Migrants, Minorities and the Media: Information, Representations and Participation in the Public Sphere

Erik Bleich, Irene Bloemraad & Els de Graauw
Published online: 09 Feb 2015.

CrossMark

Click for updates

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Migrants, Minorities and the Media: Information, Representations and Participation in the Public Sphere

Erik Bleich, Irene Bloemraad and Els de Graauw

Scholars of political communication have stressed the critical role of the media in modern liberal democracies (Bennett and Entman 2001; Chong and Druckman 2007; Koopmans and Statham 2010; McCombs 2004; Norris 2000). The media inform the public, provide a communicative bridge between political and social actors, influence perceptions of pressing issues, depict topics and people in particular ways and may shape individuals' political views and participation. Despite this critical role, students of migrants and minorities have rarely used systematic media analysis in their scholarship. We believe that the time is ripe to review how a focus on the media can help advance a field that traditionally has been explored with other types of data. In this special issue, we showcase a diverse set of new research to illustrate the ways in which media analysis advances our knowledge about migrants and minorities in the public sphere.

Understanding the factors that shape media coverage of migrants and minorities, as well as the effect of that coverage on public attitudes, policy outcomes or social relations, has a modest but growing foundation. To further advance our knowledge, this special issue is oriented around a comparative approach. Media coverage may be copious or minimal, positive or negative, social or political. These axes of difference can be examined across time; across regions, countries or cities; between media outlets of different types, political stripes or economic ownership structures; and with reference to a wide range of migrant or minority groups and issues, spanning asylum to security, integration to racial discrimination. Comparative analysis connects

Erik Bleich is Professor, Department of Political Science, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT, USA. Correspondence to: Department of Political Science, Middlebury College, Middlebury, VT 05753, USA. E-mail: ebleich@middlebury.edu. Irene Bloemraad is Associate Professor, Department of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA, USA. Correspondence to: Department of Sociology, 442 Barrows Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, CA 94720-1980, USA. E-mail: bloemr@berkeley.edu. Els de Graauw is Assistant Professor, Department of Political Science, Baruch College, the City University of New York, New York, NY, USA. Correspondence to: Department of Political Science, One B. Baruch Way, Box B5-280, Baruch College, the City University of New York, New York, NY 10010-5585, USA. E-mail: Els.deGraauw@baruch.cuny.edu.

studies on the media, migrants and minorities to broader research questions in comparative politics, sociology and communication studies, and establishes baselines for further comparative work in these fields.

Beyond comparison, we are also struck by how recent changes in archiving and computer analysis have produced an explosion of raw media data to be analysed, as well as new techniques for doing so. These tools allow scholars to undertake much broader and deeper comparisons than ever before. Archives of print media are now easy to search, and archives of radio, television and web-based media are improving. Sophisticated software programs and greater computing power provide even beginning researchers with the ability to analyse hundreds if not thousands of pages of articles, transcripts and commentary from a laptop computer. The possibilities are exciting, even if the challenges of coding and interpreting data from these rich resources can be daunting and should not be underestimated.

In what follows, we first examine what migration and minority scholars gain theoretically by examining the media. We delineate three ways to connect media studies to scholarship on migrants and minorities, focused on information, representations and participation. We concentrate on the media as a source of news and forum for public discussion, leaving for others the study of entertainment media. We next raise some critical methodological issues: how do we choose media sources to study? How do we sample media production? How do we code and analyse the data? In discussing substantive interventions as well as methodological challenges, we situate the contributions in this special issue in the broader research landscape and show how they shed new light on some of these issues. All the contributions explicitly rely on comparison, and most leverage the growing data in media archives. Given that archiving has gone furthest for print media, many of the contributors rely on newspaper analysis, although we also touch on web-based public commentary. We end by concisely summarising the contributions in this issue, and then drawing out themes that emerge across the articles, as well as outlining directions for further research.

What Do We Learn from Media Research for the Study of Migrants and Minorities?

Although some cast 'the media' as a singular entity, they are in fact a complex set of institutions, with tremendous internal variation. For our purposes, we view the media as a range of communication sources that transfer information from producers to consumers; increasingly, with internet-based and social media, consumers are also producers engaged in more direct exchanges than in traditional newspapers, magazines, TV and radio. The reach of the media can be very small and circumscribed—a small-town newspaper or a community television station watched by a few hundred people—or extremely broad. The *New York Times* is estimated to reach 1.9 million people, a circulation figure that does not capture people who look at

an occasional article online.[1] The BBC World Service claims to reach an audience of 192 million individuals around the globe.[2]

How and why are the media of interest to scholars of migrants and minorities? Three areas stand out: (i) the media provide a source of information about groups or issues related to migration and diversity; (ii) the media convey or construct particular representations of minorities and immigrants, including negative depictions; and (iii) the media act as a space for the participation of migrants and minorities in a public sphere where they can advance their interests and identities.[3] As we discuss below, these areas are not mutually exclusive, and scholars use key analytical concepts such as gatekeeping, framing, priming and agenda-setting across them. Also, across each area, we find some scholars who view the media as an important subject of study in their own right by virtue of being a window on society (e.g., Benson 2013; Chavez 2001; Santa Ana 2002), while others examine whether information, representations and participation in the media influence other phenomena, such as public opinion and policymaking (e.g., Baumgartner and Jones 2009; Iyengar 1991; Kingdon 1995; Soroka 2002).

Information and the Media: Visibility, Agenda-setting and Framing

Among the clauses of the First Amendment of the US Constitution is the provision that no law may abridge the freedom of the press. Whether embedded in constitutions, legislation, policies or norms, similar provisions across liberal democracies reflect a longstanding claim about the importance of the media: freedom of the press is necessary for an informed citizenry and robust democracy by enriching the marketplace of ideas. While scholars often recognise the limits of this lofty vision— the question of who owns the press and who produces the news is one longstanding concern (Gans 1979)—the general notion of media as a means to generate informed public discourse is prominent in much academic work (e.g., Koopmans and Statham 2010; Norris 2000).

Interest in a 'marketplace of ideas' leads media scholars to ask about the quantity, quality and type of information presented by the media. Researchers examine the presence of information about groups and topics—that is, the visibility of certain types of individuals or political and social issues—as well as the way information is conveyed and presented. A simple view is that the media report on the happenings of the day. Yet, only a small number of 'events' appears in the pages of a newspaper, on the television screen, on radio airwaves or on the internet. The media thus serve as gatekeepers that determine what is 'public' and hold agenda-setting power through their selection of which information to report, at times in ways that are not in keeping with objective reality (Baumgartner and Jones 2009; McCombs 2004; Soroka 2012; Vliegenthart and Boomgaarden 2007). The media can thus flag some concerns as having greater relevance than others, either directly through the work of journalists and media owners, or indirectly, by allowing some issues to be covered while ignoring or not seeing others.

The general thrust of agenda-setting research can be extended to coverage of particular migrant and minority groups. Santa Ana (2013), for example, finds that the proportion of network television news coverage devoted to Latinos is dramatically lower than the percentage of the Latino population in the United States. In a similar vein, Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin (2015) count mentions of Vietnamese- and Indian-origin communities in four regional North American newspapers to judge whether the 'civic visibility' of a group reflects demographic patterns. They find no such link, raising the question of why some groups receive more coverage than others.

Beyond their presence or absence, groups and issues can also be presented in particular ways. The concept of 'frames' or 'framing' is highly relevant, though it is used somewhat differently across academic fields.[4] Particularly germane to media studies is the idea of 'framing effects': the notion that how an issue is described or labelled shapes public opinion (Gamson and Modigliani 1987, 1989). Early research showed dramatic effects in how wording or highlighting certain information shifts opinion in surveys (e.g., Nelson and Kinder 1996; Rasinski 1989; Zaller 1992). Extended to the media, scholars seek to understand how the framing of issues reflects particular biases or might influence public attitudes, such as views about the European Union (Azrout, van Spanje, and de Vreese 2012). Caviedes (2015) takes on the question of framing when he asks whether right-leaning newspapers in three European countries systematically link stories about immigration to security-related concerns or if they are more apt to view immigration through an economic lens.

Visibility in the media, agenda-setting and framing are of obvious interest to scholars of migrants and minorities, but these topics have been insufficiently explored to date. Benson (2013) shows that American media are much more likely than their French counterparts to convey immigration news from an individualist, market-oriented perspective and to write personalised 'dramatic narrative' stories. Contributors to Dell'Orto and Birchfield's volume (2013) explore the distinct ways that journalists on the migration beat approach the topic in the United States and the European Union. These excellent contributions notwithstanding, we still know little about how those who work in the media collect and convey information about migrants and minorities. Similarly, while we have a rich scholarship on public opinion about immigration and towards immigrants (see Ceobanu and Escandell 2010 for one review), we know less about how media shape attitudes and views related to immigrants and immigration (but see Boomgaarden and Vliegenthart 2007, 2009; Dunaway, Branton, and Abrajano 2010). Are migrant and minority issues covered accurately? Are different groups covered in proportion to their presence in society? Is the information circulated in the media—even if accurate—prone to prime audiences for a certain type of response or to influence the direction of policymaking? There is still much work to be done on the media as a source of information about migrants and minorities.

Representations and the Media: How Migrants and Minorities Are Portrayed

Researchers also examine how the tone of media representations affects the views of ordinary people or those in politics. Research has often centred on negative depictions that might reflect a deeper, underlying racism, nativism or Islamophobia in the media or, if we view the media as a mirror on society, a reflection of broader public attitudes and institutional biases. The concept of framing is also relevant here; for example, if stories about migrants and minorities consistently have a criminality or economic threat frame, they may convey a representation of those groups as deeply problematic for society as a whole. Other scholars go further, undertaking semantic deconstruction of texts (or images) to provide deep interpretative analyses that pay attention to metaphor, rhetoric and narrative. Studies of migrants and minorities frequently put representations of race, religion and, increasingly, legal status at centre stage in media studies, helping to bridge their own disciplines and scholarship on media and communication.

Among media scholars, studies of representations have examined myriad groups, such as media frames of women (Goodyear-Grant 2013; Terkildsen and Schnell 1997), American print media representations of China (Liss 2003), and biases in Canadian media over heteronormativity and ageism (Fleras 2011). Scholars focusing on migrants and minorities have also taken up this charge, arguably the area in which studies of migrants, minorities and the media have developed the most. As early as the 1980s, Said (1981) asserted that media frequently portray Islam as synonymous with terrorism and fanaticism. Studying coverage of Muslims and Islam expanded exponentially in the wake of the British NGO Runnymede Trust's (1997) report on Islamophobia, and has evolved recently to employ computer-assisted methodology to explore representations of Muslims in large swathes of the British press (Baker, Gabrielatos, and McEnery 2013).

In the United States, Entman and Rojecki (2000) examined media portrayals of African Americans, concluding that they convey a racial hierarchy and promote differences and conflict. This finding resonates with Santa Ana's (2013) analysis of television coverage, in which he highlights how metaphorical portrayals of Latinos likely contribute to negative public perceptions. Chavez (2001) also combines visual and narrative analysis, examining front-page coverage of immigration across 10 popular American magazines from 1965 to 1999. He finds that migration is more often portrayed as a threat and invasion, especially when it comes to undocumented and Latino migration, while coverage of refugees is centred more on humanitarianism and positive stories, especially if published around July 4th, America's national Independence Day. In this special issue, Tolley extends questions raised by Zilber and Niven (2000a, 2000b), who studied racially stereotypical coverage of black members of the U.S. Congress. She asks whether white and visible minority candidates running for federal office in Canada are portrayed as equally qualified for the job.

Scholars have also focused substantial attention on the effect of political ideology on issue framing and the communication of information. Media outlets, especially

print media in Europe, are often associated with particular political viewpoints. North American papers tend to be less associated with political viewpoints than their European counterparts, but even in the United States, Gentzkow and Shapiro (2010) find that newspapers hue closely to the political leanings of their target audience, a conclusion they base on a careful comparison of phrases used in newspapers and those articulated by Republican or Democratic members of Congress, such as labelling an inheritance tax either a 'death tax' or an 'estate tax'. Bleich and colleagues (2015) investigate differences in representations of Muslims between right-leaning and left-leaning British newspapers. Perhaps not surprisingly for observers of the British press, they find that right-wing papers in Great Britain portray Muslims in a more negative light compared to left-wing papers.

Many authors who study negative media portrayals view them as a reflection of broader societal representations, and as a possible causal force, influencing people, group relations and institutions. On the effects of media representations, scholars often focus on public opinion and policy outcomes. Gilliam and Iyengar (2000) have used experimental methods to suggest that the prevalence of racialised crime reporting increases support for heavier penalties for crime in general and generates negative attitudes towards African Americans in particular. Boomgaarden and Vliegenthart (2007, 2009) examine the role of news media on the rise of anti-immigrant parties and anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe. At the same time, Merolla, Ramakrishnan, and Haynes (2012) find that efforts to describe and frame immigrants as either 'undocumented' or 'illegal' have less influence on public opinion than frames about immigration policies. From the perspective of scholars of migrants and minorities, the relevance of framing and representation is clear: it is vital to understand how different groups are portrayed and the extent to which media representations affect public opinion, political mobilisation and policy outcomes.

Participation and the Media: Production and Claims-making

Finally, researchers can approach the media from the angle of democratic participation. This entails both the question of who participates in the creation and dissemination of media products, as well as analysis of the political and social contestation enacted in the media, from claims-making in news reports to arguments advanced on social media platforms.

In terms of production, media scholars study the demographic backgrounds of journalists, the ownership of media corporations, and the relative democracy (or inequality) in social media participation and creation. In Canada, a survey of newspapers found that 4.8 percent of reporters were 'visible minorities', or non-white, a proportion far below the estimated 24.7 percent of visible minorities in the papers' markets (Miller 2006). Other studies compare coverage by minority and non-minority journalists (Cottle 2000) or provide examples of how minority journalists can carry issues into the public spotlight when working for non-minority outlets (Coates 2014). Researchers also identify inequalities on the web, whether in the creation of videos or blog postings, or participation in chat rooms or social platforms,

even though the internet is often heralded as a democratic media space. Schradie (2011) documents a significant class bias in web content creation based on survey data: those with more education and access to computers at home and work are more likely to produce material. Yi and Jung (2015) note the relative absence of foreigners in online debates about immigration and multiculturalism in Korea as well as their relative importance when they do contribute. Overall, the extent to which migrants and minorities are integrated into the institutions and sites of media production remains an underexplored area, especially compared to the extensive North American and European literature on immigrants' integration into other institutions, such as the labour market, schools, social networks and politics.

If minority voices are silenced or lack power in mainstream media outlets, one option is to generate 'ethnic' media targeting distinct racial, linguistic, religious or national-origin subgroups. Some authors stress the (tentatively) integrative function of the ethnic media in encouraging forms of participation among marginalised communities (Rigoni and Saitta 2012; Viswanath and Arora 2000; Yu and Ahadi 2010). Others highlight the ways in which the minority press provides a different window for its consumers on issues such as demographic trends or slave reparations compared to the mainstream media (Mastin, Campo, and Frazer 2005; Rodríguez 2007). Contributors to our special issue do not directly take up the topic of ethnic and minority media, but this is clearly a rich area for future research.[5]

Participation can also be considered through the lens of social and political debate enacted through the media (Helbling 2014; Koopmans and Statham 2010). In considering the myriad arenas within which public discourse can take place—from courts and legislatures to town hall assemblies and the streets—Ferree et al. identify the mass media as '*the* major site of political contest because all of the players in the polity process *assume* its pervasive influence (whether justified or not)' (2002, 10, emphasis in original). Mass media are, they contend, an arena in which political actors can judge the resonance of messages and see the counter-claims of others, reflecting not just cultural tropes and political consciousness among a 'public', but also shaping the public's views.

The media can thus be viewed as a site within which migrants and minorities can have voice and make claims. Drawing on social movements frameworks, Koopmans et al. (2005) highlight the claims articulated by migrants, minorities, their supporters and their opponents as conveyed by mainstream newspapers. They find that distinct national discursive opportunity structures shape how migrant and minority claims are asserted and conveyed, emphasising the interaction between national institutions, prevailing cultural constraints on discourse, and the types of claims articulated. More recently, Vanparys, Jacobs, and Torrekens (2013) have used a claims-making approach to understand the effect of dramatic events such as the terrorist attacks of 9/11 on the number and type of claims made about Muslims and Islam in different European settings, and Helbling (2014) has examined how political actors in six European countries have framed immigration across an eight-year timespan. Claims-making research focuses on how groups are able to participate as actors in the

mediatised public sphere, and the factors that affect their claims, extending a longstanding interest in migrants' and minorities' political participation to a new arena of the public sphere.

How Do We Study the Media? Difficult Methodological Choices

Selecting a methodology for research projects can be just as challenging as articulating a conceptual or theoretical approach to media analysis, and it is possible to see them as two sides of the same coin. Scholars first have to identify the type of media they will examine from the broad range available, from newspapers and the written press, to twentieth-century media varieties, especially television and radio, to the media of the twenty-first century, from digital versions of older media (electronic news, YouTube videos) to new forms, like social media and Twitter. As a practical matter, it is easier to study the written press because of better archiving, and it is easier to deal only with words during coding and analysis than to include an evaluation of visuals, as with television and magazines. There are also good substantive reasons for studying the print media, even as newspapers have fallen on difficult times. Flagship newspapers such as the *New York Times* in the United States and *Le Monde* in France often set the agenda of coverage by syndicating their news stories to other media outlets. Additionally, in the contemporary era, newspaper articles from virtually all sources are also published online (either verbatim or in a substantially similar form), thereby extending their impact well beyond the traditional local readership. Finally, printed newspapers are better at raising the public's awareness about a range of issues compared to other media types, including TV and online publications (Schoenbach, de Waal, and Lauf 2005).

However, even when narrowing a project to focus on newspapers—something done by most contributors to this special issue—researchers must make additional choices about studying politically left-leaning and right-leaning papers in markets where that distinction matters, choosing between more mainstream broadsheets versus 'tabloids', between 'national' and more local papers, and taking into account questions about ownership, such as whether a particular media outlet is publicly or commercially owned. Each of these permutations brings a new set of substantive questions to bear. For example, will immigrants be represented more sympathetically in left-wing newspapers as compared to right-wing ones? Is a 'national' discourse on migration so strong that portrayals are largely the same across local and national papers? Does corporate ownership matter for covering migration, for example, by framing it as an economic issue? Do tabloids link immigration more with crime than broadsheets? These are all questions taken up by the contributors of this special issue.

Beyond the selection of media sources, researchers also face consequential questions of data selection: how does one choose articles, or blog postings or radio reports, from among the thousands, if not millions, of stories available? Here, the intersection of archiving and computer search capacities is critical. Computers can be programmed to identify keywords, such as 'immigration' or 'Muslim' in the headline

or full-text of an article, but scholars still have to determine the appropriate string of words to search. Again, theoretical concerns intersect with methodology. In searching for data, the researcher is forced to reify certain constructions of minority groups over others. The decision to identify stories about 'Muslims' implicates different questions and perhaps distinct literatures as compared to a search for 'Pakistanis' or 'refugees' or 'black Britons'. Those who engage in media research must be highly attentive to how search terms and sampling might lead to particular conclusions.

Selection, searching and sampling are difficult enough. Even more challenging is the coding of the text, visuals and transcripts that come to represent 'media coverage'. As suggested by Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin (2015), researchers can learn much from simple counts—is a particular immigrant group visible or not to the public? But we can also consider the topic of a story as well as the tone. In terms of topic, scholars can investigate whether particular groups are associated with certain topics, for example, refugees and welfare use, or Muslims and terrorism. Such correlations can then be compared across time and space, as well as across types of media and minority groups, an approach taken by Caviedes (2015) and Lawlor (2015). A separate question is the tone of the coverage: if a story about refugees does talk about welfare use, is the account a sympathetic one (e.g., refugees need humanitarian assistance as they settle) or a negative portrayal (e.g., refugees strain the welfare state by staying on public benefits too long)? The overlap of topic and group (or place) reveals much, but the message left in the minds of readers or an audience can vary wildly depending on the tone or focus of coverage, as Tolley (2015) and Bleich and colleagues argue (2015).

Coding, whether of the written word, visuals or sound, also carries with it a decision—and often attendant trade-offs—between intensive, interpretative analysis of (usually) a relatively small number of texts, or broader quantitative content analysis, either by humans or computers, where particular words or word-strings are counted and examined. New software programs and more powerful computers are leading some social scientists to analyse literally millions of searches on websites like Google, or the trends in hundreds of thousands of tweets to predict the direction of the stock market or understand political mobilisation during the Arab Spring. These techniques can be applied to research on migrants, minorities and the media as well, as Tolley discusses (2015). Well-programmed computers can collect and analyse such data in a fraction of the time humans can, searches can be easily re-run if new hypotheses arise and, unlike human coders who become fatigued, bored or both, computers are 100 percent reliable in identifying and counting specified search terms.

Yet, at the same time, computers are less adept than humans at interpreting meaning, tone and the subtle cues of language and visual representation that often interest scholars of migrants and minorities most. How, precisely, can a computer identify 'racialisation'? While humans will disagree on such subjective evaluations—raising the issue of inter-coder reliability—the validity of their coding will almost certainly exceed that of a computer. Humans are socialised to cue meanings in particular contexts and to understand subtle uses of wording and metaphor. As Yi and

Jung (2015) discuss in their analysis of online debate over multiculturalism in South Korea, 'netizens' comment on both the content of others' posts as well as their tone. We take all of these methodological questions—from the selection of data sources and sampling to the practice of coding and analysis—as central to good scholarship. Decisions on methods and epistemology shape the questions researchers can answer, and perhaps even the types of answers they give. This special issue thus includes articles using computer-based coding and human coding, as well as both quantitative content analysis and more interpretative examination of tone and group portrayals.

Overview of Contributions and Broader Lessons Learned

The authors of this special issue address some but not all of the substantive and methodological issues we have raised, helping to move the study of migrants, minorities and the media forward, but also leaving many questions for future research. The articles are roughly organised along the substantive dimensions we identified above, namely, the media as a source of information, a site of representations, and an arena of participation. Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin use analysis of local media to ask how visible immigrant communities are to local residents: are they even mentioned within the public sphere? Empirically, they evaluate article counts to measure visibility and to explain variation in newspaper coverage by place and national-origin group. Examining the number of times the Vietnamese and Indian communities are reported on in San Jose, Boston, Vancouver and Toronto newspapers from 1985 to 2005, they find little evidence that demographics, newsrooms factors or simplified models of the national discursive opportunity structure affect the quantity of newspaper coverage. Instead, they advance an embedded context of reception approach that recognises the interplay between national opportunity structures and an immigrant group's specific mode of incorporation. This approach explains why Vietnamese refugees, rather than Indian economic migrants, are covered more extensively in the United States than Canada, and why immigrants' activism in domestic politics also links to greater coverage in local newspapers.

The article by Caviedes shifts the focus from counting a group's newspaper coverage to examining the topic with which immigrants and immigration are associated. His research examines the argument that there has been a growing 'securitisation' of immigration-related issues in Europe over the past decade or so. Analysing hundreds of articles about immigrants and the issue of immigration between 2008 and 2012 from the major centre-right newspapers in Britain, France and Italy, he investigates whether security-related topics predominate. While his research reveals that security themes—such as physical threat, crime and discussions of the border—are present, they have not yet overwhelmed economic stories about labour markets, asylum seekers and fiscal costs. By examining and coding the topics associated with immigrants and immigration, the media data that Caviedes assembles speak directly to a theoretical debate about how immigrants are represented in

Europe, and reveals similarities and differences in coverage across the three countries he studies.

Caviedes' analysis centres on 'national' newspapers, the most common approach in studies of migrants, minorities and the media, but in her contribution, Lawlor notes that media scholars advance good reasons to expect that local newspapers might frame immigration and migrant communities differently from national papers. To test this proposition, Lawlor uses automated coding to examine articles from 15 national and local Canadian and British newspapers from 2001 through 2012. She studies differences in the media framing of immigration by conducting cross-city, within-country and cross-national newspaper comparisons. She ultimately finds little support for the hypothesis that local newspapers, either in new or historic gateway cities, frame immigration differently from national newspapers in the same country. The main observable variation is across countries: Canadian newspapers use more economic frames, while British papers use more crime and security frames. Her research shows that even when immigrant populations and immigrant integration vary markedly across cities within a country, media discourse is remarkably nationalised and surprisingly inattentive to local context. This analysis could reassure scholars who study national newspapers that this approach may be generalisable across a country.

Scholars are also interested in the tone of coverage: are groups depicted in a favourable or negative light? Bleich and his co-authors take up this question when they examine over 1000 British newspaper headlines about Muslims, Jews and Christians from 2001 through 2012, coding each one for the positive or negative portrayal of the group. Their analysis nuances the widely accepted sense that the media consistently and overwhelmingly depict Muslims as problematic. Over the 12-year period they studied, they find that British newspaper headlines have been, overall, neutral in their tone about Muslims. At the same time, they uncover some systematic differences, too: right-leaning newspapers are more likely to portray Muslims negatively than left-leaning ones, and Muslims are portrayed more negatively than Jews or Christians. Their findings thus contribute to debates about Islamophobia and also demonstrate how headline analysis offers a new way to use the media to assess representations of migrants or minorities across time and in comparison to analogous groups.

Tolley's article also examines the degree of positive or negative media coverage. She takes head-on the thorny question of how one recognises or evaluates favourable or unfavourable coverage, assessing how political candidates' racial background might affect media coverage in electoral contests. To confront charges by some critics that media scholars 'find' racialisation because they are biased in favour of seeing it, Tolley uses both manual and automated content analysis of 18 national and local Canadian newspapers. Substantively, she finds that during the 2008 Canadian federal election, white and visible minority incumbents—those who have already held office—received coverage about their viability for office that was similar in tone. However, white challengers—those seeking to unseat an incumbent or hold a new office for the first

time—received relatively more positive coverage about their viability than visible minority challengers, a finding that she theorises using a framework of racial mediation. Methodologically, Tolley highlights the trade-offs of different ways of conducting content analysis on the same corpus of print media, considering efficiency, cost, reliability and validity, as well as whether conclusions vary by method.

Yi and Jung turn our attention to the media as an arena of participation, and provide an analysis of twenty-first-century media through their study of online discussion forums on multiculturalism in South Korea. They assess the contributions of elite-dominated mainstream media, pro-Korean 'netizens' and resident foreigners to domestic debates that take place in online communities. They suggest that nuanced, evidence-based comments can have a greater impact on the conversation, especially if they come from resident foreigners who are seen as relatively neutral observers. They also emphasise that more balanced discussions tend to occur in heterogeneous sites where discussion is open to a broader variety of contributors; homogeneous sites dominated either by elites or by Korean nationalists were more prone to employ simplistic 'victim' frames of, respectively, migrants or the native population. Yi and Jung therefore explore the complex ways in which an array of actors and types of sites contribute to debates about multiculturalism, reflecting the role of internet-based media in nurturing democratic participation about migrant- and minority-related topics.

Across the different contributions, a number of conclusions stand out. First, in each study that undertakes a cross-national comparison, the media analysis reveals some key national differences in the reporting on and coverage of migrant and minority groups or issues. This is the case across European countries (Caviedes), within North America (Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin) or across the Atlantic Ocean (Lawlor). More research is needed to understand why we see these differences, despite supra-national institutions like the European Union, or processes of globalisation that affect information flows, economies around the world, and migration patterns. Are media publics across countries distinct, and media coverage reflects this? Are journalists trained in different ways within domestic institutions? Are patterns of media ownership and production different across countries? At the same time—as Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin argue—evidence for cross-national differences does not mean that scholars can mechanically apply a 'national models' approach to comparative media research. Rather, national dynamics interact with distinct modes of incorporation for particular migrant groups, and immigrants also have some political agency that might influence coverage.

Another conclusion from the articles is that despite alarm over racialisation, Islamophobia, or the linkage of immigration to security threats, the empirical evidence for such negative portrayals is perhaps more muted than some fear. This is the case whether we consider racial differences in the reported 'quality' of political candidates in Canada (Tolley), the portrayal of Muslims in Great Britain (Bleich and co-authors), or frames of terrorism and crime used in reporting on immigration in

Britain, France and Italy (Caviedes). These findings can help nuance concerns about rampant animus within society—or, at least, the media—although in all three cases, the authors also report evidence of negative framing and tone, whether of non-white political challengers' abilities in Canada or more negative portrayals of Muslims in Britain as compared to Christians and Jews. The ability to see negativity in tone, as well as the nuances in representation, would not have been possible if authors did not engage in comparisons—across groups or countries—as a central part of their research design.

The theme of participation, either as part of media production and consumption, or as an indirect influence on media coverage, comes to the fore in a number of contributions. Bloemraad, de Graauw, and Hamlin speculate that the greater political visibility of Indian-origin individuals in electoral politics in Vancouver and Toronto might play a role in greater newspaper coverage of the community, raising the question of how participation in politics affects minorities' civic visibility in local media. Yi and Jung identify differences in online participation across types of actors, but also explore how individuals' identities and the venue of the discussion affect the likelihood of nuanced, evidence-based online conversations. They, thus, show how the contributions of particular actors and the character of the media in which they intervene can affect the quality of democratic participation itself.

The contributions in this special issue point to several fruitful directions for future research. In particular, we believe that comparison is critical; many existing media analyses consist of case studies of a particular group in one location. While these can be insightful, they are often limited to a description of media coverage that does not necessarily provide general lessons for future scholarship. The contributions to this special issue all exploit a comparative approach to tie their studies to broader debates about the relationship between migrants, minorities and the media. These lay the foundation for subsequent work that may investigate a parallel domain in a different country, a different time period or a different type of media outlet.

Extending from this core point, given the special issue's emphasis on the mainstream print media, we need more research on the coverage of migrants and minorities in other types of media, including ethnic media and social media. How much coverage do these 'non-traditional' media devote to migrants and minorities, and what frames do they use to discuss them? How do we measure the impact of different types of media on different target audiences? Are there differences across media venues in terms of information, representations and democratic participation with respect to migrants and minorities?

Finally, how does media coverage compare with other approaches for studying the public portrayal of migrants and minorities, such as analysis of government policies, public opinion polls, press releases and statements by advocacy organisations? Scholars have more commonly relied on these sources to interpret the ways in which migrants and minorities are viewed by the public. We believe that drawing on media sources will add substantially to our understanding of these groups' position in the public sphere. Yet, we also believe that grasping the similarities and differences

between the media and other sources of information, representations and democratic participation is critical to a well-rounded view of the place of migrants and minorities in contemporary societies.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Notes

[1]   See the newspaper circulation figures filed with the Alliance for Audited Media for 31 March 2013. At: http://www.auditedmedia.com/news/blog/top-25-us-newspapers-for-march-2013. aspx, last accessed 28 November 2014.
[2]   See BBC press release, 'Record audience figures as quarter of a billion people tune in to BBC's global news services', from 25 June 2013. At: http://www.bbc.co.uk/mediacentre/ latestnews/2013/global-audience-estimate, last accessed 28 November 2014.
[3]   See Murdock (2013, 44) on the relationship between information, representation and participation in studies of media and democracy.
[4]   For social movements scholars, the work of David Snow and his collaborators is foundational, notably their call for attention to 'the struggle over the production of mobilising' and 'counter-mobilising ideas' (Benford and Snow 2000, 613).
[5]   See also *JEMS* volume 31, issue 3 (2005), a special issue on minority media in multicultural Europe.

References

Azrout, Rachid, Joost van Spanje, and Claes de Vreese. 2012. "When News Matters: Media Effects on Public Support for European Union Enlargement in 21 Countries." *Journal of Common Market Studies* 50 (5): 691–708. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5965.2012.02255.x.
Baker, Paul, Costas Gabrielatos, and Tony McEnery. 2013. *Discourse Analysis and Media Attitudes: The Representation of Islam in the British Press*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Baumgartner, Frank R., and Bryan D. Jones. 2009. *Agendas and Instability in American Politics*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
Benford, Robert D., and David A. Snow. 2000. "Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment." *Annual Review of Sociology* 26: 611–639. doi:10.1146/annurev. soc.26.1.611.
Bennett, W. Lance, and Robert M. Entman. 2001. *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Benson, Rodney. 2013. *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
Bleich, Erik, Stonebraker, Hannah, Nisar, Hasher, and Abdelhamid, Rana. 2015. "Media Portrayals of Minorities: Muslims in British Newspaper Headlines, 2001–2012." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1002200.
Bloemraad, Irene, Els de Graauw, and Rebecca Hamlin. 2015. "Immigrants in the Media: Civic Visibility in the United States and Canada." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1002198.
Boomgaarden, Hajo G., and Rens Vliegenthart. 2007. "Explaining the Rise of Anti-immigrant Parties: The Role of News Media Content." *Electoral Studies* 26 (2): 404–417. doi:10.1016/j. electstud.2006.10.018.

Boomgaarden, Hajo G., and Rens Vliegenthart. 2009. "How News Content Influences Anti-immigration Attitudes: Germany, 1993–2005." *European Journal of Political Research* 48 (4): 516–542. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.01831.x.

Caviedes, Alexander. 2015. "An Emerging 'European' News Portrayal of Immigration?" *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies.* doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1002199.

Ceobanu, Alin M., and Xavier Escandell. 2010. "Comparative Analyses of Public Attitudes toward Immigrants and Immigration Using Multinational Survey Data: A Review of Theories and Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 36: 309–328. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102651.

Chavez, Leo. R. 2001. *Covering Immigration: Popular Images and the Politics of the Nation.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Chong, Dennis, and James N. Druckman. 2007. "Framing Theory." *Annual Review of Political Science* 10: 103–126.

Coates, Ta-Nahisi. 2014. "The Case for Reparations." *The Atlantic*, May 21, 2014.

Cottle, Simon. 2000. *Ethnic Minorities and the Media: Changing Cultural Boundaries.* Buckingham: Open University Press.

Dell'Orto, Giovanna, and Vicki L. Birchfield. 2013. *Reporting at the Southern Borders: Journalism and Public Debates on Immigration in the US and the EU.* Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.

Dunaway, Johanna, Regina P. Branton, and Marisa A. Abrajano. 2010. "Agenda Setting, Public Opinion, and the Issue of Immigration Reform." *Social Science Quarterly* 91 (2): 359–378.

Entman, Robert M., and Andrew Rojecki. 2000. *The Black Image in the White Mind: Media and Race in America.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ferree, Myra Marx, William A. Gamson, Jürgen Gerhards, and Dieter Rucht. 2002. *Shaping Abortion Discourse: Democracy and the Public Sphere in Germany and the United States.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fleras, Augie. 2011. *The Media Gaze: Representations of Diversities in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. 1987. "The Changing Culture of Affirmative Action." *Research in Political Sociology* 3: 131–177.

Gamson, William A., and Andre Modigliani. 1989. "Media Discourse and Public Opinion on Nuclear Power: A Constructionist Approach." *American Journal of Sociology* 95 (1): 1–37. doi:10.1086/229213.

Gans, Herbert J. 1979. *Deciding What's News: A Study of CBS Evening News, NBC Nightly News, Newsweek, and Time.* Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.

Gentzkow, Matthew, and Jesse M. Shapiro. 2010. "What Drives Media Slant? Evidence from U.S. Daily Newspapers." *Econometrica* 78 (1): 35–71. doi:10.3982/ECTA7195.

Gilliam Jr., Franklin D., and Shanto Iyengar. 2000. "Prime Suspects: The Influence of Local Television News on the Viewing Public." *American Journal of Political Science* 44 (3): 560–573. doi:10.2307/2669264.

Goodyear-Grant, Elizabeth. 2013. *Gendered News: Media Coverage and Electoral Politics in Canada.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Helbling, Marc. 2014. "Framing Immigration in Western Europe." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40 (1): 21–41. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2013.830888.

Iyengar, S. 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kingdon, John W. 1995. *Agendas, Alternatives, and Public Policies.* 2nd ed. New York: HarperCollins.

Koopmans, Ruud, and Paul Statham, eds. 2010. *The Making of a European Public Sphere.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Koopmans, Ruud, Paul Statham, Marco Giugni, and Florence Passy. 2005. *Contested Citizenship: Immigration and Cultural Diversity in Europe.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lawlor, Andrea. 2015. "Local and National Accounts of Immigration Framing in a Cross-National Perspective." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1001625.

Liss, Alexander. 2003. "Images of China in the American Print Media: A survey from 2000 to 2002." *Journal of Contemporary China* 12 (35): 299–318. doi:10.1080/1067056022000054614.

Mastin, Teresa, Shelly Campo, and M. Somjen Frazer. 2005. "In Black and White: Coverage of U.S. Slave Reparations by the Mainstream and Black Press." *Howard Journal of Communications* 16 (3): 201–223. doi:10.1080/10646170500207956.

McCombs, Maxwell. 2004. *Setting the Agenda: The Mass Media and Public Opinion*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Merolla, Jennifer, S. Karthick Ramakrishnan, and Chris Haynes. 2012. "'Illegal,' 'Undocumented,' or 'Unauthorized': Equivalency Frames, Issue Frames, and Public Opinion on Immigration." *Perspectives on Politics* 11 (3): 789–807. doi:10.1017/S1537592713002077.

Miller, John. 2006. "Who's Telling the News? Racial Representation among News Gatherers in Canada's Daily Newsrooms." *International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities and Nations* 5 (4): 133–142.

Murdock, Graham. 2013. "Media, Culture and Modern Times: Social Science Investigations." In *Handbook of Media and Communications Research: Qualitative and Quantitative Research Methodologies*, edited by Klaus Bruhn Jensen, 40–57. Hoboken, NJ: Taylor & Francis.

Nelson, Thomas E., and Donald R. Kinder. 1996. "Issue Frames and Group-centrism in American Public Opinion." *Journal of Politics* 58 (4): 1055–1078. doi:10.2307/2960149.

Norris, Pippa. 2000. *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Postindustrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rasinski, Kenneth A. 1989. "The Effect of Question Wording on Public Support for Government Spending." *Public Opinion Quarterly* 53 (3): 388–394. doi:10.1086/269158.

Rigoni, Isabelle, and Eugénie Saitta. 2012. *Mediating Cultural Diversity in a Globalised Public Space*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Rodríguez, Ilia. 2007. "Telling Stories of Latino Population Growth in the United States: Narratives of Inter-ethnic Conflict in the Mainstream, Latino and African-American Press." *Journalism* 8 (5): 573–590.

Runnymede Trust. 1997. *Islamophobia: A Challenge for Us All*. London: The Runnymede Trust.

Said, Edward W. 1981. *Covering Islam: How the Media and the Experts Determine How We See the Rest of the World*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Santa Ana, Otto. 2002. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Santa Ana, Otto. 2013. *Juan in a Hundred: The Representation of Latinos on Network News*. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Schoenbach, Klaus, Ester de Waal, and Edmund Lauf. 2005. "Research Note—Online and Print Newspaper: Their Impact on the Extent of the Perceived Public Agenda." *European Journal of Communication* 20 (2): 245–258. doi:10.1177/0267323105052300.

Schradie, Jen. 2011. "The Digital Production Gap: The Digital Divide and Web 2.0 Collide." *Poetics* 39 (2): 145–168. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2011.02.003.

Soroka, Stuart N. 2002. *Agenda-setting Dynamics in Canada*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Soroka, Stuart N. 2012. "The Gatekeeping Function: Distributions of Information in Media and the Real World." *Journal of Politics* 74 (2): 514–528. doi:10.1017/S002238161100171X.

Terkildsen, Nayda, and Frauke Schnell. 1997. "How Media Frames Move Public Opinion: An Analysis of the Women's Movement." *Political Research Quarterly* 50 (4): 879–900. doi:10.1177/106591299705000408.

Tolley, Erin. 2015. "Racial Mediation in the Coverage of Candidates' Political Viability: A Comparison of Approaches." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1002201.

Vanparys, Nathalie, Dirk Jacobs, and Corinne Torrekens. 2013. "The Impact of Dramatic Events on Public Debate Concerning Accommodation of Islam in Europe." *Ethnicities* 13 (2): 209–228. doi:10.1177/1468796812470899.

Viswanath, K., and Pamela Arora. 2000. "Ethnic Media in the United States: An Essay on Their Role in Integration, Assimilation, and Social Control." *Mass Communication and Society* 3 (1): 39–56. doi:10.1207/S15327825MCS0301_03.

Vliegenthart, Rens, and Hajo G. Boomgaarden. 2007. "Real-world Indicators and the Coverage of Immigration and the Integration of Minorities in Dutch Newspapers." *European Journal of Communication* 22 (3): 293–314.

Yi, Joseph, and Gowoon Jung. 2015. "Debating Multicultural Korea: Media Discourse on Migrants and Minorities in South Korea." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2014.1002202.

Yu, Sherry, and Daniel Ahadi. 2010. "Promoting Civic Engagement through Ethnic Media." *PLATFORM: Journal of Media and Communication* 2 (2): 54–71.

Zaller, John. 1992. *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Zilber, Jeremy, and David Niven. 2000a. "Stereotypes in the News: Media Coverage of African-Americans in Congress." *Harvard International Journal of Press Politics* 5 (1): 32–49. doi:10.1162/108118000568958.

Zilber, Jeremy, and David Niven. 2000b. *Racialized Coverage of Congress: The News in Black and White*. Westport, CT: Praeger.