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Abstract
This is a linguistic study that focuses on language use in four British newspapers that are well known in Britain for their political positions. The main aim of this essay is to compare and contrast different British newspapers in order to show how meaning is created and to identify any differences, depending on the discourse. To do this, specific theoretical frameworks have been applied, including critical discourse analysis, semantics, pragmatics and stylistics in the analysis of a number of different British newspapers.
The analysis has shown that most of the interactions are used in all of the articles. Journalists have expressed many of the same arguments in their articles. The analysis showed that the articles had many features in common and they require the reader to have a general political awareness as well as an understanding of the political leanings of the respective publications. It was discovered that the main difference in the articles is that they deviate from one another in how they present, interpret and relay topical and potentially controversial issues according to their leanings. The articles refer to the same stories and rely upon the same sources, but they pursue different angles, for example on national security, heritage and identity. These different approaches mostly depend on the newspapers' and individual journalists' political leanings. There is a difference in which discoursal features, such as hegemony and subject positioning, are used, where they occur in the text and how frequently they occur. The determining factor for these differences appears to be, however, the nature of the topic and issues surrounding it rather than particular political affiliations of those responsible for producing it.
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1. Introduction

1.1 British newspaper journalism is a form of discourse and, in the view of practitioners of the linguistic methods of critical discourse analysis (CDA), the larger discursive unit of text is the basic unit of communication (Fairclough, 1995). Newspapers have a key role in reporting social and political issues, providing social issues that are important information to all. They relate current news, and do so in a way that captures the attention of the reader, and present only those aspects which the journalist who has written the article considers to be pertinent or of interest to the reader. Broadsheets largely appeal to those who seek more detail and tend to include more factual content; they are less likely to resort to hyperbole and are somewhat more formal in their style and with fewer colloquial expressions. Tabloids, on the other hand, are perceived as supplying less factual detail and their style is more conversational. Headlines have a great impact on public awareness and perceptions; their approach is such that the reader will recognise the topic only by reading the headline, but also become enticed to read further into the article. News headlines are formulated in such a way that they may excite the interest of readers with eye-catching phrases, affective vocabulary and with rhetorical devices.¹

1.2 The research in this essay is intended to apply a critical discourse analysis (CDA) approach to a small selection of British newspaper articles in order to answer research questions which are enumerated below. The research will analyse articles with the same news topic in *The Telegraph*, *The Guardian* and *The Independent* newspapers. This study will focus on the analysis of the differences between the articles and attempt to account for these differences using a CDA approach. The aim of CDA is to uncover power aspects in discourse, the exercise of power by hegemony and the use of rhetoric and nominalisation, and to examine power relations in interactions of the newspapers which can be concealed within written texts or speech, using different methodologies and a variety of grammatical approaches. This analysis is pertinent because the British newspapers employ different stylistic strategies, e.g. in their lexical and syntactical choices, and the aim is to explore the possible reasons behind their choice of expression. CDA methodology seeks to expose the way that power can be manifested in texts; it proposes that people exercise

¹ [http://www.ne.se/uppslagsverk/encyklopedi/lång/tabloid](Accessed 3rd Apr. 2018.)
power through texts and therefore the texts referred to in this essay will constitute the primary data. The Literature Review will provide the theoretical background that will be used, analysing the data using the CDA approach.

1.3 Analytical Tools

This essay mainly applies the approaches of CDA as tools for analysing newspaper discourse. Among the concepts considered most relevant in the analysis within this research are nominalisation, hegemony and interpellation, all of which will be explained in the course of this essay. Certain other features may also be highlighted, such as rhetorical and stylistic devices as they occur.

1.4 Thesis questions

The thesis questions are as follows:

1. How does the approach vary between the selected newspapers having regard to their supposed political leanings?
2. How does the CDA approach expose these political leanings?
3. What does analysis using CDA methods reveal in terms of the way in which stories are reported?
4. How do British newspapers subject position their readers and make assumptions about their world view?

2. Theoretical background

2.1 Literature Review

It might be supposed that the primary purpose of newspapers is to provide the public with a synopsis of all current and relevant news stories for their respective readerships. While the purpose of newspapers may extend beyond this and offer other attractions to their readers, such as entertainment, this essay will be predicated on a working assumption that the purpose of newspapers is the dissemination of news. The headline in an article is an essential part of the news story which has the purpose of stimulating a reader’s interest sufficiently for him to read the entire article. The headline is usually the first part of an article that a reader will see; it con-
veys the presumption of its own relevance which accords with relevance theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995), and that of the article which sits beneath it, to the reader. It may be reasonable to assume that the reader begins to read the text with the headline; therefore, there are some expectations of what the article will apprise the reader about and the reader’s role is to connect the article’s text with the headline. As far as readability is concerned, a headline is required to be short enough to be read quickly, but still long enough for the facts to become comprehensible (Mårdh, 1980). According to Mårdh’s study, the average length of a newspaper headline is about seven words. However, the principle of putting the most important information first may overrule the use of the active voice. According to Yule (2010, p.282), “the active voice is the form of the verb used to say what the subject does (e.g. He stole it) in contrast to the passive voice”. The passive voice is also commonly used in headlines. According to Yule (2010, p.292), “the passive voice is the form of the verb used to say what happens to the subject (e.g The car was stolen) in contrast to the active voice”. Dor (2003) asserts that the main purpose of all headlines is to optimize the relevance of their stories for their readers. The headline functions as a negotiator between the story and its reader, which explains why a successful headline needs to be composed having regard to the characteristics of its readers as well as providing clues as to the content of the story (Dor, 2003).

An article normally has a headline which has certain stylistic features that make it worthy of attention in some way while also being relevant to the story. This is normally followed by the “lead”, which is the first paragraph, and comprises a detailed preview of the entire story. The lead includes all of the basic facts and will help readers decide whether they want to continue reading beyond that point. The headline and the lead signal a preferred general meaning of the text to the reader. The article needs to have an appropriate lead, a competently-written story that contains information which purports to be factual, and this information has been obtained through journalistic investigation and quotes from people being interviewed. Then it relates the story with the requisite level of detail and in the usual format of a newspaper article. It should be noted that the headline reflects the writer’s perspective, and the reader may instead pay more attention to another aspect of the story which is of more interest, or relevance, to them.

---

2 Van Dijk, Teun A. (2013). Discourse, power and access, Chapter 5, Available at: https://books.google.se/books?hl=sv&lr=&id=cuvQzgtHJiOC&oi=fnd&pg=PA84&dq=what+is+a+headline+in+an+article%2525253F&ots=bFQMcD9Hic&sig=k2kKAMcCwRSwfCv1zUD_AMHYkDA&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false (Accessed 3rd Apr. 2018.)
This essay will focus on the grammatical, structural and the lexical aspects of the articles texts with a view to applying a CDA approach in order to gauge how these are used to further the newspaper's own political agenda.

2.1.2 British Newspapers’ Political Leanings

The Labour Party in Great Britain is the centre-left political party and its support base consists of full-blown socialists and also a range of other individuals who hold moderate social democratic leanings\(^3\). The Conservative Party is the centre-right political party with its main focus on political party, especially in Great Britain and believes in the importance of a capitalist economy with private ownership rather than state control\(^4\). From the early 1920’s, when men over the age of 21 and women over 30 years of age were able to vote, the Labour Party and the Conservative Party have been the main competitors for power on the British political stage. The United Kingdom has several daily newspapers that have the format of either broadsheet or tabloid. The British broadsheet newspapers are: *The Daily Telegraph, The Sunday Telegraph, Financial Times, The Sunday Times, The Guardian,* and *The Times*. The British tabloid newspapers are: *Independent, Daily Mail, Daily Express, The Sun, Daily Mirror, Daily Star, The Mail on Sunday* and *The Morning Star*.

Newspapers that mostly support Labour are: *Daily Mirror*, its orientation follows the left-wing populist. *Sunday Mirror*, its direction follows the left-wing populist and *The Morning Star*, its orientation follows “Britain’s Road to socialism (the program of the Communist Party of Britain)”. *The Guardian*, its direction follows the centre-left. Newspapers that support the Conservatives are: *The Daily Telegraph*, its orientation follows the centre-right. *Financial Times*, its direction follows the Liberal and politically centrist. *The Sunday Times*, its orientation is generally positioned towards the centre-right. *The Times*, direction follows the centre-right. *Daily Mail*, its orientation follows the centre-right to right. *Daily Express*, its direction follows the right. *The Mail on Sunday*, its orientation is to the right. *The Sun*, its direction follows the Conservatives. *The Independent* newspaper is supposedly "independent", although its editorials...

---


4 [http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=conservative+party&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o8=1&o1=1&o7=&o5=&o9=&o6=&o3=&o4=&h=](http://wordnetweb.princeton.edu/perl/webwn?s=conservative+party&sub=Search+WordNet&o2=&o0=1&o8=1&o1=1&o7=&o5=&o9=&o6=&o3=&o4=&h=) (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)
are generally perceived as leaning towards progressive policies and those which are closer to those of the Liberal Democrat Party (BBC, 2014).

2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis

Norman Fairclough is widely regarded as a pioneer and leading light in the field of critical discourse analysis. Fairclough’s approach in CDA began with studies of social linguistics then he gravitated towards critical linguistics work. CDA is viewed by Fairclough as the study of the relationship between discourse and power, and which uncovers and describes the links between discourse and social structure (Fairclough, 1995). The term “discourse” includes all forms of language and practices, discourse as a social practice in CDA is emphasized, which extends beyond the realm of a simple text, as will be explained below. Originally, critical discourse analysis originates from a critical theory of language, where the use of language is regarded as a form of social practice, that links to “social theory” which stems from Marx, then Gramsci, and slightly more recent scholars such as Foucault (Gutting, 2003). Discourse is related to relations of power where analysis seeks to understand how discourse is implicated on what critical discourse analysis illustrates.

Advertisements (written or spoken) are discourses that may establish, reproduce or reflect social power, dominance, and eventually change and maintain social practices. In advertising, it is argued that people may be intentionally or unintentionally influenced or even misled by the language of advertising; therefore, CDA is concerned with understanding how social practices are inclined towards selecting certain structural possibilities and then excluding other forms (Fairclough, 1995). Fairclough states that CDA is viewed as the study of the relationship between discourse and power which perceives a relationship between discourse and social structure, as discourse is controlled by social structure, and it simultaneously controls social conventions (Fairclough, 1995). CDA aims to expose and challenge social inequality and injustice as one of the goals of this method is to uncover the hidden aspects of discourse which facilitate the creation and maintenance of unequal power relations. CDA seeks to provide the tools necessary to shed light on unequal power relations in public discourse by showing how it often serves the interests of the powerful forces over those of the less privileged. The approach is concerned with understanding how social practices are prone to selecting certain structural possibilities and then excluding certain forms over time through, among other things, the genres of news reporting and advertising.
Critical Discourse Analysis is a method that reveals hidden ideologies behind everyday communication; it explores the different perspectives of newspapers with affiliations across the whole political spectrum. Newspapers play a leading role in creating discourse on statements of prominent national and international politicians. Headlines have an impact upon the readers due to certain linguistic features that makes the headlines encourage the reader to engage with the article. Also eye-catching phrases, emotive vocabulary and rhetorical devices are designed to capture the attention of readers.

According to Fairclough, the assumptions about discourses, genres, and styles are that they provide a way of moving between social analysis, political analysis, political-economic analysis, and linguistic analysis and semiotic analysis between texts and interactions (Fairclough, 1989, p. 19-20). He further states: "I have glossed the discourse view of language ‘language as a form of social practice’”. This implies firstly that language is a part of society, and not somehow external to it and, secondly, that language is a social process. Thirdly, language should be considered a socially conditioned process, conditioned that is by other (non-linguistic) parts of society (ibid p.22). Fairclough’s view contradicts assertions that there is an internal and dialectical relationship between language and society; he argues that language is a part of society, part of the linguistic phenomena that are social phenomena of a special sort, and social phenomena are in some part linguistic phenomena. “Linguistic phenomena are social in the sense that whenever people are engaging in social interactions, when people speak or listen or read or write, they do so in ways which are determined socially and have social effects” (ibid p.23). These social effects can be detected in, for example, the ways which people use language in their most intimate and private interactions. When people are most aware of their own individuality and think themselves to be disorganized from social influences, they still use language in ways which are open to social convention.

Fairclough reinforces the point about the integration of language and social practice, stating: “Social phenomena are linguistic, on the other hand, in the sense that the language activity which goes on in social contexts (as all language activity does) is not merely a reflection or expression of social processes and practices, it is a part of those processes and practices” (ibid, p.23). For example, arguments about the meaning of political expressions are a common aspect of politics. Arguments may arise concerning the meanings of words like democracy, nationalization, imperialism, socialism, liberation or terrorism. These words are more commonly used consciously and also in different inappropriate ways, for example between political leaders; some political figures and commentators use these expressions with different meanings attached. Two examples of this are to be found in the use of the word "democratic" in the nations which
have named themselves the Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) and the Democratic Republic of Congo. It may be argued that the use of "democratic" in these instances was for the purpose of misleading the public and/or other nations and institutions into believing they were genuine democracies and thereby their respective electorates had the power to selected and dismiss governments when this was not the case. In that sense, politics is manifest in the disputes and struggles which occur in language and about language. However, it is not a case of there being a proportionate relationship between language and society as equal aspects of a single whole (ibid p.23). Here, Fairclough (1989) is arguing that disputes in politics will continue, but not specifically between language and society.

Language as social practice means that language is a social process and this is what differentiates discourse from non-contextualised and isolated texts. A text is a product rather than a process; it is a product of the process of text production. The term “discourse” refers to the entire process of social interaction of which a text is just a part (Fairclough, 1989, p.24). Text analysis includes analysis of productive and interpretative processes, and also a part of discourse analysis. It is important that productive and interpretative processes involve interplay between properties of texts and a considerable range of members resources (MR). MR is what people have in terms of their existing knowledge and what they use when they produce or interpret texts, including their comprehension of language, how people represent the natural and social worlds they inhabit, such as their values, beliefs and assumptions. The MR in texts which people produce and interpret are cognitive in the sense that they are in people’s minds, they are social and they have social origins and are socially generated. What is socially produced is important to people and what is made available to them; they can use this internalized MR to engage in their social practice, including discourse. Moreover, it is not just the nature of these cognitive resources that is socially determined, but also the conditions of their use. When analysing discourse from a critical perspective, it is of importance to consider differences such as the various cognitive strategies that are employed when someone is reading a poem, a magazine or an advertisement.

Discourse, on the other hand, involves social situations which can be distinguished as social conditions of production, and social conditions of interpretation (Fairclough 1989, p. 25). These social situations account for different ‘levels’ of social organization: the level of the social situation, or the immediate social environment in which the discourse occurs; the level of the social institution which constitutes a wider matrix for the discourse; and the level of the society as a whole. Fairclough suggests that these social conditions shape the MR people bring to production and interpretation which, in turn, shapes the way in which texts are produced and
interpreted (Fairclough, 1989, p.25). In identifying language as a discourse and as social prac-
tice, one is committing oneself not just to analysing texts, nor just to analysing processes of pro-
duction and interpretation, but to analysing the relationship between texts, processes, and their
social situations. These three dimensions of discourse correspond to Fairclough’s three dimen-
sions of critical discourse analysis:

Description: this is the stage which is concerned with formal properties of the text.

Interpretation: this is the stage where the focus is on the connection and the relationship between
text and interaction, seeing the text as the product of a process of production, and as a resource in
the process of interpretation.

Explanation: it is the stage that focuses on the relationship between interaction and social con-
text, on the social determination of the processes of production and interpretation, and their so-
cial effects (ibid p.26).

It is possible to refer to what occurs at each of these stages as an analysis, but it is
important to recognise that the nature of an analysis changes as one shifts from stage to stage. It
should be noted in particular that analysis at the description stage differs from analysis at the
interpretation and explanation stages. In the description stage, analysis is generally thought of as
a matter of identifying and labelling formal features of a text in terms of the categories of a de-
scriptive structure. There are various ways to transcribe any exchange of speech, and the way the
text is interpreted is influenced by how it is transcribed. In the case of interpretation, it is the
cognitive processes of participants that are analysed. In the case of explanation, it is relationships
between interactions, and more permanent social structures which shape, and are shaped by,
these events. Fairclough comments on the relation of description with interpretation on these
three stages and reveals that description is basically just as dependent on the analyst’s interpreta-
tion, as the transcription of speech. These stages represent that all are dependent on how a text is
interpreted and observed (Fairclough, 1989, p.26-27).

2.2.1 Fairclough’s Approach

Fairclough has structured a model for CDA which consists of processes of analysis and these are
tied to the dimensions of discourse which are explained below. This approach is effective be-
cause it helps focus on the signifiers which make up the text and the linguistic alternatives. The signifier is commonly interpreted in semiotic theory as the material (or physical) form of the sign; it is something which can be seen, heard, touched, smelt or tasted. Both signifier and signified are psychological. A linguistic sign is not a link between a thought and a name, but between a concept and a sound pattern. The sound pattern is not physical: it is the hearer’s psychological impression of a sound, as given to him/her by the evidence of his/her senses (Saussure, 1916). Fairclough’s approach is reliable because it offers an objective and analytical alternative. According to Fairclough (1989), all of these dimensions and analyses need to be included in order for the analyst to establish patterns which may be of linguistic interest.

The dimensions mentioned above are:
- The object of analysis (including verbal, visual or verbal and visual texts).
- The processes by means of which the object is produced and received (writing/speaking/designing and reading/listening/viewing) by human subjects.
- The socio-historical conditions which govern these processes.

Fairclough lists three kinds of analysis that can be performed, as follows:
1. Text analysis (description),
2. Processing analysis (interpretation),

2.2.2 Nominalisation

In journalism, nominalisation is used when writers are striving to convey newsworthy stories yet without directing accusations at specific individuals, corporations or other bodies. This is achieved in large part through the use of a verb, an adverb, or an adjective as the head of a noun phrase, in their headlines. An example of this might occur when a clause is transformed into a nominal or a noun-like particle. Fairclough suggests that “nominalisation is a process changed into noun or a multi-word compound noun” (Fairclough 1989, p.124).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Noun (Nominalisation)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advance</td>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The other way of using nominalisation is to take adjectives by adding the suffixes, -ness, -ism, or –ity. For example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Nominalisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sceptical</td>
<td>Scepticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>Desirability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are also nominalisations, as mentioned above, in withdrawing the agents so that any possible accusations at individuals are eliminated, which is the passive abstract concept. For example:

*The Minister of Foreign Affairs suggested that the penalty for wearing a veil should be over two years in prison.*

Nominalisation:

*The penalty for wearing a veil is to be two years in prison.*

Fairclough suggests that nominalisation implies meanings in persuasive uses of language, such as political texts. He argues that the role of a verb, such as ‘exclude’, is to refer to a process, as the example below shows. “The school” is also an example of a non-human agent, for example:

*The school will exclude disruptive pupils.*

In this structure, information is conveyed about who performs the action, who is affected and when it happens. In contrast, the role of a noun, such as ‘exclusion’, is to refer to a state of affairs. This is also an example of nominalisation through use of a passive structure:

*Disruptive pupils will be excluded*

*There is a policy of exclusion.*
Taking away the verb, a copula, and “there” is a pronoun without meaning which equates no content. No one is named as having created the “policy”; it is just there with no specified originator (Ross, 2013).

2.2.3 Hegemony

Hegemony is a concept which is inspired by Marxism and is, as a political concept, often attributed to Antonio Gramsci\(^5\). The prevailing social norms of society are, according to this view, imposed by the ruling class, which is neither natural nor inevitable; rather, it consists of social constructs imposed by powerful institutions (like the higher social classes, the political classes, the judicial system, government bodies etc.). As an example, Marxism proposes that industrial workers and farmers can liberate themselves from these hegemonies through rejecting them and establishing their own culture (Wolff, 2003). In modern linguistics, the term “hegemony” is given a wider meaning. According to this theory, hegemony encompasses any manifestation of a dominant view which is presented as unarguable fact, and where anyone who departs from that agreed view is considered to be the modern-day, political equivalent of a heretic.\(^6\)

An example of hegemony can be considered with perceptions of cannabis, and the comparisons made with this drug and alcohol. For several decades, cannabis in all its forms has been a legally prohibited substance in most countries of the world, including virtually all developed countries, and this prohibition has been sustained with the aid of international treaties. Cannabis has been sat alongside drugs such as heroin and cocaine; while its use might have been expected among certain groups in society, its illegality has meant it was generally frowned upon by those who considered themselves to be respectable and law abiding. Meanwhile, alcohol has been available, promoted, officially sanctioned and widely consumed in most societies and is so established as to have become an embedded feature of western culture. The prevailing hegemony has therefore been predicated on an assumption that cannabis was harmful in the same way as other illicit substances, while alcohol was hegemonically viewed as largely benign. However, in more recent years, there have been moves in some quarters to reverse this hegemony, and they


\(^6\)http://cadair.aber.ac.uk/dspace/handle/2160/39731 (Accessed 3\(^rd\) Apr.2018.)
have been at least partially successful. The admitted use of cannabis by some celebrities, combined with the expressed views of certain scientists in terms both of its medicinal possibilities and an emerging willingness to challenge the accepted view of cannabis have given this drug a new respectability. This effect has, arguably, been bolstered by a trend towards mistrusting those in power, leading people to question whether compliance with the law is, in fact, a moral duty. At the time of writing, however, a different situation has arisen with regard to cannabis. Many politicians, including former US presidents, have admitted to having used cannabis in their youth (Health, 2014). Certain countries, notably Portugal\(^7\) and Uruguay\(^8\), and even some US states\(^9\), have relaxed their prohibition of cannabis. Conversely, alcohol and its dangers have become more emphasized in recent years, with calls by pressure groups for bans on advertising (Health, 2014). With this, we may be seeing the inception of a reversal of hegemonic views, where cannabis becomes the accepted drug of choice and its use entirely legal and socially acceptable, while alcohol becomes associated with drunkenness, violence and dependence.

It may be said that hegemonies are developing on several sides of the argument in respect of Muslim women wearing veils in public and these align with political views. The 20\(^{th}\) century has been a time for rapid social change in the west and this has involved a process of modernization in which women have been encouraged to enjoy a range of freedoms, including the freedom of dress. Modernisation also involves urbanization and increasing levels of literacy and education\(^10\). Wearing a veil occurs throughout certain Abrahamic traditions, where it signifies a woman’s self-respect and modesty. The veil was the sign of nobility and Jewish women in Europe continued to wear veils until the nineteenth century when their lives became more intermingled with the surrounding culture and external pressures of the European life and which forced many of the women to go out with their faces exposed\(^11\). The Christian tradition of the veil may signify a man’s authority over woman and a sign of woman’s subjugation to man. The Jewish tradition of the veil is a signifier of wealth and distinction of some married women of a higher social class\(^12\). However, the Islamic purpose of the veil does not concur with the Christian, nor the Jewish, view of the veil. The Islamic veil is a sign of modesty and it has the purpose

\(^7\) http://www.ehow.com/list_6801530_marijuana-laws-portugal.html (Accessed 3\(^{rd}\) Apr.2018.)
\(^9\) http://www.health.com/health/gallery/0,,20345389_2,00.html (Accessed 3\(^{rd}\) Apr.2018.)
\(^10\) http://www.islamicity.com/mosque/w_islam/veil.htm (Accessed 3\(^{rd}\) Apr.2018.)
\(^12\) http://veil.unc.edu/religions/judaism/ (Accessed 3\(^{rd}\) Apr.2018.)
of protecting all women from what is perceived as the danger of men’s lust. Protecting women’s bodies and women’s reputation is a matter of high importance for the Quran; therefore, a man who falsely accuses a woman of, for example, behaviour that will signify that she is impure should be punished. Muslims have been exposed in public to social media and, because that change has not occurred before, such a development in human civilisation could make Islam a threat to other cultures (islamicity, 2014). Islam has not evolved in the way that Christianity and Judaism has regarding the veil. Muslims are to be found on all continents, which means that Islam is practised differently because the notion of the veil is understood in another way, so there are variations in the ways women wear the veil. According to the Quran, the niqab (veil) is not understood as a headscarf which is to be worn by all Muslim women; instead, it seems as if the term hijab has been misunderstood. “For saura 33:52 was revealed at the time of the Prophet’s marriage with a new bride and speaks of his desire to consummate his marriage, a desire which was frustrated because some guests were overstaying their visit. God has thus sent in this revelation in order to separate the guests through a veil from the private chambers of the Prophet and his bride”. The context of the hijab in this part of the Quran is a physical object for women to wear, so the veil may not have to be interpreted as a dress code, but more as a social marker for women (UNC, 1991). There is a widely shared belief among many in the West that Muslim women are oppressed and unappreciated by men if they routinely wear the veil (ibid). However, it is essential in the Islamic culture for Muslims to follow the religion. This is a point of contention. For example, many Muslim women say the veil is not essential to their religion. Also, Muslims tend to be strict in their observance of their religious rules while Christianity’s influence in the West has been fading for some years. This can lead to misunderstandings between the Eastern and Western cultures, where western women tend to have less regard for religious dogma and more regard for what they perceive to be their human and political rights. Therefore, the western hegemonic assumption is that Middle Eastern women should not wear veils in the west because of the difference in culture. There are cultural differences that Muslims encounter when migrating and the teaching of Islam is more focused on giving care and attention to females, in terms of their perception of respect, honour, dignity and integrity (UNC, 1991).

2.2.4 Metaphor

---

Metaphors are traditionally described as stylistic features of literature and a literary tool, but they are found in almost all language use (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980). All abstract vocabulary is metaphorical but, in most cases, the original language hides the metaphor. Metaphor compares concepts and everyday speech is marked by frequent use of metaphor. Orientational metaphors are one kind of metaphor used on a daily basis and often unconsciously; this kind can be seen organizing a whole system of concepts with respect to one another and they give a concept of spatial orientation. Systematicity does not just occur in orientational metaphors: it occurs in other kinds of metaphors as well. What defines orientational metaphors is that they relate abstract concepts to spatial ones, as the following examples show:

Get up, wake up,
I’m up already, we rise early,
he fell asleep, he dropped off to sleep,
he is under hypnosis, he sank into a coma.
Up town, down town, going up/down in the world, she’ll rise to the top.
he has a foot on the ladder, she is upwardly mobile, and he is a high-ranking officer. (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.15).

Another example that Lakoff and Johnson (1980) relate is happy is up, and this, too, is systematic: mood is related to notions of up and down, high and low etc. The fact that the concept happy is oriented up leads to English expressions like “I am feeling up today”. Such metaphorical orientations are not arbitrary. These kinds of metaphors have a basis in physical and cultural experience (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.14). Lakoff and Johnson (1980) also account for an extraordinarily wide variety of ontological metaphors; these explain that the basic experiences of human spatial orientations give rise to orientational metaphors and therefore human experiences with physical objects provide this extraordinary variety of ontological metaphors offering ways of viewing events, activities, emotions, ideas, etc., as entities and substances (p.25). Examples of ontological metaphors which deal with experiences are referring, quantifying, identifying aspects, identifying causes, setting goals and motivating actions.

Quantifying
It will take a lot of patience to finish this book.
There is so much hatred in the world.
You have got too much hostility in you.
(Lakoff and Johnson, 1980, p.26).

Metaphor offers a means of representing one aspect of experience in terms of another, and is by no means restricted to the sort of discourse it tends to be stereotypically associated with – poetry and literary discourse. However, any aspect of experience can be represented in terms of any number of metaphors, and it is the relationship between alternative metaphors that is of particular interest, for different metaphors have different ideological attachments (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.3). A metaphor creates new links between otherwise distinct conceptual domains, a semantic relationship with the real world. The aim of this, when used as a literary tool or for rhetorical purposes, is to convey thought more forcefully than a direct or literal statement would. That is one function of metaphors, but it is not the only one. With abstract phenomena, it is nearly impossible to express oneself without using metaphor. Metaphor is a figure of speech by which one phenomenon is substituted for another phenomenon on the basis of a perceived shared characteristic. This allows speakers and writers to use fewer words and forces the reader or listener to find the similarities. According to Lakoff and Johnson (1980, p.3), metaphors occur in "Our ordinary conceptual system" and thus they affect "the way we think, what we experience, and what we do every day language". As such, metaphors play a key role not just in human communicative practices, but in the cognitive processes that initiate them. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) regard metaphors primarily as mental vehicles through which we are able to conceptualise and contemplate abstract experiences, and that their existence as linguistic devices derives from that cognitive aspect. That hypothesis implies that they are far more fundamental than merely the means by which we communicate, but rather they are tools which facilitate abstract thought.

2.2.5 Code of Practice

There is a Code of Practice that relates to the press and the Code decides the framework for the topmost professional principles that members of the press subscribing to the Independent Press Standards Organisation have undertaken to maintain. It is the essential element of the system of voluntary self-regulation to which they have made a binding contractual commitment. It balances both the individual rights and the public's right to know.

To some extent, Code of Practice manifests hegemonic expectations of the press. For example, the independent press standards organisation UK (IPSO) is an organisation that works as a regulator for newspapers and magazines in the UK. The organisation makes sure that
the journalists set certain standards in terms of responsible reporting and then hold them to account if they fail to meet those standards. They also deal with complaints about journalism from the public. IPSO assures that there are “high standards of journalism and help to maintain freedom of expression for the press”\textsuperscript{14}. The Code of Practice states: “All members of the press have a duty to maintain the highest professional standards. The Code, which includes this preamble and the public interest exceptions below, sets the benchmark for those ethical standards, protecting both the rights of the individual and the public’s right to know”. IPSO seeks to ensure that the member newspapers and magazines follow the Editor’s Code. Examples of the Editor’s Code relevant to this study would include the requirement for accuracy, and it specifies: “The Press must take care not to publish inaccurate, misleading or distorted information or images, including headlines not supported by the text”. Under the heading “harassment”, the Code stipulates: “Journalists must not engage in intimidation, harassment or persistent pursuit”\textsuperscript{15}.

3. Methodology

3.1 Method Selection

The methodology that will be applied in this analysis will consist of theoretical tools which are primarily from the field of critical discourse analysis. Approaching language and power in context of the articles in British newspapers, will be designed to analyse and describe the way that language is used in newspapers with different political and social backgrounds. The research will compare the British newspapers’ political leanings, as to how their choice of linguistic strategies, whether the CDA aspects e.g. hegemony and nominalisation are manifested in the texts and then the differences in the articles’ word choices, choice of register, and why the newspapers are formulated differently according to the nature of the specific readership at which they are directing their journalism. This CDA analysis describes the way in which the same news story is represented and how the articles have explored the different perspectives of different newspapers according to their claimed political affiliations. Then, by the application of certain concepts which are present within CDA methodologies, such as hegemony and nominalisation, more general conclusions will be drawn.

\textsuperscript{14} https://www.ipso.co.uk/about-ipso/ (Accessed 3\textsuperscript{rd} Apr. 2018.)
\textsuperscript{15} https://www.ipso.co.uk/editors-code-of-practice/ (Accessed 3\textsuperscript{rd} Apr. 2018.)
3.2 Compare and Contrast

One commonly used method of analysis of any two or more phenomena is to compare and contrast them. Comparing involves identifying aspects that are common to both or all, while contrasting focuses on the differences. This process will be applied to the articles in the analysis. Rhetoric is a kind of discourse that aims to enhance the capability of writers or speakers to inform, persuade or motivate particular audiences in specific situations. Compare and contrast approaches often occur as a method of analysis in conative texts such as political and religious speeches, public service announcements (PSAs) and in advertising.

Stylistics within the language is what is “happening now”; what the linguistic associations are that the style of language reveals. Stylistics focuses on the study of poetic style in texts, normally in literary works (Richard Nordquist, 8 May 2017). Common features of style encompass regional accents, including the use of dialogue and individual dialects (or idiolects), the use of grammar, such as the observation of active voice and passive voice, the expansion of sentence lengths, the use of particular language registers. Stylistics is a term that is used to determine the connections between the form and effects within a particular variety of language.

The linguistic study will be performed on written texts, namely journalistic articles. The linguistic study will focus on four published articles from three mainstream British newspapers. All the articles will relate the same topic or story, and will have been written by different journalists. These will be compared and contrasted using CDA approaches and then the appropriate conclusions drawn. The primary data is enumerated in the next subchapter.

3.3 Similarities and Differences

The article “Spare us a ‘national debate’ on veils” in Appendix I is from the British newspaper The Guardian. This newspaper is for people who are interested in politics and also for everyday knowledge. It is a British paper, but has readers from all over the world as it can be read on their website www.theguardian.com. The article is from the columnists' section and an opinion piece that is written by Simon Jenkins published Monday 16 September 2013 and comprises 436

16 (http://grammar.about.com/od/rs/g/Stylistics-term.htm (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)
words. The author writes for the Guardian as well as broadcasting for the BBC. He has edited The Times and The London Evening Standard and chaired The National Trust\textsuperscript{17}.

The article “Veils are not appropriate in classrooms or airport security, says Nick Clegg” in Appendix II is also from The Guardian. It was published Monday 16 September 2013, and consists of 832 words. The author, Nick Clegg, is a British Liberal Democrat politician who was Deputy Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and Lord President of the Council from 2010 to 2015\textsuperscript{18}.

The article “It is not ‘appropriate’ for students to wear veil in classroom, says Nick Clegg” in Appendix III is from the British newspaper The Independent. It is written by Oliver Wright who is a political editor of The Independent, and it was published 16 September 2013. The article contains 549 words\textsuperscript{19}.

The article “The debate about Muslim women wearing veils is not complex. This is Britain, and in Britain you can wear what you want” in Appendix IV is from the British newspaper The Telegraph”. The author is Dan Hodges and it was published 16 September 2013. The article contains 946 words. Dan Hodges has worked for the Labour Party, the GMB trade union and managed numerous independent political campaigns\textsuperscript{20}.

These articles were chosen because they address a topic which is of popular interest, and which is controversial and inspires strong views at the interface of culture and politics. It is also pertinent to this study as answering the research questions makes it necessary to compare more than one article from the same paper to be able to find more relevant contrasts. The aim in the Analysis chapter will be to establish how approaches vary between the selected newspapers, having regard to their supposed political leanings. It will also seek to find examples of how the CDA approach can be applied systematically as a means of establishing the degree to which the claimed political leanings are evident in their reporting and, more broadly, what this reveals about the way British newspapers position their readership. It was decided to focus primarily on nominalisation, hegemony and metaphors, since an analysis of all features described in modern linguistics would not have been feasible in the time available and the aim of the research was to be able to show specific differences and similarities.

\textsuperscript{17} https://www.theguardian.com (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)

\textsuperscript{18} https://www.theguardian.com (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)

\textsuperscript{19} http://www.independent.co.uk (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)

\textsuperscript{20} http://www.telegraph.co.uk (Accessed 3rd Apr.2018.)
4. Results and Analysis

4.1 The Guardian - *Spare us a ‘national debate’ on veils* - By Simon Jenkins (See full transcript in Appendix I)

The journalist Simon Jenkins writes in the article that this is a “national crisis” a statement that could be interpreted as being hyperbolic. This article makes no recommendation other than letting institutions decide on a case-by-case basis with legal backing if/where necessary. From a CDA perspective, Jenkins is manipulating the text so as to present it in a way that is hegemonic and his word choices aim to make the reader believe that Jeremy Browne thinks the debate about banning the veil is necessary.

The language in this article is, as usual for this publication, relatively formal, and focuses on giving information and different points of view. For example; line one of the article discusses the arguments from the Home Office minister Jeremy Browne such as: “Do we really want a ‘national debate’ about veiling?” The word ‘national’ is a term that is widely understood to mean “involving people from across the country”. The government can instigate a national debate. This is also a rhetorical question where Jenkins expresses the meaning as if they answered their own question where this is an example of a question with a presupposed answer of “No”. “Do we really…?” (Appendix I: line 1) invites an answer of “No we don’t”. The structure of “do…?” which elicits an expectation of the negative, while “don't …” elicits an expectation of the positive (e.g. “don't you care about human rights?”).

Line 2 of the article has metonyms and mixed metaphors such as: “France banned the wearing of the full-face veil in public in 2010 with Belgium following not long after”. “France” and “Belgium” are metonyms’ and this quote is an example of metonym in journalism where France is, in the most literal sense, a land mass and so, as it is not a conscious entity with its own agency, it can never make any decision, including banning the wearing of the veil. The words “France” and “Belgium” here are deployed as metonymic shorthand to refer to the respective governments of France and Belgium and these authorities are able to make and implement such decisions.

Line 3 of the article states: “Their debates have been bitter and divisive”, “their” is an example of anaphora, that refers to the people back in the text to an earlier referent.

Line 4 of the article states: “Browne is reflecting a swirl of conflicting pressures”, reflecting, swirl, conflicting and pressures are all examples of mixed metaphor reflecting liberation. Mixed metaphors may be viewed negatively from a semantic perspective, especially where
it is done unintentionally. However, creative writers, including journalists, may mix their metaphors strategically in order to generate a desired effect in the text. These effects may be rhetorical, i.e. to emphasise a point, or to add humour. Sometimes it is used stylistically, to generate an effect because it can be funny, like “he has a heart as big as gold” which is more a blended metaphor, i.e. confusing two incomplete metaphors together that make no sense, than a mixed metaphor - rather like the old tongue-in-cheek expression: “this is not exactly rocket surgery, you know”.

Line 4-7 of the article states: “Some women’s groups want liberation from social authoritarianism. Others want to be left to express their religion as they see fit. Many institutions, schools, colleges, hospitals, the courts, the police need to be able to identify their clients and the public”. Indefinite pronouns and quantifying determiners, such as “some”, “others” and “many”, are commonly used in the article. When the journalist uses words like “some”, “others” and “many” in this context, these are examples of vagueness (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) which can be understood through CDA; there are no specific referents or quantities. “many” and “others” are also used again in the next paragraph which creates a parallel with previous sentences because the words are repetitive and they are also part of the rhetoric. “many” and “others” are two pairs of contrasting sentences.

Jack Straw is mentioned in the article. He was a Labour Member of Parliament between the years 1979-2015. His senior posts include being Home Secretary and Deputy Prime Minister, and holding shadow ministerial posts when his party was in opposition. He may be regarded as an elder statesman by virtue of his lengthy and illustrious career in parliament21. He is a politician who asks a question as in “if they would mind removing the niqab” (Line 13). With this question, he presents the demand as a polite request that the female Muslim population of the UK remove their face-covering when necessary rather than advocating an outright ban of the veil in public. Straw appeals to the reader by seeking cooperation, but he still argues the case for a law which makes it a requirement for woman who is asked to remove her veil in some circumstances to comply with that request.

Line 13-15 of the article states: “If the police can ban hoodies in parts of town centers because they obscure their cameras, why not other forms of dress”. Jenkins uses examples and comparisons that appeal to the reader in a way that invites the reader to consider that a request to a woman to remove her veil may be reasonable. Straw’s example makes a comparison

with the “hoodie” which is associated with hooliganism and this context is a supplement to a cultural debate about the comparison between hoodies and veils. Jenkins attempts to cause the readers to equate the hoodie with the niqab, while Straw aims to invoke the public’s natural aversion to the state dictating what people can wear, or are prohibited from wearing. There is a risk of resistance if the state began to encroach upon the rights of citizens to wear what they please. Straw is pointing to a precedent - i.e. the fact that the public has already accepted that certain modes of dress (hoodies) have been restricted for the sake of public safety, convenience etc., and that there should be no reason to object to niqabs being banned on the same basis - i.e. the law is being consistent and not discriminatory.

Line 15 of the article states: “Teachers must be able to distinguish between pupils in class”. The writer here relies upon the existing knowledge or experience of readers in order to understand why it is essential for teachers to be able to readily identify pupils. The operation of existing, or encyclopaedic, knowledge is explained by Relevance Theory (Sperber & Wilson, 1995) as being an example of implicature in this utterance, where teachers cannot teach if the pupils’ faces are covered because of a niqab.

Line 15-16 of the article state: “Those who wish to make use of public services must expect to identify themselves somehow”. From a CDA perspective, the utterance quoted above refers to pupils in class on the one hand, and then anyone (pupils or others) who are seeking to use public services.

Line 25 of the article states: “They should make their own decisions, consulting and defending them in their local circumstances”, “They” in this context is an anaphoric reference that is referred to in the same context i.e. local authorities, schools and so on.

Line 28 of the article states: “The game is not worth the candle”. This conclusion of this article consists of two metaphors in the same phrase which are a mixed metaphor. A mixed metaphor occurs when two or more are used in the same utterances and they do not align with one another, and those are “game” and “candle”. The metaphor “candle” indicates on that the fight is not worth it. It is not even worth the expense of a candle to create enough light to partake in them. Jenkins uses these metaphors in order to indicate that this debate is not worth the fight because it is dependent on the government’s final word. In other words, Jenkins is using a metaphor in this case as a rhetorical device to dismiss, maybe ridicule, the suggestion that there should be a national debate. The point Jenkins is making here is that a national law, as they have in France, is just likely to be a source of friction, and to risk allegations of racism, Islamophobia and so on, and that “it is not worth a candle”. Instead, he proposes delegating powers down to local authorities i.e. councils, and even schools, to make their own policies, but then supporting
whatever they decide. The “not worth a candle” figure of speech implicates that the UK does not want to make the same mistake as France because it is too problematic.

4.2 The Guardian - *Veils are not appropriate in classrooms or airport security, says Nick Clegg* - *Writer Unknown* (See full transcript in Appendix II)

The article for this analysis is published by the same British newspaper as the previous article. The major difference is that this article is written by another journalist, but the aim and purpose is the same as the previous article. MP Nick Clegg states that he does not want a state ban, but rather to allow pupils to interact face-to-face and to facilitate veil removal for airport security.

When compared to the first article in *The Guardian*, this one contains of more responses such as: “Browne Says...” and “Clegg says...” For example: line four of the article states: “It is not appropriate for students to wear a full veil in the classroom or for people to go through airport security with their faces covered, Nick Clegg has said”. Line 13 of the article states: “Browne said he was “instinctively uneasy” about restricting religious freedoms, but he added there may be a case to act to protect girls who were too young to decide for themselves whether they wished to wear veil or not”. In this statement, Clegg claims go to a “full veil” and this creates a discussion where some readers may be confused by Clegg's ambivalence to the veil. While supporting the principle that the law or other state edicts should not generally interfere with sartorial choices, he mentions exceptions in which he considers it reasonable to insist that a full veil, by which he presumably means one which obscures the face, is not worn or is removed.

The article claims that the then Liberal Democrat Party leader seeks to ban all Muslim girls and young women from wearing a veil in public places such as in classrooms and in public places. For example, in line 1 of the article claims: “Veils are not appropriate in classrooms or airport security, says Nick Clegg”. Also in line 9 of the article it states: “The Home Office minister Jeremy Browne called for a national debate on whether the state should step in to prevent young women having the veil imposed upon them”. In this statement, Jeremy Browne refers to the national debate on whether the state should prevent young women having the veil *imposed upon them*. Browne raises one specific point which is alluded to as the “women issue”. He is not proposing that the state should step in: he is proposing a “national debate” on whether it should step in or not, and the extent to which it should do so. He is unwilling to be perceived as the western man as the western man dictating to Muslim women what they can and cannot wear, but he still has this problem to solve of girls and women in schools, colleges, airports etc.
and the problems that causes when wearing a veil (like identification, lack of face-to-face inter-
action and so on). Having a “national debate” means he is able to avoid taking one side or the
other, but rather he can pass the decision, and thereby the responsibility for making it and any
outcomes arising from it, to the public.

Line 23 of the article states: “Responding to his comments, Clegg said: ‘I think
there is a debate going on already in households and communities up and down the country’ ”. Clegg appears to concur with Browne's view, but he is emphasizing that this debate is already in
progress at different levels in society. He is also trying to make the case for Britain being a more liberal nation than other countries which have passed laws on this.

Line 48 of the article states: “The Tory backbencher Dr Sarah Wollaston said the
veils were “deeply offensive” and were “making women invisible”, and called for the niqab to be
banned in schools and colleges”. Wollaston insists that the veil is “deeply offensive” and “mak-
ing women invisible”. She does not appear to rationalize these claims or offer evidence in sup-
port of them and so a reader may conclude these are little more than her subjective opinions.
When Wollaston refers to the niqab as “deeply offensive”, that raises the question as to why it is offensive and according to what criteria. She is taking a stronger line than Browne or Clegg, and her argument seems to be more predicated on securing women's rights as she is calling for an outright ban on the niqab in all schools and colleges. Line 45 of the article says: “However the Prime Minister has been coming under growing pressure from his own MPs for a rethink on
current Department for Education guidelines in order to protect schools and colleges from being
“bullied”.” It does not say who is being bullied, but it might be that the writer is referring to
Muslim parents or community leaders. The writer is nevertheless unwilling to express that in
explicit terms.

In summary, these two articles from The Guardian “Spare us a ’national debate’
on veils” and “Veils are not appropriate in classrooms or airport security, says Nick Clegg”
highlight a cultural distaste for implementing dress restrictions in the United Kingdom, which is
a country that prides itself on civil liberties and freedom of choice as enshrined in the British
constitution. The articles also focus on the reluctance of United Kingdom politicians to seek to
impose dress restrictions on its people. It is also a country which has committed itself to multi-
culturalism and goes to some trouble to avoid any moves which might threaten community cohe-
sion. On the other hand, there are issues related to certain items of Muslim dress which obscure
the face. Practical objections have been mentioned in terms of, for example, security in schools,
colleges and airports, where an ability to see the face and identify and interact with individuals is
essential. From a cultural perspective, the UK has placed great store on women's rights and some
commentators, including politicians, see the veil as an offence against the principle of gender equality.

4.3 The Independent - *It is not 'appropriate' for students to wear veil in classroom, says Nick Clegg - By Oliver Wright* (See full transcript in Appendix III)

The language in this article is relatively formal. The article is structured such that Nick Clegg responds to Jeremy Browne’s statements and have own respondents in contrast to *The Guardian* article where the comments were structured as two independent viewpoints regarding the same debate.

The statement from Browne, shown below, was quoted in three publications, namely *The Guardian, The Telegraph* and *The Independent*. Line 9 of Browne's argument reads: “I am instinctively uneasy about restricting the freedom of individuals to observe the religion of their choice.” In choosing the expression “restricting the freedom”, Browne is inviting the reader to accept a series of presuppositions, namely that (i) there is a natural and unarguable freedom to hold a religion of one's choice, regardless of its tenets and observances; (ii) that wearing the burkha is a fundamental duty within the religion he has in mind; and therefore (iii) that legislating to prevent the wearing of the burkha public is a violation of the freedom principle. He makes no reference to other religious practices being prohibited in the UK, such as the use of cannabis by the Rastafarian community, nor does he demonstrate that wearing burkas is actually required under the Islamic faith. In using the adjective “instinctively uneasy”, he is signaling that his personal ideology is classically liberal; he presents himself as being tolerant of alien religions and cultures and, consequently, anyone who disagrees with him must therefore be intolerant and, by implication, a bigoted individual. Browne bolsters his point by mentioning Christian minorities in the Middle East. This may be interpreted as an allusion to oppressed Christians in Muslim countries, but this is not made explicit. Such an interpretation has to be inferred, with the reader having to rely upon their own member resources, as defined by Fairclough (1989).

Line 11 of the article claims: “But there is genuine debate about whether girls should feel a compulsion to wear a veil when society deems children to be unable to express personal choices about other areas like buying alcohol, smoking or getting married.” (Also in *The Telegraph*). The issue here relates specifically to children, and the writer is drawing a parallel between forcing a child to wear a veil and activities such as buying alcohol and smoking (harmful to health) and making life-changing decisions (getting married). Also, the parallels are not valid; wearing a veil is not harmful to health, nor does donning a veil commit to a major,
life-changing decision. It could also be argued that the writer has made no mention of other items of religious dress, such as Jewish boys wearing the kippah (obligatory skullcap) or Sikh boys wearing turbans. The article does mention the basis for objections to full face covering and practical reasons, i.e. why the face should be visible both for girls and women in public places and when in state institutions such as colleges, but the parallels which Browne offers in respect of children appear irrelevant to these.

Line 14 of the article states: “We should be very cautious about imposing religious conformity on a society which has always valued freedom of expression.” This is an interesting quote from a CDA perspective. On the surface, the speaker appears to be identifying himself with the inclusive (the British people) and exclusive (the government) in his use of the second person plural pronoun. However, the “we” relates to the subject “imposing religious conformity” while neither the government, nor the wider population, want to do any such thing. The writer is using the pronoun as though he is identifying himself, and the government, with those Muslim parents as though they are the same entities. Using a third person pronoun, i.e. “they”, conveys distance and that may be something he wishes to avoid as a strong advocate for multiculturalism.

Line 32 of the article asserts: “But when a 17-year-old prospective student complained to her local newspaper that she was being discriminated against, a campaign sprang up against the ban, attracting 8,000 signatures to an online petition in just 48 hours.” This consists of a simple, factual statement. While the same facts are relayed in all of the articles, there are differences in the way they are expressed, although these differences do not appear to be significant enough to warrant close analysis.

Line 38 of the article reads: “However the Prime Minister has been coming under growing pressure from his own MPs for a rethink on current Department for Education guidelines in order to protect schools and colleges from being "bullied". This raises an interesting issue that the other articles do not cover in relation to schools, and head teachers in particular, being “bullied”. A reader is left to speculate, or make inferences, as to the form in which this bullying occurs and the reasons for the reluctance of the writer to make this explicit. It may, for example, give rise to suspicions that schools and those who manage them are fearful of falling foul of political correctness, or of accusations of racism or Islamophobia. There is also an example of nominalisation in this part of the article with the passive construction “being bullied”, and consequently it is not specified who it is that the writer has in mind as doing the bullying. Possible reasons why may be that the language used by critical analysts tend to be forms of language
whose ideological potentiality they are warning against, such as deleting agency, using passives and turning processes into entities (Billig, 2008).\(^{22}\)

4.4 The Telegraph - The debate about Muslim women wearing veils is not complex. This is Britain, and in Britain you can wear what you want - By Dan Hodges (See full transcript in Appendix IV)

Hodges claims that this is a “non-issue” taking a very pragmatic and one might say ‘British’ stance. This article uses other daily and cultural comparisons talking about both the advantages (tradition/heritage) and disadvantages (lack of identity) for these religious approaches.

Line 1-5 of the article states: “This morning Lib Dem Home Office minister Jeremy Browne has created a bit of a storm by saying that we need a “national debate” on the topic of Muslim women wearing of veils. His call was echoed by Tory MP Dr Sarah Wollaston, who said that “we must not abandon our cultural belief that women should fully and equally participate in society”. Her colleague Bob Neil said, “I do think we need to have a serious conversation about it. I respect all of those views. But they’re wrong”. This article begins by outlining the views of Browne, and two other Conservative MPs, and the writer is responding to these views. Hodges is setting the scene with his own quotations, and then letting the reader know that he takes a different view.

Line 7 of the article states: “The debate about “The Veil”, is neither necessary, nor is it complex. In fact, it is very, very simple. This is Britain. And in Britain you can wear what you want”. Thus, in Hodges’ view, there is no debate, national or otherwise. He disagrees with Bob Neil who states that there needs to be “a conversation”.

The national security issue is one issue and it is not about the practices of other cultures generally, but rather it is about one specific practice that involves hiding the face. He acknowledges there is a security issue because it is difficult to see the face on people wearing the hijab and so, from a security perspective, it is a concern in public places such as airports.

When using CDA to analyse this text, the writer tries to influence the reader. For example Line 9 of the article states: “Obviously there are practical exceptions. I can’t turn up to my local swimming pool and jump in with my clothes on, for example”. In the first sentence, Hodges is signalling that he is a reasonable person, that there are practical reasons to make exceptions and he is showing he is aware of these. The second sentence is not, as one might expect with the previous sentence, a statement that he disagrees with them. It is an analogy and one that

has to be understood by looking for the relevance of jumping into a swimming pool while being clothed. Rather than being a “bald assertion”, Hodges is inviting the reader to recover an implied parallel, and thus calculate his intended meaning from there. This short and very emphatic sentence is rhetoric, and the rhetoric is generated by his use of analogy and not by his emphasis. It is used to demonstrate his own certainty that he has insights that they do not possess and that the reader should take note of what he says.

The article ends with the strong argument and has a clear finish line which connects to the headline: line 57 of the article states: “Trust me, we don’t need a “national debate” about veils. We need a national debate about how to embed the economic recovery. How we actually get to grips with the deficit. Syria. The NHS. Welfare reform. Pensions. But if we really must have a debate, here it is. This is Britain. We wear what we damn well like. Debate over”. He begins here with an imperative: “Trust me”. He ends the article with a paragraph which includes a list punctuated as individual sentences, even though they are largely devoid of grammar. The final expression, again ungrammatical, is concordant with his assertion “But they’re wrong”. An interesting aspect of his article is that, rather than directing his focus to the substantive issue, he is apparently attempting to close down any discussion on it.

The article suggests that the incumbent government and opposition parties have a similar view on this debate when it states in line 58 of the article: “Trust me, we don’t need a “national debate” about veils. We need a national debate about how to embed the economic recovery. How we actually get to grips with the deficit. Syria. The NHS. Welfare reform. Pensions. But if we really must have a debate, here it is. This is Britain. We wear what we damn well like. Debate over”. This article also argues that this could lead to a broader debate on religious freedoms outside the United Kingdom and it is written about the serious problems that the UK is now experiencing that may provoke a reaction from the reader. Experiences that are unconnected with what Muslim women choose to wear in public places, including major economic challenges and possible military conflicts. These are intended to resonate with the reader who will recognize and be able to relate to them as they will be more likely to affect their lives than Islamic female garb.

Hodges is from a left-wing tradition, but writing for a right-wing newspaper. What Hodges is doing in this article is appealing to the archetypal Telegraph reader, i.e. generally elderly, middle class, Tory voters, and people who hold to traditional values. These people might well be expected to support a ban on veils. They are perceived as conservative, traditionalist and patriotic, and they may see veils as alien and therefore threatening. Consequently, he is appealing to a different aspect of their instincts, i.e. that of conservative libertarianism. Such people
place great store in freedoms and keeping the state “in its box” and out of people's lives. He is expressing himself in very forthright terms, and suggesting that there is something un-British about the law dictating what people can and cannot wear. Hodges appears to be expecting his readership will hold that right is absolute and inviolable.

5. Discussion

The aims of this study are to determine how the approach varies between the selected newspapers having regard to their supposed political leanings; how the CDA approach exposes these political leanings; what does analysis using CDA methods reveal in terms of the way in which stories are reported and how do British newspapers subject position their readers and make assumptions about their world view. This study is somewhat restricted because just four newspaper articles have been analysed. However, that makes it easier to focus more precisely and carefully when it comes to the articles chosen.

One could argue that the point of newspapers is to supply the public with a synopsis of all current and relevant news stories for their respective readerships. In general, newspapers exist to inform readers about matters of topical interest and also, to some extent, to provide a frame of reference and platform for the public debates relating to controversial issues and thus contribute to the process of forming opinions in society. The headline in an article is an essential part of the news story which has the purpose of stimulating a reader’s interest sufficiently for him to read the entire article.

Some writers are “quest writers”, and they are commissioned to write for newspapers. These may be regarded as story-tellers for a digital age and they come less from the straightforward, impartial news gathering tradition of trained journalists, but instead embrace a new style which favors transparency, strong analysis, opinion, a subjective standpoint and, at times, flat-out advocacy for one side of a debate. Former politician Nick Clegg, who is quoted in The Independent, appears to be one such example. There is a perception that younger readerships may be less inclined to read or accept news stories from the more traditional media outlets that older generations consider impartial and thus respect and instead prefer the style offered by quest writers.

Aside from the somewhat nebulous concept of journalistic professional integrity, many publications are now signed up to the newspaper Code of Practice. As explained in the Theoretical Background this is, by definition, a document that works as a written guideline for
the press and sets out ethical standards in newspapers and magazines. Relevant sections for this discussion are for example, truthfulness, fairness and impartiality. While codes such as these provide guidelines and some degree of press regulation, it is perhaps unrealistic to expect complete neutrality in the reporting of stories. Newspapers have political leanings, and so do their owners and likewise for individual journalists and editors. The press must also be mindful of their particular respective readerships as, if their reporting diverges too far from the readers' opinions, they may thereby lose loyalty and this will impact upon their sales. The CDA approach recognizes this and challenges the entire notion that there is such a thing as impartiality, claiming that all reality is perceived from a particular standpoint and through a particular lens. All discourse is partial; all newspaper reporting occurs from a particular angle according to critical discourse analysis, and that cannot be avoided.

Newspapers generate hegemonies in their presentation of the stories they relate. In doing so, they suggest versions of reality as being unassailable, i.e. that appear as though they are the natural and obvious truth and are thus beyond argument. Any dissent from this position can thus be presented as incorrect, a denial of truth, extreme or even heretical. The second research question for this essay has partially been answered in the previous paragraph and the first part, which concerns the legitimacy of newspapers adopting a political position, is essentially a philosophical one. On the one hand, as purveyors of news, newspapers have a moral and professional duty to avoid misinforming their readers. In some societies, newspapers are produced by or on behalf of the state and, as such, they function as vehicles for propaganda. In open and democratic societies, however, newspapers represent a diverse range of views and so it can be claimed that political leanings are acceptable. In these societies, however, newspapers represent a diverse range of views and so it can be claimed that political leanings are acceptable. However, at the extreme end of this biased news reporting lies the phenomenon of propaganda. This is the converse of objective news reporting and exists purely to influence and even control the beliefs of the readers for the purposes of political expediency.

The main points of argument on the issue of burkhas will be summarised in this paragraph. The civil liberties argument is based on the notion that people should be free to wear what ever they like. There are conflicting arguments that the readers have to handle and deal with. Some newspapers and commentators emphasize personal/individual rights and Hodges (see Sub-chapter 4.4, above) supports this strongly when he points out that “This is Britain, and in Britain you can wear what you want”. At the time of writing this article, Hodges was considered left-wing although, in the example cited, he is writing for a traditionally right wing newspaper. Others, however, highlight the security issues involved in concealing the face when terrorism is
presenting a substantial risk. From a perspective of rights, there is an argument that prohibiting
the burkha infringes a women's choice of dress. Conversely, some would claim that the burkha is
oppressive to women. Also from a rights perspective, some people contend that religious items
of dress should be respected. These could include Sikh turbans and Jewish kippahs as well as
Islamic garments. A further issue is a cultural one namely that, in western societies, people use
there facial expressions as a means of communication and that concealing the face disrespects
prevailing western values.

Newspapers have their particular view but, as seen with Dan Hodges writing for
The Telegraph, there are pundits who write for publications that have political leanings contrary
to their own. Hodges was regarded as a “Blairite”, which signifies that he was a supporter of the
former Labour Prime Minister Tony Blair. A possible explanation for this is that newspapers
may wish to demonstrate that they are open to contrary opinions and are thereby more objective
and trustworthy.

The thesis questions for this essay were as follows:
1. How does the approach vary between the selected newspapers having regard to their sup-
   posed political leanings?
2. How does the CDA approach expose these political leanings?
3. What does analysis using CDA methods reveal in terms of the way in which stories are report-
ed?
4. How do British newspapers subject position their readers and make assumptions about their
   world view?

This chapter will now review the thesis questions set out in the Introduction and will attempt to
address each of them individually. The first question asked how the approach varies between the
selected newspapers having regard to their supposed political leanings. It has been established
that the difference between the newspapers and their political leanings are that the writers use
rhetoric by the use of analogy to show the readers that the writer is certain of his statements. It
has been established that the approach varies between newspapers and their leanings. For exam-
ple, the approach varies from one newspaper that can have a specific leaning but a journalist or
politician writing for it may have a different political leaning. These articles broadly reflect their
political leanings and they use similar techniques in terms of nominalisation and hegemony, as
described in Chapter 2. The writers generally follow the political leanings of the newspapers for
which they are writing and examples being Simon Jenkins (see Sub-Chapter 4.1, above) and Oli-
ver Wright (see Sub-Chapter 4.3, above). They each have their own hegemonies and that, while they are different from one another, they use their respective hegemonies in a similar way.

When performing an analysis of the articles, there is little in them that could be considered nominalisation. The aim of nominalisation is, according to Fairclough and other CDA analysts, to present discourse in such a way as to advantage the interests of the establishment or capitalism and using language accordingly. “A nominalisation is a process converted into noun (or a multi-word compound noun). It is reduced in the sense that some of the meaning one gets in a sentence is missing - tense, so there is no indication of the timing of the process; modality; and often an agent and/or a patient. Nominalisation compresses the two sentences in the text, though exactly how we break down the nominalisation to tease out the processes is unclear” (Language & Power (1989, p.124). Fairclough suggests that nominalisation implies meanings in persuasive uses of language, such as political texts. Nominalisation and passivisation have ideological functions, like deleting agency, in order to present reality in particular ways or divert attention, but the articles are expressions of personal opinion rather than of propaganda. Hegemony is certainly detectable in all the articles, as will be explained when addressing the next question.

The second question sought to determine how the CDA approach exposes political leanings, and the research, aided by the tools offered in the CDA approach, has shown how writers attempt to persuade them of their case by including statements which may be interpreted as hegemonic. The findings support the CDA contention that news articles are less than wholly objective, but rather they tend to be structured and worded according to a particular point of view. The Oliver Wright article (see Sub-Chapter 4.3, above) exemplifies this, as his text was written in such a way as to present it in a way that is hegemonic. The article is presenting reality in such a way as to make it appear that Wright's view is the natural and baseline view and, as such, the issue is beyond debate.

With regard to the article in The Guardian (see Sub-Chapter 4.1, above), Jenkins is, from a CDA perspective, manipulating the text so as to present it in a way that is hegemonic and his word choices aim to make the reader believe that Jeremy Browne thinks the debate about banning the veil is necessary. For example, when Jenkins says: “if they would mind removing the niqab”, this takes the form of a polite request rather than a demand with the implicit threat of legal sanction if they refuse to comply. His approach is thus both gentle and also sensitive to the cultural
Indefinite pronouns such as: “some”, “others” and “many” are commonly used in the Appendix I and such words are manifestations of vagueness which can be accounted for through CDA; there is no specific referent that makes a point. “Many” and “others” are also used again in the next paragraph which creates a parallel with previous sentences because the words are repeated and they are also part of the rhetoric. “Many” and “others” are two pairs of contrasting sentences. Contrasting sentences are conjunctions that connect ideas that contrast and the most frequently used conjunction is "but", for example:

*The meal was good but expensive*
*I want to lose weight, but I hate diets.*

With regard to the article in *The Guardian* (Appendix I), there is an example in line 8-11 of the article that states examples of contrasting sentences and vagueness is often resolved pragmatically. The writer is making an assumption that the reader is not expecting precision, such as in the form of statistics, but is willing to accept vague and unsubstantiated claims on the basis of trust in the writer, and having regard to the fact that the genre is a journalistic opinion piece and not a scientific paper. From a CDA perspective, the writer's vagueness reinforces the informality of the style, which itself is suggestive of a closeness to and empathy with the reader, a notion which is questionable as he is an established, middle class London-based columnist for a national newspaper. On that basis, he is known to his readers and it is almost hegemonic that they would take his word for it and trust his judgment. This strategy might be less successful with an unknown writer.

From a CDA perspective, the utterance quoted (*The Guardian* (Appendix I) line 19-20 of the article) refers to Browne's keenness to show that he sees both sides of the argument, bearing in mind the newspaper he writes for is left-wing and commentators from the left are divided on this issue. Some suggest that banning the veil would be illiberal and contrary to the principles of multiculturalism and what he calls a “cherished freedom”, while others on the left believe the veil is a symbol of oppression. He favors, however, the former view and he seeks to win the support from his readers by presenting the liberal argument for accepting the veil but only the right-wing counter-arguments, which he knows his own readers will be less willing to accept. To that
end, he is eager to demonstrate that his is a more balanced and reasonable perspective. In the above quote about public services, he is voicing a recognition that those who object to the veil have legitimate concerns, but he is arguing that, while they “may spook some people and can sometimes pose a security threat to police”, they are not sufficient to allow such a basic freedom, i.e. how one chooses to dress, to be undermined. He is claiming that decisions on what is permissible must be taken as they arise and according to particular situations and that what he calls “the calm answer” is that there is no need for a national debate or national decision.

The third question asked what does analysis using CDA methods reveal in terms of the way in which stories are reported. In the case of Hodges' article in The Telegraph (Appendix IV) line 9-10 and what he says, these may be critiqued using the tool offered by CDA because Hodges uses the techniques highlighted as a means to influence the reader's perceptions. Using CDA to the extent of this essay question has revealed that it is common for the articles that the writers attempt to construe the news, and their opinions, in ways that may be said to manipulate readers’ beliefs.

The ambition for the fourth question is to resolve how the British newspapers subject position their readers and make assumptions about their worldview. As demonstrated above, CDA methods show how British newspapers and the journalists who write for them subject position their readers using word choices, nominalisation and hegemonies. By so doing, the political leanings of the newspapers and their writers can be exposed through analysis. This is interesting from an analytical perspective, but it also raises questions in terms of the degree to which newspapers can be regarded as impartial and objective vehicles for conveying the news to the public. One might also ask at one point to they move from news reporting to the furtherance of certain political objectives, thereby crossing the line into the domain of propaganda. Concealing such intentions is critical for their success. If the public were to be conscious of such manipulation, their awareness might immunise them from being influenced and they would thus be left to draw their own conclusions subject to them being armed with sufficient knowledge.
6. Conclusion

The focus of this research was to analyse newspaper articles using CDA as a tool, looking for features that are explained or accounted for in the CDA method. The aim was also to compare semantic and pragmatic aspects. To do this, several articles were selected in relation to a particular current and controversial topic from different British newspapers and these were analysed. The analyses were compared and contrasted in order to discern the features which present the ideological viewpoint of the writer and/or publication, and are intended to influence the reader's perceptions of the stories in question, and they have compared the presence of certain language features within the texts. The main arguments found in the articles are especially the issue of burkhas and one argument stems from the civil libertarian position that people can wear what they like. A general point is that the issue gives rise to various points of view according to which values the writer in question sees as a priority. For example, civil liberties (wear what you like), security (burkhas are a threat because of terrorism), women's rights (burkhas are a symbol of oppression) and western culture (burkhas hide the face and westerners find this disconcerting as facial expressions are part of communication and hiding the face negatively affects integration). There are conflicting arguments that the readers have to handle and deal with, for example the emphasis on the newspapers, i.e. whether the newspapers are interested in personal/individual rights and journalist Dan Hodges came was adamant when he said that people should be free to wear what they want in Britain. He is a left-wing pundit and, as shown in the Analysis and Discussion, some politicians claim this is a security issue and take a different view. It is also a women's rights issue where, according to Hodges, women have struggled to achieve equality and that includes their right of free choice when it comes to matters of dress. The security element mentioned is concerned with the concealment of the face in public at a time when terrorist attacks have been occurring in the UK and other modern western countries. There is also a religious rights dimension, whereby the banning of religious items of dress such as Sikh turbans and Jewish kippahs etc. can be perceived as intolerant and even oppressive. Lastly, there is a cultural values issue to be considered whereby in modern societies people use their facial expressions as a means of communication; the argument here is that immigrant communities disrespect the prevailing western values and isolating themselves when openly adopting such items of dress. Exposure of the face is the norm and a necessary precondition for racial and ethnic integration and covering the face can give rise to discomfort and alienation.
The results show both obvious and less obvious differences that are evident between each of the arguments. One argument presents this as a national issue (Simon Jenkins - The Guardian and Dan Hodges - The Telegraph) while another focuses on what could seem hostile against children and teachers or pose a security risk at national borders (Oliver Wright - The Independent) and the concern appears to be that terrorists could hide their faces while, for example, planting bombs etc. The UK's extensive public CCTV systems would only see a person in a burkha. The more general argument also links back to the French view that this was ban rather than one focused on national security. One advantage from a ban could be that this forces families to allow their daughters and wives not to wear a veil outside the house, which links back to MP Sarah Wollaston's argument in relation to burkhas setting back women's rights and empowerment, and this being a reason to prohibit the wearing of veils in public and empowerment as a reason to de-veil Muslim women.

The strategies the writers use to justify their ideological arguments are accounted for by the CDA approach; the newspapers exploit hegemony and nominalisation in ways that there are some observable patterns evident in the analysis. In the Analysis and in the Discussion it was shown how metaphors are used rhetorically in the articles. From a CDA perspective, the writer is manipulating the text so as to present it in a way that is hegemonic and the words used are selected so as to present a particular reality as unarguable. In the case of the first article written by Simon Jenkins, for example, that reality is that banning the wearing of the veil in public places is a necessary restriction on liberty. Applying CDA methods, this study has demonstrated how British newspapers subject the position of their readers in line with their own political affiliation, or that of the particular journalist who has written the article. Writers are using the newspapers as platforms through which they can bring readers around to their particular political viewpoints through the manipulation of language, and that CDA provides the means by which an analyst can expose both their methods and intentions.

A possible way to further this research would be to conduct an analysis of a wider range of newspapers and to compare and contrast their respective approaches. Another way could be to make an analysis that determines whether there are certain patterns depending on factors such as political leaning, culture and social group and, if so, to establish what the patterns are and how they coincide with the research in this essay. Finally, an avenue for developing this research would be to expand the topic beyond that of this research, i.e. the wearing of burkhas, and to consider other, unrelated, matters of public interest and controversy.
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Appendix V
Appendix I

Spare us a 'national debate' on veils (The Guardian).
Home Office minister Jeremy Browne wants the nation to discuss how Muslim women dress, but it is hardly a menace to society.

"Individuals and institutions should be able to make their own decisions [on the veil] ad hoc."
Photograph: Christopher Furlong/Getty Images

Do we really want a "national debate" about veiling? A Home Office minister, Jeremy Browne, thinks so. France banned the wearing of the full-face veil in public in 2010 with Belgium following not long after. Their debates have been bitter and divisive.

Browne is reflecting a swirl of conflicting pressures. Some women's groups want liberation from social authoritarianism. Others want to be left to express their religion as they see fit. Many institutions, schools, colleges, hospitals, the courts, the police need to be able to identify their clients and the public.

Many Britons clearly resent what they perceive as newcomers eager to benefit from British public services yet refusing to accept even a minimum of conformity. Others cherish freedom in all its forms, including sometimes the freedom to behave in what might be considered by others an illiberal fashion.

Certainly, the predicament of Jack Straw MP, who stated publicly that he asks the women who visit him in his constituency if they would mind removing the niqab, is understandable. If the police can ban hoodies in parts of town centres because they obscure their cameras, why not other forms of dress? Teachers must be able to distinguished between pupils in class. Those who wish to make use of public services must expect to identify themselves somehow.

Yet the point of a national debate is to yield a national decision. In this case it is not clear whether such a decision is really needed. The sight of totally hooded people wandering the streets may spook some people and can sometimes pose a security threat to police but it is hardly widespread or a menace to the state and society. Blind people manage without being able to see the people with whom they deal.

The calm answer has to be to deny this as a national crisis. Individuals and institutions should be able to make their own decisions ad hoc. Some authorities, possibly schools and colleges in populated Muslim areas and certainly the justice system, clearly regard obscured faces as a practical problem. They should make their own decisions, consulting and defending them in their local circumstances.

The state, and the law, must stand behind such decisions and, where appropriate, support them. But a national debate, a national decision, another France? The game is not worth the candle.
Veils are not appropriate in classrooms or airport security, says Nick Clegg (The Guardian)

Deputy PM says teachers should be able to address pupils face-to-face, but he does not want state ban on religious clothing.

It is not appropriate for students to wear a full veil in the classroom or for people to go through airport security with their faces covered, Nick Clegg has said.

But the deputy prime minister said he did not want to see a state ban on the wearing of religious items of clothing in particular circumstances.

His comments came as a Liberal Democrat minister said the government should consider banning Muslim girls and young women from wearing the veil in public places.

The Home Office minister Jeremy Browne called for a national debate on whether the state should step in to prevent young women having the veil imposed upon them.

His intervention was sparked by a row over the decision by Birmingham Metropolitan College to drop a ban on the wearing of full-face veils amid public protests.

Browne said he was "instinctively uneasy" about restricting religious freedoms, but he added there may be a case to act to protect girls who were too young to decide for themselves whether they wished to wear the veil or not.

"I am instinctively uneasy about restricting the freedom of individuals to observe the religion of their choice," he told the Daily Telegraph.

"But there is genuine debate about whether girls should feel a compulsion to wear a veil when society deems children to be unable to express personal choices about other areas like buying alcohol, smoking or getting married.

"We should be very cautious about imposing religious conformity on a society which has always valued freedom of expression."

Responding to his comments, Clegg said: "I think there is a debate going on already in households and communities up and down the country.

"My own view, very strongly held, is that we shouldn't end up like other countries issuing edicts or laws from parliament telling people what they should or should not wear.

"This is a free country and people going about their own business should be free to wear what they wish. I think it is very un-British to start telling people what pieces of clothing they should wear.

"I think there are exceptions to that as far as the full veil is concerned –security at airports, for instance. It is perfectly reasonable for us to say the full veil is clearly not appropriate there.

"And I think in the classroom, there is an issue, of course, about teachers being able to address their students in a way where they can address them face-to-face. I think it is quite difficult in the classroom to be able to do that."

A number of Conservative MPs have voiced dismay at the way the Birmingham Metropolitan College case was handled.

The college had originally banned niqabs and burqas from its campuses eight years ago on the grounds that students should be easily identifiable at all times.

But when a 17-year-old prospective student complained to her local newspaper that she was being discriminated against, a campaign sprang up against the ban, attracting 8,000 signatures to an online petition in just 48 hours.
Following the college's decision to withdraw the rule, Downing Street said David Cameron would support a ban in his children's schools, although the decision should rest with the headteacher.

However, the prime minister has been coming under growing pressure from his own MPs for a rethink on Department for Education guidelines in order to protect schools and colleges from being "bullied".

The Tory backbencher Dr Sarah Wollaston said the veils were "deeply offensive" and were "making women invisible", and called for the niqab to be banned in schools and colleges.

Writing for the Telegraph, she said: "It would be a perverse distortion of freedom if we knowingly allowed the restriction of communication in the very schools and colleges which should be equipping girls with skills for the modern world. We must not abandon our cultural belief that women should fully and equally participate in society."

Mohammed Shafiq, chief executive of the Ramadhan Foundation, said he was disgusted by Browne's calls to consider banning Muslim girls and young women from wearing the veil in public places.

"This is another example of the double standards that are applied to Muslims in our country by some politicians," he said.

"Whatever one's religion they should be free to practise it according to their own choices and any attempt by the government to ban Muslim women will be strongly resisted by the Muslim community."

"We take great pride in the United Kingdom's values of individual freedom and freedom of religion and any attempt by illiberal male politicians to dictate to Muslim women what they should wear will be challenged."

He added: "We would expect these sorts of comments from the far right and authoritarian politicians and not from someone who allegedly believes in liberal values and freedom."

Appendix III

It is not 'appropriate' for students to wear veil in classroom, says Nick Clegg (The Independent)

It is not "appropriate" for students to wear a full veil in the classroom- but neither should the state intervene and issue edicts about what people can and can't wear, Nick Clegg said today.
Mr Clegg was responding to comments from the Home Office Minister Jeremy Browne who called for a national debate over whether the Government should step in to prevent young women having the veil imposed upon them.

Mr Browne said he was "instinctively uneasy" about restricting religious freedoms, but he added that there could be a case to act to protect girls who were too young to decide for themselves whether they wished to wear the veil or not.

"I am instinctively uneasy about restricting the freedom of individuals to observe the religion of their choice," he told the Daily Telegraph.

"But there is genuine debate about whether girls should feel a compulsion to wear a veil when society deems children to be unable to express personal choices about other areas like buying alcohol, smoking or getting married.

"We should be very cautious about imposing religious conformity on a society which has always valued freedom of expression."

Responding to his comments, Mr Clegg said: "I think there is a debate going on already in households and communities up and down the country.

"My own view, very strongly held, is that we shouldn't end up like other countries issuing edicts or laws from parliament telling people what they should or should not wear.

"This is a free country and people going about their own business should be free to wear what they wish. I think it is very un-British to start telling people what pieces of clothing they should wear.

"I think there are exceptions to that as far as the full veil is concerned - security at airports for instance. It is perfectly reasonable for us to say the full veil is clearly not appropriate there.

"And I think in the classroom, there is an issue of course about teachers being able to address their students in a way where they can address them face to face. I think it is quite difficult in the classroom to be able to do that."

A number of Conservative MPs have voiced dismay at the way the Birmingham Metropolitan College case was handled.

The college had originally banned niqabs and burkas from its campuses eight years ago on the grounds that students should be easily identifiable at all times.

But when a 17-year-old prospective student complained to her local newspaper that she was being discriminated against, a campaign sprang up against the ban, attracting 8,000 signatures to an online petition in just 48 hours.

Following the college's decision to withdraw the rule, Downing Street said David Cameron would support a ban in his children's schools, although the decision should rest with the head teacher.

However the Prime Minister has been coming under growing pressure from his own MPs for a rethink on current Department for Education guidelines in order to protect schools and colleges from being "bullied".
Tory backbencher Dr Sarah Wollaston said the veils were "deeply offensive" and were "making women invisible", and called for the niqab to be banned in schools and colleges.

Appendix IV

The debate about Muslim women wearing veils is not complex. This is Britain, and in Britain you can wear what you want (The Telegraph) By Dan Hodg-
This morning Lib Dem Home Office minister Jeremy Browne has created a bit of a storm by saying that we need a “national debate” on the topic of Muslim women wearing of veils. His call was echoed by Tory MP Dr Sarah Wollaston, who said that “we must not abandon our cultural belief that women should fully and equally participate in society”. Her colleague Bob Neil said, “I do think we need to have a serious conversation about it.”

I respect all of those views. But they’re wrong.

The debate about “The Veil”, is neither necessary, nor is it complex. In fact, it’s very, very simple. This is Britain. And in Britain you can wear what you want.

Obviously there are practical exceptions. I can’t turn up to my local swimming pool and jump in with my clothes on, for example. When I tweeted about this earlier today a number of people asked: what about people going through airport security? And in that instance obviously veils should be removed. In the same way that when I pass through security, my shoes occasionally have to be removed. But that doesn’t alter the basic fact that if I still want to wander round in my pair of battered Adidas Samba, I’m free to do so. And any women who wishes to wear a veil is free to do that too.

“You can’t wear hoodies in shopping centres, or crash helmets in banks”, some people have pointed out. Fair enough. When the nation is trembling from an onslaught of Burka-clad streaming gangs I may reassess my view. But until then the rule remains; we are a free society, and we are free to wear the clothing of our choice.

I understand those who express concern about the cultural implications of veils. Indeed, I share them. My wife and I regularly drive through Stamford Hill to see relatives. When we do, we invariably reflect on the local Hasidic Jewish community, and how great it is that London is so rich culturally. But it’s noticeable that all the women, (and indeed the men), are essentially dressed in the same way. That’s great to look at from the outside, and reflects a strong sense of heritage and identity. Yet it also reflects conformity. And conformity is a bad thing. It stifles personal identity, and by extension freedom.
But from my point of view, that’s just tough. If I were to advocate passing a law that said Hasidic Jewish women should be banned from going out unless they’re dressed in bright, vibrant colours, I’d rightly be regarded as having lost my mind. And it’s no different to advocating we should start punishing women who decide to go out in a veil.

There are of course those who say this is a vital step for preventing the cultural oppression of women. Again, I respect that view. But I’m also sceptical that in all cases it is being expressed with total sincerity. One of the keenest advocates of “Banning The Burka” is Nigel Farage.

“What we are saying is, this is a symbol. It's a symbol of something that is used to oppress women”, he told the BBC. Which is all well and good, except a couple of weeks ago I heard that very same Nigel Farage arguing how it was perfectly acceptable for employers to refuse to employ women on the grounds they may one day become pregnant. It could be that Nigel Farage, Peter Bone, Philip Hollobone et al really have suddenly converted to the cause of radical feminism. But I doubt it.

Yes, veils can be socially and culturally divisive. But so can the debate about banning veils. I think many of those engaging in this argument do so from a genuinely liberal perspective. And I think there are an equal number who are jumping at the opportunity for a bit of good old fashioned Muslim bashing. That’s certainly how large sections of the Muslim community will see things, which in turn will no doubt do wonders for community cohesion.

But let’s put aside the moral and practical implications of banging veils for a second, and have a look at this issue from the vantage point of simple logic. The argument in favour of a ban goes as follows.

We as a society are concerned that people are culturally discriminating against – indeed oppressing – women by insisting they wear specific forms of dress. That runs contrary to our values and heritage, which stipulate women in Britain are free to wear what they please. In fact we’re so alarmed that people are being prescriptive about what women can and can’t wear, we’ve decided to prescribe what women can and can’t wear. To ensure women are free to choose how to dress we will write into law precisely how they can dress. And such is our commitment to their personal freedom, if they wear something we don’t think they should be wearing we’ll fine, arrest or imprison them.

That’s not a sketch from Bremner, Bird and Fortune. That’s a real live policy discussion being initiated by real live politicians. Trust me, we don’t need a “national debate” about veils. We need a national debate about how to embed the economic recovery. How we actually get to grips with the deficit. Syria. The NHS. Welfare reform. Pensions. But if we really must have a debate, here it is. This is Britain. We wear what we damn well like. Debate over.

Appendix V

According to the BBC (2013), the British national daily newspapers circulation are these different newspapers: The Sun with 3,128,501. The Sun’s political allegiance is that they have sup-
ported Labour at the 1997, 2001 and 2005 elections. The *Daily Mail* has the daily circulation sales of 2,171,686. The *Daily Mirror* has the daily circulation sales of 1,324,883. The *Daily Star* with their daily circulation sales of 886,814 is conservative in outlook and is critical of Labour. The *Daily Star* shares many of its values with its sister paper, the *Daily Express* with its daily circulation sales of 730,234, *The Daily Telegraph* has the daily circulation sales of 814,087. *The Times* has the daily circulation sales of 576,185 and is traditionally a moderate newspaper and sometimes a supporter of the Conservatives; it supported the Labour Party in the 2001 and 2005 general elections.

*The Guardian’s* daily circulations sales are 311,387. The main focus in *The Guardian* is its political and news oriented appearance. As mentioned with regard to *Independent*, *The Guardian* is positioned to the left of centre in terms of its political allegiance. Since its foundation, it has consistently supported the Labour Party in its editorials. However, in the election of 2010, it abandoned Labour, and decided to urge its readership to vote Liberal Democrat, which was perceived by some as a betrayal of its core principles (BBC, 2013). Subsequently, *The Guardian* went back to supporting the Labour Party (BBC, 2013).

*Independent’s* daily circulations sales are 187,837. Nationwide, *Independent* is the youngest British newspaper, first published in 1986, and was originally a broadsheet newspaper, but which has been published in a tabloid format since 2003 (BBC, 2013). This newspaper is positioned on the left of the centre and socially liberal, politically speaking, but it is not formally connected with any specific political party. As such, the paper is considered to be free from direct political influences (BBC, 2013).