

Media Framing of Immigration

A comparison of newspaper coverage in Sweden and the United Kingdom during the 2016 Brussels terrorist attack

Laura Lindström

Abstract

Through salience and framing, the media has significant power in influencing how the public views a given political, societal, or economic issue. Through the lens of framing theory, this research paper is investigating how immigration was framed in two Swedish and four United Kingdom newspapers during the week surrounding the Brussels terrorist attack on 22 March 2016 in a content analysis. By looking at coverage from three days before and three days after the attack, the terrorist attack was found having a larger impact on coverage in the UK than in Sweden. The sample included both broadsheet newspapers and tabloids; the most common frames found in the quality broadsheet newspapers in our sample were conflict and responsibility frames, while the more right-leaning anti-immigration tabloid in the sample used the threat frame to a larger extent.

Key words: framing, media, immigration, terrorism, news
Words: 17 221

Table of contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview of the topic	1
1.2	Research question and aim	3
1.3	Delimitations	4
2	Literature review	6
3	Theoretical Framework	9
3.1	Media Framing	9
3.2	Identifying frames	10
3.3	A typology of frames	12
4	Methodology	17
4.1	Country selection	17
4.2	Case study	19
4.3	Data collection & analysis	21
4.3.1	The Newspapers	22
4.3.2	Retrieving articles	23
4.4	The list of frames approach	25
5	Results	27
5.1	Sweden	27
5.1.1	Dagens Nyheter	28
5.1.2	Aftonbladet	31
5.2	United Kingdom (UK)	33
5.2.1	The Guardian	33
5.2.2	The Daily Telegraph	38
5.2.3	The Daily Mail	42
5.2.4	The Mirror	46
6	Discussion and conclusion	48
7	References	53
	Appendix A: Coding scheme	57
	Appendix B: List of articles used in analysis	59

1 Introduction

In this research, media portrayal of immigration will be investigated through the lens of framing theory in two different political contexts: Sweden and the United Kingdom (from here on the UK). Furthermore, this research will be looking into the media coverage during a recent act of terror, *The Brussels terrorist attack 22 March 2016*¹, in an attempt to investigate how such an attack can affect media coverage of immigration during a time when the issue is highly debated across Europe. The way in which the media portrays immigration is assumed to have a significant impact on how the public views the issue. By looking into the framing of immigration in different countries, this study aims to shed light on the strategies used by the media in different contexts to either support or object immigration.

1.1 Overview of the topic

The news media can be seen as a social sphere where journalists, politicians and the public meet and interact. The public gets most of its information about political issues and events from the media, which in turn has the power to decide which information it wants to provide and in what way. In a representative system of government, policy outcomes are affected by the political preferences and the beliefs of the voters. The media plays a key role in shaping these preferences and beliefs; it collects, summarizes, and frames the information that the public uses in its preference/opinion formation. The media thus acts as a key source of information for the public regarding political debate; an effective and truthful media system can thus be considered a basic pillar for any functioning democracy.

¹ On 22 March 2016, three suicide bombings occurred in Brussels, Belgium, killing 32 civilians and injuring more than 300 people. Two of the attacks took place at Brussels Airport, and one at Maalbeek metro station in central Brussels. The terrorist attack was claimed by Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant (ISIL).

Having the role of narrating what is happening in our societies, the media largely tells us what we should be focusing on by deciding which topics it deems important enough to cover. But the media not only tells us what issues we should be thinking about – it also suggests *how* we should think about them. Once the media has decided upon the issue it wants to cover, it then chooses how it wants to *frame* the issue to the audience. Framing essentially involves providing a story with an angle and providing meaning to a message depending on internal and external values of the news provider. These frames then, in turn, when skillfully presented have the power to influence its audience to think about a given issue in a certain way. The effect of framing in shaping public attitudes has been demonstrated in several previous studies (see for example Price et al. 2005; Chong 2008). The concept of framing will be further elaborated on in chapter 3 of this paper.

Immigration is a highly relevant topic today, not the least in framing research. The migrant crisis in Europe in the past years has led to increased criticism of immigration, as well as a rise in anti-immigration political parties across the continent. Immigration overall has thus been deemed the most important societal topic in most European countries today. Furthermore, since 11 September 2001, researchers have been increasingly interested in portrayals of terrorism in mainstream media (see Papacharissi et al. 2008). Acts of terror have contributed to the negative feelings towards immigration; a survey conducted by *Pew Research Center* demonstrates how the ongoing refugee crisis and the threat of terrorism following recent attacks in Europe and elsewhere are very much connected in the minds of many Europeans (Wike et al. 2016). The survey demonstrates that in 8 out of 10 European nations, half or more of the population believe incoming refugees increase the likelihood of terrorism in their country. The media plays a large part in the formation of this connection, as the types of frames the media chooses to use in its coverage has the power to influence the way the audience views a given issue, such as immigration during an act of terror.

In this research I will focus on the role of the media in steering public debate on immigration during a terrorist attack. How the media frames immigration is

deemed important, as it essentially acts as a medium between the political elite and the public; it has the ability to portray, or frame, the information it gets in any way it wants, which then is sold to the minds of the audiences. People's perceptions of and interpretations about events are dependent on what information or story is salient around them (Heider 1958). A part from creating this saliency, by selecting what to include and what to exclude from a story, the news media frame a story and thus influence how people should think about an issue. Studying the media and the frames it uses is thus important, as it inevitably plays a huge part in what we make of our social and political environment.

This research will be investigating and comparing framing of immigration in two different political/cultural settings: Sweden and the UK (see 4.1: "Country selection"). Due to the increasing interest in researching the portrayal of terrorism in the media, this research will be narrowed down to investigating how immigration was framed surrounding a recent terrorist attack: the Brussels terrorist attack 22 March 2016.

1.2 Research question and aim

While immigration has become one of the most talked about and controversial issues in Europe today, research on what motivates people to oppose or support it is still lacking. As mentioned, we get our information on public debate from the media and, indirectly, from the political elite. The way in which we understand the debate is thus highly influenced by these actors. By investigating the ways in which the media frames the issue of immigration in its coverage, we gain insight into how the public might perceive the issue and hence why they take the positions they take. Analyzing newspaper content through the lens of framing theory, this cross-cultural research thus attempts to shed light on the strategies used by the media in Sweden and the UK in forming the public's opinion on immigration.

To make investigating the strategies used in framing immigration feasible for this study, it needs to be narrowed down to a single case study. Seeing that terrorism

has become of interest to scholars, in this research we will investigate the way in which the media framed immigration during a recent act of terror: the Brussels terrorist attack 22 March 2016. The aim here is to see how news providers' framed immigration during the terrorist attack, and to see whether the attack affected coverage of immigration. The main research question is thus formulated as follows:

How did the media in the United Kingdom and Sweden frame the public debate on immigration amid the Brussels terror attack 19 March 2016 to 25 March 2016?

1.3 Delimitations

This research is a humble attempt to contribute to research in media framing in general, and more specifically to the framing of immigration in different political contexts. In this section, all necessary delimitating choices regarding this research will be presented.

The main limitations to this research are identified, firstly, by the relatively short time period covered in the analysis. In other researches, longer periods have been analyzed to make sure that the results would not be distorted by specific events or exceptions. Within the limits of this research however, a longer time period was not feasible. As the media is very active in covering immigration, especially during times of crises when it is considered by the public as the most important issue in society, a large amount of articles exist covering the topic at any given time frame. A weeks' worth of coverage was however deemed sufficient, as this study is limited to analyzing a single case study.

The second main limitation was the amount of news sources to be analyzed; as with the amount of coverage, the amount of news providers is also very broad. The results of this research would arguably have been more complete if all news providers in Sweden and the UK had been analyzed; however, this was not possible within the scope of this research. Instead, the most relevant and most read news sources were selected, as they were deemed most influential in their

respective countries. The selection process will be elaborated on further in the methodology section (see chapter 4) of this research.

Another limitation to this research investigating the media is the absence of broadcast news. A large percentage of the population arguably get their news from television broadcast, which in itself is an interesting aspect to investigate regarding media framing. Investigating the frames used in broadcast media was however not possible in the scope of this research, but is suggested for further research on the topic.

The pre-selected frames that were analyzed in this research, as elaborated on more in chapter 3, can be considered inconclusive. Many methods exist in choosing frames to be assessed; the method chosen for this study rests on previous research, a well-used method in the field of research. A deductive method was chosen for this research, as this is believed to improve reliability and replicability of the study. This method will be elaborated on further in chapter 4.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that for this topic, it could have been of interest to compare the coverage in more countries and perhaps in different cases. As the main purpose of this research was to see how immigration was framed in different contexts, both pro- and anti-immigration, Sweden and the UK were deemed appropriate (see chapter 4). Belgium was not chosen for analysis as it was believed that since the terrorist attack occurred in Brussels, the coverage of immigration would be distorted due to emotional factors; the aim here was to get a somewhat objective idea on how an act of terror affects coverage of immigration. Furthermore, due to linguistic restrictions, the two countries selected were feasible in this research.

2 Literature review

Before starting the analysis, it is worth looking into the field of research in media framing in order to map out what is known, and what gaps in research can be identified. In this literature review some of the most prominent topics and debates in the research field of media framing research are assessed - what has been done in the field and where does this research in question fit in?

A good amount of research has been done within the field of framing, focusing on one or more of the three stages in a framing process which involves information development by the political elite, framing of the information by the media, and finally the impact these frames have on the public (Matthes 2012: 248). Media framing of immigration has previously been researched on different levels of analysis, such as in a national (e.g. Gabrielatos et. al. 2008), cross-national (e.g. Frederking 2012; Helbling 2014), and local (e.g. Lawlor 2015) context to mention a few.

Framing of immigration in the mass media has been popular within framing research, focusing on the appearance of different frames in media coverage of immigration (Hayes 2008; Helbling 2014; Fryberg et al. 2011; Thorbjørnsrud 2015; Berry et al. 2015). The results generally demonstrate how the framing of immigration often depends on the actors involved, as well as upon the circumstances governing the dispute; the role of the circumstance (Brussels terrorist attack) in the framing of immigration is investigated in this research.

A general debate within this field of research has been on the amount of frames to be used in analysis, and on the method of how to retrieve frames. While some argue for an inductive method, i.e. finding the frames while conducting a content analysis, others opt for measuring the prevalence of general pre-defined frames (Sametko et al. 2000). In this research, as we shall see in the theoretical framework (see chapter 3), a deductive approach was assumed based on previous

research from which six generalizable frames were chosen (see Berry et al. 2015; Helbling 2014; Semetko and Valkenburg 2000; Neuman et al. 1992; Hendrickson 1994; Boydston et al. 2013; Fryberg et al. 2012; An et al. 2008).

Researchers have argued in favor of applying clear and concise, priori defined operationalization's of frames in content analyses (see Cappella and Jamieson 1997; Reese et. al. 2001; Chong and Druckman 2007; Tankard 2001). This deductive method is believed to enhance reliability and replicability of results, as well as make a comparison of results easier. In an inductive method, an endless array of issue-specific frames could be found, which would arguably diminish the objectivity and replicability of the research (Matthes 2009). The generic frames chosen for this research instead can be identified across different issues, and are thus not limited to specific themes (De Vreese 2005).

Since 11 September 2001, and especially during the ongoing migrant crisis in Europe, terrorism and debates regarding immigration have become a priority for governments around the world. This debate has often involved the use of rhetoric of exclusion and fear of foreigners, combined with a political demand for intensifying cross-border control of people (Huysmans et al. 2008). Cross-national studies on media framing of terrorism in connection to immigration and/or Islam have become a popular field of research with the rise of immigration (Papacharissi et al. 2008; Yusof et al. 2013; Frederking 2012). Researchers have noted that the way media react to and cover terrorist attacks is crucial for the definition and future treatment of those social groups that are considered to be responsible for the events (Hussain and Bagguley 2012). In this vein, it is worth looking into how the media in different contexts portrayed immigrants in the wake of the recent Belgium terrorist attack, as this arguably plays a part in forming public attitudes towards immigration.

While journalists in developed western states are expected to inform the public truthfully and objectively about political debates, the political culture of a country matters, and the framing of certain issues raised by the media is expected to reflect the political culture of the country in question. While the quality of the media itself can be debated, previous studies demonstrate that deeper influences such as

national interests and concerns, the nature of elite opinion and debate, as well as cultural and social practices also play a part in the framing of news coverage (Ravi 2005; Floss & Marcinkowski 2008; Helbling 2014). This is why a cross-cultural study may be of value in investigating how context matters in framing of immigration in the media.

What remains less clear is how the connection between terrorism and migration/asylum has been politically sustained since 2001. A good amount of research has previously been done on the framing of this issue within the political elite (Huysmans 2008). However, in an age of active mass media largely driving public debate, this research focuses on the framing of immigration in the media. The media is furthermore interesting to assess in framing research, as it covers more than just the views of the political elite, and perhaps provides a more complete picture of the debate as a whole.

This research is an attempt to contribute to framing research of immigration, by assessing and comparing the frames used in the media coverage in two different political and cultural contexts amid the recent terrorist attack in Brussels. By investigating how the media framed immigration during the attack, this research contributes to understanding how the immigration debate is structured and influenced by the media, and therefore understood by its audience – the public in Sweden and the UK.

3 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used in this research is framing analysis. More specifically, the aim of this research is to investigate what kinds of frames are used in the media in two different political settings, the UK and Sweden, in order to map out what arguments are most prominent in attempting to frame the opinions of the public regarding immigration. I will begin this chapter by introducing and defining media framing, to then go on applying the concept to this research in question.

3.1 Media Framing

News stories contain both information as well as frames. In general, media frames function to suggest how audiences can interpret an issue or an event. These frames then, in turn, can have a significant influence on the audience's beliefs, attitudes and behaviors (Tewksbury and Scheufele 2009: 19). Seeing that frames are abstractions that work to organize or structure the meaning of a message, they can affect how people understand, interpret and react to a presented issue. In fact, it has been argued that a very effective frame does not even need proper information to give the story meaning - the effects can rely solely on culture-based meanings, norms, and values (Tewksbury and Scheufele 2009: 19).

While considered a useful and rich theoretical concept, framing still lacks a coherent, unified definition. Framing is ultimately about choices of, for example, words, emphasis, sources, and organization of texts; framing effects can be found in words, but also in perspectives, choice of facts presented, and connections between events, issues and agents (Bolin et. al. 2016). In essence, framing means giving an angle to a news story which guides and gives meaning to the audience about a particular issue, such as immigration. The media thus has the power to construct an image in its audience's heads about the issue it covers, through the

usage of different frames. For the purpose of this research, a widely used definition of framing constructed by Robert Entman will be used:

Framing essentially involves selection and salience. To frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described. (Entman, 1993: 52)

The media both reflects and contributes to the ways in which the public and the debate over immigration is processed and understood. The way in which the media frames arguments thus plays an important role in how immigration is presented in the national debate, and can therefore affect how people respond to the issue (Fryberg et al. 2011: 3). Research done on the coverage of immigration demonstrates two distinct media critiques; on the one side it is argued that the media at times portray, or frame, a distorted, problem-oriented image of immigration by using metaphors, images, and symbols that create portrayals of immigrants or immigration as a threat (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008; Horsti, 2007). On the other end however, critics argue that the media which advocates a pro-immigration stance tend to stay silent about the problems created by immigration, and hence do not provide full disclosure on the issue which Sweden has at time been accused of (Thorbjørnsrud 2015: 776). Framing can thus be considered as a useful paradigm in analyzing the strategic creation of public messages used in the framing of a given issue, in this case immigration.

3.2 Identifying frames

This research will follow a deductive approach in that it will investigate frames that are identified in the existing research literature; the range of possible frames are thus identified and operationalized prior to the content analysis. Researchers have argued in favor of applying clear and concise, priori defined operationalization's of frames in content analyses to enhance reliability and replicability of results. Cappella and Jamieson have argued that considering any

feature of texts as possibility for news frames (inductive method) is a too broad of a view for sufficient results (1997). Four criteria a frame must meet as suggested by Cappella and Jamieson (47) are considered in this research:

1. A news frame must have identifiable conceptual and linguistic characteristics;
2. A news frame must be commonly observed in journalistic practice;
3. A news frame must be possible to distinguish reliably from other frames;
4. A news frame must have *representational validity* (i.e. be recognized by others) and not be merely a creation of a researcher's imagination.

Framing is a central concept in political communication and a powerful political tool; understanding what frames are used to define and steer the political debate on any given issue is thus important. However, due to the volume of data provided by the media, the amount and variance of relevant frames, and the dynamic nature of language, investigating this is also a challenge (Boydston et al. 2013). To address these challenges, Boydston et al. developed a unified coding scheme for investigating frames in content analysis across different policy issues. This Policy Frames Codebook is intended to provide a “general system for categorizing frames across policy issues, designed so that it can also be specialized in issue-specific ways” (4). The codebook contains categories of frames designed to be applicable to any policy issue, in this case immigration, and in any communication context, in this case news stories.

When working with a deductive approach, in order to identify a frame one needs to assess which components in a news story constitutes a frame. News frames can be examined and identified by “the presence or absence of certain keywords, typical phrases, stereotyped images, sources of information, and sentences that provide thematically reinforcing clusters of facts or judgments” (Entman 1993: 52).

The frames chosen for this research are *generic frames*, which transcend thematic limitations as they can be identified across different policy issues as opposed to issue-specific frames (Matthes 2009: 350). A news frame can be issue-focused, investigating a particular event or subject (in which case it is not generalizable to

other similar issues), or it can be generic, as when it deals with a broad sociopolitical field (de Vreese, 2005). Similarly, Iyengar (1991) differentiates between *thematic* and *episodic* frames. Thematic frames focus on a given societal issue in a broader interpretation or context, as opposed to episodic frames which are limited to focusing on isolated events within a specific issue only (De Vreese 2005: 56). According to Iyengar (1991), episodic frames simplify complex societal issues to the level of circumstantial evidence and induces a topical, disorganized, and isolated understanding of social issues rather than general and contextual as in the case of thematic frames (136-137). The use of generic frames in analysis provides this research with some generalizability, as the frames can be used across different policy areas. In the next section the predefined generic frames assessed in the analysis will be presented, along with the identifying components unique to each frame, which will guide the content analysis.

3.3 A typology of frames

The frames presented here were chosen following a deductive approach, and were selected based on previous research (e.g. Berry et al. 2015; Helbling 2014; Semetko and Valkenburg 2000; Neuman et al. 1992; Hendrickson 1994; Boydston et al. 2013; Fryberg et al. 2012; An et al. 2008 etc.) and therefore represent the most common generic frames in framing literature today. Below, each frame assessed in this study will be presented, along with expectations regarding the use of these frames in Swedish and UK media coverage. How the frames are to be identified in the content analysis will also be elaborated on.

- a. **Conflict frame:** This widely used frame emphasizes conflict between and among individuals, groups, or institutions to attract the attention of audiences (Semetko et al. 2000: 95; De Vreese et al. 2001). A conflict can consist of disagreement, tension between different sides, incompatibility between viewpoints, and politicians attacking each other in the media (Putnam and Shoemaker 2007). Research shows that conflict frames are some of the most frequently used frames in political communication (De Vreese et al. 2001). Conflict frames are important in coverage of political issues as they often ensure more balance in the arguments

presented, due to the fact that it aims to presents different sides to a story to highlight conflict (De Vreese 2004).

It is suggested that when the political elite in a nation is united regarding an issue, there is a higher chance for one-sided media reporting on that debate; when the elite is divided on a matter on the other hand, the media will likely cover the conflicting positions more carefully and thus provide a more complete picture of the debate all together (Vladisavljević 2015; Hallin, 1986; Bennett and Paletz, 1994). The political elite in the UK is generally regarded as being overall more negatively stationed towards immigration; however, the media in the country can still be seen as being divided regarding the approach to immigration depending on the political stance of the news provider in question. Sweden on the other hand is regarded as being overall more positive towards immigration and, overlooking the Sweden Democrats, most parties and media providers are open to some level of immigration (Berry et. al. 2015). In light of these arguments, we expect to find the news coverage of immigration to be more unified in Sweden than the UK, where we expect to find more differing opinions present in the coverage.

Furthermore, differences between broadsheet and tabloid newspapers are expected in coverage of immigration. Broadsheets, being regarded as quality news providers, have a tendency for more analytical reporting, wanting to provide the public with as much information as possible. As demonstrated in a study by Semetko et al. (2000), the more “serious” the newspaper is, the more prevalent the conflict frame will be (104). Thus, the conflict frame is expected to be more prominent in the broadsheets than in the tabloids in our sample.

- a. Threat Frame:** This frame is used to indicate a threat immigration or immigrants pose to society, individuals, or culture. Literature in political behavior and social psychology has suggested that elite attitudes and public opinion toward immigration are largely influenced by perceptions of threat; physical insecurity as well as perceived threats to national community and identity have been shown to accompany general intolerance and rejection towards immigrants (McLaren 2003; Lahav 2004). Perceived threat of immigration leads to insecurity, which then

again leads to increased criticism of immigrants and support for politics that aim to restrict immigration (Branton and Jones 2005; Thórisdóttir and Jost 2011).

The *Integrated Threat Theory* asserts that the perceived threats posed by immigrant groups cause fear and anxiety, which ultimately lead to prejudice toward the immigrant groups. *Political Conservatism* is deemed as a major factor influencing the extent to which these perceived threats cause fear and anxiety. According to Jost et al. (2003), political conservatism is associated with motivational concerns related to the management of uncertainty and fear; specifically, it is supported and promoted by ideological motives, such as intolerance of ambiguity, mortality salience, uncertainty avoidance, need for order and structure, and need for closure (340). Taken together, the research on political conservatism and Integrated Threat Theory suggests that conservative newspapers, in this case the Telegraph and The Daily Mail, compared to more liberal newspapers, will be more likely to frame immigration in terms of threats to the public. Moreover, in the aftermath of striking, unusual, or dangerous events, such as terrorist attacks, people are generally more likely to approve conservative policies and support conservative leaders (Nail et al. 2009; Ulrich and Cohrs 2007). In light of the arguments above, we expect firstly to find the threat frame used more in the UK media, as the UK have more restrictive immigration policies and overall a more negative attitude towards immigration than Sweden. Secondly, we expect to find the threat frame used in articles from the more conservative news providers in our sample: The Telegraph and the Guardian.

- b. Human impact frame:** This frame, also described as the human interest frame, attempts to capture the audience's attention by using an emotional angle in reporting, and putting a human face to the presentation of an event or issue (Neuman et al. 1992). In articles from news providers with a more pro-immigration stance, this frame is expected to occur frequently so as to humanize refugees/immigrants in a time when the issue of immigration is highly debated and criticized. By emphasizing the individual over the broader context, the human interest frame effectively avoids more complex dimensions regarding immigration such as laws, political argument, and laws (Aalberg and Beyer 2015: 859). Drawing upon this notion, it could thus be argued that the human interest frame

perhaps does not provide enough information regarding the whole immigration debate as its focus often lays on solely covering the human aspect of the debate. As this frame is expected to be found in pro-immigration coverage, it is thus expected to be found in the Swedish media sample, which has been accused of romanticizing the issue of immigration before and writing about the ongoing refugee crisis in an overly optimistic tone, effectively leaving out the negative aspects of immigration (see section 3.1).

- c. Morality frame:** In this frame, events and issues, in this case immigration, are presented with religious and/or moral considerations. Due to the aim of remaining objective and professional, journalists often rely on moral frames indirectly by referring to something someone else has said (Neuman et al. 1992). In this research, I will develop this frame further by including humanitarian aspects into it. This frame will be applicable when an article covers immigration by mainly relying on secondary information, especially when referring to thoughts and opinions posed by humanitarian organizations or actors. Discussion involving humanitarian issues and human rights are included in the morality frame.
- d. Economic frame:** This frame considers the costs, benefits, or monetary/financial implications regarding immigration on individual, group, institutional, regional or national level (Semetko et al. 2000: 96; Boydston et al. 2013). This is a frame that is expected to be found in both the Swedish and the UK media, as economic issues are rather prominent throughout Europe today. This frame will be identified in the sample, if the main story of the article in question emphasizes financial matters on any level regarding immigration.
- e. Responsibility frame:** In this frame, an issue or a problem is presented in a way as to attribute responsibility for its cause or solution to either a government, an individual or a group (Semetko et al. 2000: 96). The media have a critical role in shaping public opinion about who is responsible for causing or solving key social problems (Iyengar & Kinder 1987). Iyengar (1987) argues that by covering an issue or a problem in terms of an event or an individual (i.e. episodically) rather than in terms of the larger social context (i.e. thematically), the media encourages people to offer individual-level explanations for larger social problems; the

individual, for example a person living in poverty, will in this view thus be blamed for their situation instead of the government or the system overall (96). This frame can be identified by assessing whether the article acknowledges specific individuals or groups responsible for problems within immigration for example, and could provide this research with insight into how the media may potentially influence public thinking of immigration?

In this cross-cultural study, we will not only measure the media framing within two different countries, but also within news providers from different parts of the political spectrum. A Pew Research Survey has revealed that the depth of right-left political divisions in Europe over attitudes to Muslims and immigrants has sharpened in recent years, with supporters of right-wing parties strikingly more concerned of immigration and its connection to terrorism than voters on the left (Wike et al. 2016). In the analysis, we thus expect to find the more right leaning news providers (The Telegraph and The Daily Mail) to provide more negative views on immigration, and use the threat frame to a greater extent than that of more liberal, left leaning providers. Those papers with a more anti-immigration stance are furthermore expected to cover more stories of immigration after the terrorist attack, as the attack arguably justifies the use of threat frames of immigration by connecting immigration to terrorism; the more pro-immigration papers are expected to have less articles to analyze, as they are not expected to connect immigration to terrorism in the same way.

4 Methodology

In this chapter, the methodology used in the research will be presented. For this research, as the aim is to analyze the framing of news coverage, a qualitative *content analysis* was deemed the most appropriate method for conducting the study. Content analysis is one of the major methods in media research; as the name suggests, it involves analyzing the content of media, in an attempt to understand both the people who created the content as well as the people who consume it (Lule 2012). An interpretivist approach to analyzing and understanding social phenomena is thus assumed; however, while in this research it is understood that reality is socially constructed and dynamic, the research structure is not completely flexible. As will be explained in this chapter, a rather clear deductive structure of analysis with pre-defined frames has been developed. This controlled system of analysis was deemed important for the reliability and replicability of this research, and will be elaborated on further in this chapter.

This chapter will begin with a presentation of the countries being compared and the time period being analyzed, to then go on demonstrating the data collection process of newspapers and articles, and finally finish with a presentation of the “list of frames” –approach, the main method of analysis in this research.

4.1 Country selection

Being the salient issue that it is, the media framing of immigration will be investigated in two different political environments; Sweden and the United Kingdom. The interest in studying the framing in these two countries comes from the traditional differences in public opinion towards immigration; Sweden has generally been in favor of immigration, and has at times been accused of romanticizing the issue of immigration and writing about the ongoing refugee crisis in an overly optimistic tone, while the media in the UK has largely been

seen as scandalizing the image of immigration in a more anti-immigration fashion. Furthermore, both of the countries have played a significant role in the current migration crisis affecting Europe; Sweden has agreed to accept among the largest number of refugees, whilst Britain has been the most high profile advocate for changing EU rules on immigration and asylum.

In this research, the aim is thus to investigate and compare the news media framing of immigration in two different political contexts, comparing the coverage in a more left leaning, generally pro-immigration nation, Sweden, and a more conservative nation with a largely anti-immigration stance, the UK. While the journalists behind the coverage plays a certain role in the framing process, it also is the result of various other factors such as commercial imperatives, the political system and its configuration, political-cultural ideals and values, and frames presented by powerful elites (Strömbäck & Dimitrova 2006: 135). Many of these factors are culture- and nation-specific, so the use of different frames is expected to vary between different countries.

Sweden and the UK are comparable in that they are both western EU member states and possess similar values and rules regarding media operations. Furthermore, both countries enjoy a high level of press freedom, and make newspaper sources easily accessible to the public. Both countries have a strong newspaper market with high readership, which was essential for the choice of countries as this research argues that the media plays a part in forming public opinion. Finally, the linguistic capabilities of the researcher within the scope of this study had to be accounted for.

In their study investigating media systems and politics in different settings, Hallin and Mancini (2004) distinguished three fundamental models (5). Sweden was seen as belonging to the *Northern European/Democratic Corporatist Media Model*, which is characterized in countries with a long democratic tradition. The political environment is characterized by consensus and by a strong state with a developed legal system. The publishing sector is considered as an important part in the Democratic Corporatist Model. There is some competition in the market for print media, but despite this the market is regulated through various political and

cultural activities such as press subsidies. Other features in this model are non-commercial public service and a high degree of autonomy for the broadcasters. The journalism is generally considered professional and self-regulating with common ethical standards for radio, television and newspapers. The media culture in Sweden is more subtle than in many other countries; while news providers often state some sort of a political standpoint, most often they tone it down so as to remain objective to the public eye. Most news providers are considered reliable in Sweden; while some variation in political standings exist, these views are not often reflected in coverage.

In terms of Hallin and Mancini's media models (2004), the United Kingdom is considered as a part of *The North Atlantic/Liberal Media Model* (5). Long democratic tradition of democracy is also characteristic in this model, along with strong and widespread press freedom and strong individualism. Politically, most of the countries within this model have a majority system. Generally, unlike in the Democratic Corporatist Model, the media is not strongly linked to the government and political parties, but are instead governed more by commercial interests. The UK media market is massive, with newspapers ranging on the whole left-right political spectrum, and it's divided into three distinct markets in the daily and Sunday national press: quality (the Guardian, the Daily Telegraph), middle market (the Daily Mail), and mass market (The Mirror, the Sun). Tabloids are highly popular in the UK: A major criticism the UK media has received in recent years has been regarding the tabloids, which are condemned for heavy political bias of refugees and immigrants. Tabloids do however represent the most read news sources in the UK, which is why they are included in the analysis.

4.2 Case study

This research aims to investigate how terrorism affects the portrayal of immigration in the news media. The act of terror chosen for this case study is the Brussels terrorist attack which occurred 22 March 2016. The Brussels terrorist attack was chosen due to its relevance in being a rather recent and unexplored event regarding media framing research. Researchers have noted that the way

media react to and cover terrorist attacks is crucial for the definition and future treatment of those social groups that are considered to be responsible for the events (Hussain and Bagguley: 2012). With the increased negative feeling towards immigration in Europe today, looking into how the media in different contexts portrayed immigrants in the wake of the rather recent Brussels terrorist attack may indicate how the media has contributed to this development, as it arguably plays a part in forming public attitudes towards immigration.

The time period from which articles were retrieved and analyzed is 19 March 2016 to 25 March 2016. This time frame represents the week surrounding the terrorist attack in Brussels on 22 March 2016; articles were thus retrieved from three days before and three day after the attack. While the interest of this research is to primarily investigate how the media framed immigration during the attack, how the terrorist attack influenced news coverage of immigration was also considered important; thus, it was deemed valuable to compare and contrast framing from both before and after the attack. A weeks' worth of coverage was considered sufficient for the scope of this study, as it provided this research with a feasible sample considering the time restrictions of this project.

Due to the apparent connection between terrorism and immigration, the amount of articles covering immigration is expected to increase after an event such as a terrorist attack. Furthermore, the amount of articles covering immigration is expected to be rather high following the terrorist attack, as the time period is at a time of vigorous public debate on the issue of immigration; following a massive influx of refugees during the end of 2015, as well as a rise in acts of terror on the continent, the topic of immigration both within those advocating immigration and opposing it is a widely discussed topic in public debate. Thus, those advocating immigration are likely to want to differentiate it from terrorism, and are expected to use morality/human impact frames to a larger extent than those opposing it, who instead are likely to rely on frames emphasizing the threat of immigration.

It is worth noting here that we acknowledge that other factors a part from the attack itself plays a part in media portrayal of immigration; the national political environment, other acts of terror such as the Paris attack earlier in 2015, as well as

experiences of immigration in the country overall play a part in the formation of public opinion. This study focuses on a single case study, but recognizes how a comparison of different events from different time periods and contexts may have provided a more comprehensive answer to how the media frames immigration during an act of terror.

4.3 Data collection & analysis

In order to conduct the research, a sample of news coverage regarding immigration needed to be collected for analysis. For this research, the news coverage of immigration was collected from major newspapers in Sweden and the UK. The selected newspapers combined both high readership, as well as a range of political views, which was essential in order to get the best overview possible of the mainstream coverage and framing in each country. Furthermore, a major criteria for a newspaper to be chosen for analysis was accessibility; only newspapers which archives could be retrieved from the Lund University media archive were chosen due to economic restrictions.

In order to make the rules for identifying frames in a content analysis explicit and as objective as possible, the following steps were taken in constructing the analysis:

1. Make the range of possible frames explicit (see theoretical framework, chapter 3)
2. Develop a list of questions to help identify each frame (see Appendix A: “coding scheme”)
3. Collect material to be analyzed from the selected news sources (see 4.3.1: “The Newspapers” and 4.3.2: “Retrieving articles”)
4. Use the frames listed as categories in the content analysis of collected material, and code articles into these categories with the help of the pre-constructed coding scheme.

By following these clear steps of analysis, this research has a clear structure which ensures reliability and replicability. Therefore, while this research is focused on a specific case study, the clearly defined structure and pre-defined frames allows for some generalizability to other framing research in the field.

4.3.1 The Newspapers

In analyzing the news coverage in Sweden and the UK, both tabloids and broadsheets were chosen due to their prominence and high readership in both of the countries. Broadsheet newspapers are commonly known to be more objective, “quality” newspapers with higher standards regarding coverage than tabloids, focusing on facts rather than attracting readers. Put simply, tabloids are considered and referred to as “popular press” while broadsheets are regarded as “serious” or “quality” press. There are however differences in tabloids; in the UK, tabloids such as the Sun represent more “extreme” tabloids with extreme populist rhetoric and heavy entertainment focus, while in Sweden tabloids such as *Aftonbladet* are more toned down and news oriented (Örnebring 2008: 3). This has to do with a country's cultural values and media environment. Tabloids, while considered being of lower quality, has however become very popular in recent years, especially in the UK where the most read daily newspapers are in fact tabloids. Due to this high popularity of tabloids, I have chosen to include them in the content analysis of this research.

For Sweden, the following newspapers were chosen: *Dagens Nyheter* (broadsheet, independently liberal) and *Aftonbladet* (tabloid, left orientation according to UNHCR). *Dagens Nyheter* (from here on DN) is among the largest nationwide morning broadsheet paper in Sweden, which is said to be independently liberal much like most other major newspapers in Sweden (Nationalencyklopedin, *Dagens Nyheter* 2017). DN is considered to have high standards and quality in reporting, and is often referred to by other newspapers in the country. It is widely considered as a reliable source of information with unbiased reporting. *Aftonbladet* is the oldest and among the most read tabloids in Sweden, both print and online, and is said to have an independently social democratic political stance (Nationalencyklopedin, *Aftonbladet* 2017).

In analyzing the coverage in the UK, the following newspapers were chosen: *The Guardian* (broadsheet, center-left), *The Daily Telegraph* (broadsheet, center-right), *The Daily Mail* (tabloid, center-right) and finally the *Daily Mirror* (tabloid, center-left). For the UK, it was deemed necessary to select four news sources as opposed to Sweden's two, due to the large quantity of both news providers and political views of those news providers. Both the Daily Telegraph and The Guardian represent large quality newspapers in the UK, and represent different spectrums of political views in the country which is why they were deemed appropriate to compare in this study. The Guardian is Britain's leading center-left quality newspaper, with a strong online presence. The Telegraph is Britain's bestselling right-wing quality broadsheet, also with high online audience. The Daily Mail is Britain's second highest circulation daily tabloid with high online prominence. The Sun has the highest circulation and readership in the UK, but was not chosen for this research due to the fact that it in recent years has reduced the scope of hard news and political coverage to focus more strongly on sensationalist stories such as celebrities, scandals and crime. Furthermore, most likely due to this shift from serious news coverage, the Sun is not accessible through the Lund university media archive which was a prerequisite to be selected for analysis. Finally the Daily Mirror represents the center-left oriented tabloid in our collected sample, and was selected to provide balance in political views in the collected sample.

4.3.2 Retrieving articles

Having selected the newspapers to retrieve data from, the next step is to collect a sample of articles to investigate in a content analysis. Through the Lund University media archive, access to the archives of the above mentioned news sources was possible. Access to the Swedish archives of Aftonbladet and Dagens Nyheter was found through *Retriever Research* and the UK resources were accessed through *Thomson Reuters Westlaw*.

By firstly choosing the newspaper from which articles are to be found, and then applying search words into the search engine of the archives, a sample of relevant

articles regarding immigration could be collected. The search words used for each newspaper was roughly the same so as to not interfere with the results. To collect relevant articles, the following “search strings” were used:

United Kingdom:

Any of these terms: migra! OR asylum! OR emigra! OR immigra! OR refugee!

Date range: 19 March 2016 – 25 March 2016

Exclude these documents: Obituaries, personal announcements, sports

Sweden:

Any of these terms: Migranter OR Migration OR Invandrare OR Invandring OR Asylsökande OR Asyl OR Flykting OR Flyktingar

Date range: 19 March 2016 – 25 March 2016

When collecting articles from the chosen newspapers with the broad search strings presented above, and adding the date range 19/03/2016-25/03/2016 in the search, it led us to a rather broad sample of articles. To create a feasible sample for both countries, having retrieved a large number of stories using the broad search strings presented above to capture all possible news stories, a manual filtering of the retrieved sample was then conducted to eliminate false positives; as the sample gained using the above search provided a rather wide range of results, irrelevant articles as well as duplications had to be excluded manually. The criteria for an article to be used in this research was for the article to be primarily about refugees/immigrants, and to be specifically about immigrants in Europe or the EU (i.e. no stories about for example the immigration situation in Australia or the United States). The collected sample contains news stories, editorials, opinions, and letters. The final sample of articles left to be analyzed after a manual filtering are presented in table 1 below.

Table 1: *Final sample of articles retrieved for analysis*

Country	Newspaper	Style and orientation	Article
Sweden	Dagens Nyheter	Broadsheet, liberal	24
Sweden	Aftonbladet	Tabloid social democratic	15
United Kingdom	The Guardian	Broadsheet center-left	24
United Kingdom	The Daily Telegraph	Broadsheet center-right	18
United Kingdom	The Daily Mail	Tabloid center-right	26
United Kingdom	The Daily Mirror	Tabloid, center-left	7

4.4 The list of frames approach

There are two possible approaches to content analyzing frames in the news: inductive and deductive. For this research, a deductive approach was chosen; a deductive approach involves predefining certain frames as content analytic variables to verify the extent to which these frames occur in the news (Semetko et al. 2000: 94-95). These predefined frames are all presented in chapter 3. This approach makes it necessary to have a clear idea of the kinds of frames likely to occur in the news, because the frames that are not defined in advance may be overlooked. The strength of this approach includes replicability, ability to cope with larger samples, and easily detectable differences in framing within media, in this case between quality newspapers vs. tabloid-style media (Semetko et al. 2000: 94-95). A clear systematic approach to finding frames need to be adapted, in order to be as objective as possible; an unsystematic approach could lead to subjectivity and some frames may be lost in the process (Reese et al. 2001: 98).

Reese et al. (2001) present various approaches to studying news media frames; for this research in question, the *list of frames* approach was chosen for the analysis of media frames in Sweden and the UK. In this approach, a vital first step of analysis is to identify a list of frames for a particular area to be assessed, in this case immigration (100). This step was done in the theoretical framework in chapter 3. To assist the coding process in the content analysis, each of these

frames then needed to be defined in terms of specific keywords, themes, phrases etc. In this approach, the inclusion and exclusion of certain key terms and themes is of interest; this is done through a content analysis of media news. The key to this approach is to be precise about the definition of frames, and systematic about the procedure to be followed in identifying them (Reese et al. 2001: 101). A challenge here is to identify the appropriate quantity of frames; while limiting the amount of frames may lead to the loss of some of the complexity and diversity of frames, it has been suggested by researchers in the field that a smaller amount of frames improves the reliability of coding (Reese et al. 2001: 104).

The pre-defined frames, as presented in the theoretical framework (see chapter 3), represent the most regarded frames in framing literature today. Having defined the frames and retrieved the articles that were to be assessed, a content analysis was conducted. The articles were thus thoroughly read and analyzed, in order to find indications of which frame that article fits into. In order to identify the frames when analyzing the news articles, a coding scheme with 18 questions was constructed with the aim of identifying each frame (see Appendix A). While reading each article, the list of questions presented in the coding scheme were to be answered; by answering these questions, a frame could be identified. The fact that several frames are likely to be apparent in an article is acknowledged; however, in this research only the frame deemed primary was coded.

5 Results

In this chapter, the results from the content analysis will be presented in detail. First, results from the Swedish newspapers Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet will be presented, to then go on presenting the findings from the four UK newspapers: The Guardian, The Daily Telegraph, The Daily Mail, and The Mirror. Throughout the content analysis, the aim was to search for indicators allowing us to identify a primary frame used in the coverage of immigration with the help of the pre-constructed coding scheme (See Appendix A). The aim was further to compare coverage from before the terrorist attack in Brussels on 22 March 2016 and after, with the purpose of investigating whether and how framing of immigration changed due to the attack.

All of the articles analyzed can be found listed in Appendix B. Due to the lengthy titles of the articles, they will be referred to in this chapter by their given code, which are all listed in the appendix. For example, the articles in Dagens Nyheter will be coded DN1, DN2, DN3 etc.

5.1 Sweden

As previously explained, Sweden has traditionally been considered a rather pro-immigration country, and media coverage of immigration was thus expected to be rather favorable towards immigration. The framing of immigration was thus not expected to majorly vary before and after the terrorist attack. Furthermore, as explained in section 4.1, the Swedish media tends to remain rather objective in their news coverage, and do generally not portray a strong political bias in coverage. Below the findings of Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet will be presented and evaluated.

5.1.1 Dagens Nyheter

Out of 24 articles retrieved from *Dagens Nyheter*, 14 were from before the attack and 10 from after. The number of articles covering immigration thus decreased following the attack. In the coverage, the frames used were diverse and no major difference could be seen in frames used before and after the terrorist attack.

The *conflict frame* was together with the responsibility frame the two most used frames in the whole sample. The conflict frame was used in 7 articles, in 5 from before the attack, and 3 from after. After the attack, the conflict frame was used in highlighting the differences of opinion when it comes to connecting terrorism to immigration. In an article from 25 March 2016 (see appendix B: DN1) the conflict frame is apparent through the focus on bringing up actors with different views in coverage; here the negative views of immigration following the terror attack by the Polish and French prime ministers Beata Szydlo and Manuel Valls were contrasted with the views of Sweden's Minister of the Interior Anders Ygeman, who sees no connection between asylum policy and terrorism. In this way, the conflict frame is apparent. The conflict frame was further prominent in a similar article covering different opinions on how to handle immigration after the attack, focusing on European solidarity as the headline of the article, "The whole Europe will be affected – whether we want it or not [translated from Swedish]" (see appendix B: DN5). In an article by Clara Sandelind, a political scientist, two opposing views regarding immigration and the welfare state are presented, allowing us to identify the conflict frame (see appendix B: DN10). Here she presents views on how immigration is seen as a threat towards the welfare state, whilst arguing for the possibility of having a generous immigration policy and simultaneously maintaining a working welfare state.

Before the attack, two articles used the conflict frame in covering immigration and the EU-Turkey deal², highlighting differing opinions regarding the deal (see

² The EU-Turkey deal refers to a "one in, one out" deal between the EU and Turkey implemented 20 March 2016, where for every Syrian refugee returned to Turkey from the Greek Islands, a Syrian asylum seeker in Turkey will be resettled in Europe. The aim of the deal was to tackle the ongoing migrant crisis.

appendix B: DN14, DN23). The other 2 articles using the conflict frame before the attack covered the controversies of anti-immigration Danish Minister for Immigration, Integration and Housing Inger Støjberg, highlighting how here controversial immigration policies have divided the nation (see appendix B: DN18, DN19).

The *responsibility frame* was identified in 8 articles: 4 times before and 4 times after the attack. As explained in the theory section of this paper (see chapter 3), the responsibility frame is identified when the cause of or the solution to an issue is attributed to a government, a group, or an individual. Much of the articles using the responsibility frame had to do with the EU-Turkey deal both before and after the attack (see appendix B: DN3, DN6, DN8, DN20, DN22), criticizing the way the EU has handled the situation and calling upon it to set up proper resources to cope with the receiving and processing of asylum seekers. A part from the EU-Turkey deal, the responsibility frame was used in coverage on how the Swedish Migration board (migrationsverket) needs to take responsibility of age determination of refugee children coming into the country more efficiently (see appendix B: DN11).

As expected, the *human impact frame*, used in 3 articles and the *morality frame*, used in 4, were also popular in the coverage of immigration. In an article from 25 March 2016, religion was used in the morality frame covering the pope visiting a refugee camp (see appendix B: DN2). In this article, the issue of immigration was framed by emphasizing the “equal value of all in the eyes of god” during the ongoing refugee crisis, thus clearly framed as an issue of morale. Another article in the sample used a morality frame in covering a news story on how an asylum seeker in Germany saved a German right wing radical anti-immigration NPD member from a car wreckage (see appendix B: DN9). It is worth noting here that the aforementioned article occurred after the terrorist attack, seemingly attempting to humanize refugees/immigrants after receiving much critique by others following the Brussels incident.

The human impact frame was also prominent before the attack, with much of the coverage focusing on the EU-Turkey deal. While many have focused on

criticizing the issues with the deal itself and emphasizing the role of the decision makers, an article from 21 March 2016 used the human impact frame by focusing on those affected by the deal by referring to children losing their lives due to the deal and quoting an asylum seeker reflecting upon the situation (see appendix B: DN11). In a similar vein, another article focusing on the EU-Turkey deal emphasized the people suffering over the deal, by highlighting the problems with the deal for those already stranded in Greece (see appendix B: DN16); here the vital help of volunteers was acknowledged in assisting those suffering from the deal, stressing the lack of such action from policy makers. This article thus had hints of both the human impact frame as well as the responsibility frame, but as mentioned this research will only code the primary frame used in coverage to make the sample more assessable, which in this case was deemed to be the human impact frame due to the prominent focus on human suffrage.

The morality frame was also prominent in coverage of the EU-Turkey deal, most notably before the terrorist attack in Brussels, by focusing on the importance of Swedish involvement in handling the crisis (see appendix B: DN15). The Swedish involvement was also emphasized by using Christianity as a reasoning for showing empathy and aiding those in need (see appendix B: DN17) which clearly reflects a morality frame, as explained in chapter 3. The morale in helping refugees was also presented by comparing the issue to the case of Finnish immigrants coming into the country during the Second World War (see appendix B: DN13).

Finally, the economic frame was only used once in the sample collected, highlighting the positive aspects of immigration to the Swedish economy. The threat frame was not used anywhere in the sample of Dagens Nyheter, suggesting not only a pro-immigration stance in coverage but also that Dagens Nyheter seem to avoid connecting the threat of terrorism to issues of immigration. Furthermore, the effect of terrorism to coverage of immigration was deemed minimal, as no major differences could be found in frames used before and after the terrorist attack.

5.1.2 Aftonbladet

15 articles were retrieved from *Aftonbladet*, the Swedish tabloid newspaper, 7 of which were from before the terrorist attack in Brussels and 8 from after. In the coverage, all of the pre-defined frames (as presented in chapter 3) were represented; 5 of the frames identified were conflict frames, 3 responsibility frames, 2 human impact frames, 2 morality frames, 1 economic frame, and finally 2 threat frames. As with the coverage in *Dagens Nyheter*, much of the focus in *Aftonbladet* focused on the EU-Turkey deal.

From the articles before the attack, 5 out of 7 focused on the EU-turkey deal; however, differing frames used to describe the issue could be identified. The responsibility frame was used in 2 of the articles, emphasizing the faulty and un-humanitarian system of exchanging refugees with Turkey as well as the role of Sweden in the deal (see appendix B: A11, A14). In the coverage, the deal was referred to as “building an iron curtain”, further suggesting a negative stance on the deal. Regarding the deal, the morality frame was identified in an article 19 March 2016 (see appendix B: A12) as it was emphasizing the lack of focus on humanitarian aspects and the refugees in the deal, and solely focusing on the interests of the EU. The debate here went as far as to suggest the smugglers being more humanitarian and respectful of the migrants’ rights than the EU. Finally in one on the articles from the sample before the attack, a conflict frame was identified as conflicting views of the deal was emphasized (see appendix B: A15). The conflict frame was furthermore evident in an article covering the difficulty for journalists to cover the issue of refugees, as in many places they are prevented from entering asylum centers (see appendix B: A10).

The threat frame was used in one article in the sample from before the attack, covering the story of Mohamed Belkaid, the Paris bomber, and of the time he spent in Sweden prior to the attack. The threat frame was identified through the use of the pre-constructed coding sheet (see appendix A), as it was clearly connecting immigration to terrorism through telling the story of an “ordinary” immigrant turning into a terrorist.

The use of frames was also rather varied and even in the sample collected from after the Brussels terrorist attack; this finding indicates that the attack did not have a significant impact on the coverage of immigration in Aftonbladet. The conflict frame was identified in 3 articles in this sample, all of which focused on conflict between pro- and anti-immigration advocates, as well as right and left wing parties in dealing with immigration (see appendix B: A4, A5, A7).

Most of the articles in the sample did not directly discuss the Brussels attack, except one where the journalist discussed how immigration should not be connected to terrorism. Here too, the morality frame was identified due to the use of religion and Christianity, in explaining how humanity should be focused on in a crisis situation instead of stricter borders (see appendix B: A2).

The EU-Turkey deal was also evident in the coverage after the attack: in the coverage, the human impact frame was identified in that the article focused mostly on the negative impact the deal has had on refugees. Personal stories and quotes from the refugees were included, further demonstrating a human impact frame. In a debate article, the economic frame was identified as the cost of refugees to the public sector was discussed. The threat frame was identified in one of the articles, although it is worth mentioning that this was a difficult task: as the article was about a murder that took place at an asylum center, it was thus coded as an article about crime which thus, according to the developed coding scheme, is identified as a threat frame (see coding scheme appendix A). The threat of immigrants/asylum seekers was however not highlighted.

It can be concluded here that the sample from Aftonbladet did not provide any major variation of frames used before and after the Brussels terrorist attack. All of the possible frames were used in coverage, and no major indicators of either negative or positive stance regarding immigration could be identified. Furthermore, no significant differences could be found between the sample from the Swedish broadsheet and tabloid, highlighting the Swedish media tradition of objective reporting.

5.2 United Kingdom (UK)

The media market in the UK is massive, and consists of a multitude of news providers ranging from left to right on the political spectrum. Newspapers generally have a clearly stated political stance which they often portray in their coverage; pro- and anti-immigration positions are thus expected to be rather visible. The sample collected from the UK is therefore expected to vary in coverage and framing of immigration to a larger extent than that of Sweden. The sample for the United Kingdom was retrieved from 4 newspapers, 2 quality broadsheet newspapers (The Guardian and The Telegraph) and 2 tabloids (The Daily Mail and The Mirror). The results found in analyzing the sample are presented below.

5.2.1 The Guardian

As presented in the methodology section (see 4.3.1: “The Newspapers”), The Guardian is a center-left quality broadsheet newspaper in the UK. It traditionally has a pro-immigration stance, and was from the beginning of this research expected to present immigration in a sympathetic way. Below, all frames used in the sample retrieved from the Guardian are presented and assessed.

The sample from The Guardian consists of 24 articles, 5 from before the Brussels terrorist attack and 19 from after, already indicating the terrorist attack affecting the coverage of immigration. Analyzing the coverage of The Guardian, we found that all of the possible frames were used.

The *conflict frame* was the most widely used frame in coverage after the attack, with 8 articles using the frame out of the 19. The conflict frame was popular in news coverage on the Brussels terrorist attack in presenting differing views on the connection between terrorism and immigration. The coverage largely focused on calling on people not to blame immigrants for the terrorist attack. In an article from 24 March 2016 for example, the conflict frame was evident in coverage of Belgium’s ambassador to Australia rejecting claims that Europe’s security is

weak, where he said that “blaming the Syrian refugee crisis for terrorism in Europe was dangerous” (see appendix B: G5). This further highlights the denial in the article regarding the connection of immigration and terrorism. In another article, Jason Burke writes a piece opposing a notion that the UK would be safer by leaving the EU (reference to Brexit³) as it would secure greater control of immigration (see appendix B: G6). The article opposes the notion of terrorists coming to the UK from within Europe, in reference to the Brussels terrorist attack, suggesting that immigration within the EU should not be regarded as a problem. While claiming immigration within Europe was not a problem to the UK, he did write about immigrants coming from outside the continent being the real threat in a historical sense referring to past attacks in England:

Neither the 7/7 bombers who attacked London in 2005 nor the unsuccessful 21/7 bombers who followed them came from elsewhere in Europe. Only a tiny minority of other attacks over the following half decade or so have any connection to the EU. Some involved migrants, but rarely from Europe (see appendix B: G6)

While the aim of the article seemingly was to emphasize immigration not being an issue regarding terrorism, by focusing on immigration within and outside Europe he did create a sense of threat immigrants from outside Europe pose.

Another use of the conflict frame was found in coverage on the situation in Lesbos, Greece, where Lucas Amin provides the readers with differing opinions of the situation from the locals. In this article, the conflict frame is evident as conflicting local opinions are presented (see appendix B: G9):

There is no damage," she says. "Now the money comes in a different way. The volunteers, NGOs are here. The hotels are full.

³ Brexit is a commonly used term referring to the United Kingdom withdrawal from the European Union. A Brexit referendum was held in the UK on 23 June 2016, which led to a majority voting to leave the European Union.

We are finished," she says. "We are wiped off the map of tourism. We are now the island where the refugees come and drown. When all this is over, and it will be over in two or three years, what are we left with?"

The EU-Turkey deal was present in the coverage of the Guardian, both before and after the attack. Here focus is but on disagreement between the EU and aid agencies regarding the deal, highlighting conflicting opinions on the situation in an article after the attack on 23 March 2016 (see appendix B: G14).

The second most used frame was the *responsibility frame*, which was used 3 times before the attack and 4 after. Before the attack, the frame was used in connection to the EU-Turkey deal, calling upon the EU to figure out how to make the deal work in practice as it was deemed unrealistic. The responsibility frame was evident in the articles claim for the EU and its member states to provide Greece with sufficient staff from across Europe to deal with the refugee crisis (see appendix B: G21). The frame was further apparent in two articles covering the responsibility of the UK to take in more unaccompanied children from the Calais refugee camp in France (see appendix B: G20 & G22). One of the articles covered the reunification of 3 Syrian refugee children arriving to the UK from the Calais refugee camp on France (G22):

Britain has a legal – as well as a moral – obligation to provide safe haven to people fleeing some of the worst humanitarian crises of our time.

The other article (G20) about the Calais camp focused on more structural issues of responsibility sharing:

[...] she felt "embarrassed" that British volunteers were having to pick up responsibility for these children in the absence of effective help from the French and UK governments. She said immigration ministers should travel to Calais to understand the situation that unaccompanied children were living in.

Even in the sample after the attack, the coverage regarding the Calais camp kept the same tone, focusing on the responsibility of the UK to take in more unaccompanied refugee children. Three out of the four articles using the responsibility frame after the terrorist attack was about the Calais refugee camp (see appendix B: G3, G4, G19), again calling upon the UK government to take in more refugee children:

The UK has a proud history of protecting the victims of war. As the UNHCR convenes a high-level meeting calling for world leaders to step up and do more to help Syrian refugees, we urge David Cameron to continue that legacy by urgently doing more to protect these vulnerable refugees. (G3)

(...) the secretary of state must, as soon as possible, make arrangements to relocate 3,000 unaccompanied refugee children who are in European countries to the United Kingdom (G19).

While the responsibility of the UK to take in more refugees even after the attack was most evident, an article regarding the same issue using the *threat frame* was also identified. In an article 2 days following the terrorist attack (24 March 2016), the threat frame was used in coverage of how the Calais camp demolitions are “forcing more refugees to make crossings to UK” (see appendix B: G7). In the article worries about border security was emphasized through a story about asylum seekers crossing illegally into Britain in lorries. The Brussels terrorist attack was also mentioned in the coverage as an example of weak border security. The threat frame was further used in an article focusing on statements about the connection of Muslims and acts of terror, by presenting the views of the 5 then US presidential candidates (Trump, Clinton, Cruz, Kasich and Sanders)

Our European allies are now seeing what comes of a toxic mix of migrants who have been infiltrated by terrorists’ and isolated, radical Muslim neighborhoods.” We need to immediately halt the flow of refugees from countries with a significant al-Qaida or Isis presence (G17).

The *human impact frame* was used once prior to the attack, and twice after. Before the attack, coverage with this frame focused on the EU-Turkey deal, emphasizing the struggling refugees and humanitarian workers due the deal (see appendix B: G23). The two articles using the human impact frame after the Brussels terrorist attack focused on personal stories of asylum seekers; the first one labelled “Raped, pregnant, homeless: the grim reality of life as an asylum seeker”, focusing on the story of Maria, struggling with bureaucratic obstacles asylum seekers face (see appendix B: G11). The second article, published the same day, focused on the struggles of specifically female asylum seekers (see appendix B: G12):

The media say we come to take benefits, but that's not the case, says Mariam. Asylum seekers go through a hard journey. I've been homeless for three years with nobody to help except charities that offer support. Already you're traumatized and broken and destitute, and the media plays a part in tarnishing your name. So the community thinks you're coming here to take their jobs, while you're suffering.

The *morality frame* was used in three articles following the attack, focusing on solidarity after the act of terror (see appendix B: G13), the humanitarian crisis in Athens (see appendix B: G8), and the importance of helping Syrian refugees respectively (see appendix B: G2). The morality frame was identified through the use of phrases encouraging “solidarity”, “compassion”, as well as the focus on moral aspects of immigrant children having to bear the blame for terrorist attacks. Amid the terrorist attack, Bleri Lleshi wrote an article focusing on solidarity, claiming that politicians and the media are focusing on the wrong thing by attacking immigrants for the terrorist attack (see appendix B: G13).

Finally, the economic frame was only identified in one of the 24 articles. It was found in an article from 24 March by Alan Travis (Home affairs editor), who covered a story regarding the NHS (national health services) use of foreign nurses, seemingly to save money and reportedly they are payed less than British born nurses do (see appendix B: G10).

The coverage of the Guardian, as expected, largely covered the issue of immigration in a sympathetic way. The conflict frame was identified the most times in coverage; as mentioned in chapter 3 of this research, the conflict frame is regarded as a popular frame in coverage of political debate, especially in quality broadsheets, and is an important frame in that it aims to cover multiple sides of any given story. The pro-immigration stance became evident in the Guardian's use of the responsibility frame, focusing the need for the EU and the UK to take responsibility regarding the EU-Turkey deal as well as the Calais refugee camp. However, the terrorist attack did according to our collected sample have an impact on coverage of immigration; following the attack, two articles were identified as using the threat frame referring to weak border security and the connection between terrorists and Muslims. Furthermore, the sheer difference in the amount of articles discussing immigration before and after the attack indicates a connection being made between the two.

5.2.2 The Daily Telegraph

In analyzing the Daily Telegraph, a center-right quality broadsheet, 18 articles were retrieved – 6 from before and 12 from after the Brussels attack. Being a right leaning, generally anti-immigration broadsheet, much of the coverage focused on or at least mentioned the UK exit from the EU (from here on: Brexit). While the focus of this research is solely on the framing of immigration, it was deemed necessary to mention this pro-Brexit stance here due to its prominence in coverage. This is further due to the fact that, as we shall see, many of the articles after the Brussels terrorist attack used the deed as propaganda for their pro-Brexit stance. In this section the results of the content analysis of the Daily Telegraph will be presented, by evaluating which frames were used in coverage and how they differed before and after the Brussels terrorist attack.

In the analysis, we found that the most widely used frame was the *threat frame*, which was identified in 1 article before the attack and 5 after. Much of the content of these articles using the threat frame focused on the issue of border security and terrorists posing as immigrants/asylum seekers to reach Europe. After the terrorist

attack in Brussels, this frame was largely used as a way of portraying a similar threat to the UK. Examples of this frame can be found in 4 articles published on the same day, 23 March 2016, i.e. the day following the terrorist attack (see appendix B: T7; T8; T9; T10):

Thanks to open borders within the EU, and a fatally lax approach to vetting refugees, the lives of millions of Europeans have been put at risk. The head of Europol warned recently that there are 5,000 Isis-trained jihadists at large in Europe after returning from Syrian training camps (T8).

In a similar article, the threat frame is evident in that the author writes about how the “terror group behind Brussels bombing has major UK cities in its sight” (T10):

Many have EU passports and, as a result, have been free to move around Europe at will, while others have taken advantage of the refugee crisis to slip in undetected.

All of the articles using the threat frame mentioned the Brussels attack, connecting immigration to terrorism and using the events in Brussels as propaganda for strengthening borders and for leaving the EU. The main theme in coverage here was Europe’s lack of control over the influx of refugees, and that terrorists arrive to the continent with ease by posing as immigrants/asylum seekers.

The conflict frame was used in 4 articles; 1 before and 3 after the attack. In relation to the threat frame discussed above, the conflict frame was used in a similar vein discussing border control; however, here the immigration and border control debate was structured by presenting differing opinions, thus being classified as conflict instead of threat frame. In a “letters to the editor” section from 24 March 2016 labelled “Uncontrolled borders and immigration do increase risks to Britain”, conflict of opinions regarding immigration is evident in the coverage due to its display of different letters sent in by the public (see appendix B : T3):

Letter 1: Uncontrolled immigration in general, and the borderless Schengen area in particular, increase the risks to Britain, as does our seeming inability to reform the Human Rights Act.

Letter 2: I am shocked by the comments by certain members of Ukip regarding the events in Brussels. Surely this is a time for showing solidarity with Belgium, rather than scoring points over immigration and the referendum campaign.

In similar vein, an article from the day before (23 March 2016) focused on differing opinions regarding immigration and border security following the Brussels terrorist attack (see appendix B: T11). The conflict frame was thus evident, as differing opinions were measured against each other.

The conflict frame was also used in one article before the attack. In this case, it was used in connection to the EU-Turkey deal, presenting conflicting views on the deal from representatives of the EU, UK, Amnesty International, and experts in the field (see appendix B: T18). Unrelatedly, the frame was used in an article covering the immigration debate in connection to the British National Health Service (NHS), covering debates on whether or not the NHS should hire as many foreign nurses as they currently are, or whether focus should be put more on “British nurses” (See appendix B: T1).

The nursing debate was also covered in another article; the frame used here was however deemed to be economic (see Appendix B: T2). The economic frame was identified, as in this case focus was put on spending of the NHS on nurses overall as well as in hiring foreign nurses.

The responsibility frame was evident 4 times – in 2 articles before the attack and in 2 after. Before the attack, the frame was used in coverage of the EU-Turkey deal. What distinguishes the responsibility frame used in connection to the EU-Turkey deal in these 2 articles, as opposed to the one mentioned in the previous paragraph in which a conflict frame was identified, was the distinct claim of the EU bearing the responsibility of the situation. The responsibility frame was

identified here due to the clear claims of EU needing to take more responsibility of the situation:

Greek officials admitted that they were not ready to begin processing arrivals, with none of the 2,300-strong taskforce the EU had promised on the island on the new regime's first day of operation (see appendix B: T16).

In the other article covering the EU-Turkey deal, the EU was highly criticized for not only the deal itself but largely for every aspect regarding its handling of immigration on the continent (see appendix B: T17).

Even after the attack, the responsibility frame was evident. The focus was again put on the EU-Turkey deal, and EU's seemingly poor execution of the deal was highlighted once more (See appendix B: T13). The responsibility frame was further identified in an article covering an EU deportation mission of 80 000 Afghan asylum seekers, in return for EU aid to the country (See appendix B: T14). This was mostly an informative article, not taking a stand in any direction, yet the responsibility frame was identified in highlighting the role of the EU in reaching deal such as this one.

The morality frame was used twice in coverage during the two days following the terrorist attack, without mentioning the terrorist attack. The first article was covering the EU-Turkey deal, writing about Greece's lack of capacity to process asylum seekers and about UNHCR withdrawal from anything having to do with the deal (see appendix B: T12). The morality frame was identified firstly in the use of opinion presented by humanitarian organizations such as UNHCR and Medecins Sans Frontieres (doctors without borders), and by arguments claiming "people should not be punished for seeking safety". The other news article using the morality frame had to do with terminology of foreigners coming into the country illegally, encouraging British ministers to refer to them as "irregular migrants" instead of "illegal immigrants" (see appendix A T6). The morale is evident in the sentence: "People are not illegal. Their legal status may be irregular, but that does not render them beyond humanity."

The effect of the terrorist attack on immigration was highly evident in the coverage of the Telegraph; the use of the threat frame in portraying immigrants as a threat being the clearest indication of this. As explained in chapter 3, political conservatism is theorized as being a major factor in the formation of perceived threat, in that its ideals largely deal with managing uncertainty and fear of the unknown (see page 15). Having a right-leaning conservative political stance, the coverage of the Telegraph largely supports this theory. The conflict frame was also apparent in the sample, which was expected from a quality broadsheet newspaper. The responsibility frame was further used in four articles, much like the Guardian highlighting the problems of the EU-Turkey while calling upon the EU to take more responsibility in the matter.

Overall the analysis concludes that in the case of the Telegraph, the threat frame was most widely used in covering immigration in the sample. Furthermore, the terrorist attack influenced the amount of coverage on immigration as well as the frames used in coverage immensely; in the sample prior to the attack, all but one of the articles focused on the EU-Turkey deal, only using the threat frame once and instead focusing on the responsibility of the EU. Following the attack however, the threat frame was widely used in portraying immigrants and weak border security as a threat.

5.2.3 The Daily Mail

The Daily Mail is the second most read right-leaning tabloid newspaper in the UK. The sample of analysis includes 26 articles, 9 from before the attack and 17 from after the attack. The difference in the amount of articles before and after the attack regarding immigrants already indicates an effect of the terrorist attack on coverage of immigration. Considering the frames used, we also found variation in coverage before and after the attack.

The Daily Mail overwhelmingly, but not entirely unexpectedly, used the threat frame in their coverage of immigration after the Brussels terrorist attack; the threat frame was identified in 14 articles out of the sample of 17 after the attack,

and only twice in the sample from before the attack. In relation to the attack in Brussels, the coverage linked it with the poor border controls within the EU and extensively linked terrorists to immigrants. Claims of terrorists posing as immigrants or asylum seekers was prevalent in numerous articles. Most of the articles focused on the poor borders security of the EU and clearly emphasized the need for stronger borders.

Before the attack, the sample of 9 articles contained more variation in frames used than the sample after the attack did: two articles used the threat frame, but others also included the morality frame, the human interest frame, and the economic frame. Coverage from this sample included 4 articles focusing on the EU-Turkey deal; this deal was not seen positively in any of the articles, with one article framing the issue from a human impact perspective emphasizing the effect this deal has on refugees (see appendix B: DM22):

Two men, including a father of four, were trampled to death as passengers stampeded to get off an overcrowded boat landing in Lesbos at dawn.

[...] two girls aged one and two were found drowned off the island of Ro during an attempted crossing to Greece from Turkey.

The morality frame was used in an article covering the vote allowing 3 000 unaccompanied refugee children to enter the country, as “There are said to be 26,000 child refugees in Europe travelling without a parent, relative or guardian and Lord Dubs said the move would protect them from exploitation and abuse” (see Appendix B: DM 21). The moral aspect of helping children fleeing war was emphasized, with no negative image of immigrants visible in the discourse.

The economic frame was used once before the attack, in an article focusing on the burden of immigration to the national healthcare system in Britain. The news article was about how a hospital had spent 181 000 pounds on treating “just one illegal immigrant”, emphasizing the burden put on British taxpayers where “there is no hope of getting it [the money] back” (see appendix B: DM23). The argument

of the article was how treating migrants was “unsustainable” and how the healthcare system could not cope with it. As focus was clearly put on financial matters, the story was deemed to be using the economic frame.

The threat frame used in the two articles before the terrorist attack was used once regarding the EU-Turkey deal (see appendix B: DM 27). Here focus was put on visa free travel for the Turkish in connection to the deal, which the article frames as a threat to UK borders even though the UK is not a part of the Schengen agreement. The threat frame was also highly evident in another article, claiming how mass immigration poses “the graves threat to European stability” and how a war in Europe is not impossible as Southern European nations are “swamped by incomers” (see appendix B: DM26).

Immigration after the terror attack was overwhelmingly framed as a threat/security issue. Clear connections could be seen in coverage between the terrorist attack in Brussels and in framing immigrants as a threat (see appendix B: DM10, DM12, DM14, DM15, DM16). In many cases, the attack was used as a justification for closing the UK borders:

Also, the killers appear to have taken advantage of the lunatic ease with which terrorists can pose as refugees and cross EU borders unchallenged. (see appendix B: DM13)

The Daily Mail further linked terrorism and issues with immigration with Muslims in an article by Yasmin Alibhai-Brown labelled “Why will no one admit the way some western Muslims raise their children is fomenting terror?” (see Appendix B: DM6). In the article, she writes about issues of integration and says it is the Muslim upbringing that is the root of problems with immigration, and even claims that Muslims help in sheltering known terrorists in Europe.

The threat frame was further used in linking immigrants to crime in an article labelled “Germany's prisons 'are full up with migrants’” (see appendix B: DM18). As seen in the coding scheme (see appendix A) articles portraying immigrants as criminals will be coded as threat frames. Furthermore, coverage of immigrants

“sneaking into” the country in lorries was seen in 3 separate articles, in an attempt to further highlight the weak borders of the UK (see appendix B: DM3, DM9, DM7). The same story was covered in another article using the economic frame, highlighting the cost the immigrants in lorries caused (see appendix A, DM4).

The second most popular frame in the Daily Mail coverage of immigration was *the economic frame*. Out of 26 articles, 5 were deemed to be purely economic, although many of the other articles included secondary economic frames. Much of the coverage within the economic frame had to do with either the cost to the healthcare sector in taking in immigrants, or the “issue” of immigrants taking jobs from British people. Regarding the latter, the coverage of the news article has to do with the National Health Service (NHS) hiring more foreign nurses from outside the EU instead of focusing on “home-grown talent” (see Appendix B: DM2). Here they are calling out NHS for undermining Brits for cheap foreign labor. A part from the healthcare sector, public spending is further blamed on the cancellation of deporting immigrants in an article labelled “Criminals we STILL won't kick out” (see Appendix B: DM5) which emphasizes the public costs of cancelling removals of immigrants.

The conflict frame was only identified in one of the articles from the Daily Mail. In an article covering the issue of ministers referring to the incomers as “illegal immigrants” instead of “irregular migrants”, conflicting ideals between human rights advocates/commissioners and some British ministers was emphasized (see Appendix B: DM8). The lacking use of the conflict frame is not entirely surprising in tabloids; as explained in section 4.1, tabloids are generally of lesser quality, focusing more on selling stories than providing objective information. The conflict frame is thus more used in the quality press, where all sides to a given story often are provided.

Finally, the morality frame was identified in one of the letter –articles in the sample from the Daily Mail (see appendix B: DM1). Here, emphasis is put on the UK apparent ability to take in refugees, and how the UK can manage a little extra public cost in order to save the lives of asylum seekers. In it worth noting here,

however, that in the end of the article restricted movement of immigrants was still deemed important.

As we can see, the Daily Mail demonstrated a strong anti-immigration stance in the collected sample. Furthermore, as seen in the use of frames before and after the attack, the terrorist attack in Brussels majorly affected the coverage of immigration; in fact, the attack was largely used as a justification for anti-immigration policies in the sample after the attack.

5.2.4 The Mirror

The Mirror represents the left-leaning UK tabloid chosen for analysis. As we have seen, reporting in this format is less analytical than in broadsheets, and thus articles reviewed were generally much shorter. When retrieving articles with the mentioned search words (see section 4.3.2) during the time period surrounding the Brussels terrorist attack, interestingly no mention of the terrorist attack could be found in the retrieved coverage. This may indicate that during this week, the coverage of The Mirror did in fact not couple the terrorist attack to immigration at all.

All in all, 7 articles covering immigration were retrieved from the Mirror; 3 from before the attack and 4 from after. The frames used in the 3 articles from before the attack were all identified as conflict frames. Firstly, in a feature piece called “the big question”, the Mirror publishes the opinions of its audience on the big talking points in Britain (see appendix B: M6). The conflict frame was identified as the article portrayed differing opinions about whether or not Labour has “shut its ears” to people’s concerns about immigration. The topic was also published as a news article, which was also deemed as a conflict frame due to its presentation of conflict between pro- and –anti immigration campaigners (see appendix B: M7). Finally, much like in the previous analysis of the other UK news providers, the EU-Turkey deal was featured in the Mirror. The conflict frame was used in coverage here as well, due to its portrayal of conflict between those in the EU advocating the deal and human rights activists (see appendix B: M8).

After the attack, the frames featured in the coverage were the conflict frame (1), the human impact frame (2), and the economic frame (1). The economic frame was used in coverage regarding the hiring of foreign workers (see appendix B: M1), and the human impact frames were used in stories regarding worries of human trafficking (see appendix B: M2) and about refugees reaching the UK in lorries respectively (see appendix B: M3). This story has been seen in the sample of news articles using various different frames; however, here it was deemed to be human impact as the dangers of the journey for the refugees was emphasized.

Due to the low amount of articles covering immigration in the Mirror, a proper analysis was difficult to conduct. The articles that were featured were furthermore very short in comparison to those by other news providers analyzed, which made identifying frames difficult. The main finding regarding the Mirror is thus the low quantity of articles – it can be assumed that the Mirror, while stated as being pro-immigration, does not cover the immigration debate to a large extent overall. It can thus also be concluded that the terrorist attack did not affect coverage on immigration. Finally, no articles about the terrorist attack in Brussels could be found in the sample, indicating that words such as “immigrant” or “refugee” etc. were not even mentioned in stories about terrorism during this time period.

6 Discussion and conclusion

In this research, the aim has been to investigate how the issue of immigration was portrayed in Swedish and UK media surrounding the terrorist attack in Brussels on 22 March 2016. With the aim of analyzing and comparing news coverage from before and after the attack to see how immigration was framed and whether any variation could be found, the research question this study set out to answer was thus: *How did the media in the United Kingdom and Sweden frame the public debate on immigration amid the Brussels terror attack 19 March 2016 to 25 March 2016?*

The analysis was done through a content analysis of news articles from the Swedish newspapers Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet, and the UK newspapers The Guardian, The Telegraph, The Daily Mail, and The Mirror. Through the use of framing analysis, six generic frames were classified prior to the content analysis, to then with the help of a coding sheet (see appendix A) identify the frames used in the sample of news articles retrieved from the aforementioned news providers.

In Sweden, the immigration debate was framed with a rather clear pro-immigration stance, with no indication of the terrorist attack affecting the framing of immigration; no significant differences in the framing of immigration could be identified from before and after the attack in either of the chosen newspapers. In both Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet, the frames were used rather evenly, with the conflict and responsibility frames being the most prominent ones. As mentioned in the theoretical framework (see chapter 3) the conflict frame is popular especially in quality broadsheets, as it highlights all sides and arguments to a story. Both Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet used the conflict frame in their coverage of immigration the most times, indicating multiplicity of different opinions presented in the Swedish media coverage of immigration, which is

regarded as an important factor in keeping the public properly informed about political debate.

As seen in the theoretical framework (see chapter 3), we expected the more pro-immigration news providers to portray immigration by using the human impact and morality frames. However, as seen in the results, those two frames were not the most used frames in Swedish coverage. In fact, in *Aftonbladet* both the human impact frame and the morality frame could only be identified in two articles each. As previously discussed, Sweden has previously been accused of romanticizing the issue of immigration, and not discussing the possible negative impact immigration may have enough (Thorbjørnsrud 2015: 776). Considering these claims, this research actually indicates the opposite; by portraying immigration using primarily a conflict frame, different opinions on the matter are presented even when the author may present arguments in favor of immigration.

Regardless of whether they were pro- or anti-immigration, we can see a much higher impact on coverage of immigration in the UK media than in Swedish media following the terrorist attack in Brussels. In the *Guardian*, the *Telegraph*, and the *Daily Mail*, the quantity of articles covering immigration at least doubled in all 3 cases following the terrorist attack, while in Sweden the amount of articles from before and after the attack did not differ significantly. This indicates the terrorist attack affecting coverage of immigration more in the UK than in Sweden.

As discussed in the theoretical framework (see chapter 3), we expected the more conservative newspapers to frame immigration as a threat after the terrorist attack. Following the terrorist attack, the threat frame could be identified in the *Telegraph* in 5 articles following the attack. Here the frame was used to pose immigration to Europe as a threat, claiming this increases a risk of terrorists arriving to the continent posing as refugees. While being considered a quality broadsheet, the coverage from the *Telegraph* displayed heavy bias towards anti-immigration policies and had a clear propaganda for Brexit, as the act of terror in Brussels was in many cases used to justify the support for Brexit. The conflict frame was the second most used frame together with the responsibility frame. The articles using the conflict frame did follow in the same lines as the coverage using the threat

frame; however, here opposing views were also presented, providing the story with a more balanced debate.

The conflict frame was common in both of the UK broadsheets, as well as in the two Swedish newspapers. This supports the notion where it is assumed that the conflict frame is generally regarded more often in quality newspapers than in sensationalist news (see chapter 3, section 3.3). However, as the frame was evident in *Aftonbladet*, which is classified as a tabloid, we may conclude that not all tabloids are necessary of lower quality regarding the information they provide. As explained by Örnebring (2008) in section 4.3.1, some tabloids are more toned down in their coverage and more focused on news than others, which often has to do with nations cultural and media values. On the other hand, looking at the sample from the *Daily Mail* (tabloid), the conflict frame was only identified in 1 out of 26 articles. Seeing that the conflict frame is an important frame for the public to understand political issues such as immigration, as it covers different sides to a story, the presence or absence of the frame can indicate how well the public understands the immigration debate.

The results from the *Daily Mail* showed a strong anti-immigration bias, with 14 out of 17 articles after the terrorist attack portraying immigrants and immigration as a threat to Europe and the UK. Here, the threat frame was used frequently to emphasize the need for stricter borders, and to stop the immigration flow. Immigration was strongly connected to terrorism after the attack; in an opinion piece following the attack, this went as far as claiming it is the Muslim immigrants' inability to integrate that leads to terrorism. The impact of the terrorist attack on coverage of immigration can be clearly seen when contrasted with articles from before the attack; while the threat frame was identified in two articles in this sample, the human impact frame and the morality frame were also used. Here focus was put on the need to help refugee children, and on the human impact of the EU-Turkey deal. Out of all the news providers analyzed in this study, the *Daily Mail* used the economic frame the most times; here the negative impact of immigration to the healthcare sector and immigrants "stealing" the jobs of British people was highlighted.

The other UK tabloid analyzed in this research, The Mirror, proved difficult to evaluate regarding its framing of immigration. This was due to the fact that when applying the search words “migra! OR asylum! OR emigra! OR immigra! OR refugee!” (see section 4.3.2 in the methodology chapter), only 7 articles came up in the search engine. This result could indicate that The Mirror, while having stated a pro-immigration stance, does in fact not extensively cover the immigration debate, which would in fact not be unusual for a tabloid. Furthermore, no articles in this sample covered the Brussels terrorist attack; considering the search words used, we can conclude that if they did cover the attack, then they did not do so by also referring to immigration in any way in the same article.

To answer the stated research question, we conclude that Sweden framed the public debate on immigration largely as a conflict of differing opinions, which is evident as the conflict frame was the most popular frame in both Dagens Nyheter and Aftonbladet. Furthermore, the coverage was largely positive towards immigration, humanizing immigrants and refugees and highlighting humanitarian aspects through the use of the human impact and morality frames. The UK sample provided a more fragmented result, with The Guardian portraying a clear pro-immigration stance in framing the debate; the conflict and responsibility frame were evident in this sample. The Telegraph on the Daily Mail on the other hand both used the threat frame extensively, demonstrating a clear bias towards anti-immigration policies by framing immigration as a threat. Here the terrorist attack in Brussels was largely used to justify stricter immigration policies.

The way in which the media portrays immigration is assumed to have an impact on how the public views the issue; accordingly, looking at the results from our sample, we can further conclude that the immigration debate was more unified in the Swedish media than in the UK. The results largely reflect the national attitude in the two countries; as previously mentioned (see chapter 3, section 3.3) the political elite in Sweden has traditionally been regarded as being more unified in their approach towards immigration in comparison to the UK. However, it is worth noting here that the differences in the amount of news providers selected for analysis from the two countries has an impact on this conclusion.

This study is a humble contribution to the field of media framing research. In this study, we have demonstrated differences in two different political contexts when it comes to reporting about immigration, as well as how a terrorist attack affects coverage. For further research on the topic, we suggest a larger scale investigation of how the media in different contexts frame immigration. Research on how other countries frame immigration during acts of terror would be valuable, as this would contribute to the field of research in how cultural/political factors influence coverage. Furthermore, we believe it would be beneficial to compare the findings here to other cases from the past or in the future, in order to get deeper insight into how context matters in the framing of immigration.

7 References

- Aalberg, T. and Beyer, A. 2015. "Human Interest Framing of Irregular Immigration: An Empirical Study of Public Preferences for Personalized News Stories in the United States, France, and Norway". *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 59 (7) 858–875.
- An, S-K., Gower, K.K. 2009. "How do the news media frame crises? A content analysis of crisis news coverage". *Public Relations Review* 35, 107–112.
- Bennett, W., Paletz, D.L. 1994. *Taken by Storm. The Media, Public Opinion and US Foreign Policy in the Gulf War*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Ed.
- Berry, M., Garcia-Blanco, I., Moore, K. 2015. "Press Coverage of the Refugee and Migrant Crisis in the EU: A Content Analysis of Five European Countries." UNHCR commissioned report by the Cardiff School of Journalism.
- Branton, R., & Jones, B. S. 2005. "Reexamining racial attitudes: The conditional relationship between diversity and socioeconomic environment". *American Journal of Political Science* 48(2), 359–372.
- Bogdan, R., and Biklen, S. K. 1992. *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theories and Methods*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon. 5th ed.
- Bolin, N., Hinnfors, J., Strömbäck, J. 2016. "Invandring på ledarsidorna i svensk nationell dagspress 2010-2015".
- Boydston, A.E., Glazier, R.A. 2013. "A Two-Tiered Method for Identifying Trends in Media Framing of Policy Issues: The Case of the War on Terror". *The Policy Studies Journal*, Vol. 41, No. 4.
- Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. 1997. *Spiral of cynicism. The press and the public good*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chong, D. 2006. "Free Speech and Multiculturalism in and out of the Academy." *Political Psychology* 27 (1): 29–54.
- Chong, D., Druckman, J.N. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103–26.
- De Vreese, C.H. 2005. "News framing: Theory and typology". *Information Design Journal + Document Design*. 13 (1), 51-62.
- De Vreese, C. H., Jochen P., and Semetko H.A. 2001. "Framing Politics at the Launch of the Euro: A Cross-National Comparative Study of Frames in the News." *Political Communication* 18 (2): 107–22.
- De Vreese, C.H., Lecheler, S. 2012. *News framing research. An overview and new developments*. London: Sage publications.
- De Vreese, C.H., Semetko, H.A. 2004. *Political Campaigning in Referendums: Framing the Referendum Issue*, London: Routledge.
- Entman, R.M. 1993. "Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm". *Journal of Communication* 43 (4).

- Floss, D. and Marcinkowski, F. 2008. "Do Media News Frames Reflect a Nation's Political Culture?" National Centre of Competence in Research (NCCR) Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century 25, University of Zurich.
- Frederking, L.C. 2012. "A comparative study of framing immigration policy after 11 September 2001". *Policy Studies* Vol. 33, No. 4, p. 283-296.
- Fryberg, S.A., Stephens, N.M., Covarrubias, R., Markus, H.R., Carter, E.D., Laiduc G.A., and Salido A.J. 2011. "How the Media Frames the Immigration Debate: The Critical Role of Location and Politics". *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, Vol. 00, No. 0, 2011, pp. 1-17.
- Gabrielatos, C., and Baker, P. 2008. "Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: a corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press 1996-2005". *Journal of English Linguistics*, 36(1), 5-38.
- Hayes, D. 2008. "Media Frames and the Immigration Debate". Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, Department of Political Science.
- Hallin, D.C. *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hallin, D.C. 1986. *The 'Uncensored War' – The Media and Vietnam*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Heider, F. 1958. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: Wiley.
- Helbling, M. 2014. "Framing Immigration in Western Europe". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 40, No. 1, 21–41.
- Hendrickson, L.J. 1994. "Media framing of child maltreatment: Conceptualising framing as a continuous variable". Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Texas, Austin, TX.
- Hilgartner, S., Bosk, C.L. 1988. "The rise and fall of social problems: a Public Arenas Model". *American Journal of Sociology* 94, 53–78.
- Horsti, K. 2007. "Asylum seekers in the news: Frames of illegality and control". *Observatorio*, 1, 145-161.
- Hussain, Y. and Bagguley, P. 2012. "Securitized citizens: Islamophobia, racism and the 7/7 London bombings". *The Sociological Review*, 60, 715-734.
- Huysmans, J., Buonfino, A. 2008. "Politics of Exception and Unease: Immigration, Asylum and Terrorism in Parliamentary Debates in the UK". *Political Studies*, Volume 56, Issue 4, p. 766–788.
- Iyengar, S., Kinder, D.R. 1987. *News that matters: television and American opinion*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Iyengar, S. 1987. "Television news and citizens' explanations of national affairs". *American Political Science Review*, 81, 815-831.
- Jost, J. T., Glaser, J., Kruglanski, A. W., Sulloway, F. J. 2003. "Political conservatism as motivated social cognition". *Psychological Bulletin*, 129(3), 339–375.
- Lahav, G. 2004. *Immigration and politics in the New Europe: Reinventing borders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lawlor, A. 2015. "Local and National Accounts of Immigration Framing in a Cross-national Perspective". *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 6, 918–941.

- Lecheler, S., and C. H. de Vreese. 2012. "News Framing and Public Opinion: A Mediation Analysis of Framing Effects on Political Attitudes." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly* 89 (2): 185–204.
- Malloch, M.S., and Stanley, E., 2005. "The detention of asylum seekers in the UK". *Punishment Society* 7(1), 53-71.
- Matthes, J. 2012. "Framing Politics: An Integrative Approach." *American Behavioral Scientist* 56 (3): 247–259.
- McCombs, M. E., and D. L. Shaw. 1972. "The Agenda-Setting Function of Mass Media." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (2): 176–187.
- McLaren, L. M. 2003. "Anti-immigration prejudice in Europe: Contact, threat perception, and preferences for the exclusion of migrants". *Social Forces*, 81(3), 909–936.
- Nationalencyklopedin, Dagens Nyheter (accessed 20 April 2017).
- Nail, P.R., McGregor, I., Drinkwater, A.E., Steele, G.M., and Thompson, A.W. 2009. "Threat Causes Liberals to Think Like Conservatives" *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 45(4): 901-907.
- Neuman, R.W., Just, M.R., Crigler, A.N. 1992. *Common Knowledge. News and the construction of political meaning*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Papacharissi, Z., Oliveira, M.F. 2008. "News Frames Terrorism: A Comparative Analysis of Frames Employed in Terrorism Coverage in U.S. and U.K. Newspapers". *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13.
- Price, V., Nir, L., and Cappella, J.N. 2005. "Framing Public Discussion of Gay Civil Unions." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 69 (2): 179–212.
- Putnam, L. L., Shoemaker, M. 2007. "Changes in Conflict Framing in the News Coverage of an Environmental Conflict." *Journal of Dispute Resolution* 1:167–75.
- Ravi, N. 2005. "Looking beyond Flawed Journalism How National Interests, Patriotism, and Cultural Values Shaped the Coverage of the Iraq War". *Press/Politics* 10(1):45-62.
- Reese, S.D., Gandy, O., Grant, A.E. 2001. *Framing Public Life : Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Semetko, H.A., Valkenburg, P.M. 2000. "Framing European Politics: A Content Analysis of Press and Television News". *International Communication Association*.
- Strömbäck J., Dimitrova D. 2006. "Political and Media Systems Matter: A Comparison of Election News Coverage in Sweden and the United States". *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, vol. 11 no. 4, p. 131-147.
- Tankard, J.W. 2001. "The Empirical Approach to the Study of Media Framing." In *Framing Public Life: Perspectives on Media and Our Understanding of the Social World*, eds. Stephen D. Reese, Oscar H. Gandy, and August E. Grant. London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 95–105.
- Tewksbury, D., and Scheufele, D.A. 2009. "News Framing Theory and Research". In: Bryant J, Oliver MB *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*. Hillsdale: Erlbaum. 3rd ed.
- Thorbjørnsrud, K. 2015. "Framing Irregular Immigration in Western Media". *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 59(7) 771–782.

- Thórisdóttir, H., Jost, J.H. 2011. "Motivated Closed-Mindedness Mediates the Effect of Threat on Political Conservatism." *Political Psychology* 32(5), 785–811.
- Ulrich, J., Cohrs, C.J. 2007. "Terrorism Salience increases System Justification: Experimental Evidence." *Social Justice Research* 20(2): 117-139.
- Wike, R., Stokes, B., and Simmons, K. 2016. "Europeans Fear Wave of Refugees Will Mean More Terrorism, Fewer Jobs". *Pew Research Center*, July, 2016.
- Yusof, S.H., Hassan, F., Hassan, S., Osman, M.N. 2013. THE FRAMING OF INTERNATIONAL MEDIA ON ISLAM AND TERRORISM. *European Scientific Journal*, vol.9, No.8.

Appendix A: Coding scheme

This coding scheme was constructed prior to the content analysis, and was used when identifying frames in news coverage. For each frame, as seen below, questions have been formulated to help the identification process in the content analysis of news articles. In the analysis, the material was thus assessed with these questions in mind, in order to determine which frame was most prominent in each article.

Conflict Frame

1. Does the article present disagreements between individuals, parties, institutions, or groups regarding immigration?
2. Are differing opinions regarding immigration presented in the article?
3. Is the article written to oppose or criticize an event, statement, policy etc?

Threat Frame

4. Does the article mention/discuss the threat of immigration to:
 - a. national security
 - b. individual security
 - c. welfare system
 - d. cultural identity
5. Does the article connect terrorist threats/attacks to issues of immigration/refugees?
6. Does the article refer to/cover stories about crimes committed specifically by migrants/asylum seekers in the countries of destination or countries of origin?

Human impact frame

7. Does the article include personal stories by immigrants (achievements or despair)?
8. Is a news story about immigration/immigrants presented from the immigrant's point of view?
9. Does the article focus on the suffering of migrants, and presents them under a sympathetic/empathetic light, and/or presenting migrants as victims?

Morality frame

10. Does the article mention religious/moral grounds to helping immigrants/refugees?
11. Does the article mention/discuss: search and rescue operations; the provision of healthcare; food and shelter provision to migrants on arrival?
12. Does the article promote the (moral) importance of helping refugees/immigrants?
13. Does the article mention/discuss the human rights of migrants? Includes abstract discussions or discussions focusing on particular individuals or groups.

Economic frame

14. Is the article discussing financial effects of immigration on any level, in either a positive or negative way?
15. Does the article discuss costs immigrants/immigration may have to a country, an organization, a business etc.?
16. Is the quantity of immigrants coming into a country coupled with costs/benefits?

Responsibility frame

17. Is the article attributing the responsibility of the cause/problems/solutions of immigration/refugee crisis to the EU, a country, a government, or any group or individual?
18. Is the article calling upon the EU, the government, or any group or individual to solve problems regarding immigration/refugee crisis?

Appendix B: List of articles used in analysis

In this appendix the news articles analyzed will be listed, by stating the title of the article, the date the article was published, the page number, and the name of the author when applicable. The articles were retrieved from the time period 19 March 2016 – 25 March 2016. In the main text, these articles are referred to by their *individual codes*, which can be found above each article.

Dagens Nyheter (24)

[DN1]

”Sverige lovar experthjälp efter dåden i Bryssel” 2016-03-25. Sida: 6-7
Ingmar Nevéus

[DN2]

”Jag ser det som en fredsgest att påven tvättar mina fötter” 2016-03-25. Sida: 13
Peter Loewe, DN correspondent

[DN3]

”800 000 vill från Libyen till Europa” 2016-03-25. Sida: 11
TT-AFP

[DN4]

”Ingmar Nevéus: Hela Europa kommer att påverkas - vare sig vi vill eller inte”
2016-03-24. Sida: 12 -13
Ingmar Nevéus

[DN5]

”Hjälporganisationer lämnar Grekland” 2016-03-24. Sida: 24

[DN6]

”Goda tider för Sverige - men lägre tillväxt väntar” 2016-03-24. Sida: 29
Johan Schück

[DN7]

”FN dömer ut grekiska flyktingläger” 2016-03-23. Sida: 22
TT-Reuters

[DN8]

”Syrier räddade tysk högerextremist” 2016-03-23. Sida: 22
TT-AFP

[DN9]

"Därför finns ingen motsättning mellan invandring och välfärdsstat" 2016-03-22.

Sida: 8

Clara Sandelind

[DN10]

"Det måste ske på ett rättssäkert sätt" 2016-03-22. Sida: 3

Ulrika By

[DN11]

"Inget stopp för flyktingbåtar" 2016-03-21. Sida: 14

Ingmar Nevéus

[DN12]

"Starka reaktioner efter DN-reportage" 2016-03-21. Sida: 10

Juan Flores

[DN13]

"En flykting korsar vårt spår - och förändrar oss" 2016-03-20. Sida: 10-13

Susanna Alakoski

[DN14]

"Skepsis mot EU:s avtal med Turkiet" 2016-03-20. Sida: 27

TT

[DN15]

"Hjälp till Grekland förbereds" 2016-03-20. Sida: 20

TT

[DN16]

"Nya avtalet klart: Så ska Europa klara flyktingarna" 2016-03-19. Sida: 1

[DN17]

"Krisen har lärt oss greker att visa empati för andra" 2016-03-19. Sida: 10-11

Paul Hansen, Ingmar Nevéus

[DN18]

"VÄRDERINGS-KRIGAREN 2016-03-19". Sida: 8-14

Text Elisabeth Åsbrink

[DN19]

"DET DANSKA MOTSTÅNDETS ANSIKTE" 2016-03-19. Sida: 1

[DN20]

"Många frågetecken kring det nya avtalet" 2016-03-19. Sida: 8-9

Annika Ström Melin

[DN21]

"Kontrollerna av utlänningar har minskat" 2016-03-19. Sida: 21

TT

[DN22]

”Sverige kan skicka poliser till Grekland” 2016-03-19. Sida: 9

[DN23]

”Turkiet är inte lösningen” 2016-03-19. Sida: 4

DN 19/

[DN24]

”Medicinsk åldersbedömning för asylsökande på gång.” 2016-03-19. Sida: 18

TT

Aftonbladet (15)

[A1]

”Man på asylboende misstänks ha huggits ihjäl – polisen utreder mord” 2016-03-25. Sida: 16

Max Sommerstein

[A2]

”Sverige utan hopp är ett farligt land” 2016-03-25. Sida: 2

Anders Lindberg Ledarskribent

[A3]

”Skolan har växtvärk - SKL vill ha jämnare fördelning av Flyktingbarn” 2016-03-24. Sida: 20

TT-Aftonbladet

[A4]

”Tidsandan - denna förlamande konformism straffar sig Alltid” 2016-03-23. Sida: 34

Peter Kadhammar

[A5]

”Visst kan fler flyktingar bli en vinstlott” 2016-03-23. Sida: 5

Petter Larsson

[A6]

”Flyktingar räddar inte Sverige” 2016-03-23. Sida: 4-5

Ann Charlott Altstadt DEBATT flyktingkrisen

[A7]

”Partiegoism är en helt annan sak än idealism” 2016-03-23. Sida: 27

Lena Mellin Politisk kommentator

[A8]

”Flyktingarna låses in - bakom taggtråden” 2016-03-22. Sida: 14

Staffan Lindberg

[A9]

'Dör hellre här än återvänder' 2016-03-21. Sida: 11

Staffan Lindberg

[A10]

"Journalister stängs ute från flyktingläger" 2016-03-21. Sida: 4

Jon Weman

[A11]

"Veckan som gick: BRYSSEL. I natt drogs järnridån ner i Egeiska havet." 2016-03-20. Sida: 16

Oisín Cantwell, nyhetskrönikör (OC) | Lena Mellin, politisk kommentator (LM) | Anna Andersson, debattredaktör (AA) | Karin Magnusson, programledare (KM)

[A12]

"HEIMERSONS värld – Vet mer special" 2016-03-19. Sida: 24

[A13]

"Terroristen levde okänt liv i Sverige" 2016-03-19. Sida: 10-11

Isabelle Nordström | Niklas Svahn

[A14]

"Nu dras Europas nya järnridå ner" 2016-03-19. Sida: 16

Lena Mellin

[A15]

"Europa bygger en ny järnridå" 2016-03-19. Sida: 2

Anders Lindberg

The Guardian (24)

[G1]

"We'll only halt the far right in Europe if we get tough on terror and migration".
March 25, 2016.

Natalie Nougayrède

[G2]

"Syrian refugee children deserve the same welcome I was given in 1939" March
25, 2016

Alf Dubs

[G3]

"UK must do more to help reunite Syrian families separated in the refugee crisis"
March 25, 2016

Letters

[G4]

“Actors and writers call on Cameron to increase help for refugee children” March 25, 2016
Karen McVeigh

[G5]
“Belgian ambassador rejects Australia's claim it failed on security and Syrian migration” March 24, 2016
Paul Karp

[G6]
“Brexit and terrorism: EU immigration is not the main danger” March 24, 2016
Jason Burke

[G7]
“Calais camp demolitions 'forcing more refugees to make crossing to UK’” March 24, 2016
Robert Booth

[G8]
“Humanitarian crisis growing in Athens port, charity warns” March 24, 2016
Helena Smith in Athens

[G9]
“Lesbos: a Greek island in limbo over tourism, refugees – and its future” March 24, 2016
Lucas Amin

[G10]
“Ministers and NHS bosses criticised over use of overseas nurses” March 24, 2016
Alan Travis Home affairs editor

[G11]
“Raped, pregnant, homeless: the grim reality of life as an asylum seeker” March 24, 2016
Diane Taylor

[G12]
“The homeless refugee speaking out for female asylum seekers” March 24, 2016
Melissa Jun Rowley

[G13]
“Islamic State can't win in Brussels – we are fighting hate with love” March 24, 2016
Bleri Lleshi

[G14]
“Refugee crisis: key aid agencies refuse any role in 'mass expulsion’” March 23, 2016
Patrick Kingsley Migration correspondent

[G15]

“The Guardian view on the Brussels political aftermath: both dangerous and wrong” March 23, 2016

Editorial

[G16]

“Refugee crisis: human rights chief hits out at Cameron and May” March 23, 2016

Alan Travis Home affairs editor

[G17]

“US presidential candidates respond to attacks in Brussels” March 22, 2016

Tom McCarthy and Amanda Holpuch

[G18]

“Cameron criticises Ukip for linking Brussels attacks to immigration” March 22, 2016

Rowena Mason Political correspondent

[G19]

“UK MPs demand urgent help for unaccompanied children at Calais camp” March 22, 2016

Amelia Gentleman

[G20]

“House of Lords votes to let lone child refugees come to Britain” March 21, 2016

Amelia Gentleman and Karen McVeigh

[G21]

“April deadline to return migrants to Turkey 'not realistic'” March 21, 2016

Jennifer Rankin in Brussels and Helena Smith in Athens

[G22]

“Three Syrian boys arrive in UK from Calais refugee camp” March 21, 2016

Karen McVeigh

[G23]

“Migrants in Turkey still sailing for Greece as new rules come in” March 21, 2016

Patrick Kingsley in Izmir and Helena Smith in Athens

[G24]

“Refugees will be sent back across Aegean in EU-Turkey deal” March 19, 2016

Jennifer Rankin in Brussels

The Daily Telegraph (20)

[T1]

”More British nurses” March 25, 2016 Section: Editorial; Opinion; Leading articles

[T2]

“Hospitals told to end reliance on foreign nurses” March 25, 2016 Section: News

[T3]

“Uncontrolled borders and immigration do increase risks to Britain” March 24, 2016 Section: Letters

Letters to the Editor

[T4]

“Quitting EU 'would help our security' Former MI6 chief says borders could be strengthened and extremists deported Belgians failed to follow up tip-off about suspect” March 24, 2016

Section: News

[T5]

“Boris: European courts are acting against UK security Brussels bombing London Mayor says EU's restrictions on deportation and surveillance are no longer in Britain's interests” March 24, 2016

Section: News

[T6]

“Avoid term 'illegal migrants', says human rights leader” March 24, 2016 Section: News

[T7]

“The EU aspires to be a state but fails to protect its citizens from harm Allowing free movement of people across Europe helps terrorists and puts innocent lives in danger” March 23, 2016

PHILIP JOHNSTON

[T8]

“Brussels puts us in peril” March 23, 2016 Allison Pearson

[T9]

“We must not allow the hateful ideology of jihad to change our way of life” March 23, 2016 Section: Letters – Letters to the Editor

[T10]

“Britain could be next for 90-strong Isil cell of fanatics roaming Europe Security chiefs fear that terror group behind Brussels bombing has major UK cities in its sights” March 23, 2016 Section: News

[T11]

“Europe's open borders are an invitation to disaster, warns Howard The EU's Schengen Agreement is failing to keep its people safe, says former Tory leader”
March 23, 2016 Section: News

[T12]

“Asylum seeker sets himself on fire in protest against blocked Balkan route UN refugee body refuses to co-operate with EU deal as it describes Greek camps as 'detention centres” March 23, 2016 Section: News

[T13]

“Turkey's domestic laws mean EU deal may be unenforceable Thousands of migrants could avoid deportation because Ankara cannot guarantee their safety”
March 22, 2016 Section: News

[T14]

“Secret plans to repatriate 80,000 Afghan asylum seekers in return for aid revealed” March 22, 2016
Section: News

[T15]

“Turks on the way” March 21, 2016 Section: Features; Femail Letters to the Editor

[T16]

“Europe shuts door, but still the boats arrive” March 21, 2016 Section: News

[T17]

“Proceeding in haste, motivated by panic” March 19, 2016 Section: Editorial

[T18]

“Fears of a deadly rush for boats as migrants are given 24 hours to reach Europe Asylum seekers who arrive after the deadline will be sent back home in €6bn aid deal struck with Turkey” March 19, 2016
Section: News

The Daily Mail (28)

[DM1]

“Why can't we take in refugees as we did in the War?” March 25, 2016 Section: Letters

[DM2]

“NHS SIGNS UP MORE FOREIGN NURSES With 14,000 on the way, bosses accused of using cheap labour” March 25, 2016 Section: News Ian Drury Home Affairs Correspondent

[DM3]

“24 migrants in packed lorries have already won first fight in asylum bid Just days after this shocking photo was taken in Kent...” March 25, 2016 Section: News
Ian Drury Home Affairs Correspondent

[DM4]

“Stowaways have cost fruit importer £350k” March 25, 2016 Section: News
Emily Kent Smith and Inderdeep Bains

[DM5]

“Criminals we STILL won't kick out” March 25, 2016 Section: News

[DM6]

“Why will no one admit the way some western Muslims raise their children is fomenting terror?”
March 24, 2016 Section: Editorial
Yasmin Alibhai-Brown

[DM7]

”Words versus reality” March 24, 2016 Section: Editorial; Opinion, Leading articles
COMMENT

[DM8]

“Don't call them illegals, says Euro human rights chief” March 24, 2016 Section: News
Ian Drury Home Affairs Correspondent

[DM9]

“52 stowaways in just two lorries” March 24, 2016 Section: News
Ian Drury and Andrew Levy

[DM10]

“Deported by Turks as how WAS this bomb a terrorist - er still free?” March 24, 2016 Section: News
Sam Greenhill, Stephen Wright John Stevens and Claire Duffin

[DM11]

“We won't take any migrants, vows Poland” March 24, 2016 Section: News
From Sam Greenhill in Brussels

[DM12]

“With each new atrocity, ever more British voters will feel that we MUST reclaim control of our borders” March 23, 2016
John R. Bradley

[DM13]

“An attack on Europe” March 23, 2016 Section: Editorial; Opinion; Leading articles

[DM14]

“Ukip: Visa-free borders are a threat to security” March 23, 2016 Section: Features

[DM15]

“Bomb-maker the police cannot catch strikes again” March 23, 2016 Section: Features
From Stephen Wright and John Stevens in Brussels

[DM16]

“Howard: EU has hung out welcome sign for terrorists” March 23, 2016 Section: Features
James Slack and Jason Groves

[DM17]

“Blair: Flabby liberalism aids terror” March 23, 2016 Section: Features

[DM18]

“Germany's prisons 'are full up with migrants” March 23, 2016 Section: News

[DM19]

“Ed admits voters DO worry about immigration” March 23, 2016 Section: News

[DM20]

“Thousands of migrants could stay in EU as Turkey deal starts to unravel” March 22, 2016
Section: Features
From John Stevens Brussels Correspondent

[DM21]

“Peers defeat ministers to allow in 3,000 child refugees” March 22, 2016 Section: News
Jack Doyle Political Correspondent

[DM22]

“Just hours after deal to halt influx, boatloads of migrants reach Greece” March 21, 2016
Section: Features
Tom Kelly in Lesbos

[DM23]

“Hospital spent £181k treating illegal migrant” March 21, 2016 Section: News
Tom Witherow

[DM24]

“Turkey to take back migrants tonight But deal gives 77m Turks visa-free access to Europe”
March 19, 2016 Section: News From Jason Groves, Deputy Political Editor, and John Stevens in Brussels

[DM25]

“Savage brawl as gangs clash over food” March 19, 2016 Section: News

[DM26]

“COULD THIS LEAD TO WAR IN EUROPE? Apocalyptic, yes. But even if conflict can be avoided, MAX HASTINGS says unchecked will make Europe mass migration unrecognizable” March 19, 2016
Section: News

[DM27]

“A disturbing deal” March 19, 2016 Section: News

[DM28]

“225 sham marriages and a human rights farce that will make you weep special investigation”
March 19, 2016 Section: News
Neil Tweedie and Christian Gysin

The Mirror (8)

[M1]

“£1,000 charge to hire foreign staff” March 25, 2016 Section: News

[M2]

“Shambles of deportation” March 25, 2016 Section: News

[M3]

“Trafficking fears over refugee crisis” March 25, 2016 Section: News

[M4]

“25 migrants crammed in back of truck Desperate group flee Iran and Iraq” March 24, 2016
Section: News COURTNEY GREATREX

[M5]

“25 migrants found in truck March” 24, 2016 Section: News

[M6]

“THE BIG QUESTION” March 22, 2016 Section: Features; Opinion Column

[M7]

“Chuka: Heed immigration fears” March 21, 2016 Section: News

[M8]

“EU deal sends boat refugees back to Turkey We pay £500m... and take none”
March 19, 2016
Section: News BEN GLAZE Political Correspondent

