, 2007, April 29, 2010, <http://www.state.gov/g/drl/rls/hrrpt/2006/78854.htm>.

Doron, Gideon. "Two Civil Societies and One State: Jews and Arabs in the State of Israel." Civil Society in the Middle East. Ed. Augustus Richard Norton. Vol. 2. New York: Brill, 1996. 193-220.

Dunksy, Marda. *Pens and Swords: How the American Mainstream Media Report the Israeli Palestinian Conflict*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2008.

Eizkovitch, Gili. "Israel ranks low for freedom of press, after Gaza war media ban," *Haaretz.com*, October 20, 2009, April 29, 2010, <http://www.haaretz.com/hasen/spages/1122370.html>

Hemmer, Bruce, Paula Garb, Marlett Phillips, and John L. Graham. "Putting The 'Up' In Bottom-up Peacebuilding: Broadening the Concept of Peace Negotiations." International Negotiation 11.1 (2006): 129-62

Kraidy, Marwan M. "Broadcasting regulation and civil society in Postwar Lebanon." *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*. 42.3 (1998): 387-400.

"Leadership." *Yesha News*. 2009. <http://www.yesha-israel.com/about/article/id/412/Leadership.htm>.

McCombs, Maxwell. "The Agenda Setting Function of the Press." The Press. Geneva Overholser and Kathleen Hall Jamieson, eds. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005. 156-167.

Mermin, Jonathan. Debating War and Peace: Media Coverage of U.S. Intervention in the

Post-Vietnam Era. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999.

Morant, Blake D. "Democracy, Choice, and the Importance of Voice in Contemporary Media." *DePaul Law Review*, 53.943 (2004), 943-988.

Sigal, Leon V. "Sources Make the News." Reading the News: A Pantheon Guide to Popular Culture. Robert Karl Manoff and Michael Schudson, eds. New York: Pantheon Books, 1986. 9-37.

Stanley, Elizabeth A. Paths to Peace: Domestic Coalition Shifts, War Termination and the Korean War. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2009.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to my advisors, Professors Kristin Goss and Ken Rogerson, for all of your help, advice, and encouragement. Thank you as well to Duke librarians Catherine Shreve and Joel Herndon for your help in finding a random sample of articles, and to Duke Statistics PhD candidate Vinicius Mayrink for your help in conducting chi-squared tests.

Appendix 1: Source Type Within News Articles

Appendix 1.1: Sources of News Articles Across All Three Newspapers (571 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	1427	41
Named Former Government Official	52	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	862	25
Unnamed Former Government Official	3	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	45	1
Government Source	**2389**	**68**
Journalists	163	5
Academics	47	1
Businesses	32	1
Think Tanks	25	1
Ordinary Citizen	306	9
Violent Extremist Organization	71	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	49	1
Multinational Organization	78	2
NGOs	104	3
Religious Leaders	23	1
Opinion Polls	21	1
Other	183	5
Non-Government Source	**1102**	**32**
TOTAL SOURCES	**3491**	

Appendix 1.2: Sources within the Daily Star's News Articles (154 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	447	45
Named Former Government Official	10	1
Unnamed Current Government Official	208	21
Unnamed Former Government Official	1	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	21	2
Government Source	**687**	**69**
Journalists	47	5
Academics	8	1
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	5	1
Ordinary Citizen	67	7
Violent Extremist Organization	32	3
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	28	3
Multinational Organization	40	4
NGOs	*14*	*1*
Religious Leaders	4	< 0.5
Opinion Polls	6	1

Other	58	6
Non-Government Source	**309**	**31**
TOTAL SOURCES	**996**	

Appendix 1.3: Sources within the New York Times' News Articles (231 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	560	38
Named Former Government Official	28	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	422	28
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	12	1
Government Source	**1022**	**69**
Journalists	76	5
Academics	20	1
Businesses	12	1
Think Tanks	13	1
Ordinary Citizen	162	11
Violent Extremist Organization	24	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	16	1
Multinational Organization	19	1
NGOs	*36*	*2*
Religious Leaders	6	< 0.5
Opinion Polls	9	1
Other	75	5
Non-Government Source	**468**	**31**
TOTAL SOURCES	**1490**	

Appendix 1.4: Sources within the Jerusalem Post's News Articles (186 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	420	42
Named Former Government Official	14	1
Unnamed Current Government Official	232	23
Unnamed Former Government Official	2	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	12	1
Government Source	**680**	**68**
Journalists	40	4
Academics	19	2
Businesses	20	2
Think Tanks	7	1
Ordinary Citizen	77	8
Violent Extremist Organization	15	1
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	5	< 0.5
Multinational Organization	19	2

NGOs	*54*	*5*
Religious Leaders	13	1
Opinion Polls	6	1
Other	50	5
Non-Government Source	**325**	**32**
TOTAL SOURCES	**1005**	

Appendix 2: List of NGOs Cited in News Articles Across All Three Newspapers

NGOs	Number of Articles in Which Cited
Council of Jewish Communities in Judea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip (Yesha Council)	27
Peace Now	9
American Task Force on Palestine	2
Anti-Defamation League	2
Human Rights Watch	2
International Christian Zionist Center	2
International Fellowship of Christians and Jews	2
Rabbinical Council of Judea, Samaria, and the Gaza Strip	2
The Jewish Agency	2
Arkoub and Shebaa Farms Association	1
B'Tselem	1
Birthright Israel	1
Chess Federation	1
Citizens for True Social Justice	1
Conference of Presidents of Major Jewish Organizations	1
Economic Cooperation Foundation	1
Egyptian Peace Society	1
Geneva Initiative	1
Gold Star Families for Peace	1
International Crisis Group	1
International Solidarity Movement	1
Interreligious and International Peace Council	1
Israel Association for Ethiopian Jews	1
Israel Policy Forum	1
Israel Resource Center	1
Jerusalem Open House	1
Jerusalem's Gay and Lesbian Center	1
Jews Do Not Expel Jews	1
Mossawa Advocacy Center for Arab Citizens of Israel	1
New Israel Fund	1
Palestinian Center for Human Rights	1
Palestinian Children Parliament in Rafah	1
Revava	1
Security Fence for Israel	1
Strategic Assessments Initiative	1
Temple Mount Faithful	1
The American Jewish Committee	1
The Gaza Strip Agricultural Committee	1

The Human Rights Association in Nazareth	1
The Islamic Trust	1
The Jewish Legion	1
The Kibbutz Movement	1
The Orthodox Union	1
The Reform Movement	1
Veterans of Foreign Wars national council	1
Women in Black	1
Women in Green	1
Working Women's Union	1
Zionist Organization of America	1
"An Islamic charity"	1
"Human rights groups"	1
"Right-wing groups"	1

Appendix 3: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources Within News Articles

Appendix 3.1: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Daily Star's News Articles

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	451	45
Israeli	359	36
Both Arab and Israeli	4	< 0.5
Neither Arab nor Israeli	133	13
Unknown Nationality	49	5
TOTAL SOURCES	**996**	

Appendix 3.2: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the New York Times' News Articles

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	453	30
Israeli	721	48
Both Arab and Israeli	6	<0.5
Neither Arab nor Israeli	281	19
Unknown Nationality	29	2
TOTAL SOURCES	**1490**	

Appendix 3.3: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Jerusalem Post's News Articles

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	233	23
Israeli	619	62
Both Arab and Israeli	5	<0.5
Neither Arab nor Israeli	117	12
Unknown Nationality	31	3
TOTAL SOURCES	**1005**	

Appendix 4: Source Type in News Articles During the Policy Proposal and Adoption Stage

Appendix 4.1: Sources in News Pieces During Policy Proposal and Adoption (Across All 3 Papers), December 18,2003-August 14,2005 (527 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	1326	41
Named Former Government Official	50	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	807	25
Unnamed Former Government Official	3	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	41	1
Government Source	**2227**	**69**
Journalists	156	5
Academics	43	1
Businesses	29	1
Think Tanks	24	1
Ordinary Citizen	277	9
Violent Extremist Organization	66	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	47	1
Multinational Organization	72	2
NGOs	*98*	*3*
Religious Leaders	21	1
Opinion Polls	20	1
Other	163	5
Non-Government Source	**1016**	**31**
TOTAL SOURCES	**3243**	

Appendix 4.2: Sources in the Daily Star's News Pieces During Policy Proposal and Adoption, December 18,2003-August 14,2005 (143 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	419	44
Named Former Government Official	10	1
Unnamed Current Government Official	201	21
Unnamed Former Government Official	1	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	19	2
Government Source	**650**	**69**
Journalists	46	5
Academics	7	1
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	5	1
Ordinary Citizen	64	7
Violent Extremist Organization	31	3
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	28	3

Multinational Organization	38	4
NGOs	*13*	*1*
Religious Leaders	4	< 0.5
Opinion Polls	6	1
Other	56	6
Non-Government Source	**298**	**31**
TOTAL SOURCES	**948**	

Appendix 4.3: Sources in the Jerusalem Post's News Pieces During Policy Proposal and Adoption, December 18,2003-August 14,2005 (172 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	384	41
Named Former Government Official	14	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	207	22
Unnamed Former Government Official	2	<0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	12	1
Government Source	**619**	**67**
Journalists	37	4
Academics	18	2
Businesses	20	2
Think Tanks	7	1
Ordinary Citizen	73	8
Violent Extremist Organization	14	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	5	1
Multinational Organization	19	2
NGOs	*53*	*6*
Religious Leaders	11	1
Opinion Polls	6	1
Other	44	5
Non-Government Source	**307**	**33**
TOTAL SOURCES	**926**	

Table 4.4: Sources in the New York Times' News Pieces During Policy Proposal and Adoption, December 18,2003-August 14,2005 (212 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	523	38
Named Former Government Official	26	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	399	29
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	10	1
Government Source	**958**	**70**
Journalists	73	5

Academics	18	1
Businesses	9	1
Think Tanks	12	1
Ordinary Citizen	140	10
Violent Extremist Organization	21	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	14	1
Multinational Organization	15	1
NGOs	*32*	*2*
Religious Leaders	6	<0.5
Opinion Polls	8	1
Other	63	5
Non-Government Source	**411**	**30**
TOTAL SOURCES	**1369**	

Appendix 5: Source Type in News Articles During the Policy Implementation Stage

Appendix 5.1: Sources in News Pieces During the Policy Implementation Stage (Across All 3 Papers), August 15, 2005-September 12, 2005 (44 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	101	41
Named Former Government Official	2	1
Unnamed Current Government Official	55	22
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	4	2
Government Source	**162**	**65**
Journalists	7	3
Academics	4	2
Businesses	3	1
Think Tanks	1	< 0.5
Ordinary Citizen	29	12
Violent Extremist Organization	5	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	2	1
Multinational Organization	6	2
NGOs	*6*	*2*
Religious Leaders	2	1
Opinion Polls	1	<0.5
Other	20	8
Non-Government Source	**86**	**35**
TOTAL SOURCES	**248**	

Appendix 5.2: Sources in The Daily Star's News Pieces During the Policy Implementation Stage, August 15, 2005-September 12, 2005 (11 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	28	58
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	7	15
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	2	4
Government Source	**37**	**77**
Journalists	1	2
Academics	1	2
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	3	6
Violent Extremist Organization	1	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0

Multinational Organization	2	4
NGOs	1	*2*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	0	0
Other	2	4
Non-Government Source	**11**	**23**
TOTAL SOURCES	**48**	

Appendix 5.3: Sources in The Jerusalem Post's News Pieces During the Policy Implementation Stage, August 15, 2005-September 12, 2005 (14 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	36	46
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	25	32
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**61**	**77**
Journalists	3	4
Academics	1	1
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	4	5
Violent Extremist Organization	1	1
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	0	0
NGOs	1	*1*
Religious Leaders	2	3
Opinion Polls	0	0
Other	6	8
Non-Government Source	**18**	**23**
TOTAL SOURCES	**79**	

Appendix 5.4: Sources in The New York Times' News Pieces During the Policy Implementation Stage, August 15, 2005-September 12, 2005 (19 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	37	31
Named Former Government Official	2	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	23	19
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	2	2
Government Source	**64**	**53**
Journalists	3	2

Academics	2	2
Businesses	3	2
Think Tanks	1	1
Ordinary Citizen	22	18
Violent Extremist Organization	3	2
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	2	2
Multinational Organization	4	3
NGOs	4	*3*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	1	1
Other	12	10
Non-Government Source	**57**	**47**
TOTAL SOURCES	**121**	

Appendix 6: Source Type Within Op-Ed Pieces

Appendix 6.1: Sources of Op-Eds Across All 3 Newspapers (156 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	86	32
Named Former Government Official	18	7
Unnamed Current Government Official	33	12
Unnamed Former Government Official	1	< 0.5
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	1	< 0.5
Government Source	**139**	**51**
Journalists	34	13
Academics	15	6
Businesses	1	< 0.5
Think Tanks	9	3
Ordinary Citizen	9	3
Violent Extremist Organization	3	1
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	3	1
Multinational Organization	9	3
NGOs	*4*	*1*
Religious Leaders	5	2
Opinion Polls	11	4
Other	29	11
Non-Government Source	**132**	**49**
TOTAL SOURCES	**271**	

Appendix 6.2: Sources of Op-Ed Pieces in Daily Star (72 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	42	38
Named Former Government Official	10	9
Unnamed Current Government Official	12	11
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	1	1
Government Source	**65**	**59**
Journalists	10	9
Academics	3	3
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	2	2
Ordinary Citizen	4	4
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	3	3
Multinational Organization	5	5
NGOs	*2*	*2*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	3	3

Other	14	13
Non-Government Source	**46**	**41**
TOTAL SOURCES	**111**	

Appendix 6.3: Sources of Op-Ed Pieces in the Jerusalem Post (53 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	28	31
Named Former Government Official	2	2
Unnamed Current Government Official	11	12
Unnamed Former Government Official	1	1
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**42**	**47**
Journalists	17	19
Academics	2	2
Businesses	1	1
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	2	2
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	2	2
NGOs	*1*	*1*
Religious Leaders	5	6
Opinion Polls	5	6
Other	12	13
Non-Government Source	**47**	**53**
TOTAL SOURCES	**89**	

Appendix 6.4: Sources of Op-Ed Pieces in the New York Times (31 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	16	23
Named Former Government Official	6	8
Unnamed Current Government Official	10	14
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**32**	**45**
Journalists	7	10
Academics	10	14
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	7	10
Ordinary Citizen	3	4
Violent Extremist Organization	3	4
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	2	3
NGOs	*1*	*1*

Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	3	4
Other	3	4
Non-Government Source	**39**	**55**
TOTAL SOURCES	**71**	

Appendix 7: Op-Ed Authors

Appendix 7.1: Authors of Signed Opinion Pieces (across all 3 newspapers)

Types of Author	**Total Number**	**Percent of Total**
Current Named Official	7	4
Former Named Official	10	6
Journalist	76	49
Academic	23	15
Think Tank	13	8
NGO	18	12
Ordinary Citizen	3	2
Multinational Organization	2	1
Other*	4	3
TOTAL AUTHORS	**156**	

*Other includes: A freelance writer, a "social scientist," and two "analysts"

Appendix 7.2: List of NGOs that Wrote Op-Ed Columns (Across All Three Papers):

American Task Force on Palestine*
Peres Center for Peace*
Seeds of Peace
Foundation for Middle East Peace*
Americans for Peace Now
Israel's Media Watch
Bitterlemons.org*
Common Ground News Service
International Crisis Group*
Arab Media Watch
Religious Action Center of Reform Judaism
New Israel Fund
Edah

**Wrote more than one op-ed piece over the course of the time period analyzed*

Appendix 8: Source Type within Op-Eds Written by Non-Elites

Sources within Op-Eds Written By Non-Elites (Non-Government Officials and Non-Journalists) (Across All 3 Papers) (63 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	23	27
Named Former Government Official	5	6
Unnamed Current Government Official	13	15
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**41**	**49**
Journalists	9	11
Academics	3	4
Businesses	1	1
Think Tanks	1	1
Ordinary Citizen	4	5
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	2	2
Multinational Organization	3	4
NGOs	*3*	*4*
Religious Leaders	2	2
Opinion Polls	6	7
Other	9	11
Non-Government Source	**43**	**51**
TOTAL SOURCES	**84**	

Appendix 9: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources Within Op-Eds

Appendix 9.1: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Daily Star's Op-Eds

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	27	24
Israeli	33	30
Both Arab and Israeli	1	1
Neither Arab nor Israeli	45	41
Unknown Nationality	5	5
TOTAL SOURCES	**111**	

Appendix 9.2: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the New York Times' Op-Eds

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	17	24
Israeli	17	24
Both Arab and Israeli	0	0
Neither Arab nor Israeli	33	46
Unknown Nationality	4	6
TOTAL SOURCES	**71**	

Appendix 9.3: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Jerusalem Post's Op-Eds

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	11	12
Israeli	45	51
Both Arab and Israeli	0	0
Neither Arab nor Israeli	30	34
Unknown Nationality	3	3
TOTAL SOURCES	**89**	

Appendix 10: Source Type within Editorials

Appendix 10.1: Sources of Editorials (Across All 3 Newspapers: 21 Articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	16	57
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	5	18
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**21**	**75**
Journalists	1	4
Academics	0	0
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	4	14
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	0	0
NGOs	*0*	*0*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	1	4
Other	1	4
Non-Government Source	**7**	**25**
TOTAL SOURCES	**28**	

Appendix 10.2: Sources of Editorial Pieces in Daily Star (*6 Articles)*

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	1	50
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**1**	**50**
Journalists	0	0
Academics	0	0
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	0	0
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	0	0
NGOs	*0*	*0*
Religious Leaders	0	0

Opinion Polls	1	50
Other	0	0
Non-Government Source	**1**	**50**
TOTAL SOURCES	**2**	

Appendix 10.3: Sources of Editorial Pieces in the Jerusalem Post (10 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	10	71
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	1	7
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**11**	**79**
Journalists	1	7
Academics	0	0
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	1	7
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	0	0
NGOs	*0*	*0*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	0	0
Other	1	7
Non-Government Source	**3**	**21**
TOTAL SOURCES	**14**	

Appendix 10.4: Sources of Editorial Pieces in the New York Times (5 articles)

Source	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Named Current Government Official	5	42
Named Former Government Official	0	0
Unnamed Current Government Official	4	33
Unnamed Former Government Official	0	0
Hamas (Acting As Government Official)	0	0
Government Source	**9**	**75**
Journalists	0	0
Academics	0	0
Businesses	0	0
Think Tanks	0	0
Ordinary Citizen	3	25
Violent Extremist Organization	0	0
Hamas (Acting/Described as Violent Extremist Organization)	0	0
Multinational Organization	0	0

NGOs	*0*	*0*
Religious Leaders	0	0
Opinion Polls	0	0
Other	0	0
Non-Government Source	**3**	**25**
TOTAL SOURCES	**12**	

Appendix 11: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources within Editorials

Appendix 11.1: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Daily Star's Editorials

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	2	100
Israeli	0	0
Both Arab and Israeli	0	0
Neither Arab nor Israeli	0	0
Unknown Nationality	0	0
TOTAL SOURCES	**2**	

Appendix 11.2: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the New York Times' Editorials

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	1	8
Israeli	6	50
Both Arab and Israeli	0	0
Neither Arab nor Israeli	5	42
Unknown Nationality	0	0
TOTAL SOURCES	**12**	

Appendix 11.3: Nationality/Ethnic Origin of Sources in the Jerusalem Post's Editorials

Source's Nationality	**Sum Total**	**Percent of Total**
Arab	3	21
Israeli	9	64
Both Arab and Israeli	0	0
Neither Arab nor Israeli	2	14
Unknown Nationality	0	0
TOTAL SOURCES	**14**	

Appendix 12: Length of Articles for Each Newspaper

Appendix 12.1: Length of News Articles For Each Paper

	Mean Word Count	**Median Word Count**
New York Times	991.79	853
Jerusalem Post	924.51	689.5
Daily Star	759.31	724.5

Appendix 12.2: Length of Op-Eds For Each Paper

	Mean Word Count	**Median Word Count**
New York Times	953.45	828
Jerusalem Post	958.19	882
Daily Star	1059.97	958

Appendix 12.3: Length of Editorials For Each Paper

	Mean Word Count	**Median Word Count**
New York Times	536.8	499
Jerusalem Post	728.6	736
Daily Star	475.5	423.5

Appendix 13: Sample Interview Questions for Non-Governmental Organizations

1) What type of media strategy does your organization have? How much is having your voice heard in the press emphasized in the organization's objectives?
2) What is your perception of what the media are interested in? What have your successes been and what are your frustrations?
    a. How willing have newspapers been to publish op-eds written by members of your organization?
3) What do you make of my findings that government sources are heavily represented in coverage of the Israeli disengagement, at a rate of two government sources for every one non-government source? Does this surprise you? What explanations might you have?
4) Do you feel like your organization's voice is adequately represented in the press coverage of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict?
    a. Do you feel like the perspectives of non-governmental organizations in general are adequately represented in press coverage of the conflict?
5) What have you observed of the relationship between NGOs and the press within the context of this conflict?
6) Do you think NGOs perhaps should be cited as sources in news articles more often? If so, why? (Or if not, why?)
7) What is your impression of the extent to which Arabs and Israelis have equal (or unequal) representation in the news media's coverage? What do you make of my findings on the ethnicity/nationality of sources and the variation that exists across the three papers?
8) Is there any other commentary you would like to offer related to sourcing in media coverage of the disengagement?

Appendix 14: Sample Interview Questions for Reporters

1) How do you decide what type of sources to include in your articles? How do you decide whom to contact as a source?
2) What do you make of my findings that government sources are heavily represented in coverage of the Israeli disengagement, at a rate of two government sources for every one non-government source? Does this align with what you might expect?
3) Why do you think NGOs are so infrequently cited? In what cases or kinds of stories would you choose to cite a non-governmental organization?
4) What have you observed of the relationship between NGOs and the press within the context of this conflict?
5) (To *Jerusalem Post* reporter) I also found that within the *Jerusalem Post*'s coverage, 61.6% of its sources were Israeli, while 23.3% were Arab. Does this statistic surprise you? Why do you think this might be?
6) What have you observed of the differences between the Israeli, Arab, and American press? Why do you think the newspapers included in this study were so similar in the extent to which they included non-governmental sources?
7) Is there anything else you would like to add about newspapers' sources within coverage of the Israel-Palestinian conflict?