REMINDER

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS
IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

Discourses on Intra-EU Mobility and Non-EU Migration in European Media Coverage

LITERATURE REVIEW

Authors: Jakob-Moritz Eberl
Tobias Heidenreich
Hajo G. Boomgaarden
Beatriz Herrero
Rosa Berganza
Will Allen
Peter Bajomi-Lazar

universität wien

Universidad
Rey Juan Carlos

BGE

COMPAS

REMINDER

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS
IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

Discourses on Intra-EU Mobility and Non-EU Migration in European Media Coverage: A Comprehensive Literature Review

Authors: Jakob-Moritz Eberl (University of Vienna), Tobias Heidenreich (University of Vienna), Hajo G. Boomgaarden (University of Vienna), Beatriz Herrero (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos), Rosa Berganza (Universidad Rey Juan Carlos), Will Allen (University of Oxford) and Peter Bajomi-Lazar (Budapest Business School)

Correspondence address:

Jakob-Moritz Eberl
University of Vienna, Department of Communication
Rathausstraße 19/9 A-1010 Vienna, Austria
Mail: jakob-moritz.eberl@univie.ac.at

With the 2015 "refugee crisis" and the 2016 Brexit referendum, intra-European mobility and the free movement of people in the European Union are up for debate, with several countries now seriously questioning the future of free movement (Hobolt, 2016; The Telegraph, 2016). However, according to Eurobarometer data from May 2016, 58 per cent of Europeans still have positive attitudes towards intra-EU immigration. At the same time, only 34 per cent agree with immigration from outside the EU. Attitudes within single member countries can vary greatly, with Sweden having very positive immigration attitudes and Hungary, for example, comparatively negative ones, concerning both intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe (Eurobarometer, 2016). Arguably, such attitudes are reinforced by media coverage about immigration related actors and issues, their media visibility, framing and the valence of such coverage (Ruhrmann, 2002; ter Wal, 2002; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Burscher, van Spanje & de Vreese, 2015; Blinder & Allen, 2015).

News coverage is theorised as the outcome of complex interactions between actors and routines from inside and outside the media system (Brüggemann, 2014; Potthoff, 2012). On the one hand, media coverage may be very different from one country to another as a result of variation in both countries' political and media system. On the other hand, media organisations' inner logics at least play an equally important role for their reporting (Vliegenthart & van Zoonen, 2011). While a common classification of media outlets runs on a continuum between tabloid and quality media (Sparks, 2000), coverage may also differ based on a media outlet's political leaning (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Finally, real-world events, as well, may strongly impact media discourses and particularly those on immigration issues (see Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Kroon, Kluknavská, Vliegenthart & Boomgaarden, 2016).

This literature review presents an overview of how intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe are portrayed in media coverage in European countries. In an aim to identify possible differences in media discourses that may potentially lead to different influences on public opinion about immigration, the focus is both on immigration from countries within Europe (e.g., Ruhrmann, Sommer & Uhlemann, 2006; Balch & Balabanova, 2016; Vicol & Allen, 2014), as well as from countries outside of Europe (e.g., van der Linden & Jacobs,

REMINDER

With the 2015 "refugee crisis" and the 2016 Brexit referendum, intra-European mobility and the free movement of people in the European Union are up for debate, with several countries now seriously questioning the future of free movement (Hobolt, 2016; The Telegraph, 2016). However, according to Eurobarometer data from May 2016, 58 per cent of Europeans still have positive attitudes towards intra-EU immigration. At the same time, only 34 per cent agree with immigration from outside the EU. Attitudes within single member countries can vary greatly, with Sweden having very positive immigration attitudes and Hungary, for example, comparatively negative ones, concerning both intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe (Eurobarometer, 2016). Arguably, such attitudes are reinforced by media coverage about immigration related actors and issues, their media visibility, framing and the valence of such coverage (Ruhrmann, 2002; ter Wal, 2002; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Burscher, van Spanje & de Vreese, 2015; Blinder & Allen, 2015).

News coverage is theorised as the outcome of complex interactions between actors and routines from inside and outside the media system (Brüggemann, 2014; Potthoff, 2012). On the one hand, media coverage may be very different from one country to another as a result of variation in both countries' political and media system. On the other hand, media organisations' inner logics at least play an equally important role for their reporting (Vliegenthart & van Zoonen, 2011). While a common classification of media outlets runs on a continuum between tabloid and quality media (Sparks, 2000), coverage may also differ based on a media outlet's political leaning (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Finally, real-world events, as well, may strongly impact media discourses and particularly those on immigration issues (see Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Kroon, Kluknavská, Vliegenthart & Boomgaarden, 2016).

This literature review presents an overview of how intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe are portrayed in media coverage in European countries. In an aim to identify possible differences in media discourses that may potentially lead to different influences on public opinion about immigration, the focus is both on immigration from countries within Europe (e.g., Ruhrmann, Sommer & Uhlemann, 2006; Balch & Balabanova, 2016; Vicol & Allen, 2014), as well as from countries outside of Europe (e.g., van der Linden & Jacobs,

2016; Jacobs, 2016). It deals with media discourses about legal immigration (e.g., Ruhrmann et al., 2006; Cheregi, 2015), potential immigration (e.g., de Vreese, Boomgaarden & Semetko, 2011) as well as irregular migrants or refugees (e.g., Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017). First, we will review findings of issue- and actor-related visibility of immigration in media coverage. We will then elaborate on the quality of that coverage, dealing with findings related to issue-specific as well as generic framing of immigration coverage. We also consider that immigration discourses may have changed over time and sketch similarities and differences to discourses in non-European countries. We conclude by summarizing key influences on and differences between media discourses as well as by pointing to extant gaps in research and possible future avenues.

Media salience of issues and actors related to intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe

The media agenda is composed of a set of objects (e.g., issues, events, or actors), of which every object can be emphasized to different degrees (McCombs, 2005). It is argued that such media salience influences audiences' perceived importance of (e.g., McCombs & Shaw, 1972; McCombs, 2005) and knowledge about theese objects (e.g., Eveland & Scheufele, 2000; de Vreese & Boomgaarden, 2006). Considering the evidence of basic agenda-setting effects, the media are very successful in terms of transferring salience from the media agenda to the agenda of the broader public (e.g., McCombs, 2005; McCombs & Reynolds, 2009).

The salience or visibility of migration related topics in news media coverage is frequently conceptualized as the volume (e.g., Akkerman, 2011; Lawlor, 2015) or intensity (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009) of reporting. Such measurements are mostly done quantitatively and in some recent cases by computer-assisted procedures (e.g., Boomgaarden, Vliegenthart, De Vreese & Schuck, 2010; McLaren, Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2017). Most commonly, salience is measured based on the number or share of news stories referring to migration or to the presence of certain immigration related actors (e.g., Kroon et al., 2016; Lawlor, 2015; Bos, van der Brug & de Vreese, 2011). Additional stress can be put on where exactly an article is placed in a newspaper. While some look only at the front pages, others are satisfied with one reference

REMINDER

to the topic of immigration within an entire news story (De Vreese & Boomgaarden, 2006; Boomgaarden et al., 2010).

Studies in the field of communication research that deal with the salience of intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe-related issues in news coverage mostly focus on national media systems, including mainly print media outlets (e.g., Lubbers, Scheepers & Wester, 1998; Vliegenthart & Boomgaarden 2007) and television broadcasts (e.g., Statham, 2002; Ruhrmann et al., 2006; Igartua, Barrios, Ortega & Frutos, 2014). By contrast, online media (Cheregi, 2015) and especially social media sites are largely neglected (although see Bennett, 2016). Furthermore, there is only little comparative research on the salience of immigration-related actors or issues in the media across different European countries (e.g., Kroon et al., 2016; Caviedes, 2015).

To ensure that news stories in fact do relate to the issue of intra-EU mobility or non-EU migration into Europe, studies use different selection criteria. Quantitative content analyses gather textual data mainly via available online archives (e.g., van der Linden & Jacobs, 2016); this is especially the case for automated research (e.g., McLaren et al., 2017). Yet, qualitative approaches, such as critical discourse or frame analysis, also build on sources where texts are extractable online (e.g., Rasinger, 2010; Snow, Vliegenthart & Corrigall-Brown, 2007). To identify relevant stories, most studies rely on extensive Boolean search strings referring, for instance, to actors or events associated with the discourse on intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Helbling, 2012) or a few key and simple Boolean search terms (e.g., Cheregi, 2015; Schlueter & Davidov, 2011).

When looking for patterns (e.g., word co-occurrences) within the discourse, a common strategy is to analyse frequent co-occurrences of certain key terms within the data. This is applied in quantitative analyses (e.g., Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017) or in terms of corpus linguistics (e.g., Vicol & Allen, 2014; Blinder & Allen, 2015) and critical discourse analysis (e.g., Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008; Rasinger, 2010). The latter two approaches are particularly suitable to be used together to investigate the discourse on intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration. While they are complementary, both can be used as entry points and create a useful research cycle. Within this, the corpus analysis qualitatively points towards

patterns, whereas the corpus linguistic approach is able to provide quantitative measures of lexical patterns (see Baker & McEnery, 2005).

As claimed by the agenda-setting hypothesis, studies find empirical evidence for the influence of the press' emphases on public concern. In the UK, coverage about the economy and education in relation to migration issues strongly increased citizens' concerns about immigration (McLaren et al., 2017). A stable issue visibility of immigration in general is found among German news coverage, excepting a distinct peak in late 2001, which could be caused by the terrorist attacks in New York (Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009). The suggestion that salience of issues related to intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe in national news coverage can also be affected by external events is supported by findings from the Netherlands (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007) and other European countries (e.g., Kroon et al., 2016). Allen (2016) shows for example that in the UK, migration related newspaper coverage increased following the election of a Conservative-led coalition government in 2010 and the introduction of a net migration target. The actual salience of immigration-related issues or actors can differ greatly between different European countries as it is strongly influenced by contextual factors.

In many European countries, the issue of immigration is most salient in right-wing populist parties' or voters' agendas (Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Bos et al., 2011; Walgrave & de Swert, 2004, Kleinen-von Königslöw, Meyer, Vonbun, Wagner & Winkler, 2014). Results of media effects studies indicate that the more the news media report on migration, the more people tend to vote for parties with an anti-immigrant stance (Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007). A potential explanation could be the extensive attention the media focuses on immigration issues as well as on crime related topics, both of which are issues often owned by radical right parties (Walgrave & de Swert, 2004). However, while the agenda-setting approach describes how the media sets the public agenda, connections among issue salience in political campaign communications and news coverage indicate agenda-building effects as well. The salience of immigration-related issues and actors in the party agenda will thus influence these issues' and actors' salience in the media agenda (Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007).

REMINDER

As argued before, actors – just like issues – can be more or less visible in the media as they compete for media attention. Generally, there are many different actors related to the discourse of intra- and non-European migration into Europe. The terminology used to describe migrant actors can differ based on their legal status (e.g., asylum seeker), ethnicity and religion, but also on historical contexts. Research investigating intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe often focuses on the terms of "(im)migrants" (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009), "refugees" (e.g., d'Haenens & De Lange, 2001) or "asylum seekers" (e.g., van Gorp, 2005); or in their original languages: *asylum seekers/illegal immigrants* (EN), *allochtonen* (NL), *immigrati/extracomunitari* (IT) and *Ausländer/Migranten/innen* (DE), *uchodźcy/imigranci* (PL) etc. However, a few studies provide a more diverse analysis of immigrant groups. Some distinguish migrants based on their religious affiliation and find that Muslim immigrants are more salient in media coverage than, for example, Christians, Jews or Hindus (e.g., Bleich, Stonebraker, Nisar & Abdelhamid, 2015). Others differentiate between Western-, Eastern-European (e.g., Light & Young, 2009) and African migrants (e.g., Jacobs, 2016; van der Linden & Jacobs, 2016) or focus on specific ethnicities such as Roma (e.g., Kroon et al., 2016; Cheregi, 2015; Meeusen & Jacobs, 2016). Blinder & Allen (2015) show that such distinctions vary across media genre. While in the UK mostly tabloids and midmarket newspapers refer to "immigrants" or "migrants", broadsheets mention "refugees" more often than any other publication type investigated.

Most immigrant groups as well as ethnic minorities are underrepresented in nearly all European media compared to the respective number of people actually living in each country (for an overview, see ter Wal, 2002). This is particularly true when it comes to intra-European migrants (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998). In the Netherlands and Germany, the most salient groups of immigrants in news coverage were asylum seekers, Moroccans and Turks. While in Germany, immigrants from Southern and Eastern Europe also play a rather relevant role (Ruhrmann et al., 2006), in the Netherlands, immigrants from other European countries were left far behind, as were, to a lesser extent, immigrants from former Dutch colonies (Lubbers et al., 1998). Similarly, Kroon et al. (2016) show that Roma are much more present in the German, British, Slovakian and Czech news than they are in the Dutch newspapers during the same time period. In the UK, migration from Eastern Europe was increasingly

discussed in 2014, when Romanian und Bulgarian migrants obtained access to labour markets across the EU (Allen, 2016). In the mid and late 1990s Luxembourg media focused most on asylum seekers from the war in Kosovo (Nickels, 2007). While a study of British television programs indicated an increase in representations of ethnic minorities (Statham, 2002), this might be particularly tied to public broadcasting stations having to abide by normative standards of diversity (see Law, Svennevig & Morrison, 1997, Ruhrmann et al., 2006), as well as to country specific factors. In fact, a comparative analysis of political actors in immigration news coverage from 1999 to 2006 shows that migrant actors are more visible in the UK press compared to Germany, France, Austria or the Netherlands (Helbling, 2012).

Female migrants are doubly disadvantaged, as they are less visible than male immigrants (Krüger & Simon, 2005). Furthermore, actors belonging to an ethnic minority are generally presented as passive actors and are less often presented as the main protagonists of news stories (Ruhrmann et al., 2006; Ter Wal, d'Haenens & Koeman, 2005). Even when they are visible in news coverage, they are thus marginalized (Hömberg & Schlemmer, 1995).

Media visibility of immigration-related issues alone might influence audiences' attitudes about immigration as well as anti-immigrant party success. However, immigration and research on immigration in media coverage is a multifaceted issue, where many different migrant actors are of relevance; this variation is only partly addressed in extant research. Finally, the quantity of coverage is but one aspect of media coverage. The following chapters will discuss aspects dealing with the actual quality of coverage and more specifically, its framing.

Issue-specific framing in coverage of intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe

Frames are schemes of interpretation that promote a particular problem definition or causal interpretation of an issue (see Goffman, 1974; Entman, 1993). Similar to issue agenda-setting in public discourse, frames can also be more or less salient in media coverage and be used to define particular problems and justify political actors' positions or actions towards these problems (Helbling, 2014). Similar to the question of agenda-setting, in communication research, the bulk of framing studies focus mainly on framing effects on

REMINDER

audiences. The leading question therefore is not only about the nature of the frames that are used, but about the process by which these frames will influence media audiences' political attitudes (e.g., Feree, Gamson, Gerhards & Rucht, 2002).

There are different types of frames that can be studied. One of the most central distinctions is between issue-specific frames and generic news frames (de Vreese, Peter & Semetko, 2001). Generic frames, such as the game, conflict or negativity frame are argued to transcend thematic boundaries, while issue-specific frames are intrinsically related to certain topics such as immigration (e.g., Terkildsen & Schnell, 1997; de Vreese et al., 2011). In principle, a frame does not need to have a positive or negative connotation. Chong and Druckman (2007), however, argue that the valence of a frame is important to consider along with its salience in news coverage.

Most studies dealing with intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe focus on issue-specific frames and thus analyse the importance of economic, welfare, cultural, or security frames (e.g., de Vreese et al., 2011). To also capture the valence of these frames, studies either focus on the negative part of the frame (for example, immigration as a criminal, economic or cultural threat, see Meeusen & Jacobs, 2016; Balch & Balabanova, 2016; Haynes, Devereux & Breen, 2006) or split each frame into a positive and a negative version (for example investigating economic cost/threats as well as benefits of immigration, see de Vreese et al., 2011; Schuck & de Vreese, 2006).

There are various ways of actually measuring frames in media coverage. Most of the time at least some form of quantitative pre-processing has to be done to identify potentially relevant texts. After that, some researchers prefer qualitative reading of the selected articles to identify the range of arguments employed that refer to either pre-defined frames (Balabanova & Balch, 2010; Balch & Balabanova, 2016). Others follow a more quantitative approach using manual content analysis. There is the one-step-approach, where each issue-frame is identified by a set of items to be coded for every single article (Schuck & de Vreese, 2006; de Vreese et al., 2011; Cheng, Igartua, Palacios, Acosta & Palito, 2014). Another method is to first identify which issue the article is dealing with (e.g., criminal, economic, or cultural) and in a second step, to code if a problem related to a specific migrant group was reported. The combination of the two identifies the issue-specific frame (e.g., Meeusen &

Jacobs, 2016). Finally, there are also automated approaches to frame analysis. Following principal component analysis, large texts are converted into word clusters based on word co-occurrences that can be interpreted as frames (Hellsten, Dawson & Leydesdorff, 2010). Such word-clusters (i.e., principal components) are regarded as prototypical for the semantic meaning of a frame (see Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017).

Which frames are most common in media coverage may depend on the specific groups of migrants these news stories are dealing with. Generally speaking, Baker et al. (2008) find that the terms "migrants" and "immigrants" are closely associated with the frame of economic threat, while "refugees" and "asylum seekers" are associated with an economic burden. Meeusen and Jacobs (2016) find that while North-Africans, Eastern-Europeans, and Roma were all most strongly related to the criminal threat frame, North-Africans were also more often portrayed as a cultural threat than Eastern-Europeans, and Roma were more regularly depicted as an economic threat than the two other groups. Balch and Balabanova (2016) find that media coverage about immigration from Romania and Bulgaria most commonly activates frames connected to welfare chauvinism and economic nationalism, with the former having strongly increased and largely replacing the latter between 2006 and 2013.

While Eastern Europeans are thus rather seen as a threat to the economy and welfare system, this is less the case for Non-Europeans, as also shown in the media discourse on immigrants in Belgian television (see van der Linden & Jacobs, 2016). There, North-Africans are closest associated with the security threat frame, second closest with the cultural threat frame, but not at all close to an economic threat frame (van der Linden & Jacobs, 2016). Furthermore, in their study on the framing of news about Turkish membership in the European Union, de Vreese et al. (2011) find that while the framing of economic costs and benefits was quite balanced (in valence), security framing was rather focused on benefits. The cultural framing, however, was most present and strongly focused on threats of potential immigration to EU member states after Turkish membership.

Another very common frame in media research about immigration is the victimization frame, which in its valenced form is defined as a victim vs. perpetrator frame (Kroon et al., 2016). In the European context, this frame is mainly applied in relation to women, refugees

and asylum seekers, and portrays them as in need of help because of circumstances that lie beyond their own influence (Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007; Horsti 2008; Van Gorp 2005). In national news, foreigners therefore tend to be more often portrayed as victims than natives (Igartua, Barrios & Ortega., 2012). Greussing and Boomgaarden (2017) show that the victimization frame is particularly important at the beginning of a news cycle, while a news story is still unfolding, but becomes less relevant at later points. A study of Belgian press coverage shows that the perpetrator frame is a rather constant one, while the victimization frame strongly increases around the Christmas holidays, as people tend to become more charitable (van Gorp, 2005).

Frame salience may also depend on the media context, thus the country in which the news stories are written. A comparative study has shown that in the UK in particular, economic framing is more common in the news narrative of immigration compared to Italy and France (Caviedes, 2015). However, the country context does not always need to be influential, as a study of Roma victimization framing in the Netherlands, the UK, Germany, Slovakia, and the Czech Republic shows (Kroon et al., 2016). Frame emphasis may also differ based on whether the country is on the sending or receiving end of migration (Balabanova & Balch, 2010).

Furthermore, there may also be differences between media genres. While in British coverage of immigration from Romania, the economic frame, the social benefits frame and the employment frame are all much more strongly used by tabloids, the educational frame (which is less negative) and the EU-policy frame (a „constructive" frame) are more salient in quality media (Cheregi, 2015). Similarly, Kroon et al. (2016) find that the victimization frame is stronger in quality media than in tabloid outlets. An Austrian study, however, finds no strong differences between tabloids and broadsheets when it comes to the media framing of the 2015 refugee crisis (Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017).

Finally, framing of the public discourse about immigration may also come from parties' and politicians' statements in the media. Helbling (2014) finds that the salience of different issue-frames (e.g., cultural, labour and welfare, economic, nationalistic, etc.) may be different based on the dimension of immigration that is considered (for example, integration instead of immigration). He finds that the cultural frame is more present in the

REMINDER

discourse about integration of immigrants, while the labour, welfare and economic frames are more present when it comes to the question of immigration. The importance of such frames in public political discourse can also vary between countries. The nationalistic frame, for example, is strongest in France compared to Austria, the UK, Germany, the Netherlands, or Switzerland. Finally, the focus may differ also between different types of parties. While, for example, radical left parties will rather focus on labour and welfare framing, populist right parties focus disproportionately strongly on nationalistic frames (i.e. national identity, loss of traditions, etc.).

Research dealing with the framing of intra- and non-European migration into Europe uses qualitative as well as quantitative approaches to identify relevant issue-specific frames. Which frames are most prominent in the media discourse will depend on both the studies' country focus as well as the specific population of migrants the discourse is dealing with in the period of analysis. Although most research in this field deals with issue-specific frames, the next chapter will discuss the most prominent generic frame in migration news coverage, namely negativity framing.

Negativity and tone in coverage of intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe

Although there is extant literature about the alleged trend towards increasing negativity in news coverage and particularly in that of political news (e.g., Vliegenthart, Boomgaarden & Boumans, 2011), the concept of negativity – due to its complexity and ambiguity – still remains ill-defined (e.g., Kleinnijenhuis 2008). Esser, Engesser, Matthes, and Berganza (2017) argue that European research in particular in this field is very fragmented and has no agreed-upon set of empirical indicators, which may explain often diverging findings and conclusions.

Reviewing past research and conceptualisations, Lengauer, Esser, and Berganza (2012) conclude that negativity in news coverage of politics is in fact a multidimensional concept consisting of four key features of news content: tone, conflict- and/or problem framing, allegations of misconduct and actor-related negativity. In the literature on intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe, these four dimensions are mainly translated into two.

REMINDER

First, there is tone, i.e. negative vs. positive tonality of media coverage on the issue of immigration or immigration related actors (e.g., Bleich et al., 2015; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009). Second, crime- and problem- centeredness of news items on the topic of immigration or immigration related actors (Lubbers et al., 1998). To be more precise, indications of such negativity, or negative and positive tonality, in coverage of immigration can be further measured by the framing of a news story as a problem and crisis, or instead as a success (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998; Bleich et al., 2015).

To measure tone, some studies code each news item on a scale from -1 (negative) to +1 (positive) (e.g., Igartua, Muñiz, Otero & de la Fuente, 2007; Van Klingeren, Boomgaarden, Vliegenthart & de Vreese, 2015), while others follow the "core-sentence" approach, where each evaluative statement linking to actors is coded separately (e.g., Helbling, 2012). Again, others use aggregate analyses of depictions or evaluations of immigration-related actors, as well as metaphors (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Gardikiotis, 2003; Ruhrmann, 2002; Ruhrmann et al., 2006; Schemer, 2014). Finally, an increasing number of studies dealing with English-speaking countries use automated approaches to measure tone. For example, the Australian study by McKay, Thomas and Blood (2011) uses a dictionary based search of key terms and frames that were previously identified by Entman (1993) as well as McQuail (1994). The comparative study of Canada and the UK (Lawlor, 2015) also used a dictionary approach based on the sentiment of single words (see Young and Soroka, 2012). The Spanish study by Schlueter and Davidov (2011) used such a dictionary approach, identifying negative issues related to immigrant and immigration based on findings from previous content-analytical studies.

Although often denounced because of its possibly harmful effects when it is too negative, tone of coverage is important because it can provide the media audience with templates, peripheral cues, and shortcuts for understanding politics, thereby influencing voters' perceptions of political actors and ultimately influencing their attitudes and even voting behaviour (Zaller, 1991; Valentino, Beckman & Buhr, 2001). Some researchers even argue that negative and particularly confrontational news may stimulate mobilization (e.g., de Vreese & Tobiasen, 2007; Norris 2000), while others find evidence to the contrary and link it to increased political cynicism and scepticism (e.g., Capella & Jamieson, 1997; Bennett 2009;

Moy & Pfau, 2000). Concerning the study of immigration-related attitudes, negativity and negative tone have been shown to increase people's perception of immigration as more problematic relative to other policy issues (Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009). Schlueter and Davidov (2011) find a strong correlation between the volume of negative immigration related news reports and citizens' perceived immigration-related threat. This association is found to be particularly strong in regions with a small immigrant population. Crime as well as immigration related news also leads to increased likelihood of voting for anti-immigrant parties (Burscher et al., 2015).

A comparative study of news coverage in 16 western democracies shows that just after the topics "functioning of democracy, quality of governing and scandals" and "crime and judiciary", "immigration and integration" is the third most negative news topic in political news coverage (Esser et al., 2017). Generally, news about immigration seems to be strongly negative, with roughly 66 per cent negative and only 24 and 10 per cent positive and neutral coverage, respectively (Igartua et al., 2007). In the Netherlands, coverage of immigration strongly focuses on asylum seekers as well as Moroccan or Turkish immigrants. They are particularly depicted as breaking laws and causing a lot of problems in society. Coverage on other migrant groups such as immigrants from former Dutch colonies or particularly news stories about southern Europeans are much more positive in comparison (Lubbers et al., 1998). Similar results have been found for Belgian and German news, where non-EU ethnic minorities are much more likely to be associated with violent crime than natives or EU-immigrants (Ruhrmann et al., 2006; Jacobs, 2016). In some countries, migrants of a specific faith may be more stigmatized than others. Depictions of Jews are less negative in the Netherlands than those of immigrants of mostly Muslim countries (Lubbers et al., 1998) and Muslims get much more negative coverage in Germany than in British, French, or Italian news (Kolmer, 2012).

Taking a closer look at national political actors' statements on integration and immigration in media coverage, Helbling (2012) paints a less alarming, although somewhat ambivalent, picture. When it comes to negativity in coverage about immigration in Europe, negative evaluations seem to stem less from political actors in media coverage than from journalists themselves. This may have to do with journalists often portraying immigrants and refugees

REMINDER

very negatively as "masses" or "hordes", thus as enemies invading European countries. Migrants and predominantly refugees are often completely dehumanized by the use of terms referencing natural disasters (Charteris-Black, 2006; Gardikiotis, 2003; Ruhrmann, 2002, Nickels, 2007; Gabrielatos & Bakers, 2008; Rasinger, 2010) and by the use of "water themed" metaphors in particular (El Refaie, 2001). Ruhrmann et al. (2006) also find that, compared to citizens, immigrants are not only more often but also more negatively evaluated in German media coverage.

Negativity and tone of immigration-related issues and actors varies between media genres. Results suggest that coverage in tabloids is particularly more negative than that of quality newspapers (e.g., Statham, 2002; Cheregi, 2015; Lawlor, 2015; Kroon et al., 2016). Gabrielatos and Baker (2008) find that tabloids use nonsensical and strongly negatively biased terms such as "illegal refugee" and "bogus refugee" much more often than their broadsheet counterparts do. Additionally, the word "gypsy" (or "gipsy") is the most common collocation (68 times figured up) in tabloids in the UK when reporting about Roma, while broadsheets use these terms only eight times in conjunction with Roma overall (Vicol & Allen, 2014). A study comparing different television formats finds that ethnic minorities are portrayed more positively in talk shows than in any other television format (ter Wal, 2002). Furthermore, there are also differences between different types of media. Television news about immigration has been found to be much more negative than print news (e.g., Igartua et al., 2007; Ruhrmann et al., 2006). Sometimes liberal newspapers will exhibit more positive portrayals of immigrants than their conservative counterparts (Geißler, 2000). They may also focus on different dimensions of negativity, with conservative newspapers focusing more strongly on crime, while liberals on the somewhat more moderate issue of group-related problems (Lubbers et al., 1998).

In summation, the news topic of immigration is rather negatively depicted in media coverage across Europe. Immigration is often seen as a problem and as related to crime or even terrorism (Said, 1981; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009). This is also true for immigration-related actors, such as immigrants and refugees, who are dehumanized by the use of metaphors that refer most often to natural disasters. Media coverage does differentiate between different kinds of immigrants; intra-EU and non-Muslim immigrants in

REMINDER

particular are treated more favourably. Finally, the negativity of news coverage is media genre-, format-, and type-specific.

The media discourse of intra-EU mobility and non–EU migration across time and space

The media discourse on migration in Europe as a research subject in the field of communication science gained broader attention in the mid to late 1990s (e.g., Brosius & Eps, 1995; Lubbers, et al. 1998). However, periods of investigation date back to the 1970s (e.g, Geißler & Pöttker, 2006), mid 1980s (e.g., Coutin & Chock, 1995) and the 1990s (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998). While nowadays, the main focus of this research field lies on the media discourse about the so-called "refugee crisis" (e.g., Bloemraad, de Graauw & Hamlin, 2015; Caviedes, 2015; Horsti, 2016; Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017), earlier studies mostly examined other aspects of immigration, such as labour migration (for an overview see Geißler & Pöttker, 2006) or ethnic minorities (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998).

In Germany, beginning in the 1970s, the so-called "Gastarbeiter" (i.e., migrant workers, mainly from eastern and southern Europe) and their appearance in the news media were thoroughly investigated. An analysis of 84 daily newspapers in Germany revealed that "Gastarbeiter" were depicted mostly negatively and that newspapers emphasized sensationalism and implicated them in criminal activities (Delgado, 1972). This media discourse was very similar to that about minority groups in the US, although studies there often focused on race, rather than the country of origin of minorities. Drawing on results reported by Entman & Rojecki (2001), African Americans were more likely to be portrayed in relation to crime and presented as a symbol of threat than the white majority population. Furthermore, Canadian news coverage related to the Sikh community in 1974 shows similar patterns. The East Indian minority was associated with crime in just a little under 60 per cent of their overall media presence (Scanlon, 1975).

Since the 1970s, both immigration-related issues and actors have changed in salience and diversified. Indeed, studies that look at media coverage of immigration in Europe over a longer period find changes in the discourse (e.g., Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007, Ruhrmann et al., 2006). For example, studies find that the visibility of migration-related

REMINDER

issues in Dutch and British newspapers fluctuates considerably over time. While it was less salient in the middle of the 1990s, it increased strongly in salience after the new millennium (Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007; McLaren et al., 2017). This increase was particularly tied to the crisis in Kosovo, yet somewhat independent from actual asylum applications in the reporting countries (Gabrielatos & Bakers, 2008). Another study finds that between 1987 and 2003, migrant actors were portrayed as gradually more active (Ruhrmann et al., 2006). Others reveal that the focus on very specific groups of migrants increased over time. For example, van der Linden and Jacobs (2016) observe a steady increase in African immigrants being consistently depicted as a threat by Flemish television news.

Changes in the migration discourse in the media, like the exemplary ones outlined in this section, are driven by external events and contextual as well as political changes. While international events have only a temporary influence, institutional national events affect media coverage more permanently (Vliegenthart & Boomgaarden, 2007). Such an influence can be noticed during the violent attacks against asylum seekers in Germany in the 1990s. Different key events between August 1990 and July 1993 induced an increased amount of television news coverage related to 'foreigners and asylum seekers' (Brosius & Eps, 1995). Other possible events influencing media coverage on immigration were parliamentary elections (e.g., Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007) and real-world developments concerned with immigration (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Kroon et al., 2016; Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017).

There are several studies investigating media discourses on intra-EU mobility and non-EU migration into Europe within different European countries. In the UK, the media discourse on migration emphasizes aspects of costs and labour market impacts considerably more than news in Italy or France (Caviedes, 2015). Indeed, it seems that the role of the UK media is exceptional: While examining the editorials of 28 European newspapers, Pfetsch (2008) ascertains that the national press in Germany, France, Italy, and Spain showed a comparable openness towards EU scopes in terms of policy. In contrast, the UK media substantially differed from these patterns. For example, while no other country assessed the issue of European integration negatively in more than about 7 per cent of their articles, UK newspapers evaluated it as negative in 49 per cent of editorials (Pfetsch, 2008). In addition,

REMINDER

differences can be found when comparing the European discourse with media coverage related to immigration in countries from outside the EU (e.g., Lawlor, 2015; Benson, 2010). For instance, compared to the US, the French news coverage of migration-related issues shows a greater density of criticism (Benson, 2010).

Overall, when talking about the media discourse on migration, one needs to consider that this discourse has changed over the past decades and is strongly shaped by several political (e.g., Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007) and non-political (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009) events. While earlier studies focused mainly of ethnic minorities and labour migration (e.g., Delgado, 1972; Scanlon, 1975), today's research is centred on media coverage of refugee crises and European integration (e.g., d'Haenens & De Lange, 2001; Greussing & Boomgaarden, 2017; Balabanova & Balch, 2010). Still, while there are many similarities, there are also differences concerning the media discourse within Europe (e.g., Caviedes, 2015) as compared to countries from outside the EU (e.g., Lawlor 2015).

Conclusion

This review of research on media discourses about intra- and non-EU migration into Europe clearly shows that in fact, discourses on this topic are quite diverse. While generally, immigrants are underrepresented (e.g., ter Wal, 2002) and covered largely unfavourably (e.g., Said, 1981; Igartua et al., 2007), the visibility of immigration-related issues and actors may vary across time (e.g., Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007, Ruhrmann et al., 2006) and between countries (Kroon et al., 2016; Caviedes, 2015; Kolmer, 2012). In media coverage, political parties will also emphasize the issue of immigration differently, clearly reflecting their policy stances on the matter (Helbling, 2014). Furthermore, media discourses may differ based on countries being on the sending or receiving end of immigration (Balabanova & Balch, 2010). Even more relevant are the type of immigration, namely regular or irregular immigration, as well as the ethnicity of migrants and whether they are European or non-European (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998; Ruhrmann et al., 2006). Real-world events will shape the discourse over a short-time period, while shifts in the political landscape may lead to more long-term changes (e.g., Vliegenthart & Roggenband, 2007; Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2007; Kroon et al., 2016). Finally, media outlets' format (e.g., ter Wal, 2002;

REMINDER

Igartua et al., 2007; Ruhrmann et al., 2006) and political leaning (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998; Geißler, 2000), can strongly shape the media discourses about intra- and non-European migration into Europe. That in turn will eventually influence audiences' political attitudes (e.g., Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; McLaren et al., 2017) as well as party preferences (e.g., Burscher et al., 2015).

Although this literature review set out to focus on intra- as well as non-EU migration into Europe, our inquiry revealed that the issue of intra-European migration has remained widely understudied. Key works have shown how specific ethnic groups within Europe are portrayed in the media (e.g., Kroon et al., 2016; Cheregi, 2015; Meeusen & Jacobs, 2016). Even fewer, and somewhat older studies have tried to contrast immigrant groups within Europe to those that are non-European and pointed to strong differences in media reporting (e.g., Lubbers et al., 1998; Ruhrmann et al., 2006). Future research should therefore address these shortfalls by focusing more strongly on differences and similarities between discourses on intra- and non-EU mobility and migration; by establishing in more detail whether discourses do in fact distinguish between different nationalities and ethnicities; and by identifying how important these distinctions actually are. Such analyses should continue in the framework of past research analysing patterns of visibility as well as framing.

The bulk of research in this field has focused on traditional news media. Social media have largely stayed on the sidelines (although see Bennett, 2016; Prøitz, 2017). By ignoring this type of communication, social media discourses on intra- and non-EU mobility and migration have largely remained a black box. The same accounts for inter-media agenda-setting processes between the public, political actors, and the media may emanate from social media. By including social media in future research, we will be able to map media discourses of both traditional and alternative news media, and policy makers as well as the general public.

Finally, an extensive literature review also showed that the bulk of research in this field is restricted to a handful of European countries with often similar media systems. Research thus far does not allow for a proper mapping of a European discourse on intra- and non-EU mobility and migration into Europe. This is of particular importance, since scholars have

REMINDER

argued that not all EU-members take part equally in a European public sphere and media debate about European issues such as immigration and integration (Adam, 2007; Pfetsch, Adam & Eschner, 2008). To be able to properly map these discourses, in particular media coverage of newer member states such as Hungary, Poland, and Romania should therefore be studied in more detail and contrasted to long-time members or, in fact, former members.

REMINDER

References

Akkerman, T. (2011). Friend or foe? Right-wing populism and the popular press in Britain and the Netherlands. *Journalism, 12*(8), 931-945.

Allen, W. (2016). A Decade of Immigration in the British Press. Migration Observatory report, COMPAS, University of Oxford.

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse & Society, 19*(3), 273-306.

Baker, P. & McEnery, T. (2005). A corpus-based approach to discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in UN and newspaper texts. *Journal of Language and Politics, 4*(2), 197-226.

Balabanova, E., & Balch, A. (2010). Sending and receiving: The ethical framing of intra-EU migration in the European press. *European Journal of Communication, 25*(4), 382-397.

Balch, A., & Balabanova, E. (2016). Ethics, politics and migration: Public debates on the free movement of Romanians and Bulgarians in the UK, 2006–2013. *Politics, 36*(1), 19-35.

Bennett, W. L. (2009). News: The politics of illusion. 8th ed. New York: Longman.

Bennett, S. (2016). New "Crises," Old Habits: Online Interdiscursivity and Intertextuality in UK Migration Policy Discourses. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 1-21.

Benson, R. (2010). What makes for a critical press? A case study of French and US immigration news coverage. *The International Journal of Press/Politics, 15*(1), 3-24.

Bleich, E., Stonebraker, H., Nisar, H., & Abdelhamid, R. (2015). Media portrayals of minorities: Muslims in British newspaper headlines, 2001–2012. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(6), 942-962.

Blinder, S., & Allen, W. L. (2015). Constructing immigrants: Portrayals of migrant groups in British national newspapers, 2010–2012. International Migration Review.

Bloemraad, I., de Graauw, E., & Hamlin, R. (2015). Immigrants in the Media: Civic Visibility in the USA and Canada. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(6), 874-896.

Boomgaarden, H. G., & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Explaining the rise of anti-immigrant parties: The role of news media content. *Electoral studies, 26*(2), 404-417.

Boomgaarden, H. G., & Vliegenthart, R. (2009). How news content influences anti immigration attitudes: Germany, 1993–2005. *European Journal of Political Research, 48*(4), 516-542.

REMINDER

Boomgaarden, H. G., Vliegenthart, R., De Vreese, C. H., & Schuck, A. R. (2010). News on the move: Exogenous events and news coverage of the European Union. *Journal of European Public Policy, 17*(4), 506-526.

Bos, L., Van der Brug, W., & De Vreese, C. (2011). How the media shape perceptions of right-wing populist leaders. *Political Communication, 28*(2), 182-206.

Breen, M.J., Haynes, A. and Devereux, E. (2006), 'Fear, Framing and Foreigners: The Othering of Immigrants in the Irish Print Media'. *International Journal of Critical Psychology, 16*, 100-121.

Brosius, H. B., & Eps, P. (1995). Prototyping through key events: News selection in the case of violence against aliens and asylum seekers in Germany. *European Journal of Communication, 10*(3), 391-412.

Brüggemann, M. (2014). Between frame setting and frame sending: How journalists contribute to news frames. *Communication Theory, 24*(1), 61-82.

Burscher, B., van Spanje, J., & de Vreese, C. H. (2015). Owning the issues of crime and immigration: The relation between immigration and crime news and anti-immigrant voting in 11 countries. *Electoral Studies, 38*, 59-69.

Cappella, J. N., & Jamieson, K. H. (1997). *Spiral of cynicism: The press and the public good*. Oxford University Press.

Caviedes, A. (2015). An emerging 'European'news portrayal of immigration?. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(6), 897-917.

Charteris-Black, J. (2006). Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign. *Discourse & Society, 17*(5), 563-581.

Cheng, L., Igartua, J. J., Palacios, E., Acosta, T., & Palito, S. (2014). Framing immigration news in Spanish regional press. *International Migration, 52*(6), 197-215.

Cheregi, B. F. (2015). The media construction of identity in anti-immigration discourses: the case of Romanian immigrants in Great Britain. *Revista Româna de Jurnalism si Comunicare, 10*(1), 5.

Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci., 10*, 103-126. Coutin, S. B., & Chock, P. P. (1995). "Your friend, the illegal:" Definition and paradox in newspaper accounts of US immigration reform. *Identities, 2*(1-2), 123-148.

De Vreese, C. H., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2006). Media effects on public opinion about the enlargement of the European Union. *Journal of Common Market Studies, 44*(2), 419-436.

De Vreese, C. H., Boomgaarden, H. G., & Semetko, H. A. (2011). (In) direct framing effects: The effects of news media framing on public support for Turkish membership in the European Union. *Communication Research, 38*(2), 179-205.

De Vreese, C. H, Peter, J., & 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), 107-122.

De Vreese, C., & Tobiasen, M. (2007). Conflict and Identity: Explaining Turnout and Anti integrationist Voting in the Danish 2004 Elections for the European Parliament. *Scandinavian Political Studies, 30*(1), 87-114.

Delgado, J. M. (1972). *Die Gastarbeiter in der Presse: eine inhaltsanalytische Studie*. Leske. d'Haenens, L., & De Lange, M. (2001). Framing of asylum seekers in Dutch regional newspapers. *Media, Culture & Society, 23*(6), 847-860.

Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication, 43*(4), 51-58.

Entman, R. M., & Rojecki, A. (2001). *The black image in the white mind: Media and race in America* (pp. 28-29). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Esser, F., Engesser, S., Matthes, J., & Berganza, R. (2017) Negativity. In de Vreese, C. H., Esser, F. & Hopmann, D. N., Comparing Political Journalism. London and New York: Routledge

European Commission, Brussels; Directorate General Communication COMM.A.1 ´Strategy, Corporate Communication Actions and Eurobarometer´ (2016): *Eurobarometer 85.2* (2016). GESIS Data Archive, Cologne. ZA6694 Data file Version 1.0.0, doi:10.4232/1.12633

Eveland Jr, W. P., & Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Connecting news media use with gaps in knowledge and participation. *Political communication, 17*(3), 215-237.

Ferree, M. M., Gamson, W. A., Gerhards, J., & Rucht, D. (2002). Four models of the public sphere in modern democracies. *Theory and society, 31*(3), 289-324.

Gabrielatos, C., & 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.

Gardikiotis, A. (2003). Minorities and crime in the Greek press: Employing content and discourse analytic approaches. *Communications-Sankt Augustin then Berlin-, 28*(3), 339-350.

Geißler, R. (2000). Bessere Präsentation durch bessere Repräsentation. *In Migranten und Medien (pp. 129-146).* VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Geißler, R., & Pöttker, H. (2006). Mediale Integration von Migranten. Ein Problemaufriss. Integration durch Massenmedien. *In: Medien und Migration im internationalen Vergleich (pp. 13-42).*

REMINDER

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. Harvard University Press.

Greussing, E., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2017). Shifting the refugee narrative? An automated frame analysis of Europe's 2015 refugee crisis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-26.

Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004*). Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics.* Cambridge university press.

Helbling, M. (2012). Public debates, integration models, and transnationalism in Western Europe. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies, 10*(3), 241-259.

Helbling, M. (2014). Framing immigration in Western Europe. Journal of Ethnic and *Migration Studies, 40*(1), 21-41.

Hellsten, I., Dawson, J., & Leydesdorff, L. (2010). Implicit media frames: Automated analysis of public debate on artificial sweeteners. *Public Understanding of Science, 19*(5), 590-608.

Hobolt, S. B. (2016). The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent. *Journal of European Public Policy*, *23*(9), 1259-1277.

Hömberg, W., & Schlemmer, S. (1994). Fremde als Objekt. Asylberichterstattung in deutschen Tageszeitungen. *Communicatio Socialis, 27*(4), 317-338.

Horsti, K. (2008). Europeanisation of public debate: Swedish and Finnish news on African migration to Spain. *Javnost-the public, 15*(4), 41-53.

Horsti, K. (2016). Visibility without voice: Media witnessing irregular migrants in BBC online news journalism. *African Journalism Studies, 37*(1), 1-20.

Igartua, J. J., Barrios, I. M., & Ortega, F. (2012). Analysis of the Image of Immigration in Prime Time Television Fiction1/Análisis de la imagen de la inmigración en la ficción televisiva de prime time. *Comunicación y sociedad, 25*(2), 5.

Igartua, J. J., Barrios, I. M., Ortega, F., & Frutos, F. J. (2014). The Image of Immigration in Fiction Broadcast on Prime-time Television in Spain. *Palabra Clave, 17*(3), 589-618.

Igartua, J. J., Muñiz, C., Otero, J. A., & de la Fuente, M. (2007). El tratimiento informativo de la inmigración en los medios de communicación espagñoles. Un análisis de contenido desde la Teoría del Framing. Estudios sobre el Mensaje Period´stico 13, 91-110.

Jacobs, L. (2016). Patterns of criminal threat in television news coverage of ethnic minorities in Flanders (2003–2013). *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1-21.

Kleinen-von Königslöw, K., Meyer, T., Vonbun, R., Wagner, M., & Winkler, A. K. (2014). Die Sachthemen im Wahlkampf. In S. Kritzinger, W. C. Müller & K. Schönbach (ed.). Die

REMINDER

Nationalratswahl 2013. W*ie Parteien, Medien und Wählerschaft zusammenwirken* (pp. 39-66). Wien: Böhlau.

Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2008). Negativity. In W. Donsbach (ed.), The international encyclopedia of communication (pp. 3188-3192). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Kolmer, C. (2012). Gläubige Menschen – eine verdrängte Minderheit. Religion in den Medien 2007-2012 [Religious People – A Marginalized Minority. Religion in the Media 2007-2012]. In D. Amaca & R. Schatz (eds.), Integrationsindex. Beirut: Innvoatio.

Kroon, A. C., Kluknavská, A., Vliegenthart, R., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2016). Victims or perpetrators? Explaining media framing of Roma across Europe. *European Journal of Communication, 31*(4), 375-392.

Krüger, U. M., & Simon, E. (2005). Das Bild der Migranten im WDR Fernsehen. Ergebnisse einer empirischen Programmanalyse. *Media Perspektiven, 3*(2005), 105-114.

Law, I., Svennevig, M., & Morrison, D. E. (1997). *Privilege and silence.'Race'in the British news during the general election campaign.* Research report for the Commission of Racial Equality. Leeds: University of Leeds Press.

Lawlor, A. (2015). Local and national accounts of immigration framing in a cross-national perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 41*(6), 918-941.

Lengauer, G., Esser, F., & Berganza, R. (2012). Negativity in political news: A review of concepts, operationalizations and key findings. *Journalism, 13*(2), 179-202.

Light, D., & Young, C. (2009). European Union enlargement, post-accession migration and imaginative geographies of the 'New Europe': Media discourses in Romania and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Cultural Geography, 26*(3), 281-303.

Lubbers, M., Scheepers, P., & Wester, F. (1998). Ethnic minorities in Dutch newspapers 1990-5: Patterns of criminalization and problematization. *Gazette (Leiden, Netherlands), 60*(5), 415-431.

McCombs, M. (2005). A look at agenda-setting: Past, present and future. *Journalism studies, 6*(4), 543-557.

McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public opinion quarterly, 36*(2), 176-187.

McCombs, M., & Reynolds, A. (2009). How the news shapes our civic agenda. *Media effects: Advances in theory and research*, 1-16.

McKay, F. H., Thomas, S. L., & Warwick Blood, R. (2011). 'Any one of these boat people could be a terrorist for all we know!'Media representations and public perceptions of 'boat people'arrivals in Australia. *Journalism, 12*(5), 607-626.

REMINDER

McLaren, L., Boomgaarden, H., & Vliegenthart, R. (2017). News Coverage and Public Concern About Immigration in Britain. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research*.

McQuail, D. (1994). *Mass communication*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Meeusen, C., & Jacobs, L. (2016). Television News Content of Minority Groups as an Intergroup Context Indicator of Differences Between Target-Specific Prejudices. *Mass Communication and Society,* 1-28.

Moy, P., & Pfau, M. (2000). *With malice toward all?: The media and public confidence in democratic institutions.* Greenwood Publishing Group.

Nickels, H. C. (2007). Framing asylum discourse in Luxembourg. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 20*(1), 37-59.

Norris, P. (2000). *A virtuous circle: Political communications in postindustrial societies*. Cambridge University Press.

Pfetsch, B. (2008). Agents of transnational debate across Europe: The press in emerging European public sphere. *Javnost-The Public, 15*(4), 21-40.

Potthoff, M. (2012). *Medien-Frames und ihre Entstehung*. Springer-Verlag.

Prøitz, L. (2017). Visual social media and affectivity: the impact of the image of Alan Kurdi and young people's response to the refugee crisis in Oslo and Sheffield. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-16.

Rasinger, S. M. (2010). 'Lithuanian migrants send crime rocketing': representation of 'new'migrants in regional print media. *Media, Culture & Society, 32*(6), 1021-1030.

Refaie, El (2001) "Metaphors We Discriminate By: Naturalized Themes in Austrian Newspaper Articles About Asylum Seekers", *Journal of Sociolinguistics 5*(3): 352–371

Roggeband, C., & Vliegenthart, R. (2007). Divergent framing: The public debate on migration in the Dutch parliament and media, 1995–2004. *West European Politics, 30*(3), 524-548.

Ruhrmann, G. (2002). Eindimensional, selten und auf Kriminalität reduziert. Berichterstattung über MigrantInnen in deutschen Medien. *Zeitschrift für Kommunikationsökologie, 2002*, 21-25.

Ruhrmann, G., Sommer, D., & Uhlemann, H. (2006). *TV-Nachrichtenberichterstattung über Migranten–Von der Politik zum Terror TV-Coverage about Immigrants–From Politics to Terror. Integration durch Massenmedien. Mass Media-Integration,* Bielefeld: tanscript Verlag, 45-75.

Said, E. (1981). *Orientalism*, NY, 1978. Covering Islam.

REMINDER

Scanlon, T. J. (1975). *The Sikhs of Vancouver: a case study of the role of the media in ethnic relations.* Carleton University.

Schemer, C. (2014). Media effects on racial attitudes: Evidence from a three-wave panel survey in a political campaign. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research, 26*(4), 531-542.

Schlueter, E., & Davidov, E. (2013). Contextual sources of perceived group threat: Negative immigration-related news reports, immigrant group size and their interaction, Spain 1996–2007. *European Sociological Review*, *29*(2), 179-191.

Schuck, A. R., & De Vreese, C. H. (2006). Between risk and opportunity: News framing and its effects on public support for EU enlargement. *European Journal of Communication, 21*(1), 5-32.

Snow, D. A., Vliegenthart, R., & Corrigall-Brown, C. (2007). Framing the French riots: A comparative study of frame variation. *Social Forces, 86*(2), 385-415.

Sparks, C. (2000). Introduction. In C. Sparks and J. Tulloch (eds.), T*abloid Tales: Global Debates over Media Standards* (pp. 1-40). Oxford and Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers

Statham, P. (2002). United Kingdom. In J. ter Wal (ed.), *Racism and Cultural Diversity in the Mass Media. A Review of Research in 15 EU Member States* (pp. 395-420). Vienna: European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia.

Ter Wal, J. (2002). *Racism and cultural diversity in the mass media. An overview of research and examples of good practice in the EU Member States, 1995-2000*. European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia: Vienna.

Ter Wal, J., d'Haenens, L., & Koeman, J. (2005). (Re) presentation of ethnicity in EU and Dutch domestic news: a quantitative analysis. *Media, Culture & Society, 27*(6), 937-950.

Terkildsen, N., & Schnell, F. (1997). How media frames move public opinion: An analysis of the women's movement. *Political research quarterly, 50*(4), 879-900.

The Telegraph (2016). Angela Merkel has finally admitted the trust about the EU's freedom of movement: no one wants it anymore. November 16, 2016, URL: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2016/11/16/angela-merkel-has-finally-admitted-the-truth-about-the-eus-freed/

Valentino, N.A., T.A. Buhr, and M.N. Beckmann. 2001. "When the Frame Is the Game: Revisiting the Impact of `Strategic' Campaign Coverage on Citizens' Information Retention ." *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly 78*(1), 93-112.

Van der Linden, M., & Jacobs, L. (2016). The impact of cultural, economic, and safety issues in Flemish television news coverage (2003–13) of North African immigrants on perceptions of intergroup threat. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 1-19.

REMINDER

Van Gorp, B. (2005). Where is the frame? Victims and intruders in the Belgian press coverage of the asylum issue. *European Journal of Communication, 20*(4), 484-507.

Van Klingeren, M., Boomgaarden, H., Vliegenthart, R., & de Vreese, C. H. (2015). Real world is not enough: The media as an additional source of negative attitudes towards immigration. *European Sociological Review, 31*(3), 268–283.

Vicol, D. O., & Allen, W. (2014). Bulgarians and Romanians in the British National Press, 1 December 2012-1 December 2013. Migration Observatory Report, COMPAS: University of Oxford.

Vliegenthart, R., & Roggeband, C. (2007). Framing immigration and integration: Relationships between press and parliament in the Netherlands. *International Communication Gazette, 69*(3), 295-319.

Vliegenthart, R., & Van Zoonen, L. (2011). Power to the frame: Bringing sociology back to frame analysis. *European Journal of Communication, 26*(2), 101-115.

Vliegenthart, R., Boomgaarden, H. G., & Boumans, J. W. (2011). Changes in political news coverage: Personalization, conflict and negativity in British and Dutch newspapers. *In Political communication in postmodern democracy* (pp. 92-110). Palgrave Macmillan: UK.

Walgrave, S., & De Swert, K. (2004). The making of the (issues of the) Vlaams Blok. *Political Communication, 21*(4), 479-500.

Young, L., & Soroka, S. (2012). Affective news: The automated coding of sentiment in political texts. *Political Communication, 29*(2), 205-231.

Zaller, J. (1991). Information, values, and opinion. *American Political Science Review, 85*(04), 1215-1237.

REMINDER

REMINDER

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

The REMINDER project is exploring the economic, social, institutional and policy factors that have shaped the impacts of free movement in the EU and public debates about it.

The project is coordinated from COMPAS and includes participation from 12 consortium partners in 8 countries across Europe