



**MEDIA@LSE**  
Department of Media and Communications

---

## **MEDIA@LSE Electronic MSc Dissertation Series**

Compiled by Dr. Bart Cammaerts and Dr. Nick Anstead

---

### **The Discourse of Protest:**

Using discourse analysis to identify speech acts in UK  
broadsheet newspapers

**Stefan Brambilla Hall,**  
MSc in Politics and Communication

---

Other dissertations of the series are available online here:  
<http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse/mediaWorkingPapers/>

**Dissertation submitted to the Department of Media and Communications,  
London School of Economics and Political Science, August 2011, in partial  
fulfilment of the requirements for the MSc in Politics and Communication.  
Supervised by Professor Lilie Chouliaraki.**

Published by Media@LSE, London School of Economics and Political Science ("LSE"),  
Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE. The LSE is a School of the University of London. It is  
a Charity and is incorporated in England as a company limited by guarantee under the  
Companies Act (Reg number 70527).

Copyright in editorial matters, LSE © 2012

Copyright, Stefan Brambilla Hall © 2012.  
The authors have asserted their moral rights.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval  
system or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior permission in writing of  
the publisher nor be issued to the public or circulated in any form of binding or cover other  
than that in which it is published. In the interests of providing a free flow of debate, views  
expressed in this dissertation are not necessarily those of the compilers or the LSE.

# **The Discourse of Protest**

## **Using discourse analysis to identify speech acts in UK broadsheet newspapers**

**Stefan Brambilla Hall**

---

### **ABSTRACT**

Between November 10<sup>th</sup> and December 9<sup>th</sup>, thousands of students took to the streets of London, demonstrating over planned rises in university tuition fees. This dissertation explores the use of speech acts by newspapers in reporting the protests. Speech acts are linguistic practices that perform a specific function; in media and communications, these are: to inform, deliberate and witness. The first involves the provision of information; the second opens and facilitates debate; and the third produces moral judgements. All three affect the recipients of media texts in different ways.

The primary goal of the research is to attempt to identify and classify speech acts in newspaper articles, since few attempts have so far been made to do so. The aim here is to establish some of the linguistic and discursive practices that constitute speech acts. At the same time, the thesis explores their consequences for readers: the perspectives they advance, and the actions they invite. The aim here is to see how journalism, as a tool for engaging with audiences, is able to translate speech acts into action. The study also considers whether the newspapers adopt political positions in the process. It is noted that speech acts are typically found in audiovisual contexts and are rarely studied together. Therefore, the overarching purpose of the research is to take tentative steps towards opening a new avenue of inquiry in media and communications by studying the three speech acts in combination, in the context of newspaper articles.

The dissertation's literature review presents speech acts as an under-theorised aspect of journalism, one generally ignored amid discussions on media in democracies. Instead, the performative roles that speech acts play are an important part of journalism, and, by association, social constructionism. The conceptual framework builds on these theories, drawing on framing, mediation and the authoritative voice of journalism to conduct a critical discourse analysis of three articles from each of *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian* and *The Times*. The findings identify the techniques used to inform, deliberate and witness, concomitantly considering their implications for readers.

## INTRODUCTION

*‘All the advantages of Christianity and alcohol; none of their defects’*

In 1956, Aldous Huxley penned an article in *The Sunday Times* asking whether pharmacologists might one day ‘be able to do better than the brewers’. He was referring to the fact that humans had been taking drugs in various forms – especially alcohol – for centuries, yet so far none had been manufactured that came close to *soma*, the hallucinogen from his novel *Brave New World*, which produced a condition of bliss in users and perpetuated individual affinity to the state. A director of Distillers Company Limited, a drinks and pharmaceutical firm, saw the newspaper article and was inspired to read Huxley’s novel (Knightley et al., 1979: 43). Perhaps it was the above quote from *Brave New World* (2007: 46) that motivated the director to initiate production of a tranquilising agent that he hoped would replace whisky.

The sedative that resulted from Huxley’s provocation, which Distillers was soon processing and distributing, was thalidomide, a supposedly non-toxic drug sold as a remedy for morning sickness. Despite good intentions (Teff & Munro, 1976: 1), it later became clear that thalidomide had caused deformations in thousands of children whose mothers used the drug during pregnancy. The scandal went unknown and unpunished until *The Sunday Times* investigated the transition from chemist’s laboratory to pharmacist’s shelves.

The investigation itself was drawn out and complicated. Eventually, the newspaper proved that Distillers was responsible for the tragedy and managed to achieve significant compensation for victims, as well as opening debates on healthcare and freedom of speech. The newspaper was accused of being in contempt of court and sought to reform legislation and policy (Rosen, 1979: 1-8). As Harold Evans, *The Sunday Times* editor, explained: ‘the oppressive British press laws were not just a threat to the victims and their families, but a real threat to democracy itself. They were [...] stunting and deforming our freedom and liberty’ (2009: 321).

*The Sunday Times* took on corporate power, despite the fact that Distillers was its biggest advertising client (Ibid.: 326). It was able to change government policy regarding drug screening and testing (Knightley et al., 1979: 2). It successfully informed the public about a little-known medical disaster, in the process giving voice to an unrepresented section of society (Teff and Munro, 1976: 66). In many ways, the investigation is emblematic of journalism’s ideals.

It is also an example of three functions of news media. First, *The Sunday Times* disseminated information to readers, uncovering facts and moving them into the public domain to expose the truth. Secondly, the newspaper engaged in deliberation, opening debates and asking questions of the government, Distillers, and even society itself. Lastly, the investigation was an act of witnessing, whereby a moral response is demanded from audiences. These three functions – informing, deliberating, and witnessing – are speech acts: acts of communication that perform a specific role in news. The informing speech act is used to tell how the world looks like, the deliberating speech act motivates debate, and the witnessing speech act makes a moral claim about what we see. Their purpose is to report the world and to enable us to act upon it.

This dissertation is inspired by a desire to explore this relationship between news reports and audiences. In particular, it is stimulated by an interest in the way newspapers use language to portray reality, and the subsequent effects on readers. The following chapters investigate the use of speech acts by three British broadsheet newspapers. The case study chosen is the student protests that took place in London during the winter of 2010 over the issue of rising university tuition fees. The purpose of this thesis is twofold: to examine the way that newspapers use speech acts, in particular the discursive and linguistic practices in place to inform, deliberate and witness; and to see how journalism, as tool for engaging with audiences, is able to translate speech acts into action. In short, the key question motivating this dissertation is: how, and to what end, did British broadsheet newspapers use speech acts during the student protests of 2010?

In media and communications, the three speech acts are typically considered in audiovisual contexts and have rarely been studied in combination, so it is hoped that the results of the research will help form (a very small part of) the basis of future theoretical work. The social contribution of the dissertation lies in an analysis of the political side of the coverage: did any of the newspapers adopt or advance a political position during their reporting of the student protests? Were there differences between the reports, and did these alter the actions that the broadsheets invited from audiences? It is possible that ensuing academic inquiry into media and protest movements may be able to draw on any conclusions formed here.

## **THEORETICAL CHAPTER**

The theoretical chapter is divided into three sections. The first introduces the relevant theories and reviews the associated literature. From this, the conceptual framework that guides the discourse analysis is developed. Finally, the third section sets out the research objectives.

### **Literature Review**

#### *Understanding media in democratic society*

Why do media matter, and why is journalism important? A useful starting point is to review existing scholarship on the role of the press in democracies. Cases of investigative journalism, like *The Sunday Times* and thalidomide, are often held up as high points of the profession. The literature surrounding normative functions of the press in Western societies sees journalism as a democratic institution. The ‘basic’ and ‘rarely questioned’ duties of media in a democracy are to: supply accurate and sufficient information; reflect public opinion; and act as a watchdog against the state (Scammell, 2000: xiii). The supply and exchange of verified information is regarded as a necessary condition of the public sphere as envisaged by Habermas (1989). The belief is that an effective system for transmitting and receiving information must be in place in order for public opinion and political action to be effective.

Despite variations in models of the public sphere in modern democracies, Ferree et al. (2002a) highlight that media are important to each of them. In short, media are ‘the principal institutions of the public sphere’ (Curran, 1997: 29). As McNair (2000: 1) explains, government and governance must be ‘underpinned and legitimised’ by media scrutiny and intelligent debate. In order for this to occur, journalism should ensure that it acts as the public’s representative, speaking for all groups in society and not merely the powerful. Though there are calls of a ‘crisis’ in public communication (Blumler and Gurevitch, 1995), McNair argues that modern media and their audiences are more ‘sophisticated’ and effective than ever (2000: 3). Finally, journalism is expected to act as a watchdog against powerful institutions (Scammell, 2000), ensuring accountability in public and private bodies. Associated with these functions is freedom of speech, which journalism both embodies and relies on, as Street (2001) has discussed in his conceptualisations of a free press. In sum, it is commonly accepted that – in theory – a successful democracy needs a media system that lives up to the standards of providing information, representation, and government scrutiny.

Yet it is also recognised that this type of reporting has a short history. Its origins are in the beliefs of Walter Lippmann, who sought a move away from the propaganda of Western governments after World War One and towards objective and balanced reporting instead (Allan, 2010: 61). Over time, objectivity – seen as the best way to counteract political influence and serve the public interest – came to be the defining norm of Western journalism (Kaplan, 2010), and is now a ‘ritual’ of newspapermen (Tuchman, 1972). However, despite the existence of the objectivity ethic, there is a significant strand of literature demonstrating how journalism has not always lived up to expectations. Herman and Chomsky (2002) argue that newspaper support mechanisms – including ownership and advertising – actually reinforce power structures in society, to the detriment of politics and media<sup>1</sup>. Similarly, both Lichtenberg (1990) and O’Neill (2002) have implied that concentrations of ownership in mass media undermine the freedom of speech principle, and that journalism and democracy would benefit from regulation.

The underlying suggestions are that media, as part of free market systems, are more bound by economics than social duty. Indeed, the emergence of the objectivity norm was coupled with an increased commercialisation of journalism that ultimately caused its professionalisation (Schudson, 2001). Industrialisation allowed faster and cheaper production – and lower prices – meaning that newspapers became accessible to larger audiences (Curran, 2003: 24-37). Journalism was as much about profit as about news, as the authors above have lamented. However, ‘media are obligated not only to make profits but to maintain credibility in the eyes of readers’ (Schudson, 2000: 5), and newspaper owners soon realised that the best way to maximise audiences (and therefore income) was by championing their supposed impartiality. Muhlmann explains: the press ‘clung to ‘facts’ so it could bring together readers who might have different opinions on a subject, and hence reach the common denominator of an increasingly large readership’ (2008: 6). This was ‘unifying’ journalism, where the purpose of the journalist was to act as the public’s representative, reporting things that audiences could never hope to see. Muhlmann calls this journalist the ‘witness-ambassador’ (Ibid.: 19-28). This understanding presents the reporter as a *truth-teller* as well as a *truth-seeker*; the truth is something that the public would not otherwise know, and serves as a unifying force that brings together partisan audiences. As Jacquette has written (2010), the commitment to truth is the professional journalist’s most forceful imperative.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chomsky separately argued that the Watergate scandal, exposed by U.S. newspapers, was in fact a reaction to President Nixon’s ‘targeting’ of corporate interests. He claimed the rich and powerful were able to defend themselves – through media – in the process bringing down Nixon and suppressing a ‘vastly more significant’ case of political misconduct, that of COINTELPRO. See Chomsky (1973) and BBC (n.d.).

*Unheard amid the democratic din: speech acts*

To fulfil the purpose of this dissertation, which is to investigate the use of speech acts in UK press, a somewhat under-theorised aspect of modern journalism must be addressed. Namely, it must be acknowledged that journalism does more than just report the ‘truth’. It actively constructs the world and enables us to act on it by engaging with audiences. Indeed, the way news reports are constructed often places an emphasis on spectators. As Chouliaraki has suggested, media engender ‘specific *dispositions to feel, think and act*’ (2008a: 372 – her emphasis). To date, theories of journalism have centred on democratic arguments. Although it is acknowledged that media play a part in influencing audiences (McCombs, 1998), much of the literature appears to ignore the way that journalism produces such dispositions.

It cannot be convincingly argued that the media alone determine the way audiences act. Instead, many societal processes, some noticeable and some subtle, are together responsible for public action. Studying these factors in their entirety would require a complex and consuming analytical procedure. The assumption of this dissertation is that newspapers – through deliberate lexical and syntactical arrangements – report different realities, and in doing so invite different responses from audiences.

Media language is therefore performative: it fulfils a specific function. Speech acts demonstrate these performative functions: they are acts of communication that express certain attitudes, successful if the audience identify the attitude expressed by the speaker (Bach, 2005). Within media and communications, speech acts can be grouped in three categories: informing, deliberating and witnessing. They are used by journalists as tools of *reporting*, and, concomitantly, *constructing* the world. If – as acknowledged – journalism is able to shape issue agendas, public debate, opinions, identities and social reality (Fairclough, 1995: 2; Richardson, 2007: 13), then how exactly does the language used in journalism do so? What part do speech acts play in inducing these constructions? Speech acts have only become a topic of serious investigation, mainly within philosophy and linguistics, over the last century (Green, 2009). Adopting the claim that ‘speech acts are of importance to students of language and communication’ (Ibid.), this dissertation hopes to bridge the gap between journalism as a social, engaging discipline, and speech acts as communicative and performative elements of language.

Informing as a speech act is simply the provision of information by news media. As Schudson (2003) explains, ‘disseminating information about contemporary affairs of general public interest and importance’ is a core feature of journalism. Quite simply, the most basic and



enduring roles of journalism are ‘the gathering, processing and delivery of important and interesting information’ (Hachten, 2005: xiv). Fallows (1996) writes that journalists give information in order to satisfy the public’s questions of ‘what is going on?’ and ‘why?’. This, the ‘media dependency theory’, argues that audiences depend on media information to meet their needs (Ball-Rokeach and DeFleur, 1976). Essentially, the press are required to inform society so that democratic obligations can be met. They ‘distribute information necessary for citizens to make informed choices at elections; facilitate the formation of public opinion by providing a forum of debate; and enable the people to shape the conduct of government by articulating their views’ (Curran, 1997: 29). The dissemination of accurate information is believed to be crucial in sustaining democracy. Although questions remain over ‘how well most citizens are informed’, journalists ‘see their job as supplying the news’, and in this respect the informational speech act is the most central doctrine of journalism (Gans, 2010: 8).

Unsurprisingly, research focuses exclusively on these democratic credentials. Herbert Gans (2003) echoes his academic predecessors in a dissection of journalism’s ‘theory of democracy’, which uses as its bedrock the journalist’s role as gatherer and disseminator of information. However, as he explains, the provision of information ‘is so widely accepted and taken for granted that it is not really discussed’ (Ibid.: 55). In fact, the under-theorisation of the informing speech act leaves a gap in the literature, with studies concerned with whether media are contributing enough to democracy (Patterson, 1993), or whether the audience are listening (Cottle, 2009). This despite the acknowledgement that ‘modern politics are mediated politics’ (McNair, 2000: 1), and therefore any study in politics and journalism should also consider the techniques and practices in place to report and interpret issues. McNair has observed that, when ‘information’ is discussed, it is either to bemoan the dearth of ‘serious’ journalism or to criticise it for being superfluous and causing an ‘overload’ (Ibid.: 3-4). More recent avenues of inquiry have explored the way that digital media, especially the Internet, have ‘irrevocably’ changed the delivery and consumption of information (Sagan and Leighton, 2010: 119). It will be interesting to see where new technologies take the informational speech act, but this dissertation is not the place for such discussion. Since speech acts are rarely explicitly referred to in debates on information and journalism, it is hoped that a new avenue of exploration can be opened in this regard.

Yet there is a paradox within the institution of journalism: in being the social structure by which information is distributed, it is also the system that selects and verifies information (therefore withholding and discrediting other information). The reporting, filtering and exchange of information produce deliberative discourses. Deliberation only occurs under

certain conditions. Public sphere theory claims that discussions should be rational, accountable, inclusive and fair, and that media have a role in sustaining these prerequisites (Dzur, 2002). However, in most cases media deliberation does not meet these criteria, because it is shaped by many competing actors, all of whom ‘sponsor’ different beliefs and interests (Ferree et al., 2002b: 286). Scholarship inspired by Chantal Mouffe, arguing (1999) that deliberation is ‘agonistic’ and plagued by partisanship, would agree. Nonetheless, debate must occur within a system of some sort, and Ferree et al. refer to the context in which deliberation takes place as a ‘discursive opportunity structure’ (2002b: 61-85). This varies greatly between both media systems and the actors within them, is constantly changing, and is often beyond the control of participants. Bennett et al., drawing from Habermas, explain how media deliberate by manipulating this context by proposing and opposing arguments, opinions and information. They claim deliberation is identified when news accounts:

- (a) Report diverse voices (access);
- (b) Identify and comparably value those voices (recognition); and
- (c) Invite opposing views or claims to respond directly to each other (responsiveness).

(2004: 439)

*Access* concerns the actors that make it into news discourse; *recognition* relates to the presentation, identification and level of discourse afforded to those granted access; and *responsiveness* considers the opportunities and access given to conflicting actors. Importantly, Bennett et al. argue that the way the press manage news constraints will affect both the quality of debate and its consequences (Ibid.: 438-439).

Deliberation, however, is rarely considered in studies as a speech act, and – like the informing speech act – is typically analysed in relation to its democratic role. As a result, many studies refer to *public* deliberation, regarded as an essential component of democracies and recognised as highly mediated (Page, 1996: 1). Acknowledging that mediation of news can influence the information and ideas adopted by the public, Page examines three case studies that illuminate the theoretical implications of deliberation. The conclusions relevant to this study are the suggestions that, firstly, the diversity of voices offered by mainstream media are often limited – showing an example of restricted *access* – and that ‘populist’ deliberation is largely ineffective – in other words, *responsiveness* from the general populace has little impact. Other studies have looked at conditions of deliberation in democracies (Nickel, 2000; Weiser, 2000) or have considered how best to achieve the ideal of a public sphere (Jaggar, 2000; Boham, 2000; Calabrese, 2000). Most recently, the prospects for public deliberation and democracy have been considered in light of technological developments (Dean, 2003), and whether these can promote greater political engagement in

young people (Loader, 2007). This dissertation instead considers the linguistic processes by which newspapers deliberate, not publicly or for some democratic end, but within articles themselves. This is a move away from traditional debates over how the press serve as constituents of the public sphere. In this respect, the study hopes to contribute to a new field.

Witnessing is a more complex technique. It is a 'performative act [that] affirms the reality of [an] event' (Guerin and Hallas, 2007: 10), presenting informative and deliberative speech acts in combination with a call to action. Witnessing involves the use of particular discourse or imagery in order to engage 'people's potential to care' (Chouliaraki, 2010a: 1). It transforms the journalist's 'experience into language' – a 'journey from experience (the seen) into words (the said)' – and at the same time implies 'responsibility' and 'complicity' in the event (Frosh and Pinchevski, 2009: 1; Peters, 2009: 24-26). These definitions explain that witnessing is the discursive act of stating one's experience with the intention of making a demand on the public: to solicit an opinion or concern, for example. A witness is needed to describe an event for the benefit of those not present, and to act as a moral influence demanding a response. Ellis (2000) has argued, persuasively, that the acceleration of communications over the last century makes it difficult to claim 'I did not know' as an excuse for missing global successes and failures. As he explains, 'we are accomplices because we have seen the evidence and the events ... we have seen the images and heard the sounds' (Ibid.: 9-10). We are witnesses. The mediation of witnessing is as important as the speech act itself. As agents of 'symbolic power', media 'portray and narrate' events in selective ways (Chouliaraki, 2008b: 329-330), with the aim of uniting audiences and spurring them into action. In sum, the way journalists 'manage' witnessing – what they show, what they tell – significantly influences the direction of public action. These considerations form a significant part of this dissertation's analysis.

Literature on speech acts tends to be focused on witnessing; perhaps because it raises interesting questions about the extent to which mediated experiences translate into public action. To this end, Chouliaraki considers the possibility of a 'cosmopolitan ethic', a sense of global community resulting from different methods of audience engagement (2008a) or from varying presentations of 'others' (2010b). The nature of witnessing itself is versatile. It has been described as a political struggle (Ashuri and Pinchevski, 2009), and there is an interesting contrast between professional and ordinary witnessing (Chouliaraki, 2010a). The former comes from established news sources; the latter involves 'ordinary' members of the public and is facilitated by social media. This dissertation is exclusively focused on professional witnessing, though it acknowledges the importance of citizen journalism to news, outlined by Beckett (2008) and Gillmor (2006). Although user-generated content has seen a notable rise (Sagan and Leighton, 2010: 122), it is still distributed and legitimised by

large media organisations (Gans, 2010: 11; Reich, 2008), which to different degrees are able to ‘manage’ the visibility of suffering and witnessing (Chouliaraki, 2008b). Throughout the literature, there appears to be an emphasis on witnessing via visual means, perhaps because of the power and immediacy of images (Ellis, 2009: 68). For this reason it is considered relevant and interesting for media and communications to explore witnessing uniquely as part of newspaper text.

Academic inquiry into speech acts falls into several areas: the *scene and conditions* under which informing, deliberating or witnessing (the three are rarely, if ever, found together) occur; their *practical implications* in relation to normative questions about democracy, globalisation or cosmopolitanism; and, most recently, a consideration of these *questions in relation to digital technologies*. Yet few studies actually examine precise discourse within texts that could be classified as informing, deliberating or witnessing, and instead focus on the way debates are framed, the legitimacy provided to different sources, and the range of opinions allowed into the conversation. Equally, it is difficult to find research with newspaper articles as its main focus of analysis.

This dissertation, therefore, hopes to contribute to the field of media and communications by studying speech acts in a new context by conducting a discourse analysis on the student protests in London in November 2010. Previous studies of social movements have examined media framing of protests (Gamson and Modigliani, 1989; McAdam, 2000; Smith et al., 2001), and it has been argued that the success of such campaigns critically depends on the role played by media (Benford and Snow, 2000; Cammaerts, forthcoming). As discussed, however, most studies consider speech acts separately; one aim is to develop this area of research by considering the three in combination. The speech act view of journalism is important to media and communications because it acknowledges that news is able to report the world to us, while at the same time constituting it meaning and inviting us to act upon it. To date, limited academic attention has been devoted to the role of speech acts in this process.

### *Social constructionism*

Social constructionism provides the link between this dissertation’s theory – journalism and speech acts – and its conceptual framework, found in the following section. Schudson writes that news is merely an ‘account of the ‘real world’ ... not reality itself but a transcription’ (2000: 38). This means that a news story ‘is a constructed reality possessing its own internal validity’ (Tuchman in Schudson, 1991: 141). Within this framework, journalism and speech

acts perform the dual function of interpretation and provocation: they chronicle the world from a particular standpoint and give rise to different thoughts, opinions and actions. In other words, they *describe* and *shape* reality at the same time: ‘journalists not only report reality but create it’ (Schudson, 2003: 2). Within newspaper discourse, speech acts recount perceptions of the world, while through deliberation and witnessing they invite action, thus influencing the direction of debate and conflict.

This argument stems from the social constructionist belief that knowledge about the world cannot come from simply observing it; instead, understanding is also a product of social processes and interactions (Burr, 2000: 4). As Gergen and Gergen explain, ‘social construction is the creation of meaning through collaborative activities’ (2004: 7). Media, in particular, are regarded as central to these processes. Though this is not the place to answer Weber’s question of whether ‘media reflect reality or construct it in the first place?’ (2002: 2), it is reasonable to accept Schudson’s argument that ‘newspapers participate in the construction of the mental worlds in which we live’ (2000: 38). Just as Chouliaraki shows how media encourage ‘*dispositions to feel, think and act*’ (2008a: 372), this dissertation studies the way that the discursive and linguistic practices in newspapers are used to represent speech acts, and subsequently the types of ‘dispositions’ that might be produced in readers. Minimal attention has been afforded to speech acts in journalistic discourse, so this study endeavours to offer a new insight into this area. The conceptual framework that follows outlines the tools used to do so.

## Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework draws on the literature review to develop the foundation that guides the discourse analysis. Building from the theory of social constructionism, framing is adopted as a tool to identify speech acts in newspaper articles. As part of ‘the larger context of media effects research’ (Scheufele, 1999: 104), framing is considered a narrative structure within journalism; a regulative technique intended to ‘prioritise some facts or developments over others, thereby promoting one particular interpretation of events’ (Norris et al., 2003: 11). In relation to this study, it is assumed that journalists are able to present alternative realities, and that audience interpretation will vary depending on how events are framed. As Entman explains:

To frame is to select aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular ... causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.

(1993: 52)

It has been suggested that newspapers constantly and actively set the limits that audiences use to interpret and discuss public events (Tuchman, 1978: ix). Applying definitions of framing broadly to this dissertation, it is assumed that journalists frame speech acts to solicit distinct consequences and outcomes. In considering how newspapers inform, deliberate and witness, this thesis examines how frames might potentially construct ideas, contexts, and actions in readers. Although studies have extended to television framing of social movements (McLeod and Detenber, 1999), newspaper framing of protests is less well developed; in this respect the concept is relevant.

Speech acts require an ‘illocutionary force’ – both authority and a relevant context – for them to be successfully communicated (Green, 2009). To understand how speech acts are validated, we must bear in mind that professionalism and objectivity have given credibility to journalism. Objectivity is the framework found in journalism to ensure that news is reliable: ‘objectivity ... means that a person’s statements about the world can be trusted if they are submitted to established rules deemed legitimate by a professional community’ (Schudson, 1978: 7). Indeed, it is this legitimacy that gives journalism its authority, since ‘the journalist could claim elevated status as an expert commentator’ after the period of professionalisation (Rosen, 1999: 69). An appreciation of journalism’s authoritative voice is useful for the analysis, since journalism is the context – and newspaper articles the discourse – that validate speech acts.

Linking these concepts – framing and the authority of journalism – is mediation. Mediation highlights the influences that affect the receipt of information (the way things are *mediated*) and the role that media play in actually producing the connectivity between journalism and its publics (the act of *mediation*). Mediation, the situation in which media are the most important source of information and communication in society (Strömbäck, 2008: 230), highlights the processes by which media discourses produce meaning and action. Choices about how to mediate speech acts – the way they are arranged, the practices used to communicate them – are intentional and invite particular dispositions in readers. The value of mediation is in its capacity to acknowledge the critical role that media adopt in describing and constructing reality, and therefore in influencing public perception.

In short, three concepts are used for this dissertation. Mediation is taken as a macro-level theory, building from its belief that widespread use of media for information and communication allows newspapers to influence readers' perceptions of reality. This is for answering questions about *what kinds of realities newspaper discourses create*. On the meso-level, journalism's authority is considered in order to determine *the consequences of speech acts for readers of the articles*. Finally, the study uses framing as a micro-level concept for exploring specifically *how newspapers use speech acts, in terms of their linguistic, syntactic and grammatical choices*.

## Research Objectives

The rationale of this dissertation sits within the themes of mediation, journalism's authoritative voice, and framing. Generally speaking, the research attempts to answer the following question:

*How, and to what end, do UK broadsheet newspapers use speech acts in the context of coverage of the student protests over tuition fees in 2010?*

It should be noted that the study is not asking *why* speech acts are used in certain ways. Instead, it aims to uncover *how* speech acts are reported: their practices and consequences, rather than any agenda behind them. Since no attempt has so far been made to actually identify and classify speech acts in newspaper articles, this is the primary goal of the research. After this, the analysis considers the possible effects of speech acts on readers: the actions they invite, the political positions they take in doing so, and whether they vary in their use of speech acts over time. More specifically, therefore, attempts are made to discover:

- What are the discursive and linguistic practices used in speech acts?
- What are the implications of the speech acts for readers?
- From the speech acts invoked, can the adoption of a political position by the newspapers be determined?
- Was there any evolution in the newspaper discourse across the three protests?
- For all of the above questions, can any difference be found amongst the newspapers?



## RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter justifies the selection of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a research method by outlining its relevance to the research questions, as well as considering its strengths and weaknesses as an analytical tool. The chapter also explains the procedures followed to obtain the sample of empirical data.

### Research Strategy

This study examines the presentations of different speech acts – informing, deliberating and witnessing – by broadsheets, and considers the way that language choices engage with audiences. Given the assumption that speech acts are able to invite responses from audiences, a CDA is necessary to investigate the techniques used by newspapers to do so. Five features of CDA are identified (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2006: 61-65):

1. Discursive practices contribute to the construction of social identities and relations.
2. Discourse constitutes the social world and is constituted by other social practices.
3. Language should be analysed within its social context.
4. Discursive practices create and reproduce unequal power relations; CDA aims to reveal these.
5. CDA seeks to discover the role of discourse in maintaining social relations, and aims to achieve positive change.

It is clear that CDA is relevant to the research because it acknowledges the influence of discursive practices on social constructions. Language is considered a social action (Wetherell, 2001). Richardson writes, ‘language is used to *mean* things and to *do* things’ (2007: 25). CDA allows researchers to closely consider grammar and semantics within social, cultural and political terms (Gee, 2011: ix). It also studies the broader consequences of language use. The underlying belief is that discourse comes from a position of power: it is a ‘controlling force’ able to ‘persuade and manipulate individuals and social groups’ (Wodak, 2004; Bloor and Bloor, 2007: 1). Therefore, a CDA exposes the ways in which this influence is used by specifically explicating how speech acts make demands on readers.

CDA is thus the interface between speech acts in text and their subsequent effects on audiences. Several variants of CDA are known (Van Dijk, 1985: 1; Wetherell, Taylor and Yates, 2001), but this research adopts Fairclough’s approach, which is widely used and is considered ‘the most developed theory and method for research in communication’ (Phillips and Jørgensen, 2006: 60). Fairclough’s approach assumes that discourse both reproduces and alters knowledge, identities and social relations, while at the same time is shaped by pre-existing social structures (Richardson, 2007: 37; Phillips and Jørgensen, 2006: 65). To use Fairclough’s words: ‘language ... is socially shaped, but also socially shaping’ (1995: 55).

Speech acts are performative acts of language, and language is a social construction. Social constructionism is regarded as ‘the theoretical background to discourse analysis’ (Flick, 2007: 326) and places a strong emphasis on the centrality of language (Burr, 2000), so the two are natural complements. This is particularly useful to this research since social constructionism forms part of the background to the study.

No social research method can be flawless (Jensen, 2008: 266-268) and CDA is no exception. Perhaps the biggest problem in conducting a CDA is that it is a subjective method (Brown and Yule, 1983: 11; Van Dijk, 1985: 10). This means that speech acts may be identified and interpreted differently depending on the researcher. The subjectivity may stem from the fact that texts differ substantially from one to another and, as Fowler (1991) has highlighted, people are not taught how to perform CDA. Indeed, literature on methodological suggestions is generally ‘imprecise or implicit’ (Flick, 2007: 326). Consequently, the conclusions of the study cannot be considered incontrovertible; in any case Flick (Ibid.) has warned against making grand claims from CDA.

Due to CDA’s subjective nature, it is important that researchers are independent and self-critical (Bloor and Bloor, 2007: 4). In relation to this dissertation, reflexivity poses problems and advantages. On the one hand, it could be argued that a London-based student analysing student protests that took place in London could be subject to bias, and that this might distort evaluation of the texts. At the same time, direct experience and an understanding of local circumstances may help with reading and comprehending the newspaper articles and could provide the context deemed essential to CDA (Fairclough, 2007: 36).

Critics might also point to the argument that qualitative research, like CDA, is more effective when coupled with other analytical techniques (Jensen, 2008). CDA is often partnered with content analysis (Creswell, 1994). However, Bryman and Teevan argue that CDA naturally incorporates aspects of content analysis and in fact ‘goes beyond’ content analysis in its hermeneutics (2005: 344-345). Richardson agrees, explaining that CDA offers ‘interpretations of meanings of texts rather than just quantifying textual features ... [and] summarising patterns’ or merely ‘reading off’ textual meaning from coding frames (2007: 15). Although content analysis is a useful research methodology, it is restricted to specific studies, particularly those distilling ‘a large amount of material into a short description of some of its features’ (Bauer, 2000: 132-133). A CDA offers deeper analysis – albeit within a smaller sample – that has greater relevance to the research questions, as it focuses closely on exact discursive and linguistic practices rather than on general content: on ‘occurrence’ rather than

‘recurrence’ (Jensen, 2008: 255). Since CDA is considered a ‘labour intensive’ methodology (Gill, 1996: 156), the study devotes itself exclusively to CDA to avoid under-analysing the data.

## **Methods and Procedures**

The aim is to examine the use of speech acts in mainstream media, rather than in a less formal setting. Partly this was to build on previous research conducted in a pilot methodological study (Hall, 2011). More so, it is due to the noted societal function of mass media, which are able to reflect and shape public opinion (Schudson, 2000). The study of speech acts in national newspapers could thus contribute to the numerous studies on the roles that the press play in contemporary society. Despite the fact that the most extensive studies on speech acts – those concentrating on witnessing – focus on multimodality (Guerin and Hallas, 2007; Frosh and Pinchevski, 2009; Chouliaraki, 2008b, 2010a), television news is ruled out in order to concentrate on textual content. Television news places a greater emphasis on images, while time limitations often mean that stories are covered more rapidly and in less depth (Harney and Stone, 1969).

The study is also limited to national broadsheet newspapers. Tabloids are not considered for analysis since, by and large, they sensationalise news using images and headlines to dominate the page (Sparks, 2000: 10; Uribe and Gunter, 2004: 389). In conducting a discourse analysis, a large body of text is useful (Berger, 1991: 77), so the fact that broadsheets tend to have longer articles is another reason for discounting tabloids.

The student protest movement was contained within a few months over the winter of 2010. There were three official protests on November 10<sup>th</sup> (NUS, 2010a), November 24<sup>th</sup> (NCAFC, 2010) and December 9<sup>th</sup> (NUS, 2010b). As an interesting quirk, it could be suggested that each juncture of the protests represents a speech act. The first protest could be considered as informing and raising support for the student movement; the second – two weeks later – as a form of public deliberation over the government’s proposal to raise fees; and the final protest, on the day of the vote in parliament, as a mode of witnessing: the protest was calling MPs to action. With this natural experiment in mind, the analysis considers whether there was an evolution in the newspaper discourse across the three protests. For example, is there a preponderance of deliberation or witnessing the later articles? The three speech acts are still examined together, but nonetheless these are questions to consider.

The procedures followed to obtain the empirical data are now outlined. Nexis, an Internet news archive, was used to access articles. Searching the category of UK broadsheet newspapers, the three highest-circulating dailies<sup>2</sup> were selected after the elimination of Sunday editions and specialist newspapers. These are: *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian* and *The Times*. In a pilot study, the four highest-circulating newspapers were used (Hall, 2011). However, it noted similar conclusions between *The Guardian* and *The Independent*, so the latter – being the lowest circulating newspaper – was eliminated. Considering the research questions, and for the social value of this dissertation, a spectrum of political opinion is maintained across the sample, with *The Daily Telegraph* seen as a more right-wing newspaper, while *The Guardian* has noted liberal leanings<sup>3</sup>.

The search terms ‘student’, ‘protest’, ‘London’, and ‘tuition’ were used. The first student protest was on November 10<sup>th</sup> 2010 so articles after this date were searched for. The pilot study had demonstrated that a random sample across the period of the protests was not suitable, since the Nexis search returned too much data (Hall, 2011). Indeed, these terms produced an initial sample of around 400 articles. Therefore, purposeful sampling was necessary to produce a more useful sample. With this in mind, the search was restricted to specific dates: November 11<sup>th</sup>, November 25<sup>th</sup> and December 10<sup>th</sup>. These represent the day after each of the three official protests, and returned a sample of 20, 10 and 25 articles respectively. From the three dates, articles that were repeated or not final editions were filtered out. Opinion pieces, editorials and reader contributions were also eliminated since the analysis is concerned with the use of speech acts in journalism rather than individual views. Lastly, front-page stories were chosen<sup>4</sup> on the assumption that such articles are considered the most important, since editors make deliberate choices about how to structure their newspapers, deciding what is news and which of this should be afforded lead coverage (Tuchman, 1973). The final research sample consists of nine articles<sup>5</sup>, three from each of *The Daily Telegraph*, *The Guardian* and *The Times*. They are coded as TLG, GDN and TMS respectively. The articles are then grouped by date of the protest and organised alphabetically according to code name. The paragraphs are numbered for quick reference.

As discussed, Fairclough’s approach to discourse analysis is used to interpret the data. Particular attention is paid to textual practices (the linguistic devices in place), discursive

---

<sup>2</sup> As of 30/04/2011, excluding regional and specialist newspapers (ABC, 2011).

<sup>3</sup> See Appendix A.

<sup>4</sup> TMS2 was previewed on page 1 but continued to pages 4-5.

<sup>5</sup> Attached in Appendix B.

practices (the way arguments and discussions are accommodated) and sociocultural practices (the inclusion and arrangement of theories and ideologies). Attempts are made at maintaining a critical and inquisitive mindset throughout towards the texts and also to the assumptions of the researcher.

## **ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION**

This chapter outlines the research findings on the reporting of the 2010 student protests by three British broadsheet newspapers. The research questions, although interrelated, are answered in such a way as to build up a composition of how speech acts are used to portray different realities. The areas addressed are: the discursive and linguistic practices demonstrating speech acts and their implications for readers; the differences in speech act use and political position of the newspapers; and whether there was an evolution in the speech act discourse.

It is shown that the informing speech acts report facts, recount what was said and done, and give descriptions. The deliberating speech acts present a contrast of opinions, quote different sources, and enact assessments of statements. The witnessing speech acts use first-person testimony to verify an event (explicit witnessing), and engage with audiences by embedding eyewitness accounts between deliberative phrases, thereby making moral claims (implicit witnessing). The consequences of the speech acts include: an emphasis on detachment and objectivity; attempts to engage with audiences by inviting debate or guiding opinion in certain directions; and the simultaneous communication and production of an eyewitness perspective and a moral judgement.

While all the newspapers use speech acts in broadly similar ways, their descriptions, subject matters, deliberative choices, and topics selected for witnessing vary. Some rudimentary political analysis can be inferred from these differences. It is seen that, while *The Daily Telegraph* demonstrates respect and compliance with authority, *The Guardian* adopts a more critical and questioning stance, especially towards the government and the police. Generally speaking, *The Times* is situated between these two newspapers.

Finally, the way speech acts are used over the course of the three protests suggests an evolution in the discourse. There is a distinct move towards witnessing, which was not in place at all during the first protest but features heavily in the final newspaper articles. The informing and deliberating speech acts are employed in consistent ways over the three protests. The increase in witnessing as time passes could be a sign that the newspapers believe the seriousness of the issue has increased. More likely, however, is that events during

the third protest – in particular an attack on a vehicle carrying members of the royal family – presented an exceptional opportunity to use eyewitness accounts and to question how and why events transpire as they did. What can be drawn from this, therefore, is that informing and deliberating frequently occur in newspaper discourse, while it takes a remarkable event before witnessing is justified.

### **From discourse to consequence: identifying speech acts and their implications**

The newspapers make clear choices about how to organise the news. Each article begins by reporting a fact, demonstrating the importance of presenting an authoritative, non-speculative voice early on. Rosen (1999: 54) and Singer (2010: 93) underline the ‘emphasis’ on detachment regarded as ‘core’ to journalism. Following this style, words stating a date, time, place, or event – or usually some combinations of these – are the most common and easily identifiable techniques in place that are used to inform. It is these features that constitute the informing speech act, which is the most widespread across all the newspapers. For example:

*Tens of thousands of students took to the streets of London yesterday [GDN 1.1]  
15 students were injured and 32 arrests were made in the capital [TLG 2.3]  
In Trafalgar Square protesters set fire to the Christmas tree [TMS 3.7]*

The predominance of the informing speech act is indicative of ideas about the ‘inverted pyramid’ approach to news construction, where the most important facts are placed at the top of reports. Indeed, its prevalence suggests that dissemination of information remains the most critical function of journalism, and suggestions that this may change (Stephens, 2010) are so far unfounded.

Authors diverge on the nature of quoting in news reports. Tuchman (1978) argues that informing via official sources provides journalistic legitimacy, but it is all quoted speech, according to Van Dijk (1988), which gives a newspaper report its authority. Nonetheless, words such as ‘said’, ‘believes’ and ‘told’ are frequently used for recounting the remarks of students, police and politicians. Perhaps the validity gained here allows the journalists to also provide information through description. Common phrases included ‘hurled’, ‘thrown’ and ‘chasing’, to describe actions of violent protestors, while varying locution appeared for reporting different atmospheres, either within the protest – ‘chaotic’, ‘peaceful’ – or for detailing government responses: ‘combative’, ‘agonising’. In both these cases, information is provided to readers. Therefore, the informing speech act is also constituted by descriptions of what was said and done.

The deliberating speech act is never as clear-cut or obvious as in the informing case, but there are still examples to be found. One is in the presentation of a contrast, where opposing points of view are quoted together. Contrasts are an influential means of exposing and furthering the prevailing arguments, leaving the audience to deliberate on who is right or wrong:

*Police blamed ‘a continued unprovoked attack by protesters’ ... but demonstrators complained of excessive force [GDN 3.19]*

*‘We have ... seen levels of violence that we haven’t seen for a long time’ [police] said ... [But a protester] said ‘I’ve been on a lot of marches before and I’ve not seen the police this brutal’ [TMS 3.9-20]*

After the first protest, *GDN1* and *TMS1* use this method of deliberation to consider the justification of the tuition fees increase using quotes from students and members of parliament. After the third protest and the violence that took place, the technique is employed for debating the issue of blame via quotes from police officials and student witnesses in *TLG3* and *GDN3*. These are instances in which a deliberative discourse is played out through quote of opinions, meeting the standards of access, recognition and responsiveness set by Bennett et al. (2004). These ‘framing contests’ can be likened to two sports teams in an ‘arena’, where competing arguments are set up, framed and analysed, just as players contend with ‘barriers, traps and judges’ (Ferree et al., 2002b: 62). Though no team – and no debate – may emerge victorious, the process is useful for bringing existing discourses to the fore.

Quoting opinions is itself a deliberative act. Doing so elevates the newspapers to the status of arbitrator of arguments, allowing them to frame what they believe relevant and necessary. The use of multiple voices, or discourses, in news articles is what Fairclough (2007: 124-130) has called ‘interdiscursivity’, and allows the newspapers to maintain their objectivity, which favours a ‘cool, rather than emotional’ tone, one that ‘represents fairly each side’ (Schudson, 2001: 150). However, the sources used are almost always political elites. With the exception of the articles after the third protest, which feature several ‘ordinary’ voices, the newspapers predominantly quote politicians, union heads or senior police; only *TLG2* and *TMS2* include civilian sources. Even the ‘vox populi’ of the students is assumed as the NUS president, who – like other elected officials – speaks from a position of power. The overwhelming use of elite sources is evidence of Bennett’s (1990) indexing theory, which posits that news can become ‘constrained by the journalistic practice of indexing story frames to the range of sources within official decision circles, reflecting levels of official conflict and consensus’ (Bennett et al., 2006: 468). Debates thus become encased, and perhaps restricted, by official arguments.

Deliberation is also found in the evaluation of an opinion or statement. This occurs in single word choices or across entire phrases. While the newspapers do not conduct rigorous examinations, there is a notable use of grammatical terms – including conjunctions and prepositions – that, when combined with sensitive phrases enact a deliberative assessment of opinions and actions. Cohesive words such as ‘but’, ‘while’, ‘although’, ‘despite’, and ‘meanwhile’ are found in the articles alongside others holding positive or negative connotations:

*Police, meanwhile, were criticised for failing [GDN 1.2]  
Despite knowing for weeks ... the Met was caught off guard [TLG 1.3]  
There were scuffles with police ... but most protesters were not violent [TMS 2.13]  
The shadow business secretary warned ... but the business secretary said he was proud [GDN 3.12-13]*

To paraphrase Fowler (1991: 87), language is a practice; speaking or writing something is at the same time a way of *doing* something. Lexical choices in some cases suggest that the newspapers are going beyond simply posing questions to readers or asking for judgement, and are actually contributing to the discourse. Using what Fairclough (2007: 101-136) terms ‘intertextuality’ – reference to previous historical texts – the newspapers tacitly address political or social issues. They adopt positions on these issues and thus encourage further audience deliberation. Using a combination of suggestive, intertextual and critical words, the newspapers steer readers in certain directions. The examples below show how these techniques are used on the different groups within the protest – government, students and police – and how they are all portrayed unfavourably. This could be termed ‘second-layer’ deliberating, because it situates the audience in a debate before it has even properly begun.

*The second day of mass action within a fortnight ... in a further sign of the developing pressure on the government's cuts programme [GDN 2.1-11]  
Students ... brought chaotic scenes to the streets again yesterday [TLG 2.1]  
The police again penned in demonstrators [GDN 3.5]  
The attack is likely to heighten the pressure on the Met ... whose tactics in previous demonstrations has been heavily criticised [GDN 3.9]  
Months of public disorder lie ahead ... as another day of protest against rising tuition fees descended into confrontation [TMS 3.1]*

The final speech act, witnessing, can be divided into two categories. Explicit witnessing is observed through use of first-person quotes and sensory verbs. These are cases when the newspapers provide a testimony to happenings at the protests in order to confirm them: ‘bearing witness affirms the reality of the event witnessed ... [and] produces “truth” (Guerin and Hallas, 2007: 10). As Zelizer explains, newspapers ‘use eyewitnessing to report events that cannot easily be confirmed ... but are made more credible by virtue of [an] on site presence’ (2007: 411). Indeed, all the newspapers recount ‘witness’ statements, telling the



audience what they ‘said’, ‘saw’, ‘heard’ or ‘reported’. There is evidence of Peters’ (2009: 26-27) conception of the witness as ‘notoriously contradictory’ and ‘evidently fallible’ in *TLG3*, where witnesses reporting an attack on a royal vehicle contradict each other, highlighting the tension between testimony and veracity inherent in the speech act:

*A witness said the Prince was so concerned for his wife that he pushed her head down to ensure she would not be hit [TLG 3.4]*

*A student said ... ‘throughout it all, Charles was really calm and smiling’ [TLG 3.16]*

Implicit witnessing is more nuanced. It is seen in combination with the deliberating speech act, where testimony is used to confirm and also question the event. This occurs when the newspapers use a witness to attest to an event, but embed their quotes in passages in such a way as to engage with readers’ sense of justice and thus appear to take a side. Here is a deconstructed passage from *TMS2*. It begins by stating that:

*[Tomlinson’s] ... child had been kept in freezing temperatures without food or water for more than seven hours [TMS 2.11]*

This is contrasted by the fact that:

*Most protesters were not violent [TMS 2.13]*

In between, we find the moralising function of the witness:

*She was angry: ... ‘I think it’s appalling. I was really scared’ [TMS 2.12]*

*TMS3* uses the contrasting technique associated with deliberating to capture the readers’ ‘potential to care’ (Chouliaraki 2010a: 1) and employs a witness to verify the event. Prevailing knowledge dictates that ‘words are more frequently considered closer to the communication of feeling and experience’ because of the tight relationship between suffering and oral testimony (Guerin and Hallas, 2007: 7); the newspaper exploits the audience’s sympathy and concern by using the witness to identify with readers. At the same time, the witness is also frames a question about *why* the event happened in that way. In doing so, the newspaper makes a moral claim: this is wrong. Similarly, in their reporting of the royal attack, *GDN3* and *The TLG3* use witnesses to suggest a different course of action should have been taken:

*Witnesses questioned the decision of the driver [GDN 3.7]*

*A student said: ... ‘we couldn’t believe it’ ... He was astonished that the police had taken that route. ‘I don’t know why they went that way’ [TLG 3.10-18]*

Again, the witnessing speech act is used to verify and to moralise. In these examples, the act of bearing witness is *communicated* and also *produced* through the speech act. Witnesses thus offer two realities: newspapers use them to tell readers about what happened (Zelizer (2007: 417) writes, ‘verbal accounts have a mark of authenticity’), and at the same time invite the audience to apply a judgement: Who was right? Who was wrong? What should have been

done? Any moral claims are *implicit*, however, since they are not direct questions or judgements espoused by the newspapers. Nonetheless, as Entman observes, ‘communicators make conscious or unconscious framing judgements’ that are guided by ‘schemata’ which represent their beliefs (1993: 52). In choosing to include and arrange speech acts in a certain order, the newspapers make moral claims. Indeed, such moralising passages are always sandwiched between highly emotive descriptors that suggest heightened drama, conflict and tension. Precise figures for arrests and injuries are given by all of the newspapers, yet they make estimates throughout, suggesting that in some cases complete accuracy was not possible. Such frenzied narratives serve to intensify the witnesses’ moral claims.

*Police presence prevented chaos ... a last resort [TMS2]  
Rocks thrown at police, attempts to smash into the Treasury ... shoppers had to flee  
... a serious five-hour debate [GDN3]  
A sustained attack ... widespread violence ... repeatedly attacked ... repeatedly struck [TLG3]*

The practices found in newspaper speech acts will now be summarised. The informing speech acts report facts, recount what was said and done, and give descriptions. The deliberating speech acts present a contrast of opinions, quote different sources, and enact evaluations or assessments of statements. Finally, the witnessing speech acts use first-person testimony to verify events (explicit witnessing), and engage with audiences by embedding eyewitness accounts between deliberative phrases, thereby making moral claims (implicit witnessing).

The consequences of these speech acts are equally relevant. The ubiquity of the informing speech act proves that the dissemination of information is crucial to the profession of journalism. The way it is used corresponds to our traditional understandings of newspaper reporting, with an emphasis on detachment and objectivity. While deliberating speech acts appear infrequently in the newspaper articles, the practices used to deliberate remain constant, suggesting that it is an important journalistic technique. Though its purpose could be disputed, we can conclude that deliberation is employed in order to engage with audiences: it is a way of asking them to consider issues in more detail, and in some cases is used to steer political opinion in a certain direction. Both deliberating and witnessing are methods of connecting with audiences and these are consequences in themselves. They open debates to readers, pose questions, and encourage moral judgements. The subtlety of the witnessing speech act means that bearing witness is dually a communication and a production: it *communicates* a perspective – that of the eyewitness – and it *produces* a judgement – the moral appraisal of the audience. The whole process exemplifies the way that journalists ‘report’ and ‘create’ reality (Schudson, 2003: 2). Real events are written about, but their selection, highlighting, framing and shaping alter the impressions that readers receive and respond to.

## Textual difference as political perspective

Ignoring differences in writing style and observation that are subjective to individual journalists, variations are observable in the way that the newspapers use speech acts. In the informing speech act, words vary across the newspapers: *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times* include the politically loaded terms ‘mob’ and ‘rioters’ among their descriptions, while *The Guardian* merely notes ‘protesters’ and ‘demonstrators’. In addition, the controversial police tactic of confining protestors and releasing them slowly is described by *The Daily Telegraph* in a neutral, bureaucratic way – ‘containment’ – while both *The Guardian* and *The Times* applied the more populist and partisan term of ‘kettling’. The naming strategy is noteworthy – it acts as a categorising function – and ‘is an integral part of the reproduction of ideology in newspapers’ (Fowler, 1991: 84). These examples provide evidence that *The Guardian* pursues a more liberal ideology than both *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times*. However, dissimilarities go further than mere lexical choices. It is the way that subjects are arranged within the informing speech acts that more effectively highlight the way that the newspapers portray conflicting realities of the protest. While *GDN3* and *TMS3* both describe a ‘car’ as the subject of attack from protestors, *TLG3* portrays it as Prince Charles and his wife:

*A car containing Prince Charles and his wife [GDN 3.1]*

*Attacking a car taking the Prince of Wales [TMS 3.2]*

*The Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Cornwall came under attack [TLG 3.1]*

At the same time, although all the articles prioritise the royal incident, *GDN3* and *TMS3* choose to inform equally about other issues – the vote on tuition fees and the activist violence, respectively. This is achieved by placing two informing speech acts in quick succession:

*A car containing Prince Charles and his wife, Camilla was attacked last night ... in the wake of a Commons vote to force through a trebling of university tuition fees [GDN 3.1]*

*Protest against rising tuition fees descended into confrontation on the streets of London [TMS 3.1]*

*A breakaway mob [chased] and [attacked] a car [TMS 3.2]*

Here, the two newspapers move interchangeably between information, suggesting that both events were as important as each other. In contrast, *TLG3* instead focuses exclusively on the attack on the royal vehicle. Of the 29 paragraphs in its article, only one makes a passing reference to the tuition fees vote. This omission is crucial. Using one piece of information will ‘simultaneously direct attention away from others’, making an exclusion ‘as significant as inclusion’, since the reader is denied the opportunity to interpret an alternative reality (Entman, 1993: 54). Ignoring the tuition fees vote is remarkable given the context of the protests. It is clear, then, that informing is not uniform across the three newspapers.

Although the techniques used to do so are similar, the subjects chosen and presentation of information differ greatly. The way these subjects are arranged provides the biggest clues about the political position of the newspapers. *The Guardian*, for example, appears critical of the government; at one point suggesting a minister had compared students to terrorists. Conversely, *The Daily Telegraph* and *The Times* give little mention to the government, instead focusing on protesters:

*Coalition plans to raise tuition fees as high as £9,000 while making 40% cuts to university teaching budgets [GDN 1.7]*

*Michael Gove ... [used] a resonant phrase associated closely with Margaret Thatcher's efforts in the 1980s to deny the IRA television coverage [GDN 2.5]*

*Students vandalised government buildings [TMS 2.1]*

*Students ... brought chaotic scenes to the streets again yesterday [TLG 2.1]*

Similarly, the *topics* chosen by the newspapers show the biggest difference in deliberation. As discussed, one way the deliberating speech act is used is in the presentation of a contrast. After the first protest, *GDN1* and *TMS1* do so on the issue of tuition fees. *TLG3* instead focuses on the level of preparedness of the police. After the second protest, *GDN2* and *TMS2* agree again, deliberating on the 'controversial' tactic of police kettling. After the final protest, *GDN3* and *TLG3* debate events leading up to the royal incident, while *TMS3* discusses police tactics. As with the informing speech act, there is nothing *unusual* about the deliberative choices – they are merely editorial decisions, and each act of deliberation is a valid one – but they do hint at different political leanings. The fact that *The Daily Telegraph* never considers the tuition fees issue suggests a slight deference to authority, evidenced by the stance taken on the royal attack. In contrast, *The Guardian* appears to provide a robust challenge to government, criticising police and politics throughout. *The Times* is situated somewhere between the two newspapers.

### **Speech act use: consistency and evolution**

There is a distinct change in use of speech acts across the three protests. All the articles make widespread use of the informing speech act. This is in line with the 'gatekeeping' theory of journalism, where reporters are regarded as authoritative sources of news, filtering information and serving the public interest; this convention is a form of mediation (Harrison, 2010). The use of the informing speech act does not change from the first to the last protest. In all instances, the informing speech acts report facts, recount what was said and done, and give descriptions.

The deliberating speech act also appears consistent. We have seen that there are several methods by which newspapers deliberate. One example, ‘second-layer’ deliberation, is used ‘to build and destroy social goods’ (Gee, 2011: 118) and occurs when the newspapers take a position on social or political issues, be it the right to protest, the question of tuition fees, or the standards of policing. Though these cases of deliberating are rare, they are detectable and they do make tacit contributions to existing discourses on those subjects. Such cases do not seem to change over the course of the protests – though their subjects might. The simplest (and also the most common) form of deliberation is the quote of different sources. There is a clear preference for this mode of deliberation, most likely because it fits easily into the established styles and conventions of reporting. Like the informing speech act, this remains constant over the three protests.

The use of the witnessing speech act, however, changes over time. There is no witnessing in the articles concerning the first protest, but it is included in some form in the later articles. After the second protest there is evidence of explicit witnessing, where first-person testimony is quoted in order to give verification to news events; this is seen in *TLG2*. At the same time, *TMS2* introduces the concept of using eyewitness accounts in collaboration with deliberative phrases to make moral claims; this has been termed implicit witnessing. These are the only significant instances in the accounts of the first two protests. In the newspaper reports relating to the third protest, there is a marked increase in both types of witnessing, but especially explicit witnessing. Furthermore – as discussed – both *GDN3* and *TLG3* question the police, using the moralising function of the witness to do so. *TMS3* makes similar claims in reference to a disabled protestor.

What can we infer from the consistency in the informing and deliberating speech acts? What can we infer from the greater level of witnessing in articles from the third protest? Stephens (2010) has suggested a move away from the ‘pursuit’ of news, arguing that new technologies mean that dissemination of information *by newspapers* has become less important; instead he argues for ‘wisdom’ journalism, where analysis and interpretation take precedence over supply of facts. However, the ubiquity of the informing speech act shows that providing information remains the most important purpose of journalism. If there is to be a change, it will be a drastic one: the distribution of information is clearly regarded as critical and is likely to remain so. Similarly, the infrequent but uniform use of the deliberating speech act allows us to conclude that, in combination with other speech acts, it is a useful style within newspaper journalism.

The rarity of witnessing highlights its influence as a tool for engaging with audiences. The ordering of voices is significant (Fairclough, 1995: 84). The fact that eyewitnesses are quoted only in certain situations, when direct experience provides greater value than official speech, demonstrates that it needs more than an ordinary occurrence for the witnessing speech act to be used. Indeed, the moralising function of the witness is used to question how and why something happened in such a way: it takes a remarkable event before witnessing is justified. From this we can infer that witnessing is a special technique in journalism, used only during reports of great significance.

## **CONCLUSION**

This dissertation's objective was to analyse the use of speech acts by three broadsheet newspapers in the context of the 2010 student protests. It aimed to identify the linguistic and discursive practices that constitute three speech acts – informing, deliberating and witnessing – and to understand the consequences of their use. An attempt was made at uncovering the methods of engagement that the newspaper reports adopted when trying to connect with readers. The final chapter of this dissertation summarises the findings, their implications, and possibilities for further research.

The three speech acts are manifest in different ways. The informing speech act is the most common and the easiest to identify. Primarily, it involves the reporting of a fact: a date, time, place and event (or usually some combination of these). Furthermore, information is imparted to readers by recounting what was said and done by actors in the protests. Finally, the informing speech act features descriptions of places, actions and atmospheres. It is difficult to draw significant conclusions from the informing speech act. However, it is consistent with theories of 'gatekeeping' in journalism and the 'inverted pyramid' approach to news construction. It can be argued that the preponderance of the speech act demonstrates that disseminating information remains a critical function of journalism.

The deliberating speech act is observed through the presentation of a contrast, where the articles report or quote opinions and sources with the effect of exposing and accentuating the prevailing arguments in the protests. It is noted that quotes are employed as deliberative tools, since they are a means of offering opinions to readers and leave them to judge on who or what they thought right or wrong. In line with Bennett's (1990) indexing theory, the sources in the articles are overwhelmingly 'elites' who are elected or appointed officials, which meant that debates are constrained and framed by establishment voices. Finally, deliberation occurs when the newspapers enact evaluations of opinions or statements. The

articles are subtly critical of political and social issues, using Fairclough's (2007) intertextuality to make certain arguments and debates more significant than others. The consequences of the deliberating speech acts are clearer. There is a plain attempt at engagement with audiences. Using contrasts, the newspapers set up 'framing contests' for readers to judge on the better argument (Ferree et al., 2002b). At the same time, the combination of intertextual and critical words steer readers in certain directions; this is 'second-layer' deliberating, where newspapers situate the audience in debates before they properly begin.

Witnessing is identified in two forms. *Explicit witnessing* uses first-person testimony to verify and confirm an event, needed when it was unlikely the reporter had seen it live. As Zelizer writes, eye witnessing is sanctioned as one of the most effective methods of accounting for reality (2007: 424). *Implicit witnessing* combines eyewitness accounts with deliberative phrases in order to make moral judgements. This occurs rarely in the articles and is only seen after the most serious incidents, for example when children were 'kettled' by police or when rioters attacked a royal vehicle. As with deliberation, the witnessing speech act has implications for readers. The articles engage with the audience's 'potential to care' (Chouliaraki, 2010a) by using eyewitnesses as a tool for empathising and building rapport, especially when the newspapers appear critical, for example of police. Implicit witnessing thus acts as a moralising function. Information is mediated to 'promote a particular ... moral evaluation', in line with Entman's (1993) argument that framing takes place in news discourse.

This is not to say that all the newspapers inform, deliberate and witness in exactly the same ways. Though the *techniques* used are similar, there are obvious differences in the subjects chosen, the tone of the articles, and the political leanings suggested. While *The Daily Telegraph* demonstrates respect and compliance with authority, *The Guardian* appears more questioning, especially towards the government and the police. Generally speaking, *The Times* is situated between these two newspapers.

Nonetheless, one should be cautious about drawing too much from these conclusions. Indeed, definitive generalisations cannot be made from such a small sample and only one research methodology. Clearly, improvements can immediately be made in these respects by enlarging the sample and widening the research techniques. It is hoped that the findings of this study can lay the foundations for future academic inquiry into speech acts in newspaper discourse. This thesis attempted to outline some of the features that constitute speech acts; with some refining, the observations could form the basis of coding frames for content

analyses. It is essential, however, that they are verified using further critical discourse analyses before large-scale studies take shape. This would provide a fuller insight into any trends and changes in speech act use. Research could explore the effects of speech acts on particular audiences. For example, through the use of focus groups, surveys and interviews it might be possible to determine how students, police and politicians interpret media texts. This dissertation also examined media coverage of protests from a new perspective, and avenues into further research may have been opened in this regard. One opportunity might involve a comparative analysis between protests in London against those in other countries.



## REFERENCES

- ABC. (2011) *National Daily Newspaper Circulation April 2011*, URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/table/2011/may/13/abcs-national-newspapers> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- Allan, S. (2010) Journalism and its Publics: The Lippmann-Dewey Debate, in Stuart Allan (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, pp 60-70. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ashuri, T. & Pinchevski, A. (2009) Witnessing as a Field, in Paul Frosh & Amit Pinchevski (eds.) *Media Witnessing: Testimony in the age of Mass Communication*, pp 133-157. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bach, K. (2005) Speech Acts, in Edward Craig (ed.) *The Shorter Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, pp 984. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ball-Rokeach, S.J. & DeFleur, M.L. (1976) A Dependency Model of Mass Media Effects, *Communication Research* 3 (1): pp 3-21.
- Bauer, M. (2000) Classic Content Analysis: A Review, in Martin Bauer & George Gaskell (eds.) *Qualitative Researching with Text, Image and Sound: A Practical Handbook*, pp 131-151. London: Sage.
- BBC. (n.d.) *The Vision Thing – Chomsky vs. Marr 2/3*, URL: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SnjYVmhBb-4> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- Beckett, C. (2008) *Supermedia: Saving Journalism so it can Save the World*, Malden, MA: Blackwell-Wiley.
- Benford, R. & Snow, D. (2000) Framing Processes and Social Movements, *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: pp 611-639.
- Bennett, W.L. (1990) Toward a Theory of Press-State Relations in the United States, *Journal of Communication* 40 (2): pp 103-125.
- Bennett, W.L., et al. (2004) Managing the Public Sphere: Journalistic Construction of the Great Globalization Debate, *Journal of Communication* 54 (3): pp 437-455.
- Bennett, W.L. et al. (2006) None Dare Call it Torture: Indexing and the Limits of Press Independence in the Abu Ghraib Scandal, *Journal of Communication* 56 (3): pp 467-485.
- Berger, A.A. (1991) *Media Research Techniques*, London: Sage Publications.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (2007) *The Practice of Critical Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*, London: Hodder Education.
- Blumler, J. & Gurevitch, M. (1995) *The Crisis of Public Communication*, London: Routledge.
- Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1983) *Discourse Analysis*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryman, A. & Teevan, J. (2005) *Social Research Methods*, Ontario: Oxford University Press.
- Bohman, J. (2000) The Division of Labor in Democratic Discourse: Media, Experts, and Deliberative Democracy, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 47-64. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Burr, V. (2000) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*, London: Routledge.
- Butler, D. & Butler, G. (2011) *British Political Facts*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Calabrese, A. (2000) The Means of Communication and the Discourse on Sovereignty, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 65-84. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Cammaerts, B. (forthcoming) Having a Laugh? The Mediated Opportunity Structure and Logistics of Radical Protest, *European Journal of Communication*.
- Chomsky, N. (1973) Watergate: A Sceptical View, *New York Review of Books*, September 20<sup>th</sup>, 1973, URL: <http://www.chomsky.info/articles/19730920.htm> [last consulted 26 August 2011].

- Chouliaraki, L. (2008a) The Mediation of Suffering and the Vision of a Cosmopolitan Public, *Television & New Media* 9 (5): pp 371-391.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2008b) The Symbolic Power of Transnational Media: Managing the Visibility of Suffering, *Global Media and Communication* 4 (3): pp 329-351.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2010a) Ordinary Witnessing in Post-Television News: Towards a New Moral Imagination, *Critical Discourse Studies* 7 (3): pp 305-19.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2010b) Journalism and the Visual Politics of War, in Stuart Allan (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, pp 520-532. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Cottle, S. (2009) *Global Crisis Reporting*, Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Creswell, J. (1994) *Research Design: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Curran, J. (1997) Rethinking the Media as a Public Sphere, in Peter Dahlgren & Colin Sparks (eds.) *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*, pp 27-57. London: Routledge.
- Curran, J. (2003) Press History, in James Curran & Jean Seaton (eds.) *Power Without Responsibility*, pp 1-105. London: Routledge.
- Dean, J. (2003) Why the Net is not a Public Sphere, *Constellations* 10 (1): pp 95-112.
- Dzur, A. (2002) Public Journalism and Deliberative Democracy, *Polity* 34 (3): pp 313-336.
- Ellis, J. (2000) *Seeing Things: Television in the age of Uncertainty*, London: I.B. Tauris.
- Ellis, J. (2009) What are we Expected to Feel?, *Screen* 50 (1): pp 67-76.
- Entman, R. (1993) Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm, *Journal of Communication* 43 (4): pp 51-58.
- Evans, H. (2009) *My Paper Chase: True Stories of Vanished Times*, London: Little, Brown.
- Fallows, J. (1996) *Breaking the News*, New York, NY: Pantheon.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*, London: Arnold Publishing.
- Fairclough, N. (2007) *Discourse and Social Change*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- Ferree, M. et al. (2002a) Four Models of the Public Sphere in Modern Democracies, *Theory and Society* 31 (3): pp 289-324.
- Ferree, M. et al. (2002b) *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flick, U. (2007) *An Introduction to Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Fowler, R. (1991) *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*, London: Routledge.
- Frosh, P. & Pinchevski, A. (2009) Introduction: Why Media Witnessing? Why Now?, in Paul Frosh & Amit Pinchevski (eds.) *Media Witnessing: Testimony in the age of Mass Communication*, pp 1-22. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gamson, W. & Modigliani, A. (1989) Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach, *The American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1): pp 1-37.
- Gans, H. (2003) *Democracy and the News*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gans, H. (2010) News & the News Media in the Digital Age: Implications for Democracy, *Dædalus* 139 (2): pp 8-17.
- Gee, J. (2011) *How to do Discourse Analysis: A Toolkit*, Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gergen, K. & Gergen, M. (2004) *Social Construction: Entering the Dialogue*, Chagrin Falls, OH: Taos Institute Publications.

- Gill, R. (1996) Discourse Analysis: Practical Implementation, in J. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*, pp 141-158. Leicester: BPS Books.
- Gillmor, D. (2006) *We the Media: Grassroots Journalism by the People, for the People*, Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly.
- Green, M. (2009) Speech Acts, in Edward Zalta (ed.) *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2009/entries/speech-acts/> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- The Guardian (2010) *Newspaper Support in UK General Elections*, URL: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/news/datablog/2010/may/04/general-election-newspaper-support> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- Guerin, F. & Hallas, R. (2007) Introduction, in Frances Guerin & Roger Hallas (eds.) *The Image and the Witness: Trauma, Memory and Visual Culture*, pp 1-22. London: Wallflower Press.
- Habermas, J. (1989) *The Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hachten, W. (2005) *The Troubles of Journalism: A Critical Look at What's Right and Wrong With the Press*, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hall, S. (2011) *MC4M1: A Discourse Analysis of Coverage of the First Student Protest in Four British Broadsheet Newspapers*, Methodological paper submitted to Department of Media & Communications, LSE, in partial fulfilment of MSc programme requirements.
- Harney, R. & Stone, R. (1969) Television and Newspaper Coverage of a Front Page Story, *Journal of Broadcasting* 13 (2): pp 181-188.
- Harrison, J. (2010) Gatekeeping and News Selection as Symbolic Mediation, in Stuart Allan (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, pp 191-201. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Herman, E. & Chomsky, N. (2002) *Manufacturing Consent: The Political Economy of the Mass Media*, New York: Pantheon Books.
- Huxley, A. (2007) *Brave New World*, London: Vintage.
- Jacquette, D. (2010) Journalism Ethics as Truth-Telling in the Public Interest, in Stuart Allan (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, pp 213-222. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Jaggar, A. (2000) Multicultural Democracy, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 27-46. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Jensen, K. B. (2008) The Complementarity of Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies in Media and Communication Research, in Klaus Bruhn Jensen (ed.) *A Handbook of Media and Communication Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Methodologies*, pp 254-272. London, Routledge.
- Kaplan, R. (2010) The Origins of Objectivity in American Journalism, in Stuart Allan (ed.) *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism*, pp 25-37. Abingdon, Routledge.
- Knightley, P., et al. (1979) *Suffer the Children: The Story of Thalidomide*, London: Deutsch.
- Lichtenberg, J. (1990) *Democracy and the Mass Media*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Loader, B. (2007) *Young Citizens in the Digital Age: Political Engagement, Young People, and New Media*, London: Routledge.
- McAdam, D. (2000) Movement Strategy and Dramaturgic Framing in Democratic States: The Case of the American Civil Rights Movement, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 117-134. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- McCombs, M. (1998) News Influence on our Pictures of the World, in Roger Dickinson, Ramaswami Harindranath & Olga Linné (eds.) *Approaches to Audiences: A Reader*, pp 25-35. London, Arnold Publishing.
- McLeod, D. & Detenber, B. (1999) Framing Effects of Television News Coverage of Social Protest, *Journal of Communication* 49 (3): pp 3-23.
- McNair, B. (2000) *Journalism and Democracy: An Evaluation of the Political Public Sphere*, London: Routledge.

- Mouffe, C. (1999) Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism, *Social Research* 66 (3): pp 746-758.
- Muhlmann, G. (2008) *A Political History of Journalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- National Campaign Against Fees & Cuts (2010) *National Walkout and Day of Protest Against Tuition Fees*, URL: <http://anticuts.com/2010/11/23/press-release-24-november-2010-walkout-and-day-of-action-latest-updates/> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- National Union of Students (2010a) *News: NUS and UCU National Demo for November*, URL: <http://www.nus.org.uk/cy/news/news/NUS-and-UCU-national-demo-for-November/> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- National Union of Students (2010b) *News: Student Actions Ahead of Tuition Fee Vote*, URL: <http://www.nus.org.uk/en/news/news/Student-actions-ahead-of-tuition-fee-vote/> [last consulted 26 August 2011].
- Nickel, J. (2000) Free Speech, Democratic Deliberation, and Valuing Types of Speech, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 3-10. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Norris, P. et al. (2003) Introduction: Framing Terrorism, in Pippa Norris, Montague Kern & Marion Just (eds.) *Framing Terrorism: The News Media, the Government and the Public*, pp 3-25. London: Routledge.
- O'Neill, O. (2002) A Licence to Deceive, *Reith Lectures: A Question of Trust* (BBC).
- Page, B. (1996) *Who Deliberates? Mass Media in Modern Democracy*, London: University of Chicago Press.
- Patterson, T. (1993) Fourth Branch or Fourth Rate? The Press' Failure to Live Up to the Founders Expectations', *Political Communication* 10 (1): pp 8-16.
- Peters, J.D. (2009) Witnessing, in Paul Frosh & Amit Pinchevski (eds.) *Media Witnessing: Testimony in the age of Mass Communication*, pp 23-41. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Philips, L. & Jørgensen, M. (2006) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: Sage.
- Reich, Z. (2008) How Citizens Create News Stories, *Journalism Studies* 9 (5): pp 739-758.
- Richardson, J. (2007) *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Rosen, J. (1999) *What are Journalists for?*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rosen, M. (1979) *The Sunday Times Thalidomide Case: Contempt of Court and Freedom of the Press*, London: Writers & Scholars Educational Trust.
- Sagan, P. & Leighton, T. (2010) The Internet & the Future of News, *Dædalus* 139 (2): pp 119-125.
- Scammell, M. (2000) Media and Democracy: an Introduction Part II, in Maggie Scammell & Holli Semetko (eds) *Media, Journalism and Democracy*, pp xi-xlix. Brookfield: Ashgate.
- Scheufele, D. (1999) Framing as a Theory of Media Effects, *Journal of Communication* 49 (1): pp 103-122.
- Schudson, M. (1978) *Discovering the News: A Social History of American Newspapers*, New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Schudson, M. (1991) The Sociology of News Production Revisited, in James Curran & Michael Gurevitch (eds.) *Mass Media and Society*, pp 141-159. London: Arnold Publishing.
- Schudson, M. (2000) *The Power of News*, London: Harvard University Press.
- Schudson, M. (2001) The Objectivity Norm in American Journalism, *Journalism* 2 (2): pp 149-170.
- Schudson, M. (2003) *The Sociology of News*, London: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Singer, J. (2010) Journalism Ethics Amid Structural Change, *Dædalus* 139 (2): pp 89-99.
- Smith, J. et al. (2001) From Protest to Agenda-Building: Description Bias in Media Coverage of Protest Events in Washington, D.C., *Social Forces* 79 (4): pp 1397-1423.

- Sparks, C. (2000) Introduction: The Panic Over Tabloid News, in Colin Sparks & John Tulloch (eds.) *Tabloid Tales: Global Debates Over Media Standards*, pp 1-40. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Stephens, M. (2010) The Case for Wisdom Journalism – and for Journalists Surrendering the Pursuit of News, *Dædalus* 139 (2): pp 76-88.
- Street, J. (2001) *Mass Media, Politics, and Democracy*, Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008) Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Politics, *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 13 (3): pp 228-246.
- Teff, H. & Munro, C. (1976) *Thalidomide: The Legal Aftermath*, Farnborough: Saxon House.
- Tuchman, G. (1972) Objectivity as a Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity, *The American Journal of Sociology* 77 (4): pp 660-679.
- Tuchman, G. (1973) Making News by Doing Work: Routinizing the Unexpected, *American Journal of Sociology* 79 (1): pp 110-131.
- Tuchman, G. (1978) *Making News: A Study in the Construction of Reality*, London: Macmillan.
- Uribe, R. & Gunter, B. (2004) Research Note: The Tabloidization of British Tabloids, *European Journal of Communication* 19 (3): pp 387-402.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1985) Introduction: Levels and Dimensions of Discourse Analysis, in Teun van Dijk (ed.) *Handbook of Discourse Analysis: Dimensions of Discourse*, pp 1-11. London: Academic Press.
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1988) *News as Discourse*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum Publishing.
- Weber, S. (2002) What Does 'Media Construct Reality' Mean? From an Ontological to an Empirical Understanding of Construction, translated from German and found in *Medienimpulse* 40.
- Weiser, P. (2000) Promoting Informed Deliberation and a First Amendment Doctrine for a Digital Age: Toward a New Regulatory Regime for Broadcast Regulation, in Simone Chambers & Anne Costain (eds.) *Deliberation, Democracy and the Media*, pp 11-26. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Wetherell, M. (2001) Themes in Discourse Research: The Case of Diana, in Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S. (eds.) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, pp 142-8. London: Sage Publications.
- Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. & Yates, S. (2001) *Discourse Theory and Practice: A Reader*, London: Sage Publications.
- Wodak, R. (2004) What is CDA about – A Summary of its History, Important Concepts and its Developments, in Ruth Wodak & Michael Meyer (eds.) *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp 1-13. London: Sage.
- Zelizer, B. (2007) On Having Been There: 'Eyewitnessing' as a Journalistic Key Word, *Critical Studies in Media Communication* 24 (5): pp 408-428.

## APPENDICES

### Appendix A – Political Leanings

Newspaper	1992	1997	2001	2005	2010
The Daily Telegraph	Con	Con	Con	Con	Con
The Guardian	Lab/Lib	Lab	Lab	Lab/Lib	Lib
The Times	Con	Con	Lab	Lab	Con

Source: Guardian, 2010; Butler & Butler, 2011: 517

Searching for a suitable reference to back up my claim that “*The Daily Telegraph* is seen as a more right-wing newspaper, while *The Guardian* has noted liberal leanings”, I found that much of the literature appeared to accept this statement as ‘common knowledge’. Though several books and papers made the same claim, none that I came across actually cited a source that clearly stated (for example), ‘*The Guardian*, *The Times* and *The Daily Telegraph* adopt political positions X, Y and Z’. Indeed, several of the references I consulted pointed me to material that merely made generalisations about the newspapers’ political leanings, some along the line of ‘it is widely accepted that...’ or ‘it is taken for granted that...’.

I had been criticised in a methodological paper submitted to the LSE’s media and communication department for making similar assumptions myself and wished to avoid the same error again. I decided that the most effective way to demonstrate the political support granted by each newspaper was by examining their editorial pages at election time. Fortunately, Butler and Butler’s excellent volume (2011) provides a table detailing endorsements from the majority of British national newspapers, going back over a century. Given that the tuition fees debate was a political issue, I also felt that this would supply the most accurate indication of where the newspapers situated themselves during the student protests. I have replicated the results from the last five general elections above. From the table, therefore, we can conclude that:

- *The Daily Telegraph* is a right-of-centre newspaper
- *The Guardian* is a left-of-centre newspaper
- The fluctuation displayed by *The Times* implies it is a centrist newspaper; most recently it is slightly right-of-centre

*Appendix B – Research Sample*

GDN1



The Guardian (**London**) - Final Edition  
**November** 11, 2010 Thursday

**Front: 'This is just the beginning': Tory HQ attacked as fees **protest** spirals out of control: Police caught out by scale of **student** action: Both sides warn 'more of this to come'**

**BYLINE:** Jeevan Vasagar Paul Lewis Nicholas Watt

**SECTION:** GUARDIAN HOME PAGES; Pg. 1

**LENGTH:** 777 words

- 1 Tens of thousands of **students** took to the streets of **London** yesterday in a demonstration that spiralled out of control when a fringe group of protesters hurled missiles at police and occupied the building housing Conservative party headquarters.
- 2 Last night both ministers and protesters acknowledged that the demonstration - by far the largest and most dramatic yet in response to the government's austerity measures - was "just the beginning" of public anger over cuts. Police, meanwhile, were criticised for failing to anticipate the scale of the disorder.
- 3 An estimated 52,000 people, according to the National Union of **Students**, marched through central **London** to display their anger over government plans to increase **tuition** fees while cutting state funding for university teaching. A wing of the **protest** turned violent as around 200 people stormed 30 Millbank, the central **London** building that is home to Tory HQ, where police wielding batons clashed with a crowd hurling placard sticks, eggs and some bottles. Demonstrators shattered windows and waved anarchist flags from the roof of the building, while masked activists traded punches with police to chants of "Tory scum".
- 4 Police conceded last night that they had failed to anticipate the level of violence from protesters who trashed the lobby of the Millbank building. Missiles including a fire extinguisher were thrown from the roof and clashes saw 14 people - a mix of officers and protesters - taken to hospital and 35 arrests. Sir Paul Stephenson, Met police commissioner, said the force should have anticipated the violence better. He said: "It's not acceptable. It's an embarrassment for **London** and for us."
- 5 While Tory headquarters suffered the brunt of the violence, Liberal Democrat headquarters in nearby Cowley Street were not targeted. "This is not what we pay the Met commissioner to do," one senior Conservative told the Guardian. "It looks like they put heavy security around Lib Dem HQ but completely forgot about our party HQ."
- 6 Lady Warsi, the Tory party chair, was in her office when protesters broke in. She initially had no police protection as the protesters made their way up the fire stairs to the roof. Police who eventually made it to Tory HQ decided not to evacuate staff from the building but to concentrate on removing the demonstrators.
- 7 The NUS president, Aaron Porter, condemned the actions of "a minority of idiots" but hailed the turnout as the biggest **student** demonstration in generations. The largely good-natured **protest** was organised by the NUS and the lecturers' union the UCU, who have attacked coalition plans to raise **tuition** fees as high as £9,000 while making 40% cuts to university teaching budgets. The higher fees will be introduced for undergraduates starting in 2012, if the proposals are sanctioned by the Commons in a vote due before Christmas. The NUS president told protesters: "We're in the fight of our lives. We face an unprecedented attack on



our future before it has even begun. They're proposing barbaric cuts that would brutalise our colleges and universities."

8 Inside parliament the deputy prime minister, Nick Clegg - the focus of much anger among protesters for his now abandoned pledge to scrap all **tuition** fees - came under sustained attack, facing 10 questions on **tuition** fees during his stand-in performance during prime minister's questions. He said there was consensus across the parties about the need to reform the system.

9 Labour's deputy leader, Harriet Harman, said the rise in fees was not part of the effort to tackle the deficit but about Clegg "going along with Tory plans to shove the cost of higher education on to **students** and their families". She said: "We all know what it's like: you are at freshers' week, you meet up with a dodgy bloke and you do things that you regret. Isn't it true he has been led astray by the Tories, isn't that the truth of it?"

10 Meanwhile one **student** won an unexpected concession from the coalition yesterday. In answer to a question from a Chinese **student** during his trip to China, David Cameron said: "Raising **tuition** fees will do two things. It will make sure our universities are well funded and we won't go on increasing so fast the fees for overseas **students** . . . We have done the difficult thing. We have put up contributions for British **students**. Yes, foreign **students** will still pay a significant amount of money, but we should now be able to keep that growth under control."

Additional reporting by Rachel Williams and Matthew Taylor

Copyright 2010 Guardian Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved



TLG1

## The Daily Telegraph

The Daily Telegraph (**London**)  
**November** 11, 2010 Thursday  
Edition 1;

### Embarrassed police chiefs caught out by **student** riot

**BYLINE:** Gordon Rayner; Christopher Hope; Richard Edwards

**SECTION:** NEWS; FRONT PAGE; Pg. 1

**LENGTH:** 684 words

1 SIR PAUL STEPHENSON, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, has ordered an urgent inquiry into why his officers failed to prevent hundreds of **student** protesters storming the building that houses the Conservative Party's headquarters.

2 Sir Paul described the response as an "embarrassment" and issued a public apology to office workers who feared for their lives when "thuggish" rioters took control of the office block during a **protest** against the Coalition's plans to raise university **tuition** fees.

3 Despite knowing for weeks that thousands of protesters were due to march past Tory HQ at 30 Millbank, near the Houses of Parliament, the Met was caught off guard by the violence, which left 10 people in hospital and led to 35 arrests.

4 Boris Johnson, the Conservative Mayor of **London**, said Sir Paul had promised a "vigorous" investigation into why the force had positioned only a handful of officers outside the Conservative Party offices.

5 Sir Paul was not involved directly in planning the policing of the demonstration, but he is unlikely to escape criticism and is expected to be called before the Commons home affairs select committee to offer an explanation.

6 Outside 30 Millbank, the **students'** chants were almost entirely anti-Tory and anti-Liberal Democrat, with Nick Clegg, the Deputy Prime Minister, who pledged before the election to oppose **tuition** fees, being singled out for abuse.

7 Violence erupted at 1.30pm when about 2,000 **student** protesters broke off from a 52,000-strong march, intent on getting into Tory HQ.

8 Over the following three hours, hundreds of rioters got into the building, causing tens of thousands of pounds worth of damage as they smashed windows, pulled down ceilings, destroyed equipment and sprayed graffiti.

9 After dozens occupied the roof, missiles including a fire extinguisher and lumps of concrete were thrown at police on the ground, missing them narrowly.

10 Protesters made bonfires out of placards in the forecourt, and ransacked two upper floors, as well as the atrium. Three officers and seven protesters were treated in hospital.

11 Scotland Yard admitted last night that it had deployed only 225 officers along the route of the mile-long march, having spent weeks talking to the National Union of **Students**, the main organiser of the first major anti-government rally since the Coalition came to power.

12 Sir Paul said the Met would now face "tough questions" over its level of preparedness. "This was an embarrassment for **London** and for us," he said. "We cannot accept this level of violence. It was totally unexpected.

13 "We have to ask 'should we have anticipated it better' and a thorough post-incident investigation will establish this and bring all those responsible to justice.

- 14 "It must have been an awful time for the people inside that building and I'm terribly sorry for what must have been a traumatic experience. We cannot allow thuggish behaviour like this again."
- 15 The way police deal with public **protests** was overhauled after criticism of the "heavy-handed" controls used in the G20 demonstrations last year, during which Ian Tomlinson, a newspaper vendor, died.
- 16 Sir Paul said that the post-incident review would have to look at whether the fallout from several damning reports into the G20 response had adversely affected public order policing. About 300 workers were evacuated from 30 Millbank as rioters broke into offices on two floors, but 80 Conservative Party staff, including Baroness Warsi, the party chairman, stayed at their desks, and the protesters failed to get inside their HQ.
- 17 Lady Warsi refused to blame the police, saying: "Police had to do what was appropriate but the issue here is that a few people spoilt it for others who came to voice their legitimate concerns."
- 18 Aaron Porter, the head of the NUS, said a minority of protesters had "hijacked" the march, describing their actions as "despicable".
- 19 He said: "We talked about the need to prevent anything like this and how important it was to act in a responsible way. Unfortunately a minority have undermined us." The trouble was finally brought under control at 4.30pm, when scores of riot police arrived.

Copyright 2010 Telegraph Media Group Limited  
All Rights Reserved

TMS1

# THE TIMES

The Times (**London**)  
**November** 11, 2010 Thursday  
Edition 2;  
National Edition

**'Thuggish and disgraceful';**

**Yard chief condemns **student** demonstration 32 arrested as fees **protest** turns violent It was 'thuggish and disgraceful'**

**BYLINE:** Greg Hurst; Laura Pitel

**SECTION:** NEWS; FRONT PAGE; Pg. 1,6

**LENGTH:** 831 words

1 Violent **protest** confronted the coalition yesterday as a **student** demonstration against rising **tuition** fees and spending cuts exploded.

2 Sir Paul Stephenson, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, called the disorder an embarrassment and admitted that his force ought to have been better prepared as a missilethrowing mob stormed the Tory Party's Westminster headquarters.

3 Although the violence occurred during a march by **students** and lecturers, some of those who occupied the roof of Millbank Tower claimed to be acting in solidarity with public sector workers and other groups affected by spending cuts. With the coalition six months old today, ministers are watching for any sense that the disorder represents a change of mood, with demonstrators trying to emulate the violence that has swept France and Greece. About 40,000 demonstrators took part in the largest **student protest** for more than a decade.

4 In several hours of violence: 6 about 200 rampaging demonstrators kicked in windows and broke in to Millbank Tower, the Tory campaign headquarters, smashing the foyer and causing hundreds of thousands of pounds of damage; 6 about 50 occupied the roof, raining missiles down on to police; 6 at least ten people - including seven officers - were injured while others were attacked with sticks, rocks and bottles; 6 35 protesters were arrested for offences, including assault and criminal damage. Police used the social networking site Twitter to communicate with protesters. Their first message, at 4.30pm, read: "Anyone who engages in crime will be arrested." An hour later they tweeted to those on the roof: "For the safety of themselves & others we advise anyone on the roof to come down." Sir Paul conceded that his force should have been better prepared and had not expected such a level of violence. Promising an inquiry, he said that **student** demonstrations had no real history of disorder. "I think the scenes that we have seen today both inside and outside Millbank are wholly unacceptable, disgraceful behaviour," he said. "It's just thuggish, loutish behaviour and we need to ensure that we have a thorough investigation to bring these criminals to account."

5 Aaron Porter, the president of the National Union of **Students**, accused a small minority of hijacking the demonstration and called the violence "despicable". He claimed that the trouble had been planned. "We talked about the need to prevent anything like this and how important it was to act in a responsible way. Unfortunately a minority have undermined us," Mr Porter said.

6 The Anarchist Federation and the North and South **London** Solidarity Federation posted a message last week on their websites and through social network sites encouraging **students** to join the **protest**. One who responded was Jimmi O'Brien, a history **student** at De Montfort University. He wrote: "De Montfort University Autonomous will be there showing the nice polite **students** how to **protest!** F\*\*\* '68, lets [sic] fight now.!!!" The scenes added to the controversy over the coalition's decision to raise **tuition** fees to new limits of between

£6,000 and £9,000 in two years, despite the Liberal Democrats' election pledge to oppose any such rise.

7 It must be approved by the Commons and Lords next month - votes that will test the nerve of each of the coalition parties. Nick Clegg was again forced to justify his party's about-turn as he stood in at Prime Minister's Questions while David Cameron his trade mission to China. The Deputy Prime Minister called it an "extraordinarily difficult issue" and admitted that he had not been able to deliver the policy his party held in opposition, owing to the deficit and the "compromises of the coalition Government". Mr Cameron told **students** at Peking University yesterday that overseas **students** coming to Britain would benefit as higher **tuition** fees for English undergraduates would mean that fees for international **students** need not rise as fast. Mr Clegg later withdrew from a talk to Lib Dem **students** at Oxford on November 17, citing a diary clash.

8 The Liberal Democrats were singled out for particular vitriol at the demonstration, which had been planned months in advance by the National Union of **Students** and University and College Union. As well as protesting about higher fees, the marchers were opposing the announced withdrawal of educational maintenance allowance for poorer pupils in sixth forms and colleges, and over adult learning grants. **Students** and lecturers travelled from across the country, some on coaches. They met at Horse Guards Avenue and were scheduled to march to Tate Britain for speeches. The first hour of the march passed peacefully, but when the demonstrators filed past the Millbank building, where relatively few police were on duty, a group began to break the windows. The building was occupied for several hours before police removed the last of the protesters. Baroness Warsi, the Tory chairman, remained inside with party workers until the tower was evacuated at about 6pm.

Copyright 2010 Times Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved

GDN2



The Guardian (**London**) - Final Edition  
**November** 25, 2010 Thursday

**Front: School's out: children take to the streets: Student protests across UK: Isolated breakouts of violence: Clegg's 'regret' over fees pledge**

**BYLINE:** Peter Walker Paul Lewis Matthew Taylor Patrick Wintour

**SECTION:** GUARDIAN HOME PAGES; Pg. 1

**LENGTH:** 686 words

1 Tens of thousands of **students** and school pupils walked out of class, marched, and occupied  
buildings around the country yesterday in the second day of mass action within a fortnight to  
**protest** at education cuts and higher **tuition** fees.

2 Amid more than a dozen **protests**, estimated by some to involve up to 130,000 **students**,  
there were isolated incidents of violence and skirmishes with police, mostly in central  
**London**.

3 The police tactic of penning **students** into a so-called kettle near Parliament Square for  
several hours caused anger, but appeared to contain the disorder.

4 One exception came as night fell, when police mounted on horses charged at about 1,000  
**students** gathered near Trafalgar Square. The protesters ran through the area, with officers  
following. **Students** then hurled chairs and traffic cones into the road as bemused tourists  
looked on. At least two bus windows were smashed and shops were also attacked.

5 The coalition government condemned the **protests**, saying they were being hijacked by  
extremist groups. The education secretary, Michael Gove, gave a notably combative response,  
urging the media not to give the violent minority "the oxygen of publicity", a resonant phrase  
associated closely with Margaret Thatcher's efforts in the 1980s to deny the IRA television  
coverage.

6 Gove said the government would not waver, adding: "I respond to arguments, I do not  
respond to violence."

8 In contrast, Nick Clegg, the deputy prime minister, whose pre-election pledge to oppose  
increased **tuition** fees has made him the focus of **student** anger, spoke of his "massive  
regret" in having to rescind the promise.

7 "I regret of course that I can't keep the promise that I made because - just as in life -  
sometimes you are not fully in control of all the things you need to deliver those pledges," he  
told one of several angry callers to BBC Radio 2's Jeremy Vine Show. "Of course I massively  
regret finding myself in this situation."

9 But he said that the fact the Liberal Democrats had been forced into a coalition, and that the  
country's finances were worse than they had anticipated, meant they had to accept  
"compromise".

10 Asked about his reaction to footage, earlier in the week, of **students** hanging him in effigy,  
Clegg said: "I'm developing a thick skin."

11 In a further sign of the developing pressure on the government's cuts programme, Len  
McCluskey, the new leader of Unite, Britain's biggest trade union, put himself and his union  
at the forefront of "an alliance of resistance". In an interview in today's Guardian, McCluskey  
says: "There is an anger building up the likes of which we have not seen in our country since  
the poll tax."

- 12 The biggest single **protest** yesterday was in **London**, where about 5,000 people - many of them noticeably younger than those who took part in the previous mass **protest** on 10 November - spent hours kettled" in Whitehall as officers sought to prevent a repeat of the chaotic scenes when protesters burst through police lines to storm the Conservative party headquarters. Thousands more marched elsewhere around the country while others staged sit-ins at university buildings.
- 13 About 3,000 higher education **students** and school pupils gathered to **protest** in central Manchester, where there were four arrests, and a similar number gathered in Liverpool. A crowd of around 2,000 people protested in Sheffield, with about 1,000 doing so in Leeds and 3,000 in Brighton. There were scuffles in Cambridge as crowds attempted to storm the university's Senate House.
- 14 A total of 17 people were treated for injuries in **London**. Of them, 13 needed hospital treatment, including two police officers, one with a broken arm. Police said 32 people had been arrested. After being forced to apologise for the mayhem two weeks ago when fewer than 250 police were unable to marshal a crowd of more than 50,000, Scotland Yard sent almost four times as many officers onto the streets and quickly penned marchers into a section of streets. Late last night some parents arrived at the police cordon pleading for their children to be released.

Copyright 2010 Guardian Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved

TLG2

## The Daily Telegraph

The Daily Telegraph (**London**)

**November** 25, 2010 Thursday

Edition 3;

National Edition

**Police officers injured as **tuition** fee **protests** turn to violence;  
'Truanting' pupils join demonstrators Children as young as 13 take part in  
**protests** after planning movements on Facebook**

**BYLINE:** Andy Bloxham; Peter Hutchison; Richard Edwards; Laura Roberts

**SECTION:** NEWS; FRONT PAGE; Pg. 1,4

**LENGTH:** 554 words

1 **STUDENTS** protesting against a rise in **tuition** fees brought chaotic scenes to the streets  
again yesterday.

2 Protesters ransacked a police van and two officers needed hospital treatment during  
demonstrations in **London**.

3 At least 15 **students** were injured and 32 arrests were made in the capital, as up to 10,000  
**students** took part in marches throughout the country.

4 Schoolchildren made up a significant number of the protesters, with many turning out in  
their school uniform.

5 A police van following the march in Whitehall was vandalised by young men and women who  
smashed its windows, set off a smoke bomb inside, sprayed graffiti and then stood on its roof.  
The demonstrators eventually managed to break inside the vehicle and looted police  
uniforms and equipment, including body armour. Other school pupils were seen posing for  
photographs next to the wreckage, which was sprayed with graffiti.

6 In **London**, protesters had planned to demonstrate outside the Liberal Democrat  
headquarters in Westminster, in response to the party leaders' decision to break a pledge to  
abolish **tuition** fees.

7 As the **protest** moved towards the headquarters, officers implemented the controversial  
"containment" tactic to surround up to 4,000 **students** and block off Parliament Square,  
providing water and portable lavatories. The dispersal began at around 5.30pm.

8 MPs condemned the violence which marred largely peaceful **protests**. David Cameron's  
official spokesman said: "People obviously have a right to engage in lawful and peaceful  
**protest**, but there is no place for violence or intimidation."

9 In other areas, as evening fell, protesters lit dozens of fires. Missiles were thrown at buses,  
causing many routes to be diverted away from the Whitehall and Trafalgar Square area.

10 But Westminster bore the brunt of lawlessness a fortnight after the Millbank riot.

11 **Student** demonstrators scaled the railings of the Treasury, chanting "Freedom" to the  
crowd.

12 Complaints that teenagers wanted to go home, had to catch a train or needed the lavatory  
were summarily rebuffed by the lines of police.

13 Two protesters were arrested in Cambridge for obstruction, one in Liverpool for egg throwing  
and four in Manchester for public order offences and obstruction. Two people, a 15-year-old  
boy and 41-year-old man, were also arrested in Brighton.

- 14 Children as young as 13 or 14 abandoned their lessons to join the marches held across the country. It is thought that groups were set up on the Facebook website to co-ordinate their movements.
- 15 Last night, some of the **student** protesters claimed that the violence in **London** was directed by truanting schoolchildren.
- 16 Lydia Wright, 22, of the School of Oriental and African Studies, said: "It's all gone terribly wrong. It started off as two small groups from my university and University College **London**. As soon as we got down to Whitehall, we were joined by some other people, but I think it was mostly the school kids who were creating the trouble.
- 17 "They weren't really supporting the cause. Quite a few of them were just wanting to cause a disturbance."
- 18 The Metropolitan Police responded to the **protests** in central **London** by deploying more than 1,500 officers, after being caught out by the riots at Conservative Party headquarters a fortnight ago.

Copyright 2010 Telegraph Media Group Limited  
All Rights Reserved



TMS2

# THE TIMES

The Times (**London**)  
**November** 25, 2010 Thursday  
Edition 2;  
National Edition

## **Student** anger flares up as police control the protesters with 'kettling'; **Student protest**

**BYLINE:** Fiona Hamilton; Steve Bird; Alexi Mostrous

**SECTION:** NEWS; Pg. 1,4,5

**LENGTH:** 682 words

1 **Students** vandalised government buildings and lit fires near Downing Street last night as  
2 **protests** over **tuition** fees brought Whitehall to a standstill.

3 Although a heavy police presence prevented chaos on the scale of the Millbank riots a  
4 fortnight ago, 17 people were injured, including two police officers, and 32 were arrested.

5 Up to 10,000 **students**, lecturers and others had marched towards Parliament after lunch.  
6 The Metropolitan Police used its controversial "kettling" technique, criticised after the G20  
7 **protests**, to contain the crowds at the southern end of Whitehall, near Big Ben.

8 Whitehall was shut down as protesters sprayed graffiti on the Foreign Office and ransacked  
9 an abandoned police van, stealing body armour and riot helmets.

10 Thousands of **students** across the country protested against the planned rise in university  
11 fees, Westminster bore the brunt of the lawlessness.

12 A bus shelter was set on fire near the entrance to Downing Street as protesters tried to smash  
13 windows at the Treasury and threw missiles at police.

The violence did not match that of November 10 when 50,000 people marched in Millbank  
and activists stormed the Conservative Party headquarters.

The police were criticised for a lack of readiness on that day. At least 800 officers formed  
solid lines all day outside Downing Street and other sites. Officers from the Territorial  
Support Group, a specialist public order unit, were called in.

The protesters had hoped to march on the Liberal Democrat headquarters because Nick  
Clegg, the party leader, broke an election pledge to abolish **tuition** fees. After walking from  
Trafalgar Square they were contained just short of Parliament Square. Police kept them in the  
area for more than four hours and were gradually releasing them last night. The force  
defended its "kettling" procedure, saying that it had prevented the violence from spilling into  
other parts of **London**.

In parts of Whitehall students held a massive hokey-cokey. They criticised the "kettling"  
decision, which prevented them leaving for hours.

Sarah Tomlinson, who was waiting behind the police line for her daughter Katie, 16, to be  
released, said that she was angry that her child had been kept in freezing temperatures  
without food or water for more than seven hours. She added that she had been chased down  
the street by police.

Margo turner, whose 17-year-old son Sam was also trapped, said: "I think it's appalling. I was  
really scared when the police horses charged. It's their democratic right to protest. They are  
going to university in 2012 and they won't be able to afford it."

**Students** occupied buildings in Oxford, Birmingham, Cambridge, Bristol and Plymouth.  
Two protesters in Cambridge were arrested for obstruction, one in Liverpool for egg throwing

and four in Manchester for public order offences and obstruction. There were scuffles with police in Leeds and Bristol but most protesters were not violent, merely waving placards and chanting.

14 The occasion had been called Day X, with parents, teachers and trade unionists invited to join **students** at rallies organised by the Education Activist Network and the campaign group Youth Fight For Jobs.

15 Aaron Porter, president of the National Union of **Students**, which organised the November 10 **protest**, said "peaceful **protest**" was vital but violence would not win over hearts and minds. "There are no conditions in which violence is acceptable," he said.

16 Chief Inspector Jane Connors, of the Metropolitan Police, said it was a last resort. "Police officers came under attack and we needed to make sure the violence didn't spread out across the **London** streets," she said.

17 A female police officer had a hand broken and a male officer was knocked unconscious and sustained leg injuries. Fifteen civilians injured sustained during the **protests**. Eleven of them requiring hospital treatment. None of the injuries was believed to be serious. The Met arrested 15 people, eight on suspicion of violent disorder, theft and criminal damage. Four were arrested on suspicion of public order offences, one for burglary and two on suspicion of violent disorder.

18 By 11pm all protesters had been removed from the containment area.

Copyright 2010 Times Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved

GDN3



The Guardian (**London**) - Final Edition  
**December** 10, 2010 Friday

**Charles and Camilla caught up in violence after **student** fees vote: Coalition forces through fees hike by margin of 21: Vote sparks violence through central **London**: Questions for Met over attack on royal car: Charles and Camilla caught up in fees riot**

**BYLINE:** Patrick Wintour and Nicholas Watt

**SECTION:** GUARDIAN HOME PAGES; Pg. 1

**LENGTH:** 852 words

1 A car containing Prince Charles and his wife, Camilla, was attacked last night as a wave of **protest** swept through central **London** in the wake of a Commons vote to force through a trebling of university **tuition** fees for **students** in England.

2 Twenty-one Liberal Democrat MPs voted against the plans and five abstained, refusing to follow their leader, Nick Clegg, and other Lib Dem ministers in favour of a new upper limit for fees of £9,000 from 2012, the culmination of an agonising few weeks for the junior party in the coalition.

3 Outside parliament, an initially peaceful demonstration rapidly deteriorated, with fires lit in Parliament Square, rocks thrown at the police, attempts to smash into the Treasury and the supreme court and a surge into the National Gallery's impressionist rooms.

4 In freezing temperatures, an attempt to burn down the Christmas tree in Trafalgar Square was thwarted, and some Christmas shoppers had to flee the trashing of shop windows. The violence, at the end of the third in a series of demonstrations against the fee rise, was condemned by the National Union of **Students**.

5 The police again penned in demonstrators saying they were dealing with a crime scene. At least eight police officers were injured including one seriously.

6 The car containing Charles and the Duchess of Cornwall was attacked in Argyll Street by protesters who threw paint and cracked a window of the car when they were on their way to the Royal Variety performance at the **London** Palladium. The prince's spokesman said they were unharmed.

7 Witnesses questioned the decision of the driver of the prince's car to pass through crowds of angry protesters. One, Ben Kelsey, said: "There were 400 to 500 protesters there. It was fairly obvious who was in the car. It was very well lit up.

8 "Charles and Camilla looked quite relaxed at first but when they saw how many people there were they began to get worried. A few seconds later the area was packed with police. It was complete chaos."

9 The attack is likely to heighten the pressure on the Met commissioner, Sir Paul Stephenson, whose tactics in the previous demonstrations has been heavily criticised. Stephenson admitted being caught by surprise by the scale of the first demonstration last month, when protesters raided Millbank Tower. At a later **protest** the police presence was much stronger, leading to complaints about heavyhanded kettling.

10 In the Commons 21 Lib Dem MPs voted against the rise in line with their election pledge, with five abstaining and three absent, meaning that a majority of Clegg's MPs did not follow their leader and his fellow ministers into supporting the complex package billed as an engine for social mobility.

11 The vote came at the end of a serious five-hour debate in which the shadow business secretary, John Denham, warned: "If this Tory measure goes through with the support or abstention of Liberal Democrats, that party will forfeit the right to call itself a progressive political party."

12 The Lib Dems signed an NUS pledge before the election vowing not to vote for an increase in **tuition** fees. But the business secretary, Vince Cable, said he was proud of the government's package, and that his party would reunite.

13 In the wake of the vote, Clegg rushed out a message to party members urging them to reunite: "Of course I understand why many in our party wish we could have pursued a different policy.

14 "I wish that too, but we simply were not in that position, we did not win the general election but went into a coalition and had to tackle the greatest economic crisis in decades.

15 "This is a package which is fairer than the existing situation, fairer than Lord Browne's original review, fairer than the NUS proposals and fairer than the policies that both Labour and the Conservatives would have implemented had they been in government alone."

16 Although the fees increase will now be voted on in the Lords on Tuesday, there is little or no expectation that the coalition will suffer a defeat, ensuring that the biggest change to university funding for a century will be introduced in 2012.

17 Cable admitted after the vote that the government had failed to get across its central message that the reforms would ensure greater fairness.

18 For most of the day the **protests** in **London**, attended by several thousand demonstrators, were tense but peaceful. Thousands were kettled within Parliament Square for several hours and unable to leave.

19 Police blamed "a continued unprovoked attack by protesters" for the violence and containment, but many demonstrators complained of excessive force, including baton charges on foot and horseback.

20 Ten officers and at least 38 protesters were injured, according to a Met spokesman.

Additional reporting by Jonathan Paige, Esther Addley, Adam Gabbatt, Vikram Dodd and Helene Mulholland

Copyright 2010 Guardian Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved

TLG3

## The Daily Telegraph

The Daily Telegraph (**London**)

**December** 10, 2010 Friday

Edition 3;

National Edition

**Rioters attack Prince in car;**

**Paint thrown and bottles hurled at royal couple's Rolls-Royce as **student protest** turns ugly A minority 'came to attack police'**

**BYLINE:** Anita Singh; Martin Evans

**SECTION:** NEWS; FRONT PAGE; Pg. 1,2

**LENGTH:** 831 words

1 THE Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Cornwall came under a sustained attack from rioters rampaging through **London** last night in **protest** at the Government's rise in **tuition** fees.

2 A mob of **student** protesters surrounded their car, kicking the doors and shattering a passenger window as the couple travelled to the Royal Variety Performance.

3 Rioters threw white paint across the Rolls-Royce Phantom VI and pounded it with missiles, including placards, bottles and rubbish bins, as it was driven up Regent Street towards the **London** Palladium.

4 A witness said the Prince was so concerned for his wife that at one stage he pushed her head down to ensure she would not be hit by a missile.

5 The couple were unharmed in the attack, but the Duchess appeared shaken as they arrived at the venue.

6 They went ahead with their official duties and the Duchess later made light of the events, saying: "I'm fine, there is a first time for everything."

7 After the performance, which featured Kylie Minogue and Take That, the royal couple were driven back to Clarence House in a police van.

8 The attack came after a day of widespread violence which saw 12 police officers injured and rioters attacking the heart of government.

9 Windows were smashed at the Treasury and the Supreme Court, slogans were daubed on the walls of many of Whitehall's buildings and a statue of Sir Winston Churchill opposite Parliament was vandalised. Witnesses described astonishing scenes as rioters realised they were surrounding the royal vehicle containing the Prince and Duchess.

10 Matthew Maclachlan, a **student** at King's College **London**, said: "The police cars at the front of the convoy drove straight into crowds at the top of Regent Street.

11 "They got trapped in that mob and it meant that Charles and Camilla were on their own further down the road except for a Jaguar travelling behind them. Charles and Camilla's car ran into such a concentration of people that it had to stop.

12 "It was stationary for a lot of the time, then would squeeze forward an inch. They had just one bodyguard in the car with them and a chauffeur.

13 "We couldn't believe it. The car had really big windows so Charles was very much on display.

14 "People were trying to talk to him about **tuition** fees at first but when more people realised what was happening, the crowds swelled and people were throwing glass bottles and picking up litter bins and throwing them at the car.

- 15 "You could hear all this smashing. "There was one protection officer in the Jaguar behind,  
16 dressed in a tuxedo, and he was opening the car doors and using them to bash people away.  
His car took a real pummelling.
- 17 "It must have been frightening for them but, throughout it all, Charles was really calm and  
smiling at everyone.
- 18 Camilla was beaming too. He was holding his hands out towards them in a gesture that said,  
'I'm innocent'."
- 19 Mr Maclachlan, who insisted that he was not involved in the **protest**, said he was astonished  
that the police had taken that route. "I don't know why they went that way," he said. "There  
were so many protesters and they drove right into the middle of them."
- 20 Although the rear window on the Prince's side of the car was shattered, it did not break  
completely.
- 21 The claret Rolls-Royce, sometimes used by the Queen, is fitted with toughened glass as a  
security measure. However, as rioters surrounded the car the Prince had to be warned by a  
police officer to wind up his window.
- 22 Witnesses reported seeing rioters trying to throw objects into the car, before the window was  
cracked by a hail of blows. David Cameron said that those responsible for the "appalling  
scenes of violence would feel the full force of the law".
- 23 He said: "It is clear that a minority of protesters came determined to scenes of violence would  
feel the full force of the law.
- 24 He said: "It is clear that a minority of protesters came determined to provoke violence, attack  
the police and cause as much damage to property as possible. "They must face the full force of  
the law.
- 25 "It is shocking and regrettable that the car carrying the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of  
Cornwall was caught up and attacked in the violence." Police rejected suggestions that  
kettling, used to contain demonstrators, may have provoked some of the violence.
- 26 Sir Paul Stephenson, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, described the events as a "very  
disappointing day for **London**". A source close to Sir Paul said: "This is not just a tiny  
minority. There are a large number of people involved in this violence."
- 27 Police were repeatedly attacked by surges from a hard core of mask-wearing anarchists.  
Several police horses were repeatedly struck by missiles.
- 28 Footage showed one police officer lying motionless on the ground as he was fitted with a neck  
brace, after being struck. He later recovered.
- 29 Police last night reported there had been 26 arrests.

TMS3



The Times (**London**)  
**December** 10, 2010 Friday  
Edition 2;  
National Edition

**Assault on the capital;  
Protesters attack Charles and Camilla ; Treasury stormed after **tuition** fees vote**  
**BYLINE:** Adam Fresco, Billy Kenber Sean O'Neill  
**SECTION:** NEWS; FRONT PAGE; Pg. 1,3  
**LENGTH:** 939 words

1 Months of violent public disorder lie ahead, police leaders warned last night, as another day of **protest** against rising **tuition** fees descended into confrontation on the streets of **London**.

2 The trouble culminated in a breakaway mob chasing and attacking a car taking the Prince of Wales and the Duchess of Cornwall to the Royal Variety Performance. Clarence House said that they were unharmed but the rear passenger window was cracked, the doors were dented by kicks and the vehicle was splattered with white paint.

3 One protester said: "People were throwing lighters, anything they had. Camilla looked terrified." The car's police driver accelerated away and took the couple clear of trouble.

4 David Cameron said last night that the attack on the vehicle was "shocking and regrettable". The Prime Minister added that those who came "to provoke violence ... must face the full force of the law".

5 Scotland Yard believes that the **student** marches have become a magnet for groups intent on violence, ranging from anarchists to **London** street gangs. The demonstrations are thought to cloak groups determined to attack the police and property.

6 Twelve police officers were injured, 43 protesters needed treatment and 26 people were arrested. As night fell, violent elements seized control of the **protest**. Masked youths broke the windows of the Treasury.

7 In Trafalgar Square protesters set fire to the Christmas tree and police vans were attacked. Trouble raged long after MPs, despite a sizeable rebellion, voted in favour of the university fees rise from £3,000 to £9,000 per year.

8 Sir Paul Stephenson, the Metropolitan Police Commissioner, who was on the streets, said that it had been "a bloody tricky day". The Met chief was told by his officers that the trouble was not caused by large groups among the demonstrators.

9 "We have had more of these **protests** than we've seen for a long time, and we've seen levels of violence that we haven't seen for a long time," Sir Paul said. "We would be very unwise if we didn't prepare for more of the same. There are people intent on causing considerable trouble but we cannot let them interfere with the working of Parliament. Let's hope the police get the credit they deserve."

10 Senior police sources told The Times that intelligence teams had identified members of North **London** street gangs on the past two **student** marches and believe that they had been using the demonstrations to fight each other and goad the police.

11 Officers blocked vandals' entry into the Treasury, but only after rioters carried out a prolonged assault on the windows of the building with rocks, iron bars and other tools.



Denied access there, protesters made their way to the Supreme Court and began smashing glass.

The statue of Sir Winston Churchill in Parliament Square was defaced with graffiti that read "f\*\*\* police" and "Clegg eat s\*\*\*".

Benches and other street furniture, including a security guards' shelter, were set ablaze as police imposed a containment, or "kettle", on the volatile crowd outside the Palace of Westminster.

Snooker balls, flares, paintballs, crowd barriers, fireworks and placard poles were hurled at the police lines.

Officers responded by first pushing protesters back then drawing their batons and hitting out at the surging crowds. Mounted police were brought in to reinforce police lines, then drive back the angry crowds.

As the evening progressed, splinter groups became increasingly violent, culminating in the attack on the royal couple. When the show ended they left the **London** Palladium inside a police van. The Duchess said: "I'm fine, thanks. First time for everything."

After the attack the same group of protesters cornered three police officers at Marble Arch and threw bottles and objects at them. The officers retreated under the barrage until dozens of reinforcements arrived on the scene.

Many protesters blamed the kettling tactic for the trouble and some accused officers of brutality. Several said they had been hit by police while on the ground or having their hands in the air.

Jody McIntyre, who has cerebral palsy, said that he was dragged across the street in his wheelchair by police. "One policeman batoned me on my shoulder and it's now injured," Mr McIntyre, 20, said. "I was participating in the **protests**. We're trying to show in a peaceful manner that we disagree with the Government trying to create a two-tier education system.

"I've been on a lot of marches before and I've not seen the police this brutal."

Although Scotland Yard and the National Union of **Students** had planned and agreed a route, which should have taken the **students** from the University of **London** Union at Malet Street through Central **London** to Westminster, confrontation during the day seemed inevitable.

Police began with a low-key operation but within minutes of the march setting off, officers in baseball caps were scuffling with a group trying to splinter from the main demonstration.

By the time it reached Westminster police were wearing riot helmets. Crowd barriers were lifted and thrown at police as the marchers' anger at being kept on the other side of the road from Parliament boiled over into violence. Late in the evening police officers forced protesters on to Westminster Bridge where they were allowed to leave in small groups on the south of the river.

Superintendent Julia Pendry said that the violence had been unprovoked and was inexcusable. "The Met is extremely disappointed with the behaviour of protesters," she said.

Copyright 2010 Times Newspapers Limited  
All Rights Reserved



## **Electronic MSc Dissertation Series**

Media@LSE Electronic MSc Dissertations will:

Present high quality MSc Dissertations which received a mark of Distinction (72% and above).

Selected dissertations will be published electronically as pdf files, subject to review and approval by the Editors.

Authors retain copyright, and publication here does not preclude the subsequent development of the paper for publication elsewhere.

