



Virtue Signaling in Political Communication: US President's Statements on Civilian Victimization

Fatih Ceylan

ABSTRACT

This study aims to contribute to the analysis of political discourse in today's contradictory and complex structures by examining statements made by US President Biden regarding civilian victimisation in the Israeli–Palestinian war through the lens of 'virtue signaling'. The study employed a case study approach, a qualitative research design. Data were collected using the archive scanning method. The results of the scans show that President Biden made a total of 41 statements regarding civilian victimisation in the year following the start of the war. In these statements, Biden mostly emphasised themes such as the humanitarian crisis, the protection of civilians, humanitarian aid, the call for a ceasefire and the limitation of military operations. The words he used most frequently were 'Israel', 'Hamas' and 'terrorists'. It is concluded that all of his statements carried the themes/characteristics of virtue signalling behaviour; that is to say, they are all examples of ostentatious sensitivity behaviour. Furthermore, it is evident that President Biden's statements concerning civilian victimisation in this war are consistent with US foreign policy regarding the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. It is thought that this study of virtue signalling behaviour in political communication will contribute to future literature and research in this area.

Keywords: Political communication, Virtue signaling, Israel-Palestine war, Civilian victimization, US President's statements

FATİH CEYLAN
Assist. Prof. Dr.
Tokat Gaziosmanpasa University
fatcey25@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7494-5635

Citation: Ceylan F. (2025). Virtue signaling in political communication: US President's statements on civilian victimization. *Journal of Selçuk Communication*, 18(2), 847-872. <https://doi.org/10.18094/josc.1586276>



Siyasal İletişimde Gösterişçi Duyarlılık: ABD Başkanının Sivil Mağduriyetlere Yönelik Söylemleri

Fatih Ceylan 

ÖZ

Bu çalışmanın amacı, ABD Başkanı Biden'ın İsrail-Filistin savaşında, sivil mağduriyetlere yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamaların "gösterişçi duyarlılık" kavramı çerçevesinde incelenmesiyle, günümüzde çelişkili ve karmaşık yapıda zuhur edebilen siyasal söylemlerin çözümlenmesine katkıda bulunmaktır. Çalışma nitel araştırma desenlerinden biri olan durum/vaka çalışması yöntemiyle yapılmıştır. Çalışmanın verileri arşiv taraması metodu ile toplanmıştır. Yapılan taramalarda sonucu, Başkan Biden'ın savaş başladıktan sonraki bir yıllık zaman diliminde sivil mağduriyetlere yönelik toplam 41 açıklama yaptığı görülmüştür. Biden'ın açıklamalarında en çok insani kriz, sivillerin korunması, insani yardım, ateşkes çağırısı ve askeri operasyonların sınırlandırılması temalarına vurgu yaptığı ve en yoğun olarak İsrail, Hamas ve teröristler kelimelerini kullandığı görülmüştür. Son olarak gösterişçi duyarlılık bağlamında yapılan analizlerde ise açıklamalarının hepsinin gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının temalarını/özelliklerini taşıdığı, yani hepsinin birer gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı olduğu sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. Ayrıca Başkan Biden'ın bu savaşta yaşanan sivil mağduriyetlere yönelik açıklamalarının hepsinin birer gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı olmasının, İsrail-Filistin sorununa yönelik ABD dış politikasıyla da uyumlu olduğu anlaşılmıştır. Siyasal iletişimde gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı ile ilgili yapılan bu çalışmanın gelecekte literatüre ve ilgili araştırmacılara katkı sağlayacağı düşünülmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Siyasal iletişim, Gösterişçi duyarlılık, İsrail-Filistin savaşı, Sivil mağduriyetleri, ABD başkanının açıklamaları

FATİH CEYLAN
Dr. Öğretim Üyesi
Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi
fatcey25@gmail.com
ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7494-5635

Atıf: Ceylan F. (2025). Siyasal iletişimde gösterişçi duyarlılık: ABD Başkanının sivil mağduriyetlere yönelik söylemleri. *Selçuk İletişim*, 18(2), 847-872. <https://doi.org/10.18094/josc.1586276>

INTRODUCTION

The concept of virtue signaling, which is thought to have existed throughout human history, dates back to the first social structures where moral values emerged. However, it has only been very recently that the concept has been scientifically addressed and defined (Paşalı Taşoğlu & Çağlayan, 2021). It can be said that the main reason for this situation is that the human population and, accordingly, the competition in every field are increasing, and perception has become a very important factor in competition. Again, it can be said that the provision of significant advantages (becoming a phenomenon, increasing the number of followers, reaching a large audience and influencing them, etc.) by exhibiting virtue signaling behavior in social networks that have emerged with the dizzying developments in communication technologies in recent times is one of the reasons for this situation. The aim of people who exhibit virtue signaling is to convey to the public that they adopt a certain moral stance rather than contributing to the process or initiating a change.

Virtue signaling behavior, which is understood to have a multidisciplinary structure, has been used in almost every field and study with human stakeholders from the past to the present. It is seen that the history of virtue signaling behavior, which has been widely used especially in political communication practice since the beginning, dates to recent times in scientific studies, and there is a limited number of studies on it. This situation indicates that the concept of virtue signaling needs to be addressed, analyzed, and understood in different aspects in the literature. In this context, this study examines the statements made by US President Joe Biden on the victimization of civilians in the Israel-Palestine war in the one-year period after the war within the framework of the concept of virtue signaling. The aim of this study is to contribute to the analysis of political discourses that can emerge in contradictory and complex structures today by addressing the concept of virtue signaling with the dimension of political communication.

VIRTUE SIGNALING

Virtue signaling is a concept derived from signal theory. The signal theory is a concept that examines the methods used by individuals or organizations to convey a certain image to the people around them, regardless of their true intentions. The theory focuses on the signaling of difficult messages that require a lot of energy and time to be transmitted to the other side. However, good signals are focused on, and bad ones are ignored to reduce information asymmetry (Paşalı Taşoğlu & Çağlayan, 2022, p. 836).

The concept of virtue signaling has been used in the literature until it was conceptualized as virtue signaling (Grohmann, 2023; Levy, 2021; Tosi & Warmke, 2016), moral grandiosity (Flowerree & Satta, 2023; Sen & Manuoglu, 2022) or performative activism (Candelario, 2021). It has been observed that the concept has been handled with different names, such as sensationalizing and displaying virtue signaling (Paşalı Taşoğlu & Çağlayan, 2022). Undoubtedly, examining the ways in which these concepts are handled is important for understanding the concept of virtue signaling.

Tosi and Warmke (2016) define virtue signalling as an effort to gain a benefit by appearing sensitive rather than actually being sensitive. This endeavor is explained as an attempt to present oneself as morally superior to gain prestige and status within a social group or to elevate the status quo. This creates a debate on the equivalence of concrete action and abstract action design, and in this context, virtue signaling can lead to excesses of demonstration (Grubbs et al., 2020, p. 3). Grohmann (2023, p. 30) points out that that virtue signaling now operates as a form of capital, with neoliberal governance dissolving the traditional divide between workers and capitalists and recasting individuals as entrepreneurs of their own capital.

Despite the negative approach to virtue signaling, there are different approaches that state that it is not always a negative action. According to Levy (2021, p. 9545), virtue signaling plays an important role in the formation of moral beliefs by mediating one's commitment to moral values. Therefore, in Tosi and Warmke's recent work (2021), the concept of 'moral grandiosity' was proposed to replace the concept of 'virtue signaling' (Şen & Manuoğlu, 2022, p. 2). The concept is characterized by the speaker's intention at the time of the claim, rather than the content of the claim (Flowerree & Satta, 2024). The person resorts to moral grandiosity to leave a positive image on the audience. In this two-step process, the individual first seeks recognition of their moral qualities and superiority, and then engages in public moral debate to fulfill this desire (Tosi & Warmke, 2021, p. 171).

Another concept close to virtue signaling is performative activism. Performative activism is defined as supporting an issue or cause to gain the support, attention, or money of others, rather than because it is genuinely important or intended to have a beneficial impact (Candelario, 2021). Thus, it involves activities that a person engages in for self-gain rather than out of commitment to an issue or cause.

Similar to other closely related concepts, virtue signaling refers to emphasizing one's good, moral, and virtuous characteristics in order to create a positive image and reputation for one's own benefit. However, it is not possible to say that every good, moral, and virtuous behavior is virtue signaling

behavior. Therefore, there are some characteristics that help to distinguish virtue signaling behavior from other behaviors. These characteristics (see Effectiviology, n.d., Phillips, 2020; Paşalı et al. 2022) studies are given in Table 1.

Table 1 Characteristics of Virtue Signaling Behavior

1	Posts are usually simple, with a picture, a hashtag or a few words.
2	In virtue signaling, posts against injustice and unfairness almost always contain anger, but to no avail.
3	Sharing is superficial and far from personal responsibility, rather than deep enough to engage with systemic problems in the relevant event or issue.
4	The main purpose of discourse and action is to gain praise, approval and admiration from others.
5	Virtue signaling acts have little or no impact on the way things are done on the issue.
6	People do not act according to real values and behavior is insincere.
7	Those who exhibit virtue signaling use their actions and statements as a justification to feel morally superior to others.
8	The main purpose of the discourses or actions is to emphasize the good moral aspects and values of oneself, especially in relation to others.
9	Virtue signaling behavior is temporary, superficial, simplistic, contrived and insubstantial.

Our age marks a period in which the concept of virtue signaling has found a place in a wide range of fields, such as social, political, economic, environmental, religious, etc. This wide-ranging usage shows that virtue signaling exists not only in a certain field but in almost every field. In this study, virtue signaling behavior is addressed in political communication. This is because virtue signaling also manifests itself in the political communication process, and it is used in various fields such as propaganda, demagoguery, rhetoric, political marketing, and advertising (Paşalı Taşoğlu & Çağlayan, 2021, p. 496).

VIRTUE SIGNALING IN POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

It is of great importance for political actors to accurately identify the expectations and needs of target audiences and shape their communication strategies accordingly in order to establish effective communication. For this purpose, political actors use various tools to influence and mobilize public opinion. One of them is the behavior of ‘virtue signaling,’ which is an appropriate format for public discourse. According to Levy (2021, p. 9546), virtue signaling behavior can turn the environment of public moral discourse into a platform that can lead to positive change despite all negative judgments. In this framework, virtue signaling can play an important role in reshaping social values and promoting positive social change by enabling the deepening and broadening of public moral debates.

The reasons for the prevalence of virtue signaling behavior in politics and political communication stem from the structural features of democratic politics. Because in democracies,

individuals' political preferences are often shaped by the policy packages offered by political parties (Tucker, 2018). Güllüpunar (2010) relates the factors that will determine their formation to the political socialization process of the voters. The individual supports or opposes the political issues contained in these packages. In this way, it can be said that the legitimacy of political actors is realized through the level of satisfaction of the electorate with their work and policies. Because voters can declare the political party, they are dissatisfied with illegitimate in the next election (Kentel, 1991, p. 41), and the failures of these policy packages are rarely directly attributed to individual actors.

The concept of virtue signaling is addressed in the field of political communication from two important perspectives. The first is how organized political actors apply this strategy, and the second is how this method is demonstrated by focusing on political issues (Paşalı Taşoğlu & Çağlayan, 2022). In this context, virtue signaling behavior can be evaluated as superficial displays of sensitivity that aim to create a certain public perception in both digital and physical spaces, but do not make any concrete change or impact in practice. In this context, conspicuous sensitivity behavior can be evaluated as superficial displays of sensitivity that aim to create a certain public perception in both digital and physical spaces, but do not have any tangible change or effect in practice. As a result, it can be said that some of the purposes of using virtue signaling behavior by political actors are managing public perception, image management, mitigating critical discourses, and strengthening relations with certain social segments or civil society organizations.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE WARS

The land of Palestine, which has been home to important civilizations throughout history and includes Jerusalem, an important center of faith, remained under the rule of the Ottoman Empire for a long time after the Mamluks. Later, the Palestinian territories were subjected to the immigration of Jews influenced by the nationalist movement (Yıldırım, 2021, p. 3842) With its strategic location, it has been a center of attraction for many nations from the past to the present. One of them is undoubtedly the Jews who desire to return to the 'Holy Land' (Person, 2023, p. 265).

Since the late 19th century, with the implementation of policies of oppression and violence against Jews in Europe and Russia, Jews began to migrate to Palestine. These waves of emigration gained momentum immediately after World War I, when Jews received the international support, they needed for the first time (Özgül, 2018, p. 178). As a result of the Sykes-Picot Agreement and the San Remo Talks signed by France and Britain during World War I, Palestine was left to the British administration and occupied by the British in 1918. From this date onwards, Britain has made efforts to establish a Jewish

State in Palestine through various manipulative perception games (Kaştan, 2012, pp. 1798-1799). In this context, the Balfour Declaration was announced in 1917 with the Jewish-British alliance, and the first step was taken to establish a new homeland for the Jewish people in Palestine (Uyanık & Yavuz, 2023, p. 213).

With the influence of the 'Moderate World Jewry' policy implemented by the British government in the process that developed after World War II, on November 29, 1947, the United Nations (UN) issued the partition resolution that prepared the establishment of the State of Israel (Tekdal-Fildiş, 2012, p. 338). Following this, Britain ended its mandate on the Palestinian territories, and Israel was officially established in 1948 (Balci, 2015, p. 80). Although the beginning of the Palestine-Israel conflict can be traced back to the late 19th century, the real escalation date is 1948, the year the State of Israel was officially established. While this date is celebrated as a victory in Israel, for Palestinians it is characterized as the day of 'nakba' (catastrophe) (Özkoç, 2009, p. 168). Following the establishment of Israel, Arab states reacted against Israel, and four Arab-Israel wars took place in 1948, 1956, 1967, and 1973 (Balci, 2015, p. 80).

The first war, the 1948 war, initially had an equal balance, but the arms embargo imposed by the UN against the parties to the war was disrupted by the aid of aircraft, weapons, and ammunition that Israel received through Czechoslovakia. This increased Israel's advantage over the Arab countries and led to the victory of the war in favor of Israel (Demircan, 2020, p. 223). After this result, Jerusalem was de facto divided into two, with East Jerusalem under the control of Jordan and West Jerusalem under the control of Israel (Yalçın, 2021, p. 64). In 1948 and afterward, the emergence of Israel as a powerful actor in the region led to the spread of the Cold War to the Middle East. In this context, developments such as the relative decline in the power of the colonial empires and the deterioration in the relations of the Arab states with the western states expanded the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) sphere of action over the Arab states.

Then, on October 29, 1956, with Operation Kadesh, Israeli troops entered the Sinai Peninsula, and the invasion operation, which had previously been negotiated between Britain and France, was officially launched. Faced with a great reaction from the world's public opinion, Britain and France entered a diplomatically difficult period, and protests were launched around the world for a ceasefire. As a result of the war, it was understood that Britain and France were no longer in their former power and that the world power dynamics had become centered on the US and the USSR. With this war, Israel

reasserted its military superiority over the Arab states, which had been in place since the 1948 war (Keskin & Karakoç, 2022, p. 65).

Later, in 1967, it could be said that there was a balance of power in the Middle East on behalf of the Arab states. The Arab states, which faced Israel, which could not receive the necessary assistance due to reasons such as the US dealing with the Vietnam agenda and the embargo it imposed, and which received arms aid from the USSR, became more advantageous. However, the war, also called the Six-Day War, ended with Israel's victory. At the end of this war, Israel occupied the West Bank, the Golan Heights, the Gaza Strip, and the Sinai Peninsula and declared Jerusalem as its new capital (Doğanoğlu, 2020, pp. 358-359). This war intensified the problem of Palestinian refugees (Kızgır, 2011, p. 51).

In 1970, Egyptian President Nasser was assassinated and replaced by Anwar Sadat. Sadat's main goal was to regain the territories lost to Israel in the Six-Day War. To this end, he used international diplomacy to persuade Arab oil producers to impose an embargo (Koç & Yemenici, 2019, p. 74). Taking the power of other Arab countries with it, Egypt attacked the Suez Canal, which was under Israel's occupation, and Syria attacked the Golan Heights on October 6, 1973. The war is also called the 'Yom Kippur War' because it coincided with the Jewish holy day of Yom Kippur. Israel, which had retreated at the beginning of the war, gained strength with the support of the US, maintained a balance with Arab troops, and the war ended without a clear victory for any side (Bulut, 2018, p. 347). In this context, it is possible to mention that the UK in the early days and the US in recent times have had a considerable influence on the conflicts and ongoing tensions in the Middle East.

US FOREIGN POLICY TOWARDS THE ISRAEL-PALESTINE CONFLICT

Due to its strategic location, the Middle East has always attracted the attention of great powers throughout history. The increasing rivalry between the US and the USSR after World War II led to the breakdown of the USSR's influence in the Middle East. This has been an important factor in determining the US policy in the Middle East (Altunışık, 2009, p. 70). By being the first to recognize Israel only 11 minutes after its creation, the US established its position in Israel's history as a 'supportive figure' (Şahin, 2010, p. 40). Because the US saw Israel as the only power that could stop the USSR in the Middle East (Çoban Oran, 2017, p. 2033), this strategy has been one of the most important topics of US foreign policy during the Cold War. This situation can be considered as one of the indicators that the US did not support Israel indifferently, but rather as an important part of its foreign policy.

As part of its policy of balance in the period following World War II, the US adopted a distant attitude towards Israel in order not to offend the oil-owning Arab countries. Nevertheless, in the 1967 war between Israel and the Arab states, the US again sided with Israel in UN Resolution 242, which called for Israel's withdrawal from the occupied territories. In 1970, the US agreed to negotiate a two-state solution on the condition that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), led by Yasser Arafat, would cease its protests against Israel. In the 1991 Madrid negotiations, the parties disagreed on their positions, and the talks ended in failure. During the negotiations, the US was expected to take a stance in favor of Palestine, which was in a weaker position, but it was observed that it displayed a pro-Israel stance by prioritizing its strategic interests.

Then, peace talks between Israel and Palestine, which started in 1993 with the mediation of Norway and lasted for 10 years, did not yield any positive results (Kaya & Polat, 2023, p. 228). During the following 2000s, it was observed that the two-state solution was emphasized in the peace initiatives that were put on the agenda, especially at the initiative of the US Presidents. Trump's 'Peace for Prosperity' peace plan, presented in January 2020, proposed the establishment of an independent state of Palestine. Nevertheless, Trump's stance in support of Israel's occupation of East Jerusalem and the Golan Heights, in violation of UN Resolution 242, contradicts the two-state solution policy (Özkoç, 2021, p. 314). As a result, it has historically been observed that the US has always favored Israel in the Israel-Palestine conflict in line with its interests, although in some exceptional cases, it has tried to display ostensibly peaceful attitudes towards the public.

In the present day, the Israel-Palestine conflict, which has a long historical background, has been again started by Hamas' 'Aqsa Flood' on 7 October 2023 operation and continues with Israel's disproportionate use of force and the spiral of unlawful counter-violence. In the course of this war, Israel used tons of heavy munitions in its attacks, military points, attacking civilians, city centers, marketplaces, gathering camps, mosques, schools, and even hospitals with bombs. These attacks resulted in a large number of civilian deaths (more than 40.000), particularly women and children, and civilian suffering, including injuries, starvation, and disease. While the war process in which this great tragedy was experienced by the civilian population is continuing, there is a common judgment throughout the world about the failure of diplomatic institutions and organizations, especially the UN, to take the necessary steps to open aid corridors and to evacuate the civilian population (Canbey, 2024, p. 133).

The US, on the other hand, has maintained a pro-Israel stance since the beginning of this war, portraying Israel's interventions as a form of self-defense. However, as a result of the increasing number

of civilian deaths (especially the deaths of children and women) and the increasing number of victims, the US could not remain indifferent to this drama, and President Biden made statements at different times to help the civilian population who were victims of the war. However, afterwards, it was observed that these statements remained in words and nothing was actually done to address civilian victimization. This situation is attempted to be revealed in this study by examining President Biden's statements on civilian victimization within the framework of the concept of 'virtue signaling'.

METHODOLOGY

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study on displaying virtue signaling behavior in political communication is to contribute to the analyzed of political discourses that can emerge in a contradictory and complex structure today by analyzing the statements made by US President Biden regarding the victimization of the civilian population in the Israel-Palestine war within the framework of the concept of 'virtue signaling'.

Research Questions

The research questions sought to be answered in the study are as follows:

RQ1. How many statements has US President Joe Biden made about civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war in one year?

RQ2. Which themes did US President Joe Biden emphasize in his statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war?

RQ3. Which words/concepts did US President Joe Biden use the most in his statements regarding civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war?

RQ4. Are US President Joe Biden's statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war an act of virtue signaling?

Research Method

The research was conducted with a case study, also known as case study design, which is one of the qualitative research designs. A case study is usually a method where data is collected on a regular basis, and one or more instances of a situation or case are analyzed comprehensively (Subasi & Okumuş, 2017; Yıldırım & Şimşek, 2018). In this study, the issue of displaying virtue signaling behavior in political

communication is examined with the example of the statements made by US President Biden regarding the victimization of civilians in the Israel-Palestine war.

Sample of the Study

Purposive sampling method was used in the study, and the sample consisted of the statements made by US President Biden regarding the victimization of civilians in the Israel-Palestine war. However, since this war, which started on October 7, 2023, is still ongoing, the statements are also ongoing. Therefore, the data of the study was collected between October 7, 2023, and October 7, 2024, covering a period of one year after the war started. A total of 41 statements made by President Biden on 33 different dates in accordance with the purpose of the study, which were obtained by scanning this date range, constitute the sample of this study.

Data Collection

The data were collected by the archive scanning method. Data collection was done as follows: First, one-month time periods from the 7th of each month to the 7th of the next month, between October 7, 2023, and October 7, 2024, were filtered separately from the Google news archive with the key phrases 'Biden statements on the Israel-Palestine war.' Approximately 1320 news items on a total of 132 websites accessed as a result of the scans conducted in this way were analyzed. Then, 287 briefings under the 'Press Briefings' tab, 837 speeches and remarks under the 'Speeches and Remarks' tab, and 1720 statements and announcements under the 'Statements and Releases' tab in the Briefing Room on the White House website were scanned and analyzed, totaling 2844 briefings, statements and announcements. The study data were obtained by analyzing the findings obtained as a result of such scans.

Data Analyzed

The data collected within the scope of the research were analyzed using the content analysis method. The content analysis method is a method for identifying existing data on a topic and revealing facts that may exist hidden in the data (Herkner, 2003). In this study, whether the statements made by US President Biden regarding civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war carry the characteristics/themes of 'virtue signaling' behavior was determined by the case study method from content analysis.

FINDINGS

Within the framework of the extensive literature review, it was seen that the characteristics of the concept of 'virtue signaling' -as given in the form of a table in the theoretical part- generally consist of nine items. These nine characteristics were analyzed, and nine themes related to virtue signaling were created. Then, these themes were sent to three academicians related to the field and expert opinions were taken, and necessary corrections were made according to the expert opinions. The themes of virtue signaling created in this way and examples of President Biden's statements in accordance with these themes are given in Table 2.

Table 2 Themes Related to Virtue Signaling and Examples from Biden's Explanations

Theme	Short Description	Examples of Biden's Statements
Simplicity	Posts are usually simple, with a picture, a hashtag or a few words.	Innocent people are being killed and injured. I call on Israel to take greater care to protect civilians.
Feelings of Anger	Posts against injustice and unfairness almost always contain anger, but to no avail.	Hamas uses civilians as human shields. The protection of civilians must be a priority. Innocent Palestinian families do not deserve this Victimization. This is a lack of conscience.
Superficiality and Irresponsibility	Sharing is superficial and far from personal responsibility, rather than providing systemic solutions.	Israel must conduct its attacks on Hamas in Gaza in accordance with international humanitarian law, which prioritizes the protection of civilians.
Seeking Approval and Praise	The main purpose of discourse and action is to gain praise, approval and admiration from others.	I convinced the President of Egypt to open the door. I am the man who has done more for the Palestinian people than anyone else.
Ineffectiveness	Actions have little or no impact on the way things are done in the relevant subject area.	I am trying to speed up the delivery of humanitarian aid. We will provide 100 million dollars of humanitarian aid to Gaza.
Insincerity	People do not act according to real values and behavior is insincere.	I think it would be a big mistake for Israel to invade Gaza. We mourn for the many innocent Palestinians who have been killed.
Moral Superiority	In their actions and discourses, people use it as a justification to feel themselves morally superior to others.	I am the man who did more for the Palestinian community than anyone else. I am the man who opened all the assets. I am the man who made the Egyptians open the border and let the goods, medicine and food through.
Value Emphasis	The main aim is to emphasize one's own good moral qualities and values to others.	Attacks against humanitarian workers and the general humanitarian situation are unacceptable. We must reject all forms of hatred.
Impermanence and Artificiality	Behavior is transient, superficial, simplistic, contrived and insubstantial.	I have insisted to Israel leaders that the extreme violence against Palestinians in the West Bank must stop and those who perpetrate it must be held to account.

BIDEN'S STATEMENTS IN NUMBERS

The number of statements made by US President Joe Biden on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war within a year after the war started is given in Table 3.

Table 3 Biden's Statements on Civilian Victimization

Month	Frequency	Percentage (%)
October 2023	12	29,27
November 2023	4	9,76
December 2023	4	9,76
January 2024	2	4,88
February 2024	7	17,07
March 2024	3	7,32
April 2024	3	7,32
May 2024	2	4,88
June 2024	0	0
July 2024	1	2,44
August 2024	2	4,88
September 2024	1	2,44
Total	41	100

Table 3 shows that President Biden made a total of 41 statements regarding civilian victimization within a year after the Israel-Palestine war started. In addition, when the data obtained are analyzed, it is seen that President Biden made these 41 statements on 33 different dates. Biden made the most statements in October 2023 (12), the first month of the war, while the second most statements were made in February 2024 (7). On the other hand, it was observed that he made the least statements in July 2024 (1) and September 2024 (1), while he did not make any statement on the issue in June 2024. As a result, it has been observed that US President Biden made 41 statements on the issue of civilian victimization, which caused reactions and large-scale protests all over the world, on only 33 different dates in a period of 365 days, only in two months he made a little more statements, in other months he made very few statements and in one month he made no statements at all.

THEMES HIGHLIGHTED IN BIDEN'S STATEMENTS

US President Joe Biden's statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war within a year after the war started were analyzed, and the 10 themes he emphasized the most in these statements were identified and given in Table 4.

Table 4 The Most Emphasized Themes in Biden's Statements on Civilian Victimization

No	Theme	Frequency
1	Humanitarian crisis	15
2	Protection of civilians	12
3	Humanitarian aid	10
4	Ceasefire call	9
5	Limiting military operations	8
6	Ending the war	7
7	Rescue of hostages	6
8	Stopping violence	5
9	Protection of aid workers	4
10	Egypt's acceptance of aid	3

A total of 41 statements were made by President Biden regarding civilian victimization within a year after the start of the Israel-Palestine war, he emphasized the themes of *'humanitarian crisis, protection of civilians, humanitarian aid, call for a ceasefire and ending the war,'* and least emphasized the themes of *'stopping the violence, protection of aid workers and Egypt's acceptance of aid'.*

MOST FREQUENTLY USED WORDS IN BIDEN'S STATEMENTS

US President Joe Biden's statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war within one year after the war started were analyzed, and word cloud analyzed was conducted to identify the concepts/words he frequently used in these statements, and the results are given in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Word Cloud of Biden's Statements on Civilian Victimization

When Figure 1 is analyzed, it is seen that Biden used the words 'Israel and Hamas' most frequently in his statements. This finding shows that Israel and Hamas are at the center of the US

President's discourse on the Israel-Palestine war. After these two words, Biden used the words 'soldiers, killing, terrorists, civilians, Jews, slaughtered, innocent, Gaza and people' most intensely in his statements. It is seen that the intensity of these words used by Biden in his statements is represented in a balanced manner.

THE RELEVANCE OF BIDEN'S STATEMENTS TO VIRTUE SIGNALING

To understand whether US President Joe Biden's statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war within a year after the war started are acts of virtue signaling, the statements were first numbered as A1, A2, A3. Then, Biden's statements were shortened so as not to lose the themes they contain. Finally, whether Biden's statements are virtue signaling behaviors was determined according to whether the statements contain the characteristics of the concept of virtue signaling, and the results are given in Table 5 below. At this point, there is a point that should be emphasized. Whether Biden's statements bear the characteristics of virtue signaling was determined as follows: First, Biden's statements and then the characteristics of virtue signaling behavior were examined in detail. As a result of these examinations, the explanations and the themes of virtue signaling were matched in a table. Then, this table was sent to three academicians related to the field and expert opinions were taken, and as a result of the necessary corrections made according to the expert opinions, Table 5 below was obtained.

Table 5 Themes of Virtue Signaling in Biden's Statements

No	Biden's Abbreviated Remarks	Themes of Virtue Signaling
A1	Hamas attacks targeted innocent civilians; this is unconscionable.	Sense of Anger, Insincerity
A2	The humanitarian crisis in Gaza requires evacuations; the most majority of Palestinians have nothing to do with Hamas, they are innocent.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity
A3	Innocent civilians are being used as human shields, all forms of hatred must be rejected.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity
A4	Children and the elderly have been abducted by Hamas; the humanitarian crisis continues.	Anger, Superficiality and Irresponsibility
A5	It is critical that Israel abides by the rules of war and opens a humanitarian corridor.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity
A6	Egypt has opened its border, humanitarian aid must reach Gaza.	Seeking Approval and Praise, Moral Superiority
A7	I will put pressure on Israel to ensure that humanitarian aid reaches Gaza as soon as possible and that it flows continuously thereafter	Value Emphasis, Seeking Approval and Praise, Insincerity
A8	100 million dollars in aid will be provided for the humanitarian crisis in Gaza.	Value Emphasis, Ineffectiveness
A9	The first shipment of humanitarian aid will reach Gaza, and I have received promises from the Israelis and the Egyptian president that the border will be opened.	Superficiality and the Search for Approval and Praise, Impermanence and Artificiality
A10	Israel must abide by the laws of war and humanitarian aid in Gaza must continue.	Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A11	Extremist attacks in the West Bank are unacceptable and must stop.	Emotion of Anger, Emphasis on Value
A12	The protection of civilians in Gaza must be done in accordance with international law.	Superficiality and Irresponsibility, Insincerity
A13	We mourn for the innocent Palestinians who have been killed. My Administration is working closely with partners to ensure that life-saving aid reaches innocent Palestinians urgently.	Value Emphasis, Seeking Approval and Praise, Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A14	Israel's excessive attacks must stop and humanitarian aid must be increased.	Anger, Superficiality and Irresponsibility
A15	The fundamental rights of the Palestinian people must be a priority in the post-crisis administration.	Insincerity, Moral Superiority
A16	Efforts continue with the United Nations to deliver aid to Gaza.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity
A17	Wider access for humanitarian aid in Gaza.	Superficiality and Irresponsibility, Ineffectiveness
A18	Israel needs to take more care to protect civilians.	Feelings of Anger, Simplicity, Superficiality and Irresponsibility
A19	Israel must also protect civilian lives in its fight against Hamas.	Simplicity, Ineffectiveness, Insincerity
A20	Ensure the safe evacuation of civilians from conflict zones.	Impermanence and Artificiality, Insincerity
A21	Israel must withdraw from Gaza and reduce its actions.	Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A22	The killing of innocent civilians must stop; humanitarian efforts must continue.	Anger, Superficiality and Irresponsibility
A23	Hamas' use of human shields and Israel attacks are excessive.	Ineffectiveness, Insincerity
A24	Thousands of innocent people lost their lives during the war.	Value Emphasis, Ineffectiveness
A25	The US will support military logistics infrastructure to deliver aid.	Seeking Approval and Praise, Impermanence and Artificiality, Insincerity

A26	Israel must facilitate the entry of humanitarian aid, innocent lives must be prioritized.	Insincerity, Impermanence and Artificiality
A27	Israel's excessive attacks must stop; the safety of aid workers must be ensured.	Ineffectiveness, Value Emphasis
A28	The humanitarian crisis in Gaza must be resolved; civilians must be protected.	Insincerity, Sense of Anger
A29	The Palestinian people suffered greatly in the war, many innocent lives were lost.	Impermanence and Artificiality, Ineffectiveness
A30	Humanitarian aid reached Gaza through the Egyptian border with US initiatives.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity
A31	My administration will not allow 30,000 more Palestinians to die. Netanyahu has hurt Israel more than he has helped it.	Value Emphasis, Insincerity, Sense of Anger, Impermanence and Artificiality
A32	Urgently increase humanitarian coverage. On October 7, cease hostilities and release the hostages.	Seeking Approval and Praise, Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A33	The killing of aid workers is unacceptable; Israel must take responsibility.	Impermanence and Artificiality, Value Emphasis, Insincerity, Impermanence and Artificiality
A34	Israel must facilitate humanitarian aid; innocent civilians must be the priority.	Superficiality and Irresponsibility, Insincerity
A35	Increase aid to innocent civilians; ensure a ceasefire.	Value Emphasis, Moral Superiority
A36	If Netanyahu orders the invasion of Rafah, I will stop the shipment to Israel of some of the American weapons that he admits are being used to kill civilians in Gaza.	Insincerity, Impermanence and Artificiality
A37	The Palestinian people have endured hell in this war. Many innocent people have been killed, including thousands of children.	Sense of Anger, Simplicity, Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A38	I am the man who has done more for Palestinian society than anyone else.	Seeking Approval and Praise, Insincerity, Ineffectiveness
A39	The war in Gaza has killed thousands of innocent people.	Ineffectiveness, Insincerity
A40	Work on a peace agreement to end the war.	Value Emphasis, Impermanence and Artificiality
A41	International efforts must be stepped up to protect innocent civilians.	Superficiality and Irresponsibility, Insincerity, Simplicity

Table 5 shows that all of the statements made by US President Biden about civilian victimization in the war within a year after the Israel-Palestine war started containing the themes/characteristics of the concept of virtue signaling. In this case, as a result, it is clear that President Biden's statements regarding civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war are behaviors of virtue signaling.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

According to the findings, US President Biden made a total of 41 statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war on 33 different dates within a year after the war started. First of all, it is clear that the victimization of civilians in this war is a very important issue for humanity, and the world agenda in terms of causing reactions, and protests in almost every region of the world. It can be said that 41 statements made by the US President in only 33 days in a period of one year/365 days on

such an important issue is very limited, in other words, Biden did not pay much attention to civilian victimization. Because in the scans conducted within the scope of the study, it was seen that Biden made many more statements on this war on more dates. On the other hand, it can be said that the reasons why Biden made few statements on civilian victimization are as follows: Since the beginning of the war, Biden has always emphasized in his speeches on every platform that the US is/will be behind Israel until the end and that the countries in the region will find the US against them if they make moves against Israel. It is clear that Biden's words are not just words. Because the US has been providing Israel with billions of dollars in military aid since the beginning of the war, continues to openly express its support for Israel, and negotiates with countries in the region against any negative situation that may occur against Israel. All these can be considered as indicators that this war could be a war that serves the interests of the US as well. Therefore, it can be said that despite the civilian victimization, the US actually supports this war, but President Biden makes a few statements every now and then in order to avoid reactions from the world public opinion and to look good to the public. As a result, it can be said that these statements made by President Biden about civilian victimization in order not to draw reaction from the public and to look good to the public have the characteristics of virtue signaling behavior, that is, they can be evaluated as virtue signaling behavior.

President Biden's statements on civilian victimization within one year after the outbreak of the Israel-Palestine war mostly emphasized the themes of '*humanitarian crisis, protection of civilians, humanitarian aid, ceasefire call and ending the war*', and least emphasized the themes of '*stopping the violence, protection of aid workers and Egypt's acceptance of aid*'. When the most emphasized themes in the statements are analyzed, it is as if the US and President Biden are very sensitive to the civilian victimization in the war and therefore want the humanitarian crisis to be solved, civilians to be protected, humanitarian aid to be provided and the war to be ended by establishing a ceasefire. However, when analyzed in detail, it was observed that almost all of Biden's statements were short, simple, artificial, and superficial and did not lead to any realistic solution or solutions to the problem. On the contrary, the fact that Israel does not receive any sanctions from the US despite the fact that it uses war methods that cause increasing civilian deaths and victimization, moreover it always receives support, can be considered as one of the indicators that Biden is not sincere and realistic in his discourses on these concepts that he emphasizes the most. In this context, it can be said that Biden's statements on these concepts, which he emphasizes the most, are an act of virtue signaling. In addition, the fact that Biden emphasized themes such as *stopping violence and protecting aid workers* the least in his statements

confirms this conclusion. If Biden were realistic and sincere in his statements, he should have emphasized these concepts a lot.

It was also observed that Biden used the words '*Hamas and Israel*' in his statements more intensely than the others, while he also used the words '*soldiers, killing, terrorists, civilians, Jews, slaughtered, innocent, Gaza and people*', although not as intensely as these two words. It can be said that the reason for this is that these two actors are the main actors on both sides of the war, and the US perspective on this war. Because, as mentioned above, when we look at some concrete indicators (such as the US openly saying that it gives endless support to Israel and providing billions of dollars in military aid), it is understood that this war could be a war that could also serve the interests of the US. Therefore, it can be said that the US gives endless support to Israel, and even in President Biden's statements on civilian victimization, he emphasizes Hamas and Israel, soldiers, terrorists, Jews, etc., rather than words or concepts that express civilian victimization such as 'death, injury, illness, hunger and aid', emphasizing the Hamas attacks that caused the war to start and Israel's victimization and trying to show that Hamas is the biggest responsible for civilian victimization, which Biden also expresses in some of his statements. However, despite the fact that many times more Palestinian civilians than Israeli civilians were killed in this war, it was observed that Biden gave little attention to the grievances of Palestinian civilians in his statements. The storytelling method is used by creating values and symbols in discourses. With the storytelling method, there is an effort to establish a permanent and persuasive communication on the target audience (Seyfi & Soydaş, 2014). Here, it is understood that Biden uses storytelling with discourses not according to the real situation or ethical values, but according to the interests of the USA. All these indicators point to the fact that US President Biden's statements on civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war are an act of virtue signaling.

According to the statements made by US President Biden regarding the civilian victimization in the Israel-Palestine war within a year after the war started, the most emphasized themes and the most used words in the statements were examined and evaluated, it was stated that Biden's statements could be said to be a virtue signaling behavior as a result of strong indications and logical evaluations. Apart from these, according to the research findings obtained as a result of the analyses conducted to determine whether Biden's statements are indeed virtue signaling behaviors, it has been observed that all of the statements made by US President Biden within a year after the Israel-Palestine war started, regarding the civilian victimization in the war, carry the themes/characteristics of virtue signaling behavior. Therefore, as a general conclusion, it is clear that all of Biden's statements are virtue signaling

behaviors. It can be said that the reason for this result is primarily related to the US foreign policy towards the Israel-Palestine conflict. Because, as explained extensively in the theoretical part of the study, the US has always sided with Israel in the conflicts between Israel and the countries in the region in the historical process, but has tried to hide this partiality against the outside world and pretend to be neutral. But in this war, the US has always openly stated that it favors Israel. While the US supports Israel, it can be said that President Biden may have made these statements in order for the US to gain the tolerance of the world public opinion against the hatred in the world due to Israel's bombing of places where civilians live densely, such as concentration camps, marketplaces, and hospitals, killing civilians and causing great tragedies to the survivors, in other words, it can be said that he exhibited a virtue signaling behavior. Moreover, after the war started, on October 18, 2024, in a statement he made in the Speeches and Remarks section of the Briefing Room on the White House website, Biden said, 'Well, the fact of the matter is that if there were no Israel, we would have to invent one... We don't have to be Jewish to be Zionist.' As it is clear from this speech, the existence of Israel is a sine qua non for the US. In this context, since the US also has interests in the Israel-Palestine war, it is possible that it has always given unconditional and unlimited support to Israel from the very beginning, and that Israel and the US see every means, including civilian deaths and victimization, as permissible for themselves until they achieve their goals. Therefore, it can be said that US President Biden, in order to avoid public reaction against civilian victimization, has exhibited a virtue signaling behavior with his statements that are insincere, simple, superficial, and will not bring solutions to the problems.

Public discourse consists of publications, speeches and other statements made in the public interest. The purpose of these is to guide individuals' and the state's actions towards the common good and justice, where possible (Sellers, 2003). As stated in the theoretical framework, political actors should formulate their communication strategies according to the expectations and needs of the public in order to establish effective relations with the public. However, in some cases, in line with the interests of the state, every work, action, and method used by political actors, especially state administrators, may not always be in line with the expectations or needs of the public. Political actors, who have to communicate effectively with the public in all situations and conditions, use various strategies to gain public support in such situations. One of these strategies is virtue signaling. Virtue signaling is a method that can lead the public's moral discourse environment to a positive change despite all negative judgments (Levy, 2021). Here, it is understood that the US is trying to soften the world public opinion, and look good to the public by emphasizing the violation of the human rights of Palestinian civilians while supporting Israel's security

rights in line with its own interests. As a result, it is evident that Biden's policy aims to garner support from diverse groups with differing views, effectively exemplifying virtue signaling behavior.

Another important study topic on virtual signaling is its relationship with ethical values. It is an important finding that many ethical violations experienced through brands are also observed in the field of diplomacy and political communication. Because it is obvious that virtual signaling is unethical both in terms of virtue and from a consequentialist point of view. Studies have revealed that individuals and social media companies that give virtual signaling encourage online anger against others, and in this way, they gain gains to the detriment of brands that are attacked and people who are subjected to cyberbullying (Aagerup, 2022). Therefore, when the issue is evaluated from the perspective of diplomacy and international relations, it is obvious that there may be multidimensional ethical violations, and this may threaten world peace.

GENİŞLETİLMİŞ ÖZET

İnsanlık tarihi boyunca var olduğu düşünülen gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının kökeni, ahlaki değerlerin ortaya çıktığı ilk toplumsal yapılara kadar uzanmaktadır. Fakat kavramın bilimsel anlamda ele alınması ve tanımlanması üzerine yapılan çalışmalar çok yakın zaman öncesine denk gelmektedir. Bu durumun sebeplerinin; insan nüfusunun ve ona bağlı olarak her alanda rekabetin gittikçe artması, rekabette algının çok önemli faktör haline gelmesi ve baş döndürücü hızla gelişen iletişim teknolojileriyle birlikte ortaya çıkan sosyal ağlarda gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının sergilenmesiyle önemli avantajlar elde edilmesi olduğu söylenebilir. Gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının önemli avantajlar sağladığı alanlardan biri de siyasal iletişimdir.

Gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının ilk toplumsal yapılardan beri siyasal iletişimde yaygın olarak kullanılması ve önemli avantajlar sağlamasına rağmen, bilimsel çalışmalardaki geçmişinin yakın zamana dayandığı ve hakkında kısıtlı sayıda çalışma olduğu görülmektedir. Bu durum, gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının literatürde daha farklı yönleriyle ele alınması ve incelenmesi gerektiğine işaret eder. Bu çalışmanın amacı, İsrail-Filistin savaşında, sivillerin mağduriyetlerine yönelik ABD Başkanı Joe Biden'ın savaştan sonraki bir yıllık zaman diliminde yapmış olduğu açıklamaların, "gösterişçi duyarlılık" kavramı çerçevesinde incelemesi ile günümüzde çelişkili ve karmaşık yapıda zuhur edebilen siyasal söylemlerin çözümlenmesine katkıda bulunmaktır.

Çalışma nitel araştırma desenlerinden biri olan durum/vaka çalışması, diğer adıyla örnek olay incelemesi deseni ile yapılmıştır. Çalışmada siyasal iletişimde gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı sergileme

konusu, ABD Başkanı Biden'ın İsrail-Filistin savaşında sivillerin mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamalar örneği ile incelenmektedir. Amaçlı örneklem yöntemi ile yapılan bu çalışmanın örneklemini ABD Başkanı Biden'ın İsrail-Filistin savaşında, sivillerin mağduriyetlerine yönelik savaş başladıktan sonraki bir yıllık zaman diliminde yapmış olduğu açıklamalardır. Çalışmada cevabı aranan araştırma soruları şunlardır:

AS1. ABD Başkanı Joe Biden, İsrail-Filistin savaşında yaşanan sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik bir yıl içerisinde kaç tane açıklama yapmıştır?

AS2. ABD Başkanı Joe Biden, İsrail-Filistin savaşında yaşanan sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamalarda hangi temalara vurgu yapmıştır?

AS3. ABD Başkanı Joe Biden, İsrail-Filistin savaşında yaşanan sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamalarda en çok hangi kelimeleri/kavramları kullanmıştır?

AS4. ABD Başkanı Joe Biden'ın İsrail-Filistin savaşında yaşanan sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamalar birer gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı mıdır?

Elde edilen bulgular incelendiğinde; Biden'ın İsrail-Filistin savaşı başladıktan sonraki bir yıl içerisinde sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik 33 farklı tarihte toplam 41 açıklama yaptığı görülmüştür. Biden'ın en çok açıklamayı savaşın başladığı ilk ay olan Ekim 2023'te yaptığı (12) görülürken, ikinci en çok açıklamayı ise Şubat 2024'te (7) yaptığı görülmüştür. Buna karşın en az açıklamaları ise Temmuz 2024 (1) ve Eylül 2024'te (1) yaptığı görülürken, Haziran 2024'te ise konuyla ilgili hiç açıklama yapmadığı görülmüştür.

Biden'nin açıklamalarında en çok insani kriz, sivillerin korunması, insani yardım, ateşkes çağrısı ve savaşın sonlandırılması, temalarına vurgu yaptığı görülürken, en az ise şiddetin durdurulması, yardım görevlilerinin korunması ve Mısır'ın yardımları kabul etmesi, temalarına vurgu yaptığı görülmüştür. Biden'ın açıklamalarında en yoğun olarak İsrail ve Hamas, kelimelerini kullandığı görülürken, ikinci en yoğun olarak terörist, masum, Gazze, İsrailli sivilleri, öldürüyor ve kriz, kelimelerini kullandığı görülmüştür. Yine Biden'ın açıklamalarında Hamas ve İsrail, kelimelerini diğerlerine göre oldukça yoğun şekilde kullanıldığı görülmüştür. Bu durumun sebebinin, bu iki aktörün savaşın iki tarafında bulunan temel aktörler olmasından ve ABD'nin bu savaşa bakış açısından kaynaklandığı söylenebilir. Zira yukarıda da söylendiği gibi bazı somut göstergelere (ABD'nin İsrail'e sonsuz destek verdiğini açık açık söylemesi ve milyarlarca dolarlık askeri yardımlar yaması gibi) bakıldığında bu savaşın ABD'nin çıkarlarına da hizmet ettiği/edebileceği için ABD'nin İsrail'e sonsuz destek verdiğini söylenebilir. Bundan dolayı Biden'ın sivil

mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamalarda bile ölüm, yaralanma, hastalık, açlık ve yardım gibi sivil mağduriyetlerini ifade eden kelime veya kavramlardan ziyade Hamas ve İsrail'i ön planda tuttuğu söylenebilir. Burada Biden'ın Hamas ve İsrail kelimelerini en yoğun şekilde kullanması, savaşla ilgili olarak, savaşın başlamasına neden olan Hamas saldırılarını ve İsrail'in mağduriyetini vurgulayarak, sivil mağduriyetlerinin en büyük sorumlusunun Hamas olduğunu göstermeye çalıştığı da söylenebilir ki zaten Biden bunu bazı açıklamalarında açıkça ifade etmektedir.

Bulgulardan hareketle, Biden'ın sivil mağduriyetlerine yönelik yapmış olduğu açıklamaların hepsinin gösterişçi duyarlılık kavramının temalarını/özelliklerini barındırdığı, bir başka ifadeyle hepsinin birer gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı olduğu açıktır. Bu sonucun sebebinin ABD'nin İsrail-Filistin sorununa yönelik dış politikası ile ilgili olduğu söylenebilir. Çünkü çalışmanın kuramsal kısmında genişçe anlatıldığı gibi tarihsel süreçte İsrail ile bölge ülkeleri arasında çıkan çatışmaların hepsinde ABD'nin hep İsrail'den yana taraf olduğu, ancak bu tarafsızlığını dış dünyaya karşı gizlemeye ve tarafsızmış gibi görünmeye çalıştığı görülmüştür. Bu savaşta ise ABD, İsrail taraftarı olduğunu her zaman açıkça söylemektedir. ABD İsrail'i desteklerken, İsrail'in toplama kampları, pazar yerleri ve hastaneler gibi sivillerin yoğun olarak yaşadığı yerleri bombalayarak sivillerin ölüm, yaralanma ve çeşitli uzuvlarından mahrum edilmesi gibi mağduriyetlerine sebep olması dolayısıyla dünyada oluşan nefrete karşı Başkan Biden'ın bu açıklamaları ABD ve dünya kamuoyunun hoşgörüsünü alması için yaptığı, başka bir ifadeyle gösterişçi duyarlılık sergilediği açıktır. Sonuç olarak, İsrail-Filistin savaşına yönelik ABD Başkanının yapmış olduğu gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışının, başka savaşlara veya olaylara yönelik olarak, başka devlet başkanları veya siyasiler tarafından da yapılabilceği açıktır. Bu bağlamda, bu çalışmanın, herhangi bir konuda yapılmış, yapılmakta veya yapılacak olan gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışlarının anlaşılmasına yönelik okuyucularına fayda sağlayacağı umulmaktadır.

Çıkar Çatışması/Conflict of Interest

Yazar çıkar çatışması olmadığını beyan etmiştir. /The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

Yazarların Katkıları/Author Contributions

Makale tek yazarlıdır. /The article has a single author.

This work is licensed under **Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License** (CC BY-NC 4.0). 

REFERENCES

- Aagerup, U. (2022). The ethics of conspicuous virtue signaling: When brand co-creation on social media turns negative. In S. Markovic, R. Gyrd-Jones, S. von Wallpach, & A. Lindgreen (Ed.), *Research Handbook on Brand Co-Creation* (pp. 303-315). Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Altunışık, M. B. (2009). Ortadoğu ve ABD: Yeni bir döneme girilirken. [Middle East and the US: Towards a new era]. *Ortadoğu Etütleri*, 1(1), 69-81.
- Balcı, R. (2015). Arap-İsrail savaşları ve Türkiye [Arab-Israel wars and Turkey]. *Genç Kalemler Tarih Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 1(2), 80-84.
- Bulut, M. (2018). Altı Gün ve Yom Kippur savaşının modern İsrail kimliği üzerine etkisi [Effects of the Six Day and Yom Kippur wars on the identity of modern Israel]. *Tarihin Peşinde Uluslararası Tarih ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 20, 339-350.
- Canbey, M. (2024). İsrail-Filistin Savaşı'nda uluslararası kuruluşların göstermiş olduğu diplomasi performansının incelenmesi: BM örneği [Regarding the diplomatic conduct of international organizations during the Israel-Palestine war: UN sample]. *Ombudsman Akademik, SPECIAL ISSUE 2 (GAZA)*, 132-162.
- Candelario, C. (2021, September 28). *What is performative activism (and why does it do more harm than good)?*. PureWow. <https://www.purewow.com/wellness/what-is-performative-activism>
- Çoban Oran, F. (2017). Amerikan kimliği ve dış politikasında evanjelizmin izleri: Sosyal-inşacı perspektiften ABD-İsrail ilişkileri [The traces of evangelism in American identity and foreign policy: The USA-Israel relations from a social-constructivist approach]. *İnsan ve Toplum Bilimleri Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 6(3), 2019-2037. <https://doi.org/10.15869/itobiad.336254>
- Demircan, N. (2020). Yahudi devletinin inşası ve Arap-İsrail çatışmasının başlangıcı [The Jewish state building and the beginning of the Arab Israel conflict]. *Ulusa: Uluslararası Çalışmalar Dergisi*, 4(2), 215-226.
- Doğanoğlu, K. (2020). Siyasi ve askeri yönleriyle 1967 Arap-İsrail savaşı [Political and military aspects of the 1967 Arab-Israel war]. *The Journal of Social Sciences*, 7(45), 355-364. <https://doi.org/10.29228/SOBIDER.42008>
- Effectiviology. (n.d.). *Virtue signaling: When people try to show their goodness*. <https://effectiviology.com/virtue-signaling/>
- Flowerree, A. K., & Satta, M. (2024). Moral grandstanding and the norms of moral discourse. *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, 10(3), 483-502.
- Grohmann, S. (2023). Objects of virtue: 'Moral grandstanding' and the capitalization of ethics under neoliberal commodity fetishism. *Journal of Critical Realism*, 22(1), 27-48.
- Grubbs, J. B., Warmke, B., Tosi, J., & James, A. S. (2020). Moral grandstanding and political polarization: A multi-study consideration. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 88, 1-12. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.104009>
- Güllüpunar, H. (2010). *Siyasal iletişim ve aday imajı [Political communication and candidate image]*. Eğitim Yayınevi.

- Herkner, W. (2003). İçerik çözümlemesi [Content analyzed]. In M. S. Çebi (Ed.), *İletişim araştırmalarında içerik çözümlemesi [Content analyzed in communication research]* (pp. 124-176). Alternatif Yayınları.
- Kaştan, Y. (2012). Ortadoğu'da Arap-İsrail mücadeleleri ve Türkiye [The Arab-Israel struggle in the Middle-East and Turkey]. *Tarih ve Medeniyetler Tarihi*, 4, 1797-1815.
- Kaya, M., & Polat, E. (2023). Filistin Kurtuluş Örgütü'nün (FKÖ) diplomasi serüveni: Oslo barış süreci [The diplomacy adventure of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO): Oslo peace process]. *Bingöl Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 26, 226-240.
- Kentel, F. (1991). Demokrasi, kamuoyu ve siyasal iletişime dair [On democracy, public opinion and political communication]. *Birikim Dergisi*, 30, 39-44.
- Keskin, O., & Karakoç, E. (2022). 1956 Süveyş krizinin Mısır ile Türkiye'nin Orta Doğu politikalarına etkisi [The effect of 1956 Suez Crisis on Egypt and Turkey's Middle East policies]. *Bilge Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 6(2), 59-68.
- Kiş, E. (2023). 1948'den bugüne, tarihi ve siyasi yönleri ile "İsrail-Filistin sorunu" [Historical and political aspects of the 'Israel-Philistine conflict' from 1948 to today]. *Anlambilim MTÜ Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Dergisi*, 3(1), 262-274.
- Kızgır, O. (2011). *ABD Dış Politikası'nda İsrail-Filistin Sorunu: 1993-2009 [Israel Palestine conflict in USA foreign policy:1993-2009]*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Marmara University.
- Koç, H., & Yemenici, G. (2019). Golan Tepeleri: Gelişim süreci, hukuki statüsü ve soruna yönelik uluslararası tepkiler [Golan Heights: Development process, legal status and international responses to the problem]. *Ekonomi İşletme ve Yönetim Dergisi*, 3(1), 65-81.
- Levy, N. (2021). Virtue signalling is virtuous. *Synthese*, 198(10), 9545-9562. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-020-02653-9>
- Özgül, E. (2018). *Balfour Deklarasyonu ve Filistin'e Yahudi göçü [Balfour Declaration and Jewish immigration to Palestine]*. [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Balıkesir University.
- Özkoç, Ö. (2009). Savaş ve barış: Doksanlı yıllarda Filistin-İsrail sorunu [War and peace: Palestine-Israel question in 1990's]. *Ankara Üniversitesi SBF Dergisi*, 64(3), 167-195.
- Özkoç, Ö. (2021). İsrail'in Batı Şeria'daki yerleşimci politikası ve ABD'nin Filistin sorununa ilişkin barış girişimleri: İki devletli çözüm hâlâ mümkün mü? [The Israel settlement policy in the West Bank and USA's peace Initiatives on the Palestinian question: Is the two-state solution still possible?]. *Gazi Akademik Bakış*, 15(29), 311-336.
- Paşalı Taşoğlu, N., & Çağlayan, S. (2021). Dijital siyasal iletişimde gösterişçi duyarlılık davranışı ve ABD eski başkanı D. Trump'ın politik söylemleri üzerine bir inceleme [A study on virtue signaling behavior in digital political communication and the political discourses of former US President D. Trump]. In T. Yazıcı, İ. Karı, & B. Dondurucu (Ed.), *Dijitalleşen dünyada siyasal iletişim [Political Communication in the Digitalizing World]* (pp. 493-552). Literatürk.
- Paşalı Taşoğlu, N., & Çağlayan, S. (2022). Gösterişçi duyarlılık sergileme ya da duyar kasma: Kavramsal bir çerçeve [Virtue Signaling: A conceptual framework]. *Selçuk İletişim Dergisi*, 15(2), 833-859.

- Phillips, H. (2020, May 9). *Performative allyship is deadly*. Medium. <https://forge.medium.com/performative-allyship-is-deadlyc900645d9f1f>
- Seyfi, M., & Soydaş, A. U. (2014). Sivil toplum kuruluşlarında hikâyeleştirme. *Marmara İletişim Dergisi*, (22), 163-182.
- Sellers, M. (2003). Ideals of public discourse. In *Republican legal theory* (pp. 62-70). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230513402_8
- Solak, C. G. (2024). Filistin-İsrail sorununda paradigma değişikliği: Apartheid, uzatılmış yasa dışı işgal ve self-determinasyon [Change of paradigm in the Israel-Palestine conflict: Apartheid, prolonged illegal occupation and self-determination]. *Filistin Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 15, 195-236.
- Subaşı, M., & Okumuş, K. (2017). Bir araştırma yöntemi olarak durum çalışması [Case study as a research method]. *Atatürk Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 21(1), 419-426.
- Şahin, M. (2010). ABD-İsrail ilişkileri: Böyle dost düşman başına [The U.S.-Israel relations: I would wish such a friend on my worst enemy]. *Ortadoğu Analiz*, 2(21), 39-45.
- Şen, G., & Manuoğlu, E. (2022). Bir narsisizm öz tatmini olarak ahlaki duyarlılık gösterisi [Moral grandstanding as a narcissistic intrinsic satisfaction]. *Psikiyatride Güncel Yaklaşımlar-Current Approaches in Psychiatry*, 14(4), 488-498.
- Tekdal-Fildiş, A. (2012). Birleşmiş Milletler'in taksim kararı ve İsrail Devleti'nin yaratılışı [The United Nations' partition resolution and the creation of state of Israel]. *Trakya Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 14(1), 337-348.
- Tosi, J., & Warmke, B. (2016). Moral grandstanding. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 44(3), 197-217.
- Tosi, J., & Warmke, B. (2021). Moral grandstanding as a threat to free expression. *Philosophy and Policy*, 37(2), 170-189.
- Tucker, J. (2018, September 12). *The political economy of virtue signaling*. AIER. <https://www.aier.org/article/the-political-economy-of-virtue-signaling/>
- Uyanık, N., & Yavuz, H. (2023). Balfour Deklarasyonu'nun ilanı, tepki ve destekler [Announcement of the Balfour Declaration, reaction and support]. *Kastamonu İnsan ve Toplum Dergisi*, 1(2), 207-222.
- Yalçın, O. (2021). 1967 Arap-İsrail savaşı ve savaşta hava harekâtı [1967 Arab-Israel war and air operations in the war]. *Akademik Tarih ve Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 4(5), 53-104.
- Yıldırım, A., & Şimşek, H. (2018). *Sosyal bilimlerde nitel araştırma yöntemleri* [Qualitative research methods in social sciences]. Seçkin Yayıncılık.
- Yıldırım, Y. (2021). İsrail-Filistin sorununda iki devletli çözüm arayışları [Two-state solutions for the Israel-Palestine question]. *OPUS International Journal of Society Researches*, 18(41), 3840-3884.
- Yılmaz, D. (2024). Filistin-İsrail çatışması: Liberal basının bakış açısından uluslararası bir analiz [The Palestine-Israel conflict: An international analyzed from the perspective of the liberal press]. *Ombudsman Akademik*, 309-344.