

**CRIME, TERRORISM OR NIGHTMARE:
News Representations of the 2011 Norway Attacks**

Master's thesis
Sampsa Markkula

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
May 2014

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Sampsa Markkula	
Työn nimi – Title Crime, Terrorism or Nightmare: News Representations of the 2011 Norway Attacks	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Toukokuu 2014	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 77 sivua + 2 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Tutkielman tarkoituksena on selvittää vuoden 2011 Norjan terrori-iskun ja sen tekijän Anders Breivikin representaatioita välittömästi iskun jälkeen kahdessa sanomalehdessä, The Daily Telegraph ja The New York Times. Erityisesti keskityn siihen, esitetäänkö iskut terrorismina, rikoksena vai jotenkin muutoin, sekä tekeekö media kytköksiä aiempiin samankaltaisiin tapauksiin ja onko lehtien välillä eroja esitystavassa. Norjan terrori-isku on taustoiltaan ja tapahtumaympäristöltään uniikki, joten vastaavaa tutkimusta ei ole aiemmin tehty.</p> <p>Representaatioita tutkitaan Fairclough'n kriittisen diskurssianalyysin keinoin ja tukeutuen soveltuvien osin aiempiin löydöksiin mediatutkimuksen alalta. Representaatioita etsitään sekä otsikkotasolta että valittujen artikkelien koko sisällöstä.</p> <p>Osoittautui, että vaikka terrorismiviittaukset olivat otsikkotasolla vähäisiä, iskut leimattiin artikkelien sisällössä useimmiten terrorismiksi. Breivikiä verrattiin useissa artikkeleissa yhdysvaltalaisiin samankaltaisten iskujen tekijöihin. Lehtien väliltä löytyi useita kiinnostavia eroja artikkelien määrässä ja sisällössä.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords CDA, discourse analysis, media, terrorism	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

1 INTRODUCTION.....	7
2 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF MEDIA TEXTS	9
2.1 Introducing discourse analysis	9
2.1.1 Critical discourse analysis.....	11
2.2 Fairclough’s model of CDA.....	12
2.2.1 Textual properties	13
2.2.2 Discursive practices	14
2.2.3 Social practices	16
2.2.4 Ideology in CDA.....	17
2.2.5 Representation in CDA	18
2.3 Critique of CDA.....	19
2.4 Discursive practices of news production.....	21
3 PREVIOUS STUDIES AND TERMINOLOGY.....	23
3.1 Defining terrorism.....	23
3.2 Related background.....	24
3.2.1 The Norway attacks	25
3.2.2 Other relevant cases of domestic terrorism.....	26
3.3 Previous studies.....	26
3.3.1 Domestic and foreign terrorism	26
3.3.2 Hoffman on representations of terrorism.....	28
3.3.3 U.S. and British media conventions.....	28
4 DATA AND METHODS	30
4.1 Research questions	30
4.2 Data	31
4.3 Methods of analysis	32
5 REPRESENTATIONS IN HEADLINES	36
5.1 Representations of the incident	36
5.2 Representations of the perpetrator	39

5.3 Noticeable themes and trends	42
5.3.1 Difference in number of headlines between DT and NYT	42
5.3.2 Conflicting numbers of victims	43
5.3.3 Prevalence of category 2 representations.....	44
5.3.4 Perpetrator represented more neutrally than the event	45
5.3.5 Headlines in category 4.....	46
5.3.6 Headlines in category 5.....	48
6 REPRESENTATION IN ARTICLES.....	50
6.1 Category 1	50
6.2 Category 2	54
6.3 Category 3	56
6.4 Category 4	59
6.5 Category 5	62
7 DISCUSSION.....	66
7.1 How are the Norway 2011 attacks and their perpetrator represented in the two newspapers?	66
7.2 Connections to previous domestic terrorists	68
7.3 Comparison of the newspapers.....	70
7.4 Other issues	72
7.5 Conclusion.....	74
BIBLIOGRAPHY	75
APPENDIX 1: Headlines in The Daily Telegraph	78
APPENDIX 2: Headlines in The New York Times	82

1 INTRODUCTION

Media texts create representations of the world through language and both contribute to, and are themselves influenced by, the views and ideologies of people who create and consume the texts. These social aspects of language are especially salient in texts concerning controversial events such as terrorism or serious crimes. Such events are bound to raise strong opinions and feelings in people, and the way in which they are represented through media to the public can directly and indirectly influence the tone of these opinions and feelings. In addition, the opinions and the feelings of the journalists producing these texts are likely to influence how the events are represented in the media.

In the present study, I analyze how the July 2011 terrorist attacks in Norway – the Oslo bombing and the shootings in Utoya island perpetrated by right-wing extremist Anders Behring Breivik – were initially represented in two newspapers, The Daily Telegraph from the U.K and The New York Times from the United States during the first week after the attacks. The primary question in the present study is whether the attacks, whose perpetrator is a member of the majority population, were initially classified as an act of terrorism or a crime. Along this primary research question, the present study attempts to find if Breivik's attacks were compared or connected with previous prominent cases of domestic terrorism, and whether there were significant differences between the reporting of the two newspapers – along with possible reasons for these differences. The starting hypothesis is that Breivik's actions are likely to be labeled as terrorism due to the similarities between Breivik's and few previous domestic terrorists' ideologies and methods.

I have analyzed news items from the web archives of the newspapers using both a statistical analysis of the vocabulary used in the headlines of the articles and in-depth qualitative critical discourse analysis of the content of ten articles. An online source is used as the data for the analysis due to my focus on initial impressions, as the internet is the fastest news media available and also continuously growing in importance as a news media. In my analysis, I use Norman Fairclough's (1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2003) model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) as my main theoretical background and methodological framework. Fairclough's theory is contrasted and supplemented by

selected concepts from other critical discourse analysts, prominently Blommaert (2005). Also selected findings from the field of communication studies are used to support and contrast my findings, including Powell's (2011) study of U.S. media coverage on terrorism and Redden and Witschge's (2010) study of online news.

This present study is thus an analysis of a reasonably recent media case, utilizing the methods of linguistic CDA and a background of communication studies. As such, one of the primary objectives of the present study is to present an example of how a combination of detailed linguistic analysis and an understanding of the wider communicative context and background can perhaps produce more detailed findings than either of the two used in isolation. As such, the study is likely to be of interest primarily to the fields of linguistics, especially (critical) discourse analysis and communication and media studies.

In the following chapter I provide a short summary of discourse analysis, critical discourse analysis and particularly Norman Fairclough's model of critical discourse analysis, along with other relevant theories and terms. Sources other than Fairclough are included when necessary for criticism or supplementary information. The third chapter is a review of previous studies, primarily from the field of media studies, related to terrorism and includes clarifications on terrorism and the particular incident in question. The fourth chapter presents the research questions and aims of this study and introduces the data and methods of analysis. The fifth chapter consists of quantitative, statistical analysis of representations in the news headlines, while the sixth chapter includes a thorough qualitative analysis of ten sample articles. In the seventh chapter I provide conclusions and summaries from both analyses, and conclude by addressing the validity and relevance of the present study, as well as suggestions for possible future research.

2 CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS OF MEDIA TEXTS

The theoretical basis of this study is Norman Fairclough's (1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2003) three-dimensional model of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA). In this chapter I will briefly summarize CDA, other relevant theories I have utilized in the study and the reasons for applying these particular theories and sources. Central concepts and terms are introduced as necessary.

2.1 Introducing discourse analysis

In general terms, discourse analysis can be defined as a multidisciplinary, constantly evolving field of study concerning itself with the study of discourse (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009). Thus even as texts of some sort or another form the object of analysis in most forms of discourse analysis, it is not a purely linguistic discipline, but borrows from sources such as social sciences to comprehensively understand the issues it studies.

The central concept of *discourse* can be interpreted in many ways. A traditional if old-fashioned definition of discourse in linguistics is *a body of text larger than a sentence*. However, this definition is excessively broad: another, more useful definition is to define discourse as a body of text larger than a sentence *in context*. (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 24). Critical discourse analysis pioneer Norman Fairclough defines discourse as *language use as a social practice* (1992: 62-63) with a further explanation that *it is both socially shaped and socially shaping at the same time* (1995b: 54-55). Along the same lines, Pietikäinen and Mäntynen (2009: 27) offer yet another more refined definition: that discourse is *language use that has social conditions and effects*. Jan Blommaert (2005) distances his definition from the textual and linguistic roots of discourse analysis by stating that discourse is *all forms of meaningful semiotic human activity seen in connection with social, cultural and historical patterns and developments of use*. However, not all of these definitions are useful for the present study. Some, such as the first one, are too broad and others (such as Blommaert's definition above) focus on issues which are not primary in this context. Blommaert (2005), for example, has based his model on his criticism of traditional CDA that it is too grounded in the realities of the Western world. While this is a good and well

justified argument, it does not match the scope of the present study's as the present study focuses on Western media, it would be counterproductive to overly rely on Blommaert's model.

In this case, *context* is defined as the factors that influence *creating, interpreting and using* meanings in discourse, following Pietikäinen and Mäntynen's (2009: 30) definitions. In discourse analysis, therefore, both the text in itself and its context are the objects of study (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 20), including how the context shapes the language use and is shaped by it in return. Context is not always immediate, as pointed out by Blommaert (2005) – such factors as the text producer's *resources* for using language (i.e. language skills) and the text's history before entering the scope of an academic discourse analysis are also parts of the context. It should be noted that this view of context is not incompatible with the definition above, but merely complementary, as Blommaert argues that these types of context are usually left out in most forms of traditional linguistic discourse analysis (2005: 57).

In the present study, discourse is defined as *text with social conditions and effects* following Fairclough (1992: 62-63, 1995b: 54-55) and Pietikäinen and Mäntynen (2009: 27). It should be noted here that within the scope of this study, I use Fairclough's definition of *text* as encompassing all types of language use as object of study, including spoken language and visual objects (Fairclough 1992: 62-63) instead of the everyday meaning of the word *text* which refers to written language only.

In addition to the meaning and definition above, there also exists a second meaning for the word discourse: a discourse (as a countable noun) can be used to refer to an established manner or method of language use in a particular context or setting. Thus, for example “an academic discourse” would refer to the established ways of language use in an academic setting or context, or “a courtroom discourse” would refer to such ways in a court room. This is the predominantly used meaning of “discourse” in non-linguistic fields of study. (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 25-27). In regard to the present study, this definition is not as crucial as the one described above, but nevertheless allows one to refer to a “news discourse”, “online media discourse” or even “post-9/11 western media terrorism discourse” among other things.

2.1.1 Critical discourse analysis

According to Fairclough (1992), models for discourse analysis can be roughly divided to critical and non-critical ones, although the division is far from absolute. What then constitutes a “critical” analysis? Blommaert (2005: 1) sees a critical analysis as predominantly an analysis of *power effects*. He sees the primary function to be studying what power does and how. Inequality is singled out as a particularly interesting effect of power. Fairclough (1992) also mentions power in his specifications. He defines critical discourse analysis as being focused on how power and ideology shape discourse and how discourse affects social structures and systems of belief in return, as opposed to purely describing the effects of context and text to each other (1992: 12.) Thus it can be viewed that critical discourse analysis is concerned not only with *what* and *how* is said, but also with *why* is said, and by *whom*. The primary focus is to identify the – sometimes hidden – opinions, agendas and ideologies embedded in the text.

According to Fairclough (1992: 113), journalism is a field which is shaped by power and ideology, and in turn affects social lives and knowledge of people. Concerning media texts, this can be understood so that texts are invariably influenced by the ideologies and views of their creators - including not only the writer(s) but also the publishers, editors, possible reviewers as well as the owners and stakeholders of the publishing company. And as media texts give information to their readers, they at the same time play a part in constructing and changing the reader’s world view and opinions. Based on the above considerations, I find critical discourse analysis to be better suited to my topic of study than non-critical discourse analysis, since critical discourse analysis provides me with tools to take into account and evaluate these underlying social factors and power relations in both how they have influenced the text’s production and also how they might influence the opinions of the readers.

There is no single critical discourse analysis: various scholars have created theoretical and methodological tools and frameworks which all fit in the “school” of critical discourse analysis (Blommaert 2005). These methods all have something in common but also some key differences. Norman Fairclough, the pioneer of CDA, first published his framework of CDA in 1989 and refined it through many further publications (e.g. Fairclough 1992, 1995a, 1995b, 2003). This framework consists of a three-dimensional

model of analysis of *textual properties*, *discursive practices* and *social practices* as objects of study.

Fairclough's model is by no means the only theory of critical discourse analysis – for example Teun A. van Dijk has created another widely known method, a triangulation framework that links cognition, structure and context (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 19). Blommaert (2005) identifies Ruth Wodak and Paul Chilton in addition to Fairclough and van Dijk as the four central names of critical discourse analysis, while providing a critical analysis method of his own as well. However, the various models and methods of critical discourse analysis are somewhat different in their contents and objects of focus. Due to this, not all methods are as well suited to all topics of study as others. For example, Blommaert's (2005) principles on which he builds his system of critical discourse analysis are not as relevant to the topic of the present study as Fairclough's.

Fairclough's model is also explicitly suited to the analysis of media texts in Europe and the United States, while Blommaert's standpoint focuses more on issues such as limited language resources of immigrants and explicitly criticizes Fairclough and other traditional CDA proponents in being too west-centric, as discussed briefly in the previous section. Additionally, as can be seen in section 2.3, Fairclough's three dimensions of analysis can be concisely linked to the diverse factors influencing news production as identified by Soloski (1997: 146-152). Based on the above considerations I find Fairclough's model of CDA to be the most fitting model of critical discourse analysis for my topic of study.

2.2 Fairclough's model of CDA

Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA involves three specific levels or dimensions of analysis: *textual properties*, *discursive practices* and *social practices*. To again compare to the definitions in section 2.1, textual properties correlate with analyzing the text as an object, social practices with the context, and discursive practices deal primarily with the relation between a text and its context, i.e. how the context influences the text and how the text influences its context. Although Fairclough separates these three dimensions for analysis, he stresses that the dimensions are not mutually exclusive or completely separate from each other. Thus it is possible for one

topic of interest to be investigated under two or all three of these dimensions. (1992: 71-96).

2.2.1 Textual properties

The first dimension of analysis is textual properties, and it focuses on description of linguistic properties of the text itself. Fairclough (1992) defines four particular objects of interest in the text: vocabulary, grammar, cohesion and text structure. Vocabulary concerns itself with individual words and their meaning. Grammar means how words are combined into clauses and sentences. Cohesion is how these clauses and sentences are linked to each other and how they form a complete, coherent text. Finally, text structure involves organizational properties of text, meaning the properties of a text that mark it as a text of a certain type, such as a news report. (Fairclough 1992: 75-78). As the present study concerns written representations of an issue and not with doing grammatical analysis – and all the data falls into a single type of text (a news report), the one linguistic property which in this context requires more examination is naturally vocabulary.

Concerning analysis of vocabulary, Fairclough notes that there is no one definite vocabulary: different organizations, values or individuals can and will interpret the same word in a different way and with different connotations. While practically anything in vocabulary can be studied, Fairclough identifies three main topics of interest. The first is alternate wordings - e.g. how something is reworded, or something is more intensively worded as something else. A classic example of this is rewording “terrorists” as “freedom fighters” (or vice versa).. The second topic is word meanings. As mentioned above, every institution or organization uses their own vocabulary, so the question here is whose meanings are intended; this links to the social practices level of analysis. The third point of interest is metaphor. Again, metaphors have social and political importance, and there may be ideologically competing metaphors evident. (Fairclough 1992: 76-77).

The present study is one of representation, and representation – as defined in CDA – is something that is always present in a text. What is represented and how is decided by choices – what is said, how is said and what is left unsaid. (Fairclough 2003). Based on these considerations, one can easily see that concerning a topic such as the present

study, alternate wordings and word meanings are a crucial topic of analysis. To draw some examples of the actual analyzed data, *Mr. Breivik*, *monster* and *suspect* create very different representations of the very same individuals through simple choice of words. Metaphor is not my primary focus, but nevertheless any metaphors evident in the data are analyzed as far as they bear importance related to my research questions and aims. As a final comment on vocabulary-heavy analysis, it must be taken into account that in CDA – as evident in the very definitions of discourse in the previous sections – everything exists in context. Thus, one should not blindly look at the individual words, but place them in both the immediate and the wider social context in order to properly analyze them. This approach has been taken in the present study to the extent of my ability.

2.2.2 Discursive practices

The second dimension, discursive practices, focuses on interpreting the various processes related to the text's production, distribution and consumption (Fairclough 1992: 78.) News texts, as an example, are produced through a complex organization and undergo many changes from an initial draft or news agency report into a finalized product (Pietikäinen and Mäntynen 2009: 117). News can be distributed through different media, e.g. television, newspapers or the internet, each of which influence how the text can be constructed: a printed newspaper, for example, cannot include moving images, and the news published in the internet can be quickly updated as new information becomes available. The channel of publication also influences the contexts and situations where the text can be consumed. All of these factors must be taken into account when analyzing the dimension of discursive practices.

Fairclough (1992: 78) includes some useful points on how to study the issues of text production, distribution and consumption using his framework. Regarding production, it is noted that in many cases there is no single producer; for example in a news report, in addition to the journalist writing the report there can also be the influence of an editor, a source whose interview forms the basis of the report, and the general guidelines which represent the stakeholders' (e.g. media company, external owner) influence on the newspaper itself. In case of text distribution, there are various ways in which text are typically distributed (e.g. a one-to-one conversation versus a newspaper), and distribution can also reach targets which were not initially intended (“overhearers”)

(Fairclough 1992: 79-80). An example of such overhearing concerning online news is that a consumer could plausibly enter an online news portal via e.g. a link in social media, even if said consumer were not a part of the intended target group or would usually not consume said news agency's products. Also the issue of text consumption can be analyzed in multiple ways. Text can be read carefully or simply glanced over; they can be intended for only one reader or many, and are usually – but not always – read according to their intended genre (e.g. a news report is not read as an essay). Additionally, some texts are used only once, others are preserved as they are and/or transformed into other texts. Text consumption can also have consequences from changing people's ideologies or views of identity to leading to political and social changes. (Fairclough 1992: 79).

In addition to the above listing of what discursive practices are about, Fairclough (1992: 82-86) identifies three primary topics of interest in the study of discursive practices: force, coherence and intertextuality. Force is a text's "actional component" – what kind of interpersonal action the producer wants to induce with the text. A text's force could thus be a question, a command, an explanation etc. The second topic, coherence, refers to how a text can be intended to be interpreted (by a producer) or simply interpreted (by a consumer) to form a coherent whole based on completely implicit relations between the meanings of the textual components, rather than explicit cohesion of words and clauses. This means that the text can create additional, implicit meanings to someone who has the necessary resources and knowledge to understand them, but not to someone who lacks such resources. Also, there is always the possibility to interpret these implications in a different – and not necessarily wrong – manner.

Fairclough (1992: 84-85) defines intertextuality as the tendency of texts to contain traces and remains of other, preceding texts. For example, media texts are layered, earlier versions constituting parts of the current version, making them heavily intertextual (Fairclough 1995b: 48.) A news report is likely to be created through several draft phases, commented and edited by people other than the initial author, and the whole text is based on information provided by e.g. press releases or interviewees. Intertextuality can be explicit, or "manifest", in which other texts are explicitly quoted, or implicit ("interdiscursivity") where the presence of other texts is not overtly apparent but can nevertheless be detected by thorough analysis (Fairclough 1992: 84-85).

2.2.3 Social practices

The third dimension, social practices, involves explanation or interpretation of the underlying social structures behind the discourse. Fairclough (1992: 66) identifies a few possible orientations of social practice that can have implications in discourse: economic, political, ideological and cultural. However, his CDA concerns mostly the ideological and political orientations of social practice (1992: 67). Blommaert's views echo this, as he sees a critical analysis of discourse as first and foremost an analysis of power effects (2005: 1). The dimension of social practices in CDA is thus primarily the ideologies and power structures and effects which concern the analyzed text. Considering the topic of the present study is a heavily ideologically motivated act that has raised extensive discussion on issues of ideology and power, some of them evident in the analyzed data, the importance of this cannot be understated.

Fairclough (1992: 65) further stresses that the relationship between discourse and social practices must be seen as dialogical, and analyzed as such. Both the effects of social practices on the discourse and the effects of discourse on the social practices must be taken into account. This view prevents excessively emphasizing either the social factors which play a part in creation of discourse or the socially shaping function of the discourse on ideologies, identities and so on. Both directions of influence are crucial for analysis.

A central concept to this dimension of CDA is *ideology*. Following Fairclough's (1992: 87-89) definitions for the sake of clarity and consistency, ideologies signify and construct physical or social reality, manifest in discursive practices and contribute to creating or maintaining power relations. By this definition, ideology in discourse can fundamentally be understood as a social phenomenon connected to the text and the discursive practices connected to the text's production and consumption. On the same lines, Blommaert (2005: 158) finds ideology a crucial topic of study in discourse analysis as a link between discourse and power. As ideology is one of the two most crucial concepts of CDA related to the present study, the issue is examined more thoroughly in the following subsection.

Another term which Fairclough presents as crucial on the level of social practice is *hegemony*. Fairclough defines hegemony as a type of social power. By his definitions,

hegemony is both leadership and domination, power over society as a whole. However, hegemony refers to a special type of power, a type which is not complete but always in a state of change, since it is power achieved through integration and alliance, not direct domination. (1992: 91-92).

Blommaert further defines the concept of hegemony in relation to discourse with ideas that are compatible with Fairclough's views and can be used to further construct and define the concept. In Blommaert's (2005: 166-168). view, hegemony is a "soft" or "consensual" form of power, as opposed to force, or "hard" power of e.g. the legal system and its enforcement. Hegemony can thus be seen as cultural dominance. Blommaert also presents the view that hegemony can stay in place since being "anti-hegemonic" carries a cost: not being heard, not having power or various legal, political and social repercussions. Thus there can be many arguments and ideologies which are *oppositional*, i.e. oppose a part of the hegemony, but not *anti-hegemonic*, i.e. opposing the hegemony as a whole. Blommaert argues that oppositional ideologies are often tolerated by hegemony, while anti-hegemonical ones are not.

Blommaert's view of hegemony as soft, cultural and consensual power is not at odds with Fairclough's definition as social power through integration and alliance (although Fairclough is far vaguer on the social and political context). Based on the abovementioned arguments and definitions and drawing on Fairclough's concepts and Blommaert's focus on the socio-political side of discourse, a more complete view of hegemony can be achieved. Hegemony is thus "soft" power through cultural dominance, achieved through consensus, integration and alliance.

2.2.4 Ideology in CDA

As mentioned above, ideology as per Fairclough (1992: 87-89) is a social phenomenon which relates to both the text and related discursive practices. To define the concept further, one must choose which definitions to follow. Blommaert (2005: 158-159) notes that while a crucial topic of analysis, ideology is an extremely vague concept and anyone attempting to analyze it will face a multitude of differing definitions. Building on a variety of definitions, Blommaert identifies two ways to conceptualize ideology: specific and general. Specific ideologies, according to Blommaert, serve a specific purpose and are used by specific individuals and factions. Examples of such ideologies

include the various political and cultural “-isms” (e.g. communism, racism), “schools” or “doctrines” and political alignments (e.g. conservative, progressive).

General ideologies, on the other hand, are less easy to define. Blommaert has adopted a view in which a general ideology is in a way a culturally defining one – a sum of a given cultural group’s thoughts, structure and development. He further argues that for a modern, western society, capitalism would be such general ideology and that as such, it would not necessarily be seen as *an* ideology because it is so pervasive throughout society. (2005: 159-160). Fairclough’s definitions of ideology (1992: 86-91) is quite vague on this aspect of what ideology is in relation to society.

Fairclough argues that while ideologies can be found in discourse, they do not have any given location in a text. He argues that while text forms and content contain elements of ideologies which have influenced the text’s production, it is impossible to read the ideology from the text without the context of its production and the meanings attributed to the texts in its interpretation. Thus, according to Fairclough, ideologies are a property of both context *and* the text which reproduces and transforms the social practices behind its production (1992: 88-89).

Fairclough’s and Blommaert’s definitions of ideology are by no means the only ones, but since the various definitions all differ from each other, one can only adhere to one definition at a time. Since Fairclough’s definition only focuses on the relationship between ideology and discourse, the definition utilized in the present study is an amalgam of Fairclough’s and Blommaert’s ideas. According to Blommaert (2005: 167), ideology is considered to be a *part of power*, not a separate entity. On the other hand, Fairclough (1992: 88-89) defines ideology in discourse is a property of both text and context. Ideology could thus be seen as a manifestation of power that is either found in the social context where the text was produced (e.g. the author’s own views, for example) or what is attributed to the text by the reader. The concept is relevant to the present study in reviewing the social practices connected to the production of the analyzed text: for example, do the authors of the articles have some agenda explicitly or implicitly discernible from the text?

2.2.5 Representation in CDA

The concept of representation is an essential one in both Fairclough's CDA and in the present study. The concept is pervasive throughout Fairclough's work, especially concerning analysis of media texts. It is not directly related to any of the three dimensions of analysis, but rather a complex concept drawing from all three levels.

Representation is an essential term in discourse analysis, and one of the key concepts in my study. According to Fairclough (2003: 27), representation is a description of a physical, mental or social part or aspect of the world in text. By text, I here refer to the common linguistic definition of term (Fairclough 2003: 3) that encompasses not only written language, but also spoken language and for example visual and moving images. Thus, representation basically means a textual description of a physical, social and/or mental phenomenon or process in the world. However, representations also exist in a context. Fairclough (1995b: 103-14) notes that texts do not reproduce reality perfectly: the representations in a text are always influenced by the party who produces the text. This in turn ties the concepts of representation closely to that of ideology, discussed above. Representations are inherently ideological, as they are the products of humans with their own motives, beliefs and frameworks constraining their ability to produce the text. There may also be discursive practices – a related component, as the process of the text production may impose restrictions on what is said and how (for more detail on this, see the section on discursive practices of news production in chapter 2.4).

Based on the above definitions, one can see why representations are the primary interest of the present study. The representations in the analyzed text reflect the discursive and social practices – from the realities of news production to complex ideologies behind the authors – that have affected the production of any given representation in the text. By focusing the research on the representations, it is possible to attempt to discern the various motives and social factors connected to how the attacks were reported.

2.3 Critique of CDA

Critical discourse analysis has through its history also accumulated some critical views on how it should be conducted. As mentioned before, CDA is by no means a uniform entity, but rather a collection of theories and research methods created by various linguistic scholars, and as such the essential definitions and points of interest vary from scholar to scholar. However, some criticisms have been pointed towards the general

theory and methodology of CDA as a whole. Blommaert (2005) includes an excellent collection of the most prominent views, which I review in the next chapter, followed by my own criticism towards these points.

First, CDA has been accused of being vague regarding its central concepts, especially those related to social science. Second and more important, the analysis can be seen as biased. CDA does not necessarily take into account that texts can be read in different ways in different situations; rather, a single way to interpret the text is chosen as the basis of analysis. Related to that, it is possible in CDA to simply criticize one ideology on the basis of another – by using one’s own interpretation of the text to come to a “critical” conclusion of the underlying ideology. Finally, traditional CDA as done by Fairclough and others is, according to Blommaert, excessively rooted in the timeframe and geopolitics of its origins. Fairclough, for example, can create excellent analyses of discourse in Britain of his lifetime, but many basic assumptions made in CDA are non-evident in e.g. post-colonial Africa. (Blommaert 2005: 31-33).

While all of the above points are certainly valid and important to note, none of them condemn the usability and credibility of CDA completely. Regarding the point about vagueness, while some central concepts are defined in CDA – and in my understanding they are not necessarily excessively vague – everyone using CDA in their studies can further define the essential terms and concepts relevant to their own studies. Concise definitions are important, but they are at least to some degree each writer’s own responsibility. Fairclough describes his CDA as a “framework” (1992: 62), and he has later elaborated on some crucial concepts and terms (e.g. Fairclough 1995a, 1995b, 2003).

The issues of multiple interpretations of a text, criticizing from one’s own viewpoint and focusing on one’s own area and time are in my opinion highly related to each other. In all these cases, the problem is in the initial outlook of the scholar, not in the theory or method itself. The issue is whether the writer wants to or is capable of viewing the issue at hand from multiple standpoints or not. In my view this means that one can use the “framework” of CDA to do many kinds of research. Some of it may well be excessively opinionated or one-sided, but there is no proof that all of it is. The responsibility, as with the vagueness of concepts and terminology, lies with the user of the framework. Concerning the present study, I have attempted to avoid these major pitfalls by

providing extensive definitions of the crucial concepts of CDA and using more than one source, including sources that are critical of Fairclough, whose work provides the primary theoretical and methodological background to the study. Concerning e.g. ideology, which is at best vaguely defined by Fairclough, a more concrete definition is created by merging Fairclough's definitions with those of Blommaert, who provides a mostly compatible and more thorough view on the issue.

2.4 Discursive practices of news production

The production of news is a complex and many-phased affair, and is of direct relevance to a CDA-based study of media news. Text production, as has been mentioned, is one of the three key points of interest in the analysis level of discursive practices, along with distribution and consumption. Examining the typical realities of news production offers valuable insight regarding not only the discursive practices of text production, but also those of text distribution and consumption.

Fairclough (1992: 78) acknowledges that a newspaper article is produced by a team of individuals through complex routines. He further (1995b: 48) notes that media texts have an “embedded and layered” character, that is, earlier drafts and versions of those texts constitute layers in the final product; former texts from news agency reports to draft versions of the article are transformed multiple times during the production of the final text. Soloski (1997:146-152) further illustrates these processes from the viewpoint of how they influence the product, a phenomenon which he calls *organizational control*. Soloski identifies a many-layered chain of authority in a newspaper environment, where the reporter is subjected to restrictions from his superiors, i.e. the editor of the paper and, indirectly, the publisher. This is most often done by means of *news policies*, internal guidelines within a media company – and which vary from company to company - which guide the content and tone of the texts they produce. Soloski gives examples of news policies, including whether to publish names of crime victims and a stance of not publishing bloody pictures, sex or immoral content in a “family newspaper” intended for children to consume.

Soloski also identifies another practice which controls the content of news texts: the *professional norms* of journalists (1997: 143). Unlike news policies, which vary from one media company to another, these are universal and include concepts such as

objectivity and what is considered newsworthy. Regarding objectivity, Soloski does not claim that journalists are completely impartial observers, but rather claims that an unbiased, fact-based reporting should be strived for. On the topic of newsworthiness, he points out that since usually newsworthy events are those that deviate from the status quo, journalists indirectly support the current state of affairs by reporting events, such as crimes, that break that status quo. (1997: 143-144).

These issues are also identified as actual and central challenges for journalists by Burns (2002). Especially concerning 'constructing' news items from second-hand sources such as other news reports and official reports, Burns discusses that for example using emotionally or ideologically loaded expressions to represent events or people is a very complex issue. In theory, it should not be done. In practice, no journalist is truly objective, and based on the severity of the reported issue and the reliability of the available information the use of each expressions must be decided individually. Not all of the decisions are made by the actual author: Burns asserts that editors make regularly quite significant changes to the journalists' article drafts, sometimes cutting out large sections to fit some required criteria, such as what the newspaper's target audience wants to read.

As one can clearly see, this correlates nearly completely with the analysis model of CDA: textual properties (the actual news text) are influenced through discursive practices (professional norms and news policies) and by social practices (ideologies of professional ethics, ideologies upheld by the publisher). Also, the abovementioned findings and assessments provide a necessary knowledge basis for actually analyzing the text in the present study from a viewpoint that takes into account the discursive and social practices of journalism.

3 PREVIOUS STUDIES AND TERMINOLOGY

This chapter strives to clarify the terminology and to describe the events which are important to the present study, along with a review of previous studies of particular interest. Since various terms and concepts can be understood in various ways in different contexts, it is important to present a clear definition which is used within the scope of this study. For this study, one such concept is terrorism – and more specifically, foreign and domestic terrorism. A short description of the Norway attacks is also included, abridged from the Wikipedia article concerning the event with the dates and facts checked from multiple media sources to ensure factual accuracy.

3.1 Defining terrorism

According to Hoffman (1998: 13), terrorism is a concept which, though principally known to almost everyone, is hard to concisely define. This difficulty of definition is further complicated by the fact that there are several written definitions of the terms *terrorism* and *terrorist*, most of which include some key concepts but each vary somewhat in what is included. For example in the United States, the State Department, the FBI and the Department of Defense each define terrorism with some key differences, attributed to the abovementioned organizations' objectives in opposing terrorism. Indeed, terrorism appears to be one of those concepts which is extremely hard if not impossible to define exactly, i.e. to create a definition which encompasses everything that is terrorism and nothing which is not. However, it is still possible to put together a good, if somewhat vague, definition of the term. Terrorism can also be defined in relation to what it is not. In the following two paragraphs I will summarize Hoffman's views on defining terrorism. A third paragraph will detail Hoffman's notes on specifically right-wing terrorism, followed by a final paragraph of evaluating these definitions' suitability for the present study.

Hoffman posits five attributes of terrorism (1998: 43). First, the aims and motives are political. Second, violence or threat or violence is involved. Third, there is attempt to cause wide psychological influence to people other than the direct target(s). Fourth, it is done by an organization with identifiable command structure and related to that, fifth that this group is "subnational...or non-state entity" (ibid.) He further proceeds that terrorism can be defined as "deliberate creation and exploitation of fear through violence or the threat of violence in the pursuit of political change" (ibid.)

Criminals or individual lunatics can employ the same methods and tactics as terrorists, such as murder, bombings and threats, even against the same kind of targets. The key difference here between the three is thus not methods but the objects and reasons of the action. A criminal acts to further his own interests – e.g. to gain money – and an individual madman acts to fulfill a personal goal, however deluded that may be. A terrorist, however, tries to attain social and/or political goals with his actions. Also, a terrorist can be seen to attempt to influence the public opinion while a criminal does not. A single individual acting based on a whim or delusions cannot be seen to constitute a terrorist organization by himself, and his actions thus do not meet the definitions of terrorism given in the paragraph above (Hoffman 1998: 41-43).

Hoffman (1998) states that although right-wing terrorism is commonly seen as mostly indiscriminate and senseless street violence, it has its more organized and systematic side. These terrorists truly believe that their nation can only be saved by eliminating liberal policies and immigration, among other issues. Right-wing terrorism does, like other forms of terrorism, aim to alter the public opinions and social policies. Hoffman also compares American right-wing terrorists to European ones: in his view, while both share common denominators such as racism, xenophobia and anti-liberal views, there are also differences. American extreme right is often highly religious, while their European counterparts are almost exclusively secular. (1998: 164-165).

The abovementioned points constitute a functional definition of what exactly we refer to with the expression *terrorism*. In relation to the present study, it must be taken into account that Breivik's attacks in Norway actually do not meet all of Hoffman's criteria of terrorism. Namely, they are not perpetrated by an organization rather than a single individual, and thus could be also seen as the actions of an individual lunatic as described in the previous paragraph. However, Breivik does seem to fit in Hoffman's abovementioned profile of a European right-wing terrorist. As a key point in this study is to discern whether the attack is seen as terrorism or as something else in the media, this is an intriguing fact to note.

3.2 Related background

The following sections of the study are dedicated to providing essential summaries of Breivik's attacks in Norway as well as (brief) introductions to other cases of domestic

terrorism, primarily in the U.S. which proved relevant to the study. The sections are not intended to be comprehensive, but to simply provide the necessary background information to understand the context in which the data for this study was created. All facts have been verified from multiple media sources to be correct.

3.2.1 The Norway attacks

On 22 July 2011, a series of two attacks – a bombing and a mass shooting – was made by Anders Behring Breivik in Norway. The first attack was a car bomb detonated in front of government buildings in Oslo, the capital city of Norway, leading to deaths of eight people and injuries for 209. Less than two hours later, Breivik entered a Worker's Youth League (a Norwegian moderately left-wing political youth organization) summer camp on Utoya island close to Oslo, disguised as a police officer, and opened fire on the attendees, killing 69 people within a span of approximately one and a half hours until he was detained by the police on the island. The total number of victims was 77, although it was initially after the attack estimated to be higher, with numbers as high as 92 appearing on the chronologically first headlines in the data of this study.

Breivik claimed to be a high-ranking member of and act on behalf of a far-right organization called the Knights Templar and considered himself a warrior fighting a civil war. However, no proof of the existence of such an organization has been found. Breivik has stated that he opposes multiculturalism and the spreading of Islam in Europe and has stated his admiration of various right-wing organizations in Europe. He compiled a manifesto – consisting of text written by a variety of right-wing organizations and thinkers – detailing his views which he sent to a number of e-mail addresses before the attacks.

Breivik was found to be criminally insane by forensic psychiatrists in 2011, but following a heated debate on the decision amongst Norwegian mental health experts he was evaluated a second time in 2012 and found not to have been psychotic during his attacks nor during the evaluation. On July 22, 2012 Breivik was found sane and guilty of terrorism, murder and fatal explosion and was sentenced to the maximum penalty under Norwegian law, 21 years of preventive detention, meaning that his sentence can be extended indefinitely as long as he remains a danger to society.

3.2.2 Other relevant cases of domestic terrorism

Within the studied data, there is a number of references to two historical cases of domestic terrorism in the U.S. – the 1995 Oklahoma City bombing and the Unabomber. For reader convenience, a rough description of these two cases is provided in the next two paragraphs.

April 19, 1995, U.S. citizen Timothy McVeigh detonated a massive car bomb outside an Oklahoma federal building in what was the most destructive terrorist attack in the U.S. before the attack on the World Trade Center. 168 people were killed and over 600 injured. McVeigh was motivated by a perceived brutality and tyranny of the federal government, based on recent cases where e.g. the FBI was generally perceived having used excessive force in law enforcement situations.

“The Unabomber” – the term used to refer to the terrorist before his identity was found out – or Theodore Kaczynski, is a former mathematics professor who later isolated himself from society and between 1978 and 1995 sent 16 mail bombs to American universities and air lines. Kaczynski – like Breivik – wrote a manifesto detailing his motivations – Kaczynski was attacking people involved with modern technology, as he believed it was detrimental to human freedom. In 1995 he sent his manifesto to The New York Times, claiming to stop his actions if it was published. Kaczynski was subsequently identified based on his writing style and caught. Related to the Breivik case, it is noteworthy that Breivik’s manifesto is said to contain large sections which are directly plagiarized from Kaczynski’s.

3.3 Previous studies

In the following sections I have included references to select previous studies conducted on the topic of representations of terrorism in media and studies on analyzing online news in general. These results provide important knowledge to which the results of the present study can be compared and contrasted.

3.3.1 Domestic and foreign terrorism

Powell (2011) in an article on U.S. media coverage of terrorism has extensively studied the media responses to a number of terrorist attacks in the U.S. from the viewpoint of communication studies. Of particular interest are her findings on differences in media

descriptions between domestic and international terrorists. According to Powell (2011: 98-99), descriptions of domestic terrorists focus on the perpetrator's intelligence, planning and mental instability, as well as personalization of the perpetrator. On the other hand, international terrorists are mostly described as angry and extremist, and often but not always depersonalized (2011: 99-100).

Powell (2011: 100-101) further claims that in the case of domestic perpetrators, media actively searches for a motive for the act, which is usually creating fear, sending an anti-government message or seeking attention, whereas the motives of international perpetrators are often presented as revenge for Muslims killed by the U.S. government or Islamic radicalism. This implies that the motives of domestic terrorists are explained more specifically and personally, and reasons are attempted to be found for their actions.

A third difference between media coverage of domestic and international terrorism in Powell's study is the allusion to a future threat. Her study shows that in the case of domestic terrorists, the attack is presented as a single event with little fear of a future threat and the perpetrator is routinely mentioned as acting alone. Thus there is no further threat if the perpetrator has been captured or killed and he has been working alone. On the other hand, international terrorists are almost invariably linked to a terrorist organization such as the al Qaeda by media, and thus the threat of further attacks by the organization is intensified. This difference results in representing domestic terrorism as individual acts of mentally unstable perpetrators and heightening the fear of outsiders by focusing on ties to international terrorist organizations in cases of international perpetrators.

If the above points are compared to Hoffman's definitions of terrorism given earlier in this chapter, it can be seen that according to Powell's study, the coverage of domestic terrorists focuses on the third point in the definition: creating psychological effect on people other than the target of the attack, such as fear in the general population or an anti-government message. However, the issue of being a part of an organization does not seem to be a defining characteristic of a terrorist here. Indeed, Powell sees acting alone as a common characteristic of a domestic terrorist.

In relation to the present study, Powell's findings are compared to the media portrayal of Breivik and his attacks. Since Powell has studied specifically terrorism in the US as portrayed by US media, whereas the present study concerns a case of domestic terrorism in a country foreign to the media studied, this difference must be remembered and taken into account during the study.

Yet another interesting viewpoint is provided by Fairclough (2006: 140-161). In discussion of discourse and globalization, war and terrorism he points out that the modern media discourse of *terrorism* has been greatly influenced by the September 11, 2001 World Trade Center attacks and their aftermath. While Fairclough discusses this primarily from the viewpoint of the portrayal and justification of actions against terrorism, the idea that post- WTC attacks discourse of terrorism readily connects the concept of terrorism to actions of *foreign parties*. This is actually evident in the existence of the very term *domestic terrorism* – terrorism that is not the work of foreign culprits has to be differentiated from other terrorism by using the specification “domestic”, but foreign terrorism is almost invariably simply *terrorism*, not for example “foreign terrorism” or “external terrorism”.

3.3.2 Hoffman on representations of terrorism

Hoffman (1998) has a few intriguing findings which are of particular interest to the present study. He claims that actual terrorists almost invariably represent themselves as something other than terrorists, most often evoking images of freedom fighters, the military, or defending or avenging something (1998: 29). Breivik apparently believes himself to be a warrior defending the European culture, connecting with two of these examples. Hoffman posits that the reason why this self-representation as something other than a terrorist is so prevalent is that terrorism is a term with so negative connotations that it is almost invariably used to refer to one's enemies (1998: 31). Thus no-one calls himself a terrorist – it is more of a label used by the society to represent its enemies in a deeply negative manner.

3.3.3 U.S. and British media conventions

Hoffman (1998) has also conducted an interesting examination of US media headlines in the 1970s that reported on terrorist acts. While not a linguistic study, he noticed that the newspapers, striving for “objectivity and neutrality” (1998: 36) have used the words

terrorism and *terrorist* surprisingly little, often substituting these words for more military-related terms such as *guerilla*, *commando* or *extremist*. Of eight newspapers reporting on the same attack, only two used *terrorism* or *terrorist* in their headlines. While this study is old and thus examines a different geopolitical situation and a different age of news culture, this argument of favoring neutral terminology is sound and probably still true today.

Redden and Witschge (2010) have studied the online reporting of various media, including the online news archive of the Daily Telegraph. Although their topic is not directly connected to crime or terrorism reporting, their findings concerning the Daily Telegraph are noteworthy enough to include here. The key idea in their study was how much online news sources recycle and reuse the same texts and components, both internally (in different news items by the same publisher) and externally (using other online news sources' material). They found out that especially the online archives of traditional newspapers include several items which have at least partially the same content.

However, their results concerning The Daily Telegraph web archive were particularly interesting, considering that the same news archive is used as a data also in the present study. When studying the amount of news items within a short time period (generally seven to ten days) on five different news topics – in quite similar manner that is done in my study – The Daily Telegraph was found to include the most or second most online news concerning each of the topics when compared to a number of other newspapers and news sources, including BBC Online. The Telegraph's content was, however, not particularly much more homogenous than its competitors – a trend which was common to the online archives of traditional broadsheet newspapers in general. Additionally, The Daily Telegraph was found to commonly utilize a technique where new web articles are created by updating previous ones, while using pre-existing text as the basis for the new article. (Redden and Witschge 2010: 173-175). According to Fairclough (1992, 1995b), this type of intertextuality is common to all news article production. It simply appears to be a more transparent process in online reporting, where the articles can be updated – and new articles published – immediately when a crucial bit of new information is acquired.

4 DATA AND METHODS

This chapter includes the research questions of the present study and methods of data selection and analysis. The research questions along with their rationale are presented in the following section, after which the type and selection processes of the data used are explained in detail, followed then by a description of the analysis methods used in the study.

4.1 Research questions

The primary research question of the present study is:

- How are the Norway 2011 attacks and their perpetrator represented in the Daily Telegraph and the New York Times?

Specifically, I study what kinds of terms are used to represent the attacks and their perpetrator. A major issue of interest is to what extent the incident is represented as terrorism, as crime, or by using some other terminology to highlight the special nature and immense tragedy of the event.

In addition to the primary question, I have the following auxiliary research questions:

- How are the attacks or the perpetrator compared or contrasted to previous incidents of domestic terrorism or mass murder and the people behind those incidents?
- What types of differences, if any, can be found between the representations in the U.S. and British newspapers?
- What factors can explain these differences?

These secondary research questions have been selected based on issues that I hypothesized that were likely to emerge based on initial findings from the data and the theoretical background. The differences in data amount between the Daily Telegraph (DT) and the New York Times (NYT) were immediately evident, and the similarities between Breivik's actions and those of Kaczynski and McVeigh were also large enough to warrant more precise examination. The questions also touch on possible differences and any similarities between the two data sources, and their possible causes. While

direct comparison between US and British media is not a goal of the present study and cannot be reliably done within the limited scope of data in this study, differences found are nevertheless investigated and possible causes and reasons of such are examined.

4.2 Data

The data for this study consists of articles concerning the 2011 Norway attacks in two major English-language newspapers, The Daily Telegraph (Great Britain) and The New York Times (United States), from a period of one week after the attacks, which took place 22 July 2011. Thus the time period covered is from 22nd to 28th of July 2011. The Daily Telegraph archive contains 163 headlines from the time period in question, while The New York Times archive includes 23. The Daily Telegraph and The New York Times were chosen as the two newspapers in this study to represent British and U.S. media, respectively. Both newspapers have wide circulation: they are among the top three newspapers in their respective countries. Additionally, both are widely regarded as high-quality newspapers, both having received various journalistic awards for quality. Since this study focuses on the online news, the fact that both also have extensive and accessible online archives is naturally also a contributing factor. The number of newspapers studied was set as two due to factors related to the scope of the study – an in-depth analysis of more material is simply not within the scope of a Master's thesis.

The articles studied were taken from the web archives of abovementioned newspapers rather than from the actual paper copies. This was done for several reasons. First, since the present study concerns itself with the first news of the event in question, starting from the date of the incident and continuing only one week since, it is logical to choose sources which present the news in the fastest manner. As mentioned by Fenton (ed. 2010) and Burns (2002), one of the key advantages of the internet over print and televised media is speed. Journalists can both acquire and publish material quickly over the internet. There has been notable criticism about the quality of online reporting, but online newspapers also have the possibility to constantly update and revise their material as new information becomes available. Especially traditional broadsheet newspapers, such as The Daily Telegraph, have been found to exercise this possibility and the quality and informational diversity of their online news compare favorably to other online news sources (Redden and Witschge 2010). Even though it is true to some extent that all information in the net cannot be trusted, I find no compelling reason to

disregard online news archives maintained by well-known newspapers as a credible source.

Second, the internet is constantly becoming a more widely utilized, influential and accepted medium concerning news, as acknowledged by Burns (2002). Thus I find that ignoring online news as a subject of study is counterproductive. As the scope of material that can be studied in a Master's thesis is relatively small, all possible forms of media cannot be included. As this study concerns itself exclusively with initial reports of the event from a rather short timeframe of seven days, it is only logical to study the media which creates these reports most quickly. Based on these considerations, I have chosen to include only the online archives as material to the present study.

It is important to stress that direct comparison between the two newspapers is not a primary objective of the present study. Observations of discernible differences between the papers based on nationality or similar criteria will naturally be made as appropriate, but the primary focus is to use these two papers as representatives of the U.S. and British media. Another issue of note is that The Daily Telegraph is clearly conservative politically, while The New York Times has no directly discernible political alignment. Again, comparison between political views is not the main focus, but the political stances of the newspapers are background information that must be taken into account in the analysis. Directly comparing the British and U.S. media based solely on only two newspapers of differing political affiliations and major differences in the number and length of news items covering the topic of this study would be rather pointless.

4.3 Methods of analysis

The process of analysis was twofold. The first analysis was quantitative and statistical in nature, and concentrates on the headlines of the news. The word choices used to represent – in this case, to directly refer to – either the event or its perpetrator were analyzed and grouped into distinct categories. The second analysis type was a more in-depth analysis of select news items utilizing Fairclough's CDA to full extent. This analysis focused on particularly interesting expressions and paragraphs within the main body of text instead of only headlines, also on other ideologically loaded word choices than those directly describing the event or the perpetrator, as necessary. Texts for analysis were selected equally from all the categories in which the news items were

grouped during the first analysis. The first analysis enabled to examine the large amount of data in at least cursory detail within the scope of this study without arbitrarily completely omitting any of the news items, while the second provided more in-depth analysis of a small number of sample articles.

In the first analysis, the word choices were grouped into five main categories based on the connotations of the terms used. The following paragraphs provide a concise summary of what each category contains. The categories were selected based on the initial impressions of the data, while considering their relevance to the actual research questions (categories 1, 2, 3 and 5) and leaving an opportunity to highlight and address any potential topics of interest not covered in the actual research questions (category 4).

Category one includes word choices which represent either the incident or the perpetrator as terrorism or terrorist. Notably, any derivatives of the word *terror* (including *terrorism* or *terrorist*) belong in this category, as do any other terms or expressions which evoke images of terrorism based on their use in today's media discourse.

Category two consists of wordings which are commonly used in the media when reporting on war, major disasters, violent crime and similar topics. This primarily includes such expressions as *killings*, *murder*, *attack* or *incident* or any wording that refers to the method of the attack (e.g. *shootings*). Concerning the perpetrator, terminology such as *killer*, *murderer* or *suspect* belongs in this category, as does any reference to him by using his name.

The third category comprises of terms which emphasize the inhumanity and tragedy of the situation. This includes words which have stronger negative connotations than terms in the second category, but do not refer to terrorism. For example any reference of the incident as a *tragedy*, *massacre* or *nightmare*, or of the perpetrator as a *monster*, belongs in this category.

A fourth category exists to contain expressions that do not fit any of the above three and are for one reason or the other particularly interesting. An example of headline belonging to the fourth category is one where the attack is early on speculated to be committed by Islamic terrorists. The fourth category contains very few examples, as I

most of the headlines are covered by the other categories, but it was included in order to direct some attention to issues of particular interest in the data.

The fifth category includes headlines which do not refer to the event or perpetrator directly at all. Typically such headlines focus completely on either the event (and do not refer to the perpetrator directly) or on the perpetrator (and thus do not refer to the event directly). There are certain headlines which refer to neither the event nor its perpetrator directly but can still be seen as being *about* the event (and thus included in the study), such as focusing on the victims or the social and political aftermath of the attacks.

Since The Daily Telegraph includes several times more headlines on the topic than the New York Times, the amount of headlines allocated to the five categories is given also as a percentage value of the total amount of headlines in each newspaper to retain some level of comparability between the two. It must be stressed again that direct comparison between the papers is not a primary focus of this study and cannot be reliably done using the data available to this study. However, being able to draw at least some comparisons between the two is undeniably useful.

Some headlines contain representations that can be placed in multiple categories. Because the division of representations between terrorism and crime is a primary focus of the present study, the first category of terror-related words takes precedence over all other categories. Thus, if the event is represented as a *terror attack* which combines a category 1 terrorism term (terror) and a category 2 term (attack), the headline is allocated in category 1. Similarly, category 3 takes also precedence over category 2 since word choices such as *massacre* or *monster* can be seen as more ideologically loaded, and thus stronger, than expressions such as *killings* or *suspect* that are standard news language in this type of news.

In the second phase of the analysis, a total of ten articles were examined in more detail. Since I have two newspapers to analyze and I have already split the headlines into five different categories in the first analysis, I have chosen one article from both of the newspapers that has been allocated to each of the five categories based on the event, the perpetrator or both. This makes for two articles per category and five per newspaper. Since the second analysis is intended to build upon the work done in the first round of analysis, I have selected those articles that are for some reason or the other particularly

interesting specimens for study. While it is impossible to study all the articles with any depth within the scope of a Master's thesis, this selection allows a deeper insight into the most interesting ones.

My analysis of the selected descriptions proceeds following the guidelines of Fairclough's three-dimensional model of analysis – that is, I analyze the data in three levels: textual properties, discursive practices and social practices. The textual properties in my data that are of most interest to this study are related to vocabulary, especially alternate wordings and word choice, although other, particularly salient textual properties are examined in the second analysis. As for discursive practices, the focus is on the practices of text production, especially on the particular processes of news text production. The influence of news policies and journalistic professional norms (Soloski 1997) is attempted to be inferred from the textual properties, such as word choices, where possible. As the key discursive practices of text distribution, production and consumption are closely intertwined, the other practices are naturally studied along the main focus. As for social practices, the phenomenon of terrorism as well as the ideologies behind news text production will be focused on.

5 REPRESENTATIONS IN HEADLINES

In this chapter, I review the individual headlines of both newspapers and analyze the word choices based on Fairclough's model of CDA. The headlines are first analyzed from each newspaper individually, and the chapter concludes with comparison of similarities and differences found between the two sources.

From both newspapers, the word choices in the headlines were allocated into five categories: terrorism, crime, neutral, special interest and not mentioned, presenting the number of headlines belonging in each category as a percentage of the total. The words related to the event and the perpetrator are presented separately. Word choices which were allocated in the fourth category of *special interest* were examined individually. After the statistical data, the discursive and social practices behind the choices are examined in more detail and the final section compares the findings from each of the papers. The original headlines are included in Appendix 1 (The Daily Telegraph) and Appendix 2 (The New York Times).

For the analysis of the headlines, nothing in the content of the articles themselves is taken into account. Only the text found in the index pages of the newspapers' web pages is used as data in this analysis.

5.1 Representations of the incident

The following tables present the distribution of the headlines concerning representations of the incident between the five categories first in The Daily Telegraph (Table 1) and then in The New York Times (Table 2). The first category, *terrorism*, contains headlines which include representations that overtly refer to terrorism or any derivative of the term. The second category, *crime*, contains headlines which include representations that can be seen as normal in news reporting of violent crime. The third category, *negative*, contains those headlines which represent the event in a way that highlights the tragedy and inhumanity of the event. The fourth category, *special*, includes those headlines which do not fit into any of the predefined categories. The fifth category, *no direct reference*, contains those headlines which do not represent the incident directly.

Category	Percentage of headlines	Number (total 163)
Terrorism (1)	3.68%	6
Crime (2)	39.26%	64
Negative (3)	7.36%	12
Special (4)	1.22%	2
No direct reference (5)	48.47%	79

Table 1. Headlines concerning the event in the DT.

Category	Percentage of headlines	Number (total 23)
Terrorism (1)	4.35%	1
Crime (2)	34.78%	8
Negative (3)	8.70%	2
Special (4)	4.35%	1
No direct reference (5)	47.83%	11

Table 2. Headlines concerning the event in the NYT.

As tables 1 and 2 show, the distribution of the representations between the two newspapers' headlines is highly similar in how the headlines fall into the five categories. In both newspapers, slightly over half of the headlines include some sort of direct representation of the incident. A great majority of the representations falls in the second category, using terminology I consider standard or common in news items reporting on violent crime. Category 2 contains – in both cases – slightly over one third of the total headlines and approximately two thirds of those headlines which do directly refer to the incident. Also in both papers, category 3 is the next most prevalent, with twice as many representations as category 1 – representations with direct connotations towards terrorism are a small minority in both cases with less than 5% of the total number of headlines falling into this category. The fourth category of headlines which require special attention and/or are hard to group into the other categories contains only one or two headlines in both papers as it was supposed to. This confirms that the categories were defined successfully as most headlines fell in the primary categories.

In category 1, The Daily Telegraph was consistent in using the expression “terror attack(s)” in every instance. The New York Times used the expression ‘martyrdom operation’ instead in its only headline that was allocated to category 1. Although the expression does not directly contain any words that are derivative of the word *terror*, I included the expression in the first category due to the term’s strong implicit connotations to terrorism. In my view, this expression directly draws a parallel between Breivik and Islamic suicide attacks.

As for category 2, the term that was most used in The Daily Telegraph was “attack(s)”, which was used a total of 25 times (over one-third of all expressions in category 2). “Killings” was used six times, “(killing) spree” four times and “mass murder” once. The rest of the terms allocated in category 2 referred to the methods of the attack: “shooting”, “bombing”, “explosion” etc. of which “shooting” was the most prevalent with 17 mentions. This is not surprising considering that significantly many more people were killed in the Utoya island shooting than by Breivik’s bomb in Oslo. The New York Times used similar terminology. “Attack(s)” was again the most used expression, used four times (half of all instances in category 2). “Killing(s)” was used twice, and the methods of the attack were also referenced twice (“shooting” and “shooting and bomb attacks”).

Category 3 was in both instances the third-largest, after categories 5 (no direct reference) and 2, although still small compared to either of those two. In the Daily Telegraph, “massacre” was the most used term in this category (eight counts). “Tragedy” was used twice, and there were single instances of expressions which are taken from witness quotes: “‘absolutely horrific’ attacks” and “like a nightmare”. The two contributions to this category from the New York Times also include a “massacre”, as well as “fatal trap”. “Massacre” is by far the most used single expression in the third category, making up two thirds of all mentions in the DT and half of those in the NYT.

Only few headlines from either paper could be allocated to category 4, as was expected. From The Daily Telegraph there are two, in which the aftermath of the bombings is represented as “like a war zone” and the other is about “history of Islamic militant attacks in Europe”. The first one is special as it is the only headline – in either paper – which explicitly represents the event as comparable to war. The second one, naturally, earns its place in this category by implying that the attacks were perpetrated by Islamic

terrorists (the article is unsurprisingly from the day the events happened). The New York Times' sole contribution to this category is entitled *The Terror from Within*. This headline lands in the fourth category instead of the first for two reasons. One is the fact that this is a clear allusion to domestic terrorism. The other, the more important one, is that the headline is unquestionably vague as it is not clear whether it refers to the event, the perpetrator or domestic terrorism in general. As this stage of analysis is solely based on the headlines and not their content, the most rational choice was to label this in the fourth category concerning both the event and the perpetrator. The contents of the article itself will be analyzed in the following chapter.

In both newspapers, slightly fewer than half of the headlines did not refer directly to the event (category 5). Most of those headlines include a reference to the perpetrator instead. Such headlines can be seen as focusing on the perpetrator by not including references to the event. Similarly other headlines which refer to the event but not to the perpetrator focus on the event by not including other references.

Only a minority of the headlines refer neither to the event nor the perpetrator directly: in The Daily Telegraph, 23 headlines (14.11%) do not contain direct reference to either; in The New York Times the number is 4 (17.4%). The focus of such articles is in most instances either the victims or the large-scale social repercussions of the attack. The contents of such headlines are examined more thoroughly in section 5.3.5, including some interesting exceptions to the generalization above.

5.2 Representations of the perpetrator

The following tables present the distribution of the headlines concerning representations of the perpetrator, Anders Behring Breivik, between the five categories first in The Daily Telegraph (Table 3) and then in The New York Times (Table 4). The first category, *terrorism*, would contain the headlines which overtly represent Breivik as a terrorist (there were none). The second category, *crime*, contains headlines which represent Breivik in a manner that can be seen as normal when reporting on violent criminals. The third category, *negative*, contains those headlines which represent the perpetrator in a particularly negative way. The fourth category, *special*, includes those headlines which do not fit into any of the predefined categories. The fifth category, *no direct reference*, contains those headlines which do not include direct representation of the perpetrator.

Category	Percentage of headlines	Number (total 163)
Terrorism (1)	0.00%	0
Crime (2)	46.63%	76
Negative (3)	1.23%	2
Special (4)	2.45%	4
No direct reference (5)	49.7%	81

Table 3. Headlines concerning the perpetrator in the DT.

Category	Percentage of headlines	Number (total 23)
Terrorism (1)	0.00%	0
Crime (2)	30.43%	7
Negative (3)	4.35%	1
Special (4)	4.35%	1
No direct reference (5)	60.87%	14

Table 4. Headlines concerning the perpetrator in the NYT.

Looking at the above tables, it can be summarized that the two newspapers' representations of the perpetrator are similar – but not identical – to each other. What immediately catches the eye in both tables is that there are exactly zero expressions used in either of the newspapers which could be allocated into the first category. I will return to this later. Other than that, the distribution of representations between the categories looks quite similar to that of the representations of the event. Category 2 has most representations and the number of headlines which included no direct representation is similarly high. Categories 3 and 4 contain only few expressions. It can be quickly summarized that the perpetrator seems to be referred to more neutrally than the event, as there are no category 1 representations and significantly fewer category 3 representations than in the representations of the event. This issue is examined more thoroughly in section 5.3.3 below.

In category 2, the Daily Telegraph has noticeably more headlines which fall into this category than the New York Times. Furthermore, the two newspapers have also

differences in their choice of vocabulary within this category. The Daily Telegraph's favorite method of referencing Breivik is by using his name (48 counts, or almost two thirds of all instances in category 2). "Killer" is used second most often (23 times), "suspect" twice and "gunman" once. Two headlines have both "killer" and "Breivik" in their vocabulary and one has "suspect Anders Behring Breivik". The New York Times, on the other hand, prefers the expression "suspect" which is used four times (over half of the total in category 2). Breivik is referred to by name only once and "killer" is used twice. It is also noteworthy that a significantly larger portion of the Daily Telegraph's headlines fell into category two than those of the New York Times (46.63% vs. 30.43%).

There are in total only three headlines which represent the perpetrator that can be allocated to category 3. The Daily Telegraph uses "laughing gunman" and "quiet man who became peacetime Europe's worst mass killer" and The New York Times refers to Breivik once as a "right-wing monster" (since the NYT has so many fewer headlines overall, the single mention pushes its percentage higher than the DT's which has two mentions). Connecting something like *laughter* to mass murder and labeling Breivik directly as the *worst* mass killer within the given timeframe do certainly count as negatively colored expressions, as does labeling him a *monster*.

The four headlines from the DT which I allocated into the fourth category are all about the confusion related to the perpetrator's identity and possible accomplices. Three are phrased as questions: "who is responsible?" and "who was behind the attack?" – the third one specifies the question by positing "Was far-Right group behind the attacks?" The fourth headline is about "Mysterious group called the Knights Templar". The first three headlines, phrased as questions, are all from the first day – the day of the attacks. The fourth one dates later. As explained in the previous section, the NYT's headline *The Terror from Within* lands in category 4 concerning both the event and the perpetrator, primarily due to the vagueness of the wording in respect of the object of reference.

About half of the headlines in the DT (49.7%) and three-fifths of those in the NYT (60.87%) did not contain a direct reference to the perpetrator. However, most of those headlines that omit reference to the perpetrator include a reference to the event. Those headlines can generally be seen to focus on the event by obscuring the perpetrator. As

mentioned in the previous section, there were some headlines which omitted direct reference to both the perpetrator and the event; for more detailed investigation of those headlines, see subsection 5.3.5 below.

5.3 Noticeable themes and trends

In the following subsections I will review recurring themes and trends as well as any additional points of interest found in the above analysis of the news headlines. One issue which was not readily apparent from the analysis but is dealt with here is the conflicting numbers of victims presented in the headlines. Other themes include the difference in number of headlines between the two newspapers, the overall prevalence of category 2 neutral expressions and the tendency for the perpetrator to be represented more neutrally than the event. Also the contents of various category 4 headlines are examined here in more detail, followed by analysis of the headlines in category 5, especially the issue of what is the focus of those headlines which do not refer to either the perpetrator or the event directly.

5.3.1 Difference in number of headlines between DT and NYT

One obvious difference between the data from the two newspapers that immediately catches one's attention is the great disparity between the numbers of headlines in each. The Daily Telegraph's number of 163 headlines is more than seven times as many as The New York Times' 23. Although no certain answer as to why this is so can be found – and indeed finding such an answer is by no means crucial to the present study's results – the disparity is so noteworthy that at least a cursory glance to its probable reasons is in order.

My hypothesis is that this disparity is caused by a combination of differences in reporting norms and customs between the newspapers and differences in the geographical (and cultural) distance between United States and Norway, and Britain and Norway. Redden and Witschge (2010: 173) found that the Daily Telegraph had more online articles concerning a single topic than any other newspaper included in their study. However, many other British papers included, depending on the news topic, numbers of articles which were low enough to be comparable to the smaller number of articles posted by The New York Times. Based on these findings, a considerable difference between the norms and customs of reporting in different newspapers can be

assumed. A similar difference between newspapers in the U.S. and Britain generally cannot be assumed, since the variety in British newspapers has previously been found to be so large.

Another factor which must be taken into account when investigating the difference in the number of headlines is the geographical and cultural distance. Great Britain and Norway are both European countries with a relatively short distance from one to other and strong cultural ties dating back to the early Middle Ages. The United States, on the other hand, is far more geographically and also culturally removed from Norway and Europe. While news from Norway are foreign affairs in both countries, it can be assumed that in the Great Britain, news from such a near country as Norway are considered more important and interesting than in the United States, from where Norway can be seen as simply one Northern European country amongst others. This assumption is also supported by Burns (2002: 118) who states that the proximity of the event is crucial when determining its newsworthiness.

5.3.2 Conflicting numbers of victims

One issue which must be highlighted here is that the headlines within the seven-day timeframe give a variety of different, conflicting numbers of victims in the attacks. As mentioned in section 3.2 above, the final number of victims was 77, 69 of whom died in the shooting on Utoya island. However, higher estimates were published in the media initially, including in the headlines examined here.

The Daily Telegraph published three different estimates throughout the period in the headlines, none of which was ultimately correct. The initial victim estimate from July 23rd was “at least 87” dead. On the next day, a headline told about “85 young victims”, implying that this was the number of people killed on Utoya island. On July 26th, a headline reported that the police had revised the number of victims to 76, one lower than the actual number. The New York Times gave two estimates on the number of victims, both too high. On July 23rd the NYT reported that “at least 80” were killed in the shooting. On July 24th, a headline claimed that the total number of victims from both the shooting and the bombing was “at least 92”.

It is highly likely that the number of victims was initially thought to be higher due to the confusion after the event, with wounded people taken into hospitals and likely a number of people considered missing, with their whereabouts unknown and initially presumed dead. A full survey of the reasons of such miscalculations does not fall into the scope of this study, but the issue is important to note nevertheless. The confusion about the number of victims, as seen in the newspaper headlines, is clear evidence of how accurate information is not easy to come by in such a situation. In effect, the issue of the number of victims is focused on here to highlight the confusion and lack of information surrounding the first days after the attacks. This is something that has undoubtedly had a large effect on the production of these news texts, and thus must be taken into account in the analysis.

5.3.3 Prevalence of category 2 representations

The second category of neutral representations and standard reporting terminology was consistently the one which included the most representations in both newspapers and concerning both the event and the perpetrator. In all cases category 2 included over one third (yet less than one half) of all headlines. Although there were more category 5 “no representation” headlines in all four cases, only less than 20% of the headlines referred to neither the perpetrator nor the event.

Examining the prevalence of category 2 representations, three factors must be taken into account. First, my initial basis for category 2 was for it to contain representations which can be seen as standard and ordinary for media reporting of serious crime, war, terrorism and similar man-caused disasters which lead to considerable loss of life. As such, this is the *normal* category – it was indeed my initial prediction that it would contain the largest number of headlines. If the case were not so, my reasons for defining this specific category as it is could well be questioned. In this light, the prevalence of category 2 seems to confirm that these types of expressions are indeed the norm.

Second, as mentioned by Hoffman (1998:36), the news media tends to favor neutral terminology over expressions which carry significant ideological connotations. While I must acknowledge that this statement is certainly not universally true, especially in the world of tabloid newspapers, but regarding the newspapers analyzed in the present study, both known for their quality, this can be taken at face value in the current context. This is indeed the primary reason why this category is considered the normal

one as mentioned above. Although Hoffman's study is not wholly comparable to this one, dealing with different types of terrorism news in a different time, the similarity of these findings to those presented by Hoffman cannot be ignored. It is also reasonable to assume that striving for reporting which is as objective as possible is a part of many newspapers' news policies and many journalists' professional norms (Soloski 1997).

The second factor that must be appreciated is that the headlines studied here are all from the first week after the attacks. Thus, they include the very first news composed by these newspapers over the issue. Related to this point, it must be remembered that there was a great deal of uncertainty and lack of proven information on the issue. It was not initially certain who or which group was behind the attacks, and Islamic terrorist organizations were suspected, among others. There was great confusion about the number of victims. Breivik also claimed from the start to be part of a larger organization, and there was a search for possible accomplices by the Norwegian police. This means that a neutral tone would be preferable if avoiding of speculation and disinformation is desired by the media. This, of course, is yet another reason why it can be assumed that neutral tones are preferred by newspapers and journalists.

Using neutral, even vague, terminology is a necessity in a situation where accurate information is scarce and almost all information on the event is uncertain, provided that at least somewhat objective and accurate representation of the issue in question is desired. As we can infer from previous studies, giving an objective representation is usually an important goal for news media. These factors can, in my view, explain the high number of category 2 headlines.

5.3.4 Perpetrator represented more neutrally than the event

In the light of the results of analyzing the headlines, an argument can be made that the perpetrator is overall represented in a more neutral manner than the event in both of the newspapers. The key points which support this argument are as follows. First, there were zero instances in both newspapers that labeled Breivik directly as a terrorist. Second, there were also significantly less category 3 expressions than when concerning the event, again in both newspapers. In numbers, more than 95% of the Daily Telegraph's and over 90% of the New York Times' headlines fell into categories 2 (neutral) and 5 (no direct reference) concerning the perpetrator. While these two

categories were the two most common also when referring to the event, the number of headlines was somewhat lower, less than 90% of the headlines in both papers.

Perhaps the most interesting single result of this part of the analysis is that while both newspapers referred to the event as *terrorism* – although only a few times– neither directly labeled the perpetrator as a *terrorist*. In part this tendency can be attributed to the lack of information available. As accurate, verifiable information was very scarcely available to the media during the first days after the attack – as evidenced by conflicting reports of the number of casualties, for example – labeling a person as *terrorist* would likely have been too risky, in case that some new information becomes available. However, the existence of the incident itself cannot be denied and thus it can be labeled more freely – although overt references of terrorism are rare also when concerning the incident.

Another issue is that there are less category 3 representations of Breivik than of the attack throughout. In the DT, 7.36% of all representations of the incident fell into category three, while only 1.23% of those of the perpetrator went into the same category. The NYT had 8.7% of representations of the incident and half of that, 4.35% of representations of the perpetrator, in the third category. Again, my hypothesis here is that it could be considered easier and more in line with journalistic norms to describe events in very negative terms than to apply those same terms to people. It must be remembered that at the time when these headlines were written, there was no certainty on even the issue of whether Breivik worked alone or not. In such circumstances, it may well be easier and more prudent to describe the event as a *massacre* rather than the person who caused it as a *monster*.

5.3.5 Headlines in category 4

Category four is the odd category for those representations that do not fit anywhere else or merit special investigation otherwise. Such category could not be expected to contain many representations, and that is the case. In the DT, two of the headlines (1.22%) were allocated to this category concerning the event, and four (2.45%) concerning the perpetrator. In the NYT, a single headline (4.25% of the total) was allocated to this category regarding both the event and the perpetrator.

Of the category four headlines in the DT, five of the six had something to do with the initial uncertainty of the perpetrator of the attacks. Two headlines were flat out questions: *who is responsible* and *who was behind the attacks*. A third one, likely backed up with some more available information about the attacks, posits the question of whether a *far-right group* was behind the attacks. The fourth is entitled “*Mysterious group called the Knights Templar*”, alluding to the possible existence of a terrorist group or network behind the attacks. The fifth one is about the *history of Islamic militant attacks in Europe*, and based on the headline it appears to give background information based on the initial misconception that the attacks might have been perpetrated by Islamic terrorists. The final category four headline in the DT, which is the only one not to directly touch the uncertainty issue, explicitly compares the scene of the attacks to be *like a war zone*.

As seen above in section 5.3.2, the lack of accurate information again characterizes the representations found in the headlines from the first days after the attacks. Instead of referring to Breivik directly, the first headlines have to make do with positing questions about the identity of the attacker, and later about whether he acted alone or if there was an organization – right-wing or Islamic – behind the attacks. There is even an implicit reference to Islamic terrorists in the fifth headline, published when nothing was certain about the attacks. This shows that there is a definite connection between a terror attack and Islamic terrorists in the modern Western discourse of terrorism, as mentioned by Fairclough (2006). There is also speculation of whether there was a group or organization behind Breivik; this speculation is also evident in the category 5 headlines by the DT discussed at more length in the following section. The sole mention of *like a war zone* is interesting in its own right; the carnage wrought by the attacks is seen as so massive that it is directly comparable to war instead of only crime.

The NYT includes the headline “*The Terror from Within*”, which I have allocated into category four related to both the event and the perpetrator. It does include the word *terror*, which makes it a candidate for the first category, but the wording is vague enough so that it cannot be clearly assessed whether the headline refers to the event, the perpetrator or the issue of domestic terrorism in a larger scale. This makes it a special case that belongs to the fourth category. This headline is noteworthy as it is both an explicit reference to domestic terrorism, and the only headline which carries even implicit association of Breivik as a terrorist. The contents of this article are examined

more thoroughly in the next chapter, as the NYT's representative of a category four article.

Based on the headlines from the DT, uncertainty of the people or faction behind the attacks can be seen as a central theme in category four articles; however, there are not very many of these articles considering the total amount of headlines included in the data and thus the uncertainty-representations do not merit a category of their own. The war zone reference is different enough from the usual category two headlines to merit a special mention here. The Terror from Within is one of the most interesting headlines in the whole data yet special enough in its vagueness so that it cannot be allocated to any other category.

5.3.6 Headlines in category 5

As already mentioned, slightly less than half of the headlines do not represent either the event or the perpetrator directly (slightly over 60% of the headlines of the NYT do not refer to the perpetrator). Most of such headlines, however, do represent the other instance (perpetrator or event). Only 23 headlines (14.11%) in the DT and 4 headlines (17.4%) of in the NYT include no direct reference to either.

The focus of such headlines includes interesting differences between the two newspapers. Considering the number of headlines – 23 versus 4 – it is hardly surprising that the DT includes more variation in the topics of its headlines which do not refer to the event or the perpetrator.

To start with The New York Times, three of the headlines focus on the social and cultural repercussions of the attack in Norway, and the fourth focuses on the victims. The social aftermath is represented with words such as *the past is a foreign country*, that both *justice* and *vengeance* are necessary, and a declaration that the society will be kept open. The single victim-focused headline focuses on a single survival story, the persons' *faith in politics unshaken* despite the tragedy.

The victims and social issues also form a large group (together 11 out of 23) of the headlines in The Daily Telegraph. Notably, these two issues are intertwined in few of the DT's headlines, such as *Norway holds minute of silence for victims*. Survival stories (*16-year old played dead among bodies to survive*) and the social aftermath (*Paradise*

lost) are also present. However, two additional types of focus are found in the DT that were completely absent in the NYT. There are a total of 8 headlines which deal with the effects of the event to the British society, including news about British right-wing bloggers and statements by Prime Minister Cameron that the threat of similar incidents happening in Britain is taken under surveillance. There are also a couple of headlines which are intertwined with those that deal with British responses to the attacks, which speculate the possibility of a larger organization – either “The Knights Templar” or some generic right-wing organization – behind Breivik.

6 REPRESENTATION IN ARTICLES

This chapter elaborates on the foundation of the analysis presented in the previous chapter. Representation of the event and the perpetrator is analyzed thoroughly in each article, following the categories presented in the previous chapter's analysis. The analysis in this chapter focuses on the textual properties level of Fairclough's CDA, touching on also the discursive practices level as appropriate – as mentioned in the second chapter, these layers do overlap significantly. The main discussion related to the discursive and social practices related to these textual properties will be found in chapter 7. However, in addition to these representations and categories, any other issues worthy of notice are also examined. In particular, this applies to any recurring patterns in the articles and any connection to other noted cases of domestic terrorism.

From The Daily Telegraph, the article "*At least 87' killed as Norway terror attacks rock Oslo and youth camp*" and from The New York Times the article *Oslo Suspect Cultivated Parallel Life to Disguise 'Martyrdom Operation'* were chosen for analysis as representing the first category. In the second category are articles *Norway killer Breivik plagiarized American 'Unabomber'* (DT) and *Norway Shooting and Bomb Attack Leaves at Least 92 Dead* (NYT). The third category is represented by *New Zealand teenager youngest of Norway massacre victims* (DT) and *A Right-Wing Monster* (NYT). *Was far-Right group behind the attacks?* (DT) and the NYT's especially interesting headline *Terror from Within* represent category four. In the fifth category, the examined articles are *British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals* (DT) and *Justice? Vengeance? You Need Both* (NYT).

6.1 Category 1

The Daily Telegraph article *'At least 87' killed as Norway terror attacks rock Oslo and youth camp* is dated July 23rd and was thus written very soon after the attacks took place. Thus it is not surprising that the article's content primarily focuses on providing what information about the attacks is available and what the immediate responses were, quoting authorities, politicians, eyewitnesses and survivors. The implications of the attack for Britain are also touched on. The New York Times article *Oslo Suspect Cultivated Parallel Life to Disguise 'Martyrdom Operation'* is from a later date – July 25th – and it has a very different focus and tone, being almost exclusively about the background of Anders Breivik.

The DT article quotes a statement by Norwegian justice ministry that the perpetrator was “Anders Behring Breivik, a 32 year-old Norwegian national”. No additional information besides the name, age and nationality is given. However, it is noteworthy that Breivik is referred to as a *terrorist* twice in the article. He is also referred to as a *gunman*. At the time when the article was written, it was reported that officials “believe” Breivik was also responsible for the Oslo bombing, but “have not ruled out the possibility that he had accomplices”. Especially from the last part it is evident that at the time of the writing of this article, there was not much information available. The description of Breivik is likely brief because that was the only information available to the media.

This confusion and lack of information about the details of the perpetrator is further backed up by the confusion about the number of victims evident in the article as well as the confusion about the perpetrators initially. The article claims that “at least 87 people were feared dead”, backing the statement with conflicting reports from the officials. In the second paragraph of the article, the police are quoted stating that 10 people are confirmed dead from the shooting and seven from the bombing, with the “total was likely to rise”. However, in the first paragraph, the police “say that at least 80 people were killed in the youth camp after initially reporting the death toll at 10”. These two statements show that the number of victims was certainly unclear to even the authorities initially. Furthermore, the people involved in rescuing the survivors are reported as having seen “between 20 and 30 bodies” and “at least 20 dead people” in the water around the island. The article also reports initial evident confusion about the perpetrator (although Breivik had been identified at the time the article was written). There had been “repeated warnings that al-Qaeda was planning...attack” in countries involved in the war in Afghanistan, such as Norway. Also “at least one Islamic terror group” had taken responsibility for the attacks, although the officials quickly found out that the attack was not the work of Islamic terrorists.

The attacks were described in very strong and negative terms in the DT article. Breivik “massacred teenagers” and “mowed down students” on the island and the victims made “desperate attempts” to avoid the bullets. The “powerful explosion” or the bomb “devastated” or “caused widespread destruction”. “Bodies lay strewn among the devastation” and a journalist said the bombing area was “like a war zone”. The

Norwegian prime minister Jens Stoltenberg was said to be “struggling to cope with the enormity of the attack”. Almost every description of the attacks – either the shooting or the bomb – had strong adjectives added to emphasize the severity and horror of what happened.

Considering how recent the DT article is – a day after the attacks – it can be seen as somewhat surprising that the term *terrorist* is used when information seems to be very scarce. However, one possible cause can be found in the comments from British and U.S. politicians quoted in the article. President Barack Obama was quoted as offering “any support [The United States] can” and co-operation in preventing such “horrible attacks”. The British Prime Minister David Cameron, along with his condolences, was quoted as saying that the “attacks are a stark reminder of the threat we all face from *terrorism*”. One cannot ignore the fact that the British Prime Minister has publicly used the word *terrorism* in connection with these attacks, which can be seen as ‘permitting’ the media to also do so. However, it must be remembered that terrorism is an issue familiar to the British, and thus the term may be used more freely in British media than for example in the Nordic Countries, so Cameron’s statement is by no means the only possible cause of the Telegraph using *terrorism* in their headline. It is simply the one connection that can be explicitly made based on the text.

The short description of Breivik from 23rd day is in stark contrast to the NYT article from 25th day, which provides an entire news article full of information about Breivik: the focus is not on the attacks, but mostly on investigating how Breivik became a mass murderer, based on quotes from people who knew him, expert opinions and even some quotes from Breivik’s manifesto. Regarding the manifesto, a connection is drawn in the article to an American domestic terrorist: it is mentioned that Breivik copied parts of the Unabomber’s manifesto to his own. This article is notably different to the DT one in tone as well. Compared to the explicitly negative expressions and the word *terrorist* used by the DT, the NYT article utilizes less direct descriptors and somewhat more reserved terminology.

The attacks are referred to as “mass murder”, “bomb [Breivik] detonated” and *[Breivik’s]“martyrdom operation”*, the last one quoted from Breivik’s manifesto. These words are all quite descriptive of the event and are not particularly ideologically loaded with the exception of the *martyrdom operation* quote. Even then, the loaded term – it is

hard to argue that a “martyrdom operation” which leads to dozens of innocent victims does not immediately bring terrorism to mind – is quoted verbatim from the perpetrator’s writing and is not something the journalists themselves came up with. Thus, compared to the DT article, the NYT article describes the attack in quite neutral and detached manner and from a different viewpoint.

Throughout the article, it is almost always the voices of interviewed people – and most often in direct quotes – which describe Breivik. When such source is not used, he is simply referred to “Mr. Breivik” at all times, never using descriptive representations such as *killer* or *terrorist*. The descriptions from people who knew something about Breivik – former colleagues, classmates and such – primarily focus on two areas: Breivik being “ordinary” and the fact that he was not always a right-wing radical. On the issue of ordinariness, Breivik is referred to as: “unremarkable, one of the crowd, easy to forget”, and “quiet but intelligent”. All of the descriptions seem to underline that he was perceived as an ordinary person and the fact that he turned out to be the perpetrator of these attacks was highly surprising. There is also a similar mention to Breivik’s past: he is referred to as “Once a schoolboy who was fond of hip-hop and had a Muslim best friend”.

An interesting fact is that this article seems to be an excellent example of the issues Powell (2011) highlights in reporting domestic terrorism. She states that domestic terrorists are described focusing on the perpetrator’s intelligence, planning and mental instability, and that domestic terrorists are personalized in media while foreign terrorists are angry, extremist and often depersonalized. The media is also said to search for a motive for the act. (Powell 2011: 98-100). Reviewing the word choices in the article, Breivik is said to be “intelligent” and the efforts he made to plan his attacks are highlighted several times: he is said to have been “plotting” the attack, “fine-tuning” the bomb and to have maintained his double life “meticulously”. Although there are no word choices that would unambiguously label Breivik as insane, the article offers quotes from Breivik’s acquaintances which suggest a few possible “breaking points” which may have steered Breivik towards this act, including a mention that when Breivik’s sister moved to United States, Breivik began to “spiral”. As mentioned above, a degree of personalization is clearly evident in the article, which indeed focuses on what type of person Breivik is – and even more on what he *was* like before he became a

violent extremist. Similarly one can see a degree of searching for a motive in how the article attempts to find the reasons which led to the tragedy.

However, Breivik's representation in the article also matches two of Powell's criteria of reporting foreign terrorism: in addition to representing Breivik as dangerously well-prepared and searching for a motive in the act, the article highlights Breivik's extremist views and anger. He is mentioned as "dedicated" to his "martyrdom operation" and as seeing immigrants and people who accommodate them as "enemies" and "traitors worthy of execution". In addition to that, he is stated to believe he is a part of "resistance movement" instead of a terrorist or mass murderer. An expert is quoted as saying that Breivik has "an apocalyptic view" and that he sees himself as "part of history".

As a whole, the article highlights both traits common to reporting domestic and foreign terrorism according to Powell (ibid.). However, I find that the traits of domestic terrorism reporting are more overt than the foreign terrorism reporting traits. Much more focus is given to representing Breivik as a dangerously intelligent man who carefully planned his actions and implying – but never stating directly – that he might not be entirely sane than representing him as *simply* an angry extremist.

6.2 Category 2

The Daily Telegraph article *Norway killer Breivik plagiarized American 'Unabomber'* is from July 24th, two days after the attacks. The article focuses on a connection between Breivik and a U.S. domestic terrorist, the Unabomber. The New York Times article, *Norway Shooting and Bomb Attack Leaves at Least 92 Dead*, is from the same date. It is an extensive report of the attacks and what was known at the time about its background, while also including interesting references to other acts of terrorism.

The DT article mentions twice "twin attacks" where "at least 93 people" were killed. The number of victims is well off the actual number (77), which shows that there was still some confusion and misinformation about the attacks at the time the article was written. "Martyrdom operation" is also mentioned once, quoted from Breivik's manifesto as in the above-discussed NYT article. Breivik is referred to as "(Anders Behring) Breivik", "the suspect" and "the 32-year old". Regarding direct

representations, this article thus utilizes the neutral word choices that can be seen as typical for this type of reporting.

However, the main content of the article is not the attacks themselves – they were already covered the previous day by the DT article discussed in the previous section. This article focuses on connections and comparison between Breivik and U.S. domestic terrorist Theodore Kaczynski, also known as the Unabomber. Breivik and Kaczynski are actually referred to as “*two terrorists*” in the article. The explicit connection between the two – the fact that Breivik copied parts of Kaczynski’s manifesto – is mentioned in other articles, and in this one as well. However, this article delves deeper into the issue.

Breivik is mentioned to have lifted key sections of his manifesto from Kaczynski’s writings, although he has replaced some words – a mentioned example is “*leftist*” with “*cultural Marxist*”. It is also stated that although Breivik has included citations in his text, Kaczynski has not been credited for his writing. Interestingly, experts interviewed for the article think that Breivik was inspired by Kaczynski, and that there are similarities between the two. A police researcher is quoted in the article as saying “The Unabomber was very intelligent and who [sic] was also a person that was very difficult to detect,” about similarities between the two.

This article provides an unambiguous answer to one of the key questions of this study: Breivik’s actions were indeed compared to previous cases of domestic terrorism in other countries, and it was done to the extent that it was the focus of an article two days after the attacks. It must be noted that in this case, a British newspaper draws the parallel between Breivik and an American terrorist. Of course, there exists a tangible connection between the two – the fact that Breivik has used Kaczynski’s material as basis for his writings.

The NYT article describes the attacks in many different ways. There are neutral terms such as “twin attacks...that killed at least 92 people” and multiple cases of “the attacks” – standard terminology based on the findings of this study, with special note going to the fact that the assumed number of victims differs both from the actual number and from the estimate of the Daily Telegraph from the same date. However, negative representations which would have been fallen in the third category in the headline

analysis are also used: “the deadliest attack [since World War II]” as well as these descriptions: “[Breivik] coolly and methodically shot them”, “hunting down those who fled” which evokes a negative reaction by giving such a detailed account of the act that seems quite gruesome. However, a third tendency also emerges in the representations. The attack is also represented in very detached, analytical, even clinical terms: “operation”, “a remarkably meticulous attack” – Breivik is also said to have “directed his firepower”. Finally, the article outright states that *this is domestic terrorism*. It seems that both the negative descriptions and the clinically analytic ones work to highlight danger – in this case, danger of domestic terrorism.

There is also a wide variety of phrases used to describe Breivik: “the Norwegian man”, “the suspect”, “Anders Behring Breivik” and “Mr. Breivik” (the last of which seeming at this point to represent a standard procedure of naming crime perpetrators in the New York Times) are the neutral terms used. More descriptive representations come in quotes from acquaintances and a police official: “gun-loving Norwegian obsessed with what he saw was threats of multiculturalism and Muslim immigration” and “right wing and Christian fundamentalist, respectively”. In addition to these, there is also the definite terrorism connection: Breivik is said to be *the Norwegian equivalent to Timothy McVeigh*. Here, he is compared to another known domestic terrorist, again from the U.S. This can be seen as a justified comparison, since McVeigh also targeted the government over a perceived ‘injustice’, as did Breivik at least to some extent – both actually bombed a government building in their attacks.

In addition to this connection to domestic terrorism, Breivik’s manifesto is compared and contrasted to the rhetoric of Al Qaeda. A terrorism expert is quoted as stating that Breivik’s writings bear an “eerie resemblance to [writings] of...Al Qaeda leaders..from a Christian rather than Muslim point of view”. Both are said to contain same elements, such as “accounts of the Crusade”s, “a sense of historical grievance” and call for “apocalyptic warfare to...defeat the enemy”. Indeed, the expert states that Breivik’s writing “seems an attempt to mirror Al Qaeda, exactly in reverse”.

6.3 Category 3

The Daily Telegraph article *New Zealand teenager youngest of Norway massacre victims* is dated July 28th, so it follows the attacks by almost a week. This short article highlights the human tragedy by focusing on a single victim of the attack. The New

York Times article *A Right-Wing Monster* is from 25th day, and focuses again on Breivik – this time on his agenda and repercussions of Breivik’s actions on the issues he has highlighted in his manifesto. The article provides yet more interesting connections to U.S. domestic terrorism and political crime history.

As for the direct representations of the event and perpetrator, the DT article has only a few. The inevitable “attacks” appears once. “The shootings...and bomb attack” and “car bomb” are also used. In addition to these three *neutral* representations, there are three of the *negative* category: two instances of “massacre” and a mention of “horrific shootings”. The perpetrator is represented by using his name and the term “lone gunman”. Additionally, a person who knew Breivik when he was young is quoted stating that Breivik was a “troublesome child”. This article gives the number of victims as 76, with a mention that this is not a final number and the officials believe that the number may still increase. As the actual number of victims was 77, this is the closest estimate in any of the articles studied this far. This is not surprising as the article follows the attacks by several days. There is evidently no significant confusion about the number as was the case in earlier articles where even 15 more victims were presumed than there actually were.

As a whole, the attacks and Breivik are clearly not in the focus in this text, and are thus directly referred to less than in the other articles. The primary focus of this article is identifying the “believed youngest victim” of the attacks: a 14-year old girl born in New Zealand. The girl’s parents are also interviewed for the article. The police are mentioned as releasing the names of the victims as they are identified at the moment of the article’s writing, and the young age of the victims is again highlighted. The article states that “most of the victims [whose names were released the previous day] were less than 20 years old” and “ten of the names released today are teenagers”. When considering this emphasis on the victims, the negative descriptors attached to the event in the article are hardly surprising. An interesting phenomenon can also be found regarding the headline: it speaks of a *New Zealand teenager* while the contents of the article specify that the girl in question was born in New Zealand but lived most of her life in Norway. This might be a case of emphasizing a connection to the English-speaking world, which would not be completely unfathomable considering that the newspaper in question is British.

The NYT article departs from the norm observed thus far regarding the representations of the attacks. The attacks are not specifically described in this article – the agenda behind them and the attacks’ impact on European politics is discussed instead. The attacks are referred to once as *crimes* which must be “denounced”, but the most of the representations are more on the third category side: “mass murder of helpless teenagers”, “tragedy”, “the horror in Norway” and “terrible atrocity”. There is also a direct terrorism representation: “the Norwegian’s act of terrorism”. The representation of Breivik is also rather different than in the other articles. Except when referring to him by his name, all the representations highlight both his ideology and the monstrosity of his actions: Breivik is referred to as “psychotic ideologue of the right”, “a true right-wing radical” and finally in what also gave the article its headline, “a distinctively right-wing kind of monster”. These representations clearly follow a theme, being almost uniformly of the kind that were sorted in category 3 in the headline analysis. A more thorough inspection of the article’s content and themes below provides a solid justification for choosing this type of terminology.

As it happens to be, the article is clearly right-wing politically itself. It argues that outside of the immediate context, Breivik’s arguments (in his manifesto) are quite similar to those voiced by European “mainstream cultural conservatives” including several political leaders, such as David Cameron, Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy. The article is actually quite straightforward about this agenda: it outright states that “On the big picture, Europe’s cultural conservatives are right” in that immigration and Islam are a problem in Europe. There is also direct criticism of the EU – which is said to be looking “more like a folly every day” and a perceived European way of handling conservatism or right-wing politics: there is a statement that European governing classes believe that immigration, multiculturalism and national identity are problems only for bigots, racists and fascists. This is clearly a text with a social agenda.

The abovementioned agenda is not, however, only to judge European governments. The primary agenda, based on the above statements, is a warning. The article presents the idea that Breivik’s actions and his motivations should not be seen as a reason to reject all criticism towards multiculturalism right-of-center political views. Indeed, the article even states that while Breivik’s actions were terrible, the underlying ideology has to be “admitted”, and warns that it would be easy to condemn criticism to these issues after such a right-wing act of terrorism. Based on these considerations, the selection of terms

used to refer to the attacks and Breivik throughout the article leave little to the doubt. The constant emphasis of Breivik as right-wing may serve as a sort of reminder that Breivik's underlying ideology – while not his methods – is indeed shared by “mainstream cultural conservatives”, such as the article's target audience (at least partially) and its writer (almost certainly). There is a rhetoric emphasizing that an act of terrorism, and/or a terrible crime, has been done based on a legitimate ideology shared by a number of people and world leaders. On the other hand, the focus on the horror and atrocity of the attacks and reference to Breivik as “psychotic” and a “monster” seems to be a sort of defense mechanism – a textual way to distance Breivik and his actions from the ‘good’ conservatives, after such a direct mention of a shared ideology.

The article also contains references to U.S. domestic terrorism and crime: in this case to ubiquitous Unabomber but also, if quite tangentially, Jared Loughner, the man who shot Congress representative Gabrielle Giffords. The Unabomber, Theodore Kaczynski, is used in the article in comparison to Al Gore to create a parallel to the relationship between Breivik and the European conservatives. The article argues that Kaczynski's views on modern consumerist society and environmentalism are basically similar to former U.S. presidential candidate Al Gore's. However, the argument continues, Kaczynski's methods of terrorism do not discredit the idea, which is still naturally better pursued through Gore's political and media actions than terrorism. This is seen as a parallel situation to the one between Breivik and European leaders such as the abovementioned Cameron, Merkel and Sarkozy. On the other hand, Jared Loughner is mentioned only in passing – it is stated that he was initially thought to be similar right-wing extremist to Breivik, but Loughner was actually found to be insane. In short, the NYT article is noteworthy in two aspects. The first is that the article is unapologetically right-wing politically in its attitude and actually accepts the basic arguments of Breivik's ideology. The other is that of all the analyzed articles, it is the one which most negatively represents Breivik, as a psychotic monster.

6.4 Category 4

The Daily Telegraph article analyzed here, *Was far-Right group behind the attacks?*, dates from July 23rd – the day following the attacks – is essentially speculation on who were behind the Norway attacks. The article is so recent after the attacks that while Breivik was captured when it was written, there is evidently very little information made public at that point. The New York Times piece, *Terror from Within* is from July

26th and is a rather introspective text which muses on the recent mass killings in the U.S. and now in Norway and their possible causes.

The DT article contains only few direct representations of the attacks or the perpetrator: Breivik is referred to only as “the captured suspect” and “gunman”. His name is not mentioned in the article. The event is represented as, “bomb” and “shootings”, “attack” and “terrorist attacks”. Taking into account the early publishing date and comparing the text to the other articles, it is evident that there had been very little information about the attacks available at the time of writing. There is no estimate of the number of victims, and Breivik’s name is not used at all, likely due to the identity of the captured perpetrator not being released at the time. It is also noteworthy that the term *suspect* is used: there is no certainty that the right person has been apprehended – at least this is not clear to the media. The main content of the article, speculation on who the aggressors were – which is discussed in the next chapter – supports this view that the article has been written with a minimal amount of verified information available.

In the speculation on who was behind the attacks, the article interestingly holds a stance that an Arabic terrorist faction – al-Qaeda is specifically named – is likely to be behind the attacks, although “a far-Right group” or “right-wing extremists” are also speculated as possible culprits. A number of possible motives for al-Qaeda to attack Norway are suggested in the article. One is the presence of Norwegian troops in Afghanistan, and it is also specified that the Labor party, whose summer camp was attacked by Breivik, authorized the troops’ deployment there. An al-Qaeda leader is also mentioned as having said in 2007 that al-Qaeda would target Norway if the Norwegian troops participated in war against Muslims. Attacking multiple targets at once is also quoted as being a favored tactic of al-Qaeda. However, although Islamist groups are presented as arguably the most likely suspect, intelligence analysts are quoted “refusing to rule out the possibility” that the attacks were performed by right-wing extremists. One reason to suspect this is identified: the fact that the suspect is Norwegian. This is in turn commented on by a reminder that al-Qaeda is known to recruit locals and that Norwegian citizens have been ‘trained’ in the Middle East. Yet it must also be taken into account that ever since the September 11 attacks in the U.S. in 2001, the Western world has had a tendency to equate *terrorism* to Al Qaeda and similar Islamic organization.

Based on these facts, it can be seen that at first, the attacks were likely thought to be work of Islamic terrorists. However, al-Qaeda or other groups are not directly accused of the act in this text. Instead, a number of possible reasons why they might have done it are listed, while the possibility that the attacks were perpetrated by right-wing extremists is also highlighted. An interesting fact here is that the representation of foreign terrorists, when initially suspected for the act, seems to follow Powell's (2011: 100-103) findings of reporting international terrorism. The most prevalent possible motive, Norway's involvement in Afghanistan, ties to the fact that revenge is identified as one of the key motives of foreign terrorists in media. The article also exclusively discusses organizations, as opposed to individuals, in this regard – Powell identifies ties to an international terrorist organization another key characteristic of foreign terrorism reporting.

The New York Times article is also quite light on direct representations: the attacks are described as “killings”, “slaughter” and “tragedy” while Breivik is only referred to by his name. These few representations are due to the fact that the article is structured quite similarly to the one analyzed in the previous sub-section: this is an opinion piece, not a direct report of the events. The key ‘agenda’ of the article is that although humans tend to attribute danger to foreign and outside sources, most of acts of violence are actually committed by people of the same background or nationality than the victim. Essentially the article appears to argue that internal threats, such as domestic terrorism, should be taken seriously instead of blaming external factions or foreign cultures.

The article lists a large number of examples of large-scale or otherwise notorious instances of intra-cultural violence. The first reference is to the Oklahoma bomber, Timothy McVeigh. The article notes that in both McVeigh's and Breivik's case, the authorities' initial reaction was to suspect “extremists or jihadists” – the DT article analyzed above gives a perfect example of this in the Norway case. In addition to this comparison, the article gives more examples: the most known U.S. school shootings and political assassinations such as those of John F. Kennedy and Anwar Sadat. Again, Breivik is compared to McVeigh in terms of scale – their attacks left a particularly large number of victims. The latter examples move on a larger scale of civil wars, referring both the current ones in Middle East and the historical case of U.S. civil war, before literally going Biblical with Cain and Abel references. The apparent purpose of this listing is to create a sense of history of intra-cultural violence, going as far as citing

religious texts as having examples of such. A non-violent example of ‘blaming the foreign’ is also given: some of those who cannot accept president Obama continue to falsely claim that he is a foreigner.

Thus, while the topic is different than in the previous NYT article which defended right-wing values, the underlying idea is the same – to affect reader opinion. In this case, the article seems to function as a reminder that the issue of intra-cultural violence is an existing phenomenon – and an old one at that – and must be lived with. The blame should not be shifted on external sources. The article hammers the point home with its conclusion: a quote from an unnamed Norwegian scholar on Breivik: “He’s one of us.”, further noting that it makes “the tragedy both scary and familiar”.

Regarding the two articles in this category, it must be noted that there were particularly few direct representations of both Breivik and the event in both of them. This is naturally due to the fact that one of the articles was published before almost any information about the event or its perpetrator was released, while the other focuses on the socio-cultural impact of the event rather than the event itself. It is also important to remember that these two articles were selected for further study because they both were issued in the ‘special’ fourth category according to their headlines, each for a different reason. Based on this, it cannot be seen as excessively surprising that the direct representations of the three easily identified categories of terror, crime and ‘particularly negative’ are not as ubiquitous here as in most of the other articles.

6.5 Category 5

The DT article, *British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals*, is dated July 25th and, is mostly about the purported existence of a right-wing group called the Knights Templar. The NYT article, *Justice? Vengeance? You Need Both*, is from 28th day of the same month, and continues the trend of the NYT’s articles of the socio-political repercussions of the attacks, in this case focusing on the dilemma of justice and revenge.

The DT article is yet another one which has only a few direct representations of either Breivik or the attacks. Breivik is mentioned by name, and also referred to as a “crackpot”. The only reference to the attacks is a quote by a British right-wing blogger: “killing [of] innocent Norwegian children in the name of anti-government politics”.

Compared to any of the other articles analyzed, the fact that the attacks are barely referred to at all immediately catches the attention. Aside of the above quote, there is no mention of the event at all. However, considering that there have been two full days to report the incident – plus any other news articles from the same day – and the fact that the focus of the article is not on either Breivik or his actions, this is understandable. After all, there are 163 headlines from seven days related to the attacks in the DT online archive – it can hardly be assumed that all of them share content.

Instead of Breivik or the attacks, the article's focus is on a possible connection to a larger network: the article's person of interest is British right-wing blogger Paul Ray, who was suspected of being a part of the alleged group "The Knights Templar" which Breivik mentioned and claimed to be a member of in his manifesto. Unsurprisingly, Mr. Ray adamantly denies any such connection in his interview in the article, and denounces Breivik as a crackpot whose actions have "no place in modern civilized society". The article does provide the basis on which Ray was suspected of being a member of Breivik's network, but the basis amounts to basically quotes from Breivik's writing and similarity between two people's online nicknames, which cannot be seen as actual proof in any circumstances. Paul Ray is also allowed his defensive comments, but other than that, the article is remarkably neutral in its word choices on whether the allegations are true or not.

Although considering that there has not been any actual proof of the existence of the alleged "Knights Templar" organization at all in the years after the attacks, the article may initially appear as questionably newsworthy speculation. However, it must be taken into account that the writers of the article have not had years to speculate, merely a few days – and the threat of anti-multicultural domestic terrorist organization is considerable in a different manner in those circumstances, with little to no investigation being completed and the aftershock of the events still being fresh. In that sense, this article seems to be similar to the previous category's DT piece, speculating on ideas that were thought plausible or likely at the time but turned out not to be.

As is the case with the DT article, the NYT piece has only few scant references to Breivik and even less to his deeds. Initially, Breivik is referred to as "the man who has confessed to massacring 76 people" and later in the same paragraphs the attacks are said to be "a monstrous atrocity". Later on in the article, the writer refers to a study which

states that most people accept death penalty for “the worst of the worst” and that “Mr. Breivik qualifies to that distinction”. Neither Breivik nor the attacks were explicitly referred to in the headline, and they are not the primary focus of the article’s body text either – instead, the prime topic of this article is the question of what would be a suitable punishment to Breivik for his crimes. As mentioned above, there are few words dedicated to the description of the events. There is no evidence of any doubt of who the guilty party is – although the victim count is still off, if only by one. This article clearly presupposes the reader already knows the details, and instead focuses on the future. The article is written by Thane Rosenbaum, who is at the end explicitly identified as a law professor writing a book on revenge – a fact which I find important to know before analyzing the article’s subject matter. This is due to the fact that this is clearly a moral treatise more than a reporting of what took place in Norway.

In this article, the writer compares the situation to two topical U.S. cases: one where a mother is awaiting trial for the suspected murder of her own child, and another where a child murderer is about to be released from prison after 28 years. The first case is compared to the matter which is about to become topical in Norway at the time the article was written: what will be Breivik’s punishment, as Norway does not use capital punishment and the normal maximum sentence is 21 years in prison. The second case is highlighted via a question – can any prison sentence with a possibility of release be a just punishment for such cruel crimes, especially from the point of view of the victims’ families. As this is not an ethical study, I must refrain from discussing these topics further here and instead focus on what takes place in a discursive sense. From this viewpoint, it is readily apparent that this text is – as mentioned above – not a newspaper *report* in the strict sense of the word. It is actually an argumentative text, not entirely dissimilar to the NYT article discussed in relation to category 3: *The Right-Wing Monster*.

In this particular text, the author argues that it is in the nature of justice to be also vindictive, and there is an implicit but recognizable argument that death would be the correct punishment in the author’s mind. This conclusion can be reached based on several cues in the text itself. First, the author states that Norway as a country, with the maximum of 21 years of prison sentence and not allowing capital punishment, is *legally and morally* unprepared to face the challenge of Breivik. Second, the author states that in his opinion, having vengeful feelings is morally appropriate. Apart from these, the

author refers to the biblical “eye for an eye” (marking the second instance in the space of five articles that the U.S. newspaper includes biblical references) as well as popular revenge-centered stories from Shakespeare’s *Hamlet* to the 2000 film *Gladiator*. He also explicitly states that the man who has served 28 years in prison for child murder has “grossly underpaid for his crimes” and that “legal systems should...satisfy the needs of victims to feel avenged”. In the light of the above arguments, I cannot come to any other conclusion than that the article presents criticism towards the Norwegian justice system for only permitting an ‘inadequate’ punishment. The criticism is, of course, not entirely towards Norway, as examples of perceived failures of the U.S. justice system are also given. Of course, it later turned out that the Norwegian justice system has an option to keep Breivik behind the bars up to indefinitely, so considering this in hindsight might well make this argument look invalid. But then again, probing the moral dimensions of justice, crime and punishment do not fall within the scope of the present study.

7 DISCUSSION

In this chapter, the key findings presented in the previous two chapters are considered more thoroughly, based on the theoretical background of this study. Discussion of the findings is organized in sections sorted by the original research questions. The key question of how the attacks and Breivik were represented in US and British newspapers is addressed first. References, comparisons and contrasts to historic cases of domestic terrorism are summarized in the following section. A third section is dedicated to rough comparison and contrast between The Daily Telegraph's and The New York Times' reporting of the incident as can be seen from the limited data of this study, as well as discussion on the possible reasons for the differences. The fourth section handles other emergent issues of note which have not warranted a research question of their own but are nonetheless interesting. Finally I conclude the discussion with a summary of the limitations of the present study and some suggestions for topics for further study.

7.1 How are the Norway 2011 attacks and their perpetrator represented in the two newspapers?

Having now described the data analysis of the present study, it is time to revisit the key research question: How are the Norway 2011 attacks and their perpetrator represented in American and British newspapers? As can be expected, the answer is multifaceted enough that it is impossible to shorthand it in one word or sentence. As a preface to the actual discussion, three observations can be made. First, the reporting in both the newspapers was, concerning most factors, quite similar. Second, the trends of reporting the event and its perpetrator which emerged in the headline analysis did not completely match the findings from the in-depth analysis of the articles. Third, the second point does not necessarily mean that the results of the two analyses are in conflict.

As already pointed out in chapter 5, the distribution of the headlines between the five categories was highly similar in both newspapers, both concerning the event and Breivik. A large number of headlines did not directly represent Breivik or the attack, while less than one-fifth of them (14.11% in DT, 17.4% in NYT) directly represented neither. In both newspapers, and concerning both the event and Breivik, the great majority of the representations were in the second category – the category of common news discourse regarding serious crimes and calamities. The other three categories – direct terrorism connection (1), overtly negative representation compared to standard

news text (3), and the category of phrases of special interest (4) were all in minority, with 0% to 8.7% of the total headlines allocated to these categories concerning either Breivik or the attacks, per newspaper.

The analysis of the actual articles, on the other hand, presented a slightly different picture. As has become evident in the previous section, the text content of the articles included direct references to terrorism – and also the particularly negative expressions associated with category 3 – more often than the headlines did. Breivik is explicitly referred to as a terrorist in six of the ten articles analyzed. Five articles' text contains descriptions that would have registered in category three in the headline analysis. Only one of the articles, The Daily Telegraph's *British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals* analyzed under category 5, contains neither category 1 or 3 representations within the text. It is also the article in which Breivik and his actions were represented the least, compared to the others. In short, this means that the text content of the articles represents Breivik and his actions in a generally more negative manner and/or represents the act more strongly as terrorism than the headlines do.

The question that immediately arises from these findings is, of course, what factors can explain these differences between the representations in the headlines and those in the text content? There is no single answer, but a multitude of factors that contribute to this result can be found. One, and perhaps the most influential one at that, is the fact that the headline is a very different instance of text than the article's content. The most obvious difference is of course that the headline is shorter – it can only include one representation at best, whereas the text can include several. Another factor is that at the time when the articles were written, there was very little information available on the motivation behind the attacks. This means that any mention of terrorism was speculative at best – and a text as short as a headline is not well suited for speculation. Mentioning terrorism in this context would thus require some context or reference to base the assessment that Breivik is a terrorist. This can be tied to the findings of Hoffmann (1998: 36) that U.S. newspapers, at least, strive for objectivity and tend to avoid “terrorism” and its derivatives in news headlines.

Looking at the first DT article, with terrorism mentioned in the headline, the article includes a quote where Prime Minister David Cameron states that the attacks are terrorism. The first category NYT article mentions *Martyrdom operation*, which is

virtually impossible to read as anything other than a terrorism reference in the context of media report of a mass killing. In both of the category 2 articles and the category 3 NYT article, the terrorism representations are accompanied by comparison and contrast with previous domestic terrorism cases. The category 4 DT article stands out as it directly represents the attacks as terrorism, but offers no certainty of the perpetrator: Islamist terrorists and a *Far-Right Group* are offered as possible culprits. The key issue here is likely to be the possibility that the attack would have been the work of Al Qaeda or similar group – the cultural impact of the World Trade Center attacks has all but fused the word *terrorism* into any suspicious activity performed by Middle-Eastern people in the U.S. or Europe. This impact of the WTC attacks on modern Western discourse of terrorism is in line with Fairclough’s (2006) claims on the issue. Indeed, based on this data it appears that a possibility of the attack having been performed by a Middle-Eastern group appears to be an equally strong justification for using the word “terrorism” as a precedent by prominent politicians or detailed comparisons with previous mass killers who have been labeled terrorists. It would appear that acts of domestic perpetrators are not labeled as terrorism as easily as those by foreign groups, especially groups that have participated in acts classified as terrorism previously.

To conclude with a return to the original question, the data indicates that Breivik is actually seen as a domestic terrorist and his actions as terrorism. These representations are invariably connected to some form of external reference or basis, such as expert opinions or detailed comparison to previous terrorists. The headlines, for the most part, do not represent Breivik or his actions as terrorism, but every one of the analyzed articles that actually dealt with Breivik or the attacks as its primary subject included either terrorism representations, consistent use of expressions falling within category 3 for the particularly negative representations, or both.

7.2 Connections to previous domestic terrorists

The second research question of this study was concerned with references to other well-known cases of domestic terrorism – a phenomenon that Breivik is also part of, if he is considered a terrorist instead of “merely” a criminal. Naturally, presenting such a research question already presumes that references or connections would be found, and indeed they were. To quickly summarize the findings from the previous chapter, a full half of the analyzed articles – four NYT articles and one DT article – included overt references to other cases of domestic terrorism, primarily the two Americans Theodore

Kaczynski and Timothy McVeigh. The following section delves into more detail concerning these domestic terrorism references.

Two of the articles – the category 2 one from the DT and category 3 one from the NYT - include lengthy references to the U.S. domestic terrorist Theodore Kaczynski, also known as the “Unabomber”. In all of the cases, there is a clear intention to compare Breivik to Kaczynski or McVeigh. Regarding Kaczynski, the point of comparison is quite obvious: both men wrote manifestos detailing their ideology (and Breivik apparently plagiarized large amounts of Kaczynski’s for his own) and both targeted their perceived ideological enemies – leftists in Kaczynski’s case, proponents of multiculturalism in Breivik’s case. This is highlighted in the category 2 DT article, *Norway killer Breivik plagiarized American ‘Unabomber’*. The NYT article, *Right-Wing Monster* further highlights that both Kaczynski’s and Breivik’s written ideologies are not completely out of line with thoughts expressed by politicians supporting ideologies of similar direction.

Another two articles – in this case, the category 2 and 4 articles from the NYT, include references of similar scope to another U.S. domestic terrorist Timothy McVeigh. The category 2 NYT article, *Norway Shooting and Bomb Attack Leaves at Least 92 Dead*, goes as far as to state Breivik to be the “Norwegian equivalent of Timothy McVeigh” – McVeigh, like Breivik, targeted government structures and caused an unusually high number of victims. The category 4 article, *The Terror from Within*, finds another common denominator: both in McVeigh’s and Breivik’s case, the authorities initially suspected a foreign party to be the perpetrator.

In addition to Kaczynski and McVeigh, the analyzed articles included one-off references of various terrorists and criminals, such as Jared Loughner, the man who shot U.S. congresswoman Gabrielle Giffords and was found insane (he was initially believed to be a right-wing extremist like Breivik). However, these mentions have little significance concerning the research questions of this study, and are thus not addressed further. However, one last point of interest concerning this research questions comes from what was *not* said: there were no mentions of British incidents, domestic or foreign, in any of the articles.

To conclude this question with a short summary, there were indeed references to other acknowledged cases of domestic terrorism. The cases referred were both American, and three of the four references were made by the U.S. newspaper – which in part can explain why there were no references to any British cases. Another fact is that the cases of Kaczynski and McVeigh do indeed, as discussed in the above chapters, have many similarities to the Breivik case, and as such it is not surprising that these two had the most references. In a way, the fact that so many similarities were identified between Breivik and these two acknowledged domestic terrorists is yet more proof that Breivik is seen as a (domestic) terrorist – and as discussed in the chapter above, these references were often used as basis to refer to Breivik as a terrorist in the text itself.

7.3 Comparison of the newspapers

The possible differences between the reporting of the NYT and the DT were the topic matter of the third research question, and the causes of any such differences the fourth. As has been previously mentioned, comparing only two newspapers is no basis for a reliable comparison between journalistic cultures. Instead, this section approaches the topic solely from the point of view of comparing and contrasting these two newspapers themselves, without any intention of this to represent accurate comparison of US and British journalism. In general terms, three noteworthy differences were found between the two newspapers. One, the Daily Telegraph has markedly more articles concerning the topic from the time period than the New York Times. Two, the DT articles analyzed tended to be shorter than the NYT ones. Three, the NYT demonstrated a trend for including articles which delved deeper in the social, cultural and political repercussions of the attacks.

The difference in the number of headlines in the two newspapers is of course quite significant: 163 in the DT versus 23 in the NYT. The Daily Telegraph has thus published over seven times as many articles on the website as The New York Times. This is a major difference, and some thought should thus be directed in attempting to explain it. One possible explanation is of course distance: Great Britain is geographically and culturally much closer to Norway than the U.S. is, so it is hardly surprising that a British newspaper covers this topic in more detail than an U.S. one.

Another possible explanation is regional or organizational journalistic culture. This is backed up by the findings of Redden and Witschge (2010): they have examined the intertextual process of producing online articles, and found out that the online news

items often share content, and that newspapers tend to produce new online articles by copying a part of the content from an old article and adding updated information. Interestingly, The Daily Telegraph was specifically mentioned as utilizing this practice, and was in the study found to have the greatest number of online articles within a specific time period among all the studied newspapers. It is also worthy of notice that two of the NYT articles included a mention that a version of the same text has also appeared in the printed version of the newspaper. The structure of the NYT articles was also generally more in line with printed newspaper article's structure, while the DT articles were structured similar to typical items found on a newspaper's website.

Based on the above, the hypothesis can be reached that the DT online articles are, at least to some extent, created directly for online use, updated and used as a basis for later articles. The NYT articles, on the other hand – or at least some of them – are online versions of printed articles. This can offer an explanation to difference in the number of articles, and also to the difference in article length: typical online articles tend to be shorter than typical printed newspaper articles. At this point, I have to stress that giving a concrete answer to this particular question is impossible within the scope of this study, as the number of articles studied in-depth was far too small to draw a full picture of how these newspapers construct their online articles.

The third topic of interest is that a full three of the five analyzed NYT articles - *A Right-Wing Monster*, *The Terror from Within* and *Justice? Vengeance? You Need Both* – focused on the larger-scale repercussions of the attacks and not on the attacks themselves. *A Right-Wing Monster*, a Category 3 article, is readily identifiable as a text with an agenda: it is a defense of right-wing political viewpoints while strongly denouncing the use of terrorism to further this (or any other) political goal. *The Terror from Within* is a reminder that despite the tendency to attribute blame of attacks such as those perpetrated by Breivik to foreign sources, many acts of violence both recent and historical have in fact been perpetrated by people from the same country or culture as the victims. The final article is a moral treatise on how difficult it is to find a fitting punishment for the worst criminals. All of these articles are at least tangentially related to Breivik, but they approach the issue from another viewpoint than simply reporting the event.

To summarize, all of the three articles have an agenda, and as such also *explicitly* represent an ideology. The ideologies behind the articles differ from one to the other. One argues that a political viewpoint is no less acceptable because one proponent of this viewpoint attempted to further his ideology via terrorism. Another reminds that there is a tendency to attribute negative issues to foreign sources, and this tendency is often wrong. The third argues that harsh punishments are sometimes necessary, and a light punishment can be unjust in the eyes of some. The most interesting issue at hand is that while such explicit ideology was not found in any of the DT articles, it is present in three of the five analyzed NYT articles. One intriguing connection that can be made is between the category 3 article and Blommaert's (2005) concept of *hegemony* – which can be seen as the prevalent mode of discourse. Blommaert asserts that hegemony does not tolerate anti-hegemonic discourse: the category 3 article here can be thus interpreted in the social context as hegemony re-asserting itself. The dominant view here would be that right-wing political arguments can be made and these can be justified. The article aims to re-establish this view: the fact that one person chose to use reprehensible means to further right-wing ideology does not discredit the entire ideology.

Another interesting fact in the NYT articles is that these three articles also all find a way to bind the subject matter to the U.S. via comparing Breivik's actions and their aftermath to comparable American issues. In effect, the issues arising from Breivik's actions are connected to existing American issues, which is an intriguing phenomenon as similar tendency was not found in the Daily Telegraph regarding British issues. This naturally brings to mind Burns's (2002) idea of proximity as crucial issue concerning newsworthiness. The events taking place in relatively distant geographical area are effectively made more salient to the U.S. readers by connecting them to matters that are perhaps closer to the 'intended reader'.

7.4 Other issues

Outside the defined research questions, one topic of interest appeared prominently in most of the analyzed articles. This was the issue of how the confusion and lack of precise information during the week after the attacks influenced the reporting in the newspapers. This confusion was primarily highlighted in two ways. The first, apparent in half of the articles, was the incorrect number of victims of the attacks. Five of the ten articles analyzed gave a number of victims, almost always an estimated number or 'at

least' number. None of the five matched the actual final number. The chronologically first estimate, from July 23rd mentioned 'at least 80' victims. On the following day, The Daily Telegraph reported 'at least 93' and The New York Times 'at least 92' victims. On July 28th, both papers reported 76 victims, only one off the actual number, 77.

Another example of confusion regarding the actual events is the category 4 DT article *Was far-Right group behind the attacks?* It is evident from only the headline that at the point the article was written – it was published on July 23rd – the actual culprit of the attacks was still unconfirmed. Although far-Right extremists were suspected, suspicion was also cast on Islamic terrorists, and the article actually included quite an extensive list of possible motivations for Islamists to strike against Norway. This is yet another item of proof to the assessment that terrorism is in the current media and everyday discourse of Europe and the U.S. immediately – even instinctively – connected to the acts of al Qaeda and similar Islamist organizations. Although the possibility that the attack was perpetrated by foreign terrorist was quickly ruled out, the possibility of a far-Right organization behind Breivik remained an acknowledged possibility for some time. The DT article *British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals* provides an example of this, as it details a politically right-wing blogger who had been connected to the investigation.

What can we then make of all of this information? First, this serves as a concrete proof within the data of the present study that newspapers are willing to publish incomplete information when reporting of this type of events. Second, the listing of potential motives for Middle-Eastern terrorists to strike against Norway and reporting on people possibly connected to Breivik and his purported organization shows that in addition to incomplete information, speculation can also be found in these texts. I do not mean to imply that the published information is misleading by purpose – I am certain that details such as the existence and identity of an organization behind the perpetrator or the exact count of victims were also vague for the officials at the time these articles were written and published, and there is a definite effort seen in updating the number of victims day by day to provide the most exact information available. Unfortunately assessment of how media verifies or not verifies the published information does not fall within the scope of the present study, but both of the points brought up here are issues that could potentially be studied further in another context.

7.5 Conclusion

In this last section, I will briefly summarize the findings of the present study, and conclude with an assessment of the issues regarding the study's reliability and topics of interest for possible further research. Regarding the findings, it was evident that Breivik was generally considered to be a terrorist within the actual text of the articles, although the headlines used primarily neutral language. Several of the articles also directly compared Breivik's actions and motives to those of known domestic terrorists in the U.S. The material from the Daily Telegraph and The New York Times differed in number of articles and the articles' general content, with the DT having a greater number of articles, generally shorter articles and the NYT focusing more on social, political and cultural issues arising from the event. These differences can to some extent be explained as the product of different journalistic cultures in the two newspapers and also with factors such as the different cultural and geographical distance between Norway and the U.K and Norway and the U.S.

It must also be acknowledged that the present study is highly limited as research. The sample is rather small and far from comprehensive, as the ten articles analyzed in detail cover only slightly more than one tenth of the total number of articles available from the newspapers from the time period studied. The data also covers only two newspapers and thus cannot be considered to prove any actual insight to the differences between U.S. and British reporting. Due to the limited scope of a Master's thesis, the selection of topics covered by the research question was necessarily narrow. Issues such as the social and political repercussions of the event studied were touched only tangentially, and even that only due to the fact that they comprised a significant amount of material in the analyzed articles. The emergent topic of unreliability of published information and the speculation evident in the articles could not be analyzed in detail within the scope of this study – and in any case would be better suited to a study from a communication sciences or media studies perspective.

Indeed, many of the points highlighted above would make excellent topics for further study, whether as a linguistic or communication-oriented research. The cultural, social and political issues connected to reporting of terrorism appear in particular to be an intriguing topic. The confusion and lack of information evident in the news texts in hindsight is another such topic. In more general terms, one could easily conceive a study concerning e.g. the development of linguistic representations of terrorism in the

media over the recent years (particularly comparing pre- and post- World Trade Center attacks) or comparison between the representation of Breivik and another domestic terrorist(s). In an even larger scale, the conventions and issues of media reporting concerning any high-profile event, especially one that is bound to elicit a heavy emotional response from text consumers, remain a central topic of media studies, whether the study approaches its subject matter from linguistic or another perspective. However, even as this study is far from being a comprehensive treatise on the subject, I hope that it will serve as an example of how a multidisciplinary approach, in this case combining Critical Discourse Analysis with select examples of communication sciences, can provide a more exhaustive picture of the subject of media analysis than an analysis which is based rigidly on one discipline only.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources:

The Telegraph 2013. Norway news. (25 Apr 2012)

[http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/.](http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/)

The New York Times 2013. Norway News – Breivik Attacks, July 2011. (17 Apr 2012)

<http://topics.nytimes.com/top/news/international/countriesandterritories/norway/index.html?offset=30&s=newest>

Norway: ‘At least 87’ killed in terror attacks. (20 Nov 2013).

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8656143/Norway-At-least-87-killed-in-terror-attacks.html>

Norway shooting: Anders Behring Breivik plagiarised 'Unabomber'. (20 Nov 2013).

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8658269/Norway-shooting-Anders-Behring-Breivik-plagiarised-Unabomber.html>

New Zealand teenager youngest of Norway massacre victims. (20 Nov 2013).

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8666949/New-Zealand-teenager-youngest-of-Norway-massacre-victims.html>

Norway: was far-Right group behind attacks? (20 Nov 2013).
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8655979/Norway-was-far-Right-group-behind-attacks.html>

Norway shooting: British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals. (20 Nov 2013).
<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/norway/8661131/Norway-shooting-British-police-investigating-Knights-Templar-right-wing-radicals.html>

Oslo Suspect Cultivated Parallel Life to Disguise 'Martyrdom Operation'. (26 Apr 2014)
http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/25/world/europe/25breivik.html?ref=norway&_r=0

Oslo Suspect Wrote of Fear of Islam and Plan for War. (26 Apr 2014)
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/24/world/europe/24oslo.html?ref=norway>

A Right-Wing Monster. (26 Apr 2014)
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/25/opinion/25douthat.html?ref=norway>

The Terror From Within. (26 Apr 2014)
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/26/opinion/26jacoby.html?ref=norway>

Justice? Vengeance? You Need Both. (26 Apr 2014)
<http://www.nytimes.com/2011/07/28/opinion/28rosenbaum.html?ref=norway>

Secondary sources:

Berkowitz, D. (Ed.) (1997). *Social meaning of news: a text-reader*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Blommaert, J. (2005). *Discourse: a critical introduction*. Cambridge: University Press.

Burns, L.S. (2002). *Understanding journalism*. London: Sage.

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995a). *Critical discourse analysis – the critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1995b). *Media discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing discourse – textual analysis for social research*. London: Routledge.

Fairclough, N. (2006). *Language and globalization*. London: Routledge.

Fenton, N. (Ed.) (2010). *New media, old news*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Fenton, N. 2010. Drowning or waving? New media, journalism and democracy. In Fenton, N. (Ed.). *New media, old news*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 3-16.

Hoffman, B. (1998). *Inside terrorism*. London: Victor Gollancz Ltd.

Pietikäinen, S. and Mäntynen, A. (2009). *Kurssi kohti diskurssia*. Tampere: Vastapaino

Powell, K.A. (2011). Framing Islam: An Analysis of U.S. Media Coverage of Terrorism since 9/11. *Communication studies* 62, 90-112

Redden, J. and Witschge, T. (2010). A new news order? Online news content examined. In Fenton, N. (Ed.) 2010. *New media, old news*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 171-186.

Soloski, J. 1997. News reporting and professionalism. In Berkowitz, D. (Ed.) 1997. *Social meaning of news: a text-reader*. Thousand Oaks: Sage, 138-154.

APPENDIX 1: Headlines in The Daily Telegraph

Oslo attack: killer parked car bomb at door of PM's office
 Norway attacks: police confirm names of further 24 victims
 Norway shooting: Anders Behring Breivik first words to police were 'I am now finished'
 Breivik 'linked to' Johnny 'Mad Dog' Adair, Ulster terrorist
 Oslo bombing: civil servant's miraculous escape
 Norway attacks: killer Anders Breivik told police 'I've finished now' when he was arrested
 'Fiction became reality' on Utoya, says novelist
 Outrage as Morrissey compares massacre to fast food
 UK blogger denies links to Breivik
 Norway attacks: 'how we watched and listened as the horror unfolded'
 Norway shooting: long process of identifying Anders Breivik's victims begins
 Norway attacks: July 28 as it happened
 New Zealand teenager youngest of Norway massacre victims
 Norway: 16 year-old played dead among bodies to survive
 Norway killer sent 'manifesto' to BNP
 Anders Behring Breivik may have made plans to strike again
 Anders Breivik surrendered with hands above head
 Norway attacks: police name 14 more victims
 Norway 'will not be intimidated by attacks'
 Store CCTV shows moment of Oslo bomb blast
 Norway: killer surrendered to police with hands above his head
 Video of Utoya camp on day before attack
 Norway killer: 'no link' to British far-right groups
 Norway attacks: July 27 as it happened
 Norway police detonate explosives found on Anders Behring Breivik's farm
 National Front member suspended for defending Breivik
 Torch parade for Norway massacre victims
 Norway killings: police response 'could not have been faster'
 Right-wing British blogger fears he provided inspiration
 Norway terror attacks: July 26 as it happened
 Breivik emailed 'manifesto' to 250 British contacts
 Norway's Labour party vows to recover after deadly attacks
 Police release first shooting victims names
 Breivik 'surprised' he wasn't stopped from shooting earlier
 Norway killer: teenager came face to face with Anders Behring Breivik
 Mother updated by daughter's texts throughout Utoya tragedy
 Anders Breivik used online war games as 'training'
 Norway killings: Mysterious group called the Knights Templar
 Norway killings: Breivik's plan for the day
 Norway killings: Breivik in his own words
 Norway killings: Breivik's countdown to mass murder
 Norway killings: Breivik's diary of a killer
 Norway killer's lawyer Geir Lippestad defended neo-Nazi
 Utoya Island teenagers to revisit scene of massacre
 Breivik's stepmother in shock at actions of 'well-behaved boy'
 Norway killer placed on suicide watch
 Lawyer: Anders Breivik was on drugs
 Glenn Beck: his most controversial quotes
 Breivik expected to be killed before reaching island

Killer Breivik took drugs to make him 'strong'
 Norway attack: photos emerge of Anders Behring Breivik posing with guns
 Justice minister hails 'fantastic' work by police
 Killer praises Japan as model country
 Norway attack: prosecutor says killer could get 30 years
 Norway's luxury prison
 Norway killer could be held in 'luxury prison'
 Norway killer: English Defence League leader 'never met Anders Behring Breivik'
 100,000 people in Oslo march for peace
 Police revise Norway death toll to 76
 Norway attacks: Europe to study potential far-right threats
 Norway terror attacks: July 25 as it happened
 British police investigating Knights Templar right wing radicals
 Norway killer's links to English extremists
 David Cameron orders review into threat of far-Right groups
 Anders Behring Breivik' links to British extremists
 Breivik came to attention of intelligence services in March
 Father says Breivik should have turned gun on himself
 The British far-Right is nothing but a rabble
 Anders Behring Breivik listened to Clint Mansell during spree
 Stepbrother of Crown Princess among Anders Breivik's victims
 With a smile, Breivik refuses to accept guilt
 Norway survivor 'hid under dead bodies'
 Anders Behring Breivik in his own words
 Glenn Beck: Utoya teens 'like Hitler youth'
 Thousands gather for Norway massacre victims procession
 Investigation into Norway killer's 'two terror cells' claim
 Norway killer's father: my son should have shot himself
 Breivik's father: my son should have killed himself
 Anders Behring Breivik's cultural references
 Cameron: 'our hearts are with Norway'
 David Cameron: UK security must be reviewed
 Norway mourns victims
 Anders Breivik warns of 'two more terror cells'
 The killer was a 'mummy's boy'
 Norway killer: who were the Knights Templar?
 New amateur video of Oslo blast
 Norway holds minute of silence for victims
 Breivik's estranged parents under armed guard in France
 Princess's brother among island shooting victims
 Norway's royal family leads moment of silence for terror victims
 Norway shooting: princess's half-brother among victims
 Norway shooting: extra security at UK mosques
 Norway killer: former PM was main target
 Paradise lost
 Norway attack: legal process facing Anders Behring Breivik
 Norway attacks: Anders Behring Breivik 'a bomb waiting to explode'
 Norway killer wants to wear uniform at court
 There is nothing to study in the mind of Norway's mass killer
 Norway shooting: the opening of a wound that may never heal
 Hunt for Britons linked to the killer
 Norway shooting: Anders Breivik's diary of terror

Norway shootings: July 24 as it happened
 Report that warning about the far-Right was ignored
 German tourist hailed a hero after saving 30 lives
 Breivik had no time for girlfriends but saved money for prostitutes
 Norway killer: Brown, Blair and Prince Charles 'targets'
 Father horrified by Anders Behring Breivik killing spree
 Norway shooting: police response criticised
 We can no longer ignore the threat from extreme-right groups
 Norway killer Breivik's grooming plans: make-up and a sunbed
 Norway shootings: Anders Breivik cannot get more than 21 years
 Norway killer Breivik plagiarised American 'Unabomber'
 Norway shooting: Anders Behring Breivik's planning appears meticulous
 Norway killer's London plot to 'seize power' in Europe
 Pope 'prays for the victims' of Norwegian massacre
 Father horrified by Anders Behring Breivik killing spree
 Norway shootings: Anders Behring Breivik's parents in 'state of shock'
 Breivik describes his personal interests
 Norway mourns massacre victims
 Breivik in his own words: CV describes 'revolutionary conservative'
 Norwegian gunman claims he acted alone
 Breivik recorded video before killing spree
 Norway attacks: Killer acted alone
 Norway attacks: in today's world, nowhere is safe
 The laughing gunman who killed 85 young victims, one by one
 Breivik posted hate-filled video on YouTube hours before attacks
 Norway attacks: inside the mind of a killer
 Norway shooting eye-witness: I saw the corpses of my friends
 Quiet man who became peacetime Europe's worst mass killer
 Anders Behring Breivik was active member of far-right party
 Suspect beckoned campers before shooting them dead
 Norway terror attacks: July 23 as it happened
 Norway: an insular nation that was clinging to its idyll
 International outrage at Norway attacks
 Norway: shooting incidents from the past 20 years
 Norwegian royal family meet island massacre survivors
 Cameron: attacks on Norway are 'absolutely horrific'
 Norwegian police detain man carrying a knife
 Norway shootings 'beyond worst nightmare'
 Profile of suspect Anders Behring Breivik
 Norway: The Queen expresses shock at killings
 Utoya eyewitness: it's like a nightmare
 Norwegian PM: investigation into motive of the attack ongoing
 Utoya Island Shooting in pictures
 Suspect Norwegian gunman arrested and charged
 Mass shooting at Norway island youth camp
 'At least 87' killed as terror attacks rock Norway
 'At least 87' killed as Norway terror attacks rock Oslo and youth camp
 Was far-Right group behind the attacks?
 Amateur video taken just after Oslo bomb blast
 Norway attacks: July 22 as it happened
 Oslo: 'it was like a war zone'
 Norway attacks: timeline of tragedy

Destruction wrought by Oslo bomb blast
Norway attack: who was behind the attack?
WikiLeaks files show Norway unprepared for terror attack
Emergency services assess Oslo bomb devastation
Norway attacks: who is responsible?
Carnage in wake of Oslo bomb blast
History of Islamic militant attacks in Europe
Oslo explosion in pictures
Aftermath of Oslo explosion
'One or more bombs' rock central Oslo

APPENDIX 2: Headlines in The New York Times

At Least 80 Dead in Norway Shooting
Norway Shooting and Bomb Attack Leaves at Least 92 Dead
Norway Attacks Put Spotlight on Rise of Right-Wing Sentiment in Europe
For Labor Party Campers, Island in Norway Turned Into Fatal Trap
Killings in Norway Spotlight Anti-Muslim Thought in U.S.
Norway Mourns Those Killed in Massacre
Oslo Suspect Cultivated Parallel Life to Disguise 'Martyrdom Operation'
A Right-Wing Monster
Attack Reignites Immigration Debate in Divided Oslo
After Killings, Unease in Norway, Where Few Police Carry Guns
The Terror From Within
Survivor Describes Moments of Terror in Attack in Norway
Norwegian Killer's Father: 'He Should Have Taken His Own Life'
Russia Youth Group and Putin Distance Themselves From Killer's Compliments
Breivik and His Enablers
Norway Suspect Denies Guilt and Hints He Did Not Act Alone
Lawyer Says Suspect in Norway Attacks Is 'Insane'
Norway Suspect Wished to Use Anthrax, but Had No Expertise
In Norway, the Past Is a Foreign Country
Justice? Vengeance? You Need Both
Norway's Premier Vows to Keep an Open Society
Norway Killings Shift Immigrant Debate in Europe
Young Norway Survivors' Faith in Politics Unshaken