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Abstract

The past two decades and, in particular, during the EU referendum campaign immigration has proven to be a prominent theme in UK politics and the media. This paper builds on a study written by Moore and Ramsay (2017), who studied all online articles about the 2016 EU referendum published by the main national media outlets. This study examines how immigrants are presented in the run-up to the EU referendum and what the similarities and contrasts are in their presentation between pro- and contra-immigration stances. Only articles in English were studied. The 25 corpus articles are opinion pieces that were published in the UK quality print and online press between 14 April and 30 June 2016. Each of the articles was placed in one of the MPOV categories according to whether the author is pro- or contra-immigration or adopts a more neutral stance towards immigration. Critical Discourse Analysis was used to analyse the data. The results show that 541 negative frames and labels are used in the corpus in contrast to 15 positive frames. Further, there is a clear disjunction between the overall message and the literal content of the corpus articles. (191 words)
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Introduction

The British referendum on EU membership on June 23, 2016 was a memorable event in the history of modern Europe (Cap, 2017, p. 67) that was preceded by a 10-week campaign, which was ‘one of the most divisive, ugly and corrosive campaigns in modern British history’ (Parry, 2016 in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 63). The EU referendum has influenced political, economic, as well as social life in both the UK and beyond. Politically, the referendum results might well empower anti-EU parties in the rest of Europe and it might lead to another independence referendum in Scotland, as a substantial part of the Scottish voted Remain. Then, economically, the pound and the euro suffered a considerable decline in value right after the referendum (Micallef, 2016). Additionally, a number of major companies and organisations have decided to move their London-based headquarters to other cities in the EU due to Brexit, such as HSBC, Barclays and UBS (Jersey Evening Post, 2018). Furthermore, socially, the UK might lose a proportional amount of funds that used to be awarded to UK organisations by the European Commission, for instance, around 295 UK charities received a sum total of £210.9 million (Cooney & Ferell-Schweppenstedde, 2017, p. 4).

The two themes that were mentioned the most by news media to persuade readers were the economy and immigration, with almost a third of all referendum-related articles referring to the latter (Moore and Ramsay, 2017, p.64). The former was more frequently used by the Remain camp, whereas Leave emphasised the immigration issue. In the end, 52% of the British voters were in favour of leaving the European Union (Cap, 2017, p. 67).

Immigration, the main theme studied in this thesis, was not only an issue during the EU referendum campaign, but it has also been a prominent theme in UK politics in the past two decades, with politicians responding to public demand to put more effort into reducing immigration and into solving its underlying issues (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 3). Since workers from the Caribbean arrived in 1948 on The Windrush, many thousands of immigrants have arrived in the United Kingdom, many of whom travelled from other Commonwealth countries, e.g. Kenya and Uganda. In the past two decades, many Eastern Europeans have come to live and work in the UK thanks to freedom movement within the EU. The relationships between natives and immigrants have, however, not always been very positive. On the one hand, the British were pleased with the incoming workers as there were
labour shortages and people enjoyed multiculturalism, but on the other hand, race tensions emerged, with an extreme example being the race riots in the 1980s (BBC, s.d.).

There are a range of ways in which people’s opinions are influenced by immigration. According to van Klingeren et al. (2016, p. 3) the public is primarily influenced by their own everyday encounters with immigrants or the opinion of friends and family and by the media. Cap (2017, p. 67) argues that the discourse used by the media when describing immigration is one of hatred, xenophobia, uncertainty and anxiety and their discourse includes a harsh Self-Other distinction. Sometimes even descriptive words can become pejorative if their use is irrelevant, i.e. with references to the race, nationality or religion of a person or group (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 13).

Given the impact of Brexit and the prominence of immigration in the media during the past decades, this thesis addresses the following research questions:

1. How are immigrants presented in opinion pieces in the quality print and online press in the run-up to the EU referendum?

2. What are the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between pro and contra-immigration stances?

These questions will be addressed using the corpus that was created for this study. Furthermore, there are a number of hypotheses that will be presented in the methodology. The first presumption is that articles in which the author seems to be contra-immigration will have more negative mentions than articles written by someone who is more neutral or who is pro-immigration. Second, pro-immigration articles will have more positive mentions than more neutral or contra-immigration articles. Third, articles in which the author adopts a more neutral stance towards immigration use a similar number of positive and negative mentions of immigration. Fourth, contra-immigration articles will have more negative mentions than positive mentions. Finally, pro-immigration articles will have more positive mentions than negative mentions. The hypotheses will be covered in more detail in chapters three and five.

A number of studies have been conducted into the press coverage of Brexit, but many of the studies look at themes other than immigration. This thesis builds on a study written by Moore and Ramsay. Their research was the first to study all online articles about the 2016 EU referendum published by the main national media outlets (Moore & Ramsay, 2017). Whereas the Moore and Ramsay study focuses on newspapers and news magazines as well as
broadcasters, for instance the BBC and ITV, and digital-only news media, this study will only focus on the first two media types. It is well-known that online media and social media are of considerable importance nowadays, but the British print press still plays an important role in politics, which is why we chose to focus on this media type (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 3). According to The Migration Observatory (2013, p. 2) the UK national newspapers have a proportional influence on people’s opinion about immigration and that is the reason why examining the language used by newspapers can help us understand the terms of the immigration debate and the role newspapers play in shaping those terms.

Similarly, while Moore and Ramsay cover multiple themes, such as economy, immigration, sovereignty, etc., this study focuses on how immigration was covered during the campaign. Moreover, we will focus only on opinion pieces published by the quality press. The quality press is expected to write in a more balanced, fair and intelligent way than the popular press does, but that ideal seems sometimes difficult to achieve as the language used by the quality press might be biased and stereotypical. The popular and quality press are ‘increasingly resembling one another’ (Lefkowitz, 2016). Tabloidisation has become a common phenomenon, with the quality press drifting towards tabloids. Opinion pieces were chosen, because the writer chooses a certain style and certain words to persuade the reader (Connor, 1996 in Alonso Belmonte, 2007).

In the first chapter, we focus on establishing the necessary background for the following chapters, giving an overview of the evolution of immigration into the United Kingdom evolved and helping to explain why the issue of immigration was so important during the EU referendum campaign. The second chapter examines theory related to the press and in particular the press presentation of minority groups. In the former, we will describe the influence of the press on its readership, the difference between quality and popular newspaper titles and a definition of opinion pieces will be elaborated. The latter includes information about de-humanisation, studies that deal specifically with press coverage of immigration and studies that deal specifically with Brexit and immigration. Chapter three describes the methodology followed by a presentation and discussion of the results in chapters four and five. We will conclude by giving an overview of the main findings and by making suggestions for further research in chapter six.
1. **Background**

This chapter will provide the necessary background information for this study.

1.1 Immigration in the UK

The number of immigrants in the United Kingdom is larger than it has ever been; immigration is now seen as one of the country’s most pressing issues (Somerville et al., 2009, p. 1). To understand how immigration in the UK has grown, we need to examine UK migration history. This section will first focus on the main waves of immigration into the UK with its push- and pull-factors and then, we will elaborate on the response of the government and the public on immigration.

1.1.1 Main waves of immigration into the UK

After the Second World War, Britain suffered labour shortages which encouraged mass immigration from the Commonwealth to the UK. The symbolic start of this was the arrival of 500 Jamaican workers by ship on the Empire Windrush on 22 June, 1948 (BBC, s.d.). Caribbean immigration was followed by immigration from Kenya, Uganda, Pakistan and Bangladesh, among others (BBC, s.d.), which is explained below. The citizens of these countries benefited the protection of the UK as their countries used to belong to the British Empire (BBC, s.d.).

First, citizens from Kenya and Uganda were expelled from their country and found refuge in the UK. In 1968 thousands of Kenyan Asians fled to Britain as a result of the Kenyan government using their independence to oblige foreigners to resign their position as soon as a native Kenyan replacement was found (BBC, s.d.). Then, many Asians, who were Commonwealth citizens and who had moved to Uganda as it was part of the British Empire, were deported by Ugandan dictator Idi Amin after Uganda’s independence (Office for National Statistics, 2016). The UK took in 28,000 fleeing Uganda in the following months (BBC, s.d.).
Immigrants from the previously-mentioned African countries, together with people who fled Pakistan and Bangladesh due to intensifying political unrest, not only came to the UK as refugees, but they also were attracted by the ongoing availability of employment in the manufacturing, textile and service sectors (Striking Women, s.d.).

Further, in the late 1980s, 1990s and in the beginning of the 21st century, immigration from Eastern Europe to the UK increased considerably. Following the fall of the Iron Curtain in 1989, many Eastern Europeans fled their countries, which resulted in no less than 46,000 applications for asylum in 1998, 42% more than the preceding year (BBC, s.d.). Freedom of movement in the European Union was established by the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, which made it possible for every EU citizen to live and work in any other of the EU countries (European Parliament: At your service, 2018). In 2004, ten countries joined the European Union: Estonia, the Czech Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Slovakia, Poland, Slovenia, Malta and Cyprus. Three years later, Romania and Bulgaria became part of the EU. The enlargement clearly had an obvious influence on the UK as many immigrants from those countries arrived in the subsequent years (Office for National Statistics, 2016).

Finally, between 1993 and 2015 the number of immigrants more than doubled from 2 million to 5 million, of which 3.2 million live in London. Most immigrants in the UK are of Polish descent (The Migration Observatory, 2017a, p.2), which coincides with the considerable increase in Eastern European immigration following EU expansion (The Migration Observatory, 2017a, p.3). Research shows that most EU nationals migrate to the United Kingdom because of a job offer, whereas most non-EU nationals arrived in the UK to study (Full Fact, 2018).

1.1.2 Response of the British government and citizens

On the one hand many people respond quite well to immigration into the UK as it has often been a solution to labour shortages and perceived levels of integration have often led to Britain being described as multi-cultural. British Parliament encouraged mass immigration after the Second World War with the British Nationality Act, which entitled Commonwealth citizens to settle in the UK, which in turn helped address labour shortages. Today, immigrants remain an important element of the UK labour market. Immigrant workers fill 42% of vacancies in the
cleaning industry or packing industry, 36% of process operative vacancies (i.e. textiles, food, tobacco, rubber, etc.) and 35% of vacancies in cleaning and housekeeping in 2015 (The Migration Observatory 2017b, p.4).

On the other hand, increasing immigration contributed to racial tensions, new regulations and escalating levels of xenophobia. The British government reacted to the growing number of immigrants and the rising tensions with the introduction of work vouchers even Commonwealth citizens had to apply for under the 1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act (Office for National Statistics, 2016). Despite governmental effort, tensions intensified and police harshness resulted in the infamous Brixton riots on 11 April 1981, leaving more than 300 wounded (BBC, s.d.). According to Sommerville et al. (2009, p. 1) the public feared immigration increasingly as more and more immigrants entered the UK. Polling data showed that between 66% and 80% of the public preferred less immigration in the late 1990s. The same fear caused a new far-right political party, the British National Party (BNP), to win Council seats in northern towns in 2002 (BBC, s.d.) and it made the UK impose a seven year restriction on employment opportunities for workers from countries that joined the EU in 2004. Additionally, global financial problems arose and the combination of unemployment and increasing immigration in the UK resulted in the creation of a points-based system for non-EU migrants in 2008 (Office for National Statistics, 2016).

Many parts of the media added to the previously-mentioned tensions by emphasising, for example, the unfounded idea that immigrants are the cause of overcrowded social services, i.e. the NHS, schools, etc. (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 78). As immigration has proven to be a challenging issue in UK history, it was chosen as a particular focus by the Leave camp during the EU referendum campaign.

1.2 Brexit and immigration

On 23 June 2016, UK voters chose to leave the European Union. David Cameron, the then prime minister had shown his preference to hold an EU referendum three years earlier (House of Commons Library, 2018) to confirm his position as PM. The British people, however, voted differently than expected and the United Kingdom is due to leave the European Union on 29 March 2019 (House of Commons Library, 2018). The preceding section shows the historical
and ongoing importance of immigration in the UK and this section seeks to explain the
relationship between immigration and Brexit, by considering the economic climate, the rhetoric
of the right, UKIP, the popular press and conservative Leave figures.

1.2.1 Socio-economic climate

The United Kingdom, as well as mainland EU, suffered several major issues in the run-up to
the EU referendum in June 2016: the 2008 economic crisis, the 2014 Annexation of Crimea by
the Russians, Terrorist attacks by ISIS and increasing migration waves into the EU (Riley &
Ghilès, 2016). However, in 2016, the British economy performed fairly well, with GDP growth
being the strongest of all EU countries and with unemployment rates being the lowest after
Germany. There were, nevertheless, three economic reasons that might have stimulated British
discontent (Romei, 2016). First, in the past decades, inequality had increasingly risen, or, in
other words, poverty figures had risen, enlarging the gap between the poor and the rich.
Because of that, many people felt they did not have much influence in politics (Fenton, 2016),
which made them more prone to vote for change. Second, real earnings had not increased in
almost an entire decade, which means that people could only spend the same amount of money
as they could at the beginning of the economic crisis (Romei, 2016). Third, the number of
working families that lived in poverty had risen, causing the child poverty rate to increase from
18.8% to 21.5% between 2009-10 and 2013-14 (Romei, 2016).

1.2.2 Rhetoric of the two camps

Parry (2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 63) describes two interesting developments in
the themes chosen by the Leave and Remain camp. First, political rhetoric in the UK has
become more and more racist and fear- and anger-filled. Second, British nationalistic ideas
have become very anti-immigrant and determined by their fear of immigrants. According to an
analysis of the evolution of British discourse about Europe by John Todd, these developments
are long-standing, meaning that there is a ‘consistent divide between a British self and
continental other, which was reinforced by increasing prominence of anti-immigration
rhetoric’ (Todd in Cooper, 2016). Further, the Remain and Leave camp profiled themselves with campaigns focusing each on a particular theme, with the former emphasising the economy and the latter the immigration issue (Parry, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 63).

There are multiple ways by which the two camps tried to persuade voters whether to support Brexit or not (Vasilopoulou, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 114) and according to Ruth Wodak (Wodak in Cooper, 2016) the issues they covered all revolve around fear. The Leave camp linked their main issue, immigration, to economy, security and social change. That way they could offer sovereignty as a solution to all problems and people could ‘take back control’ of immigration and, in addition, the country (Vasilopoulou, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 114), as they emphasised their fear of loss of sovereignty and loss of control of immigration (Cooper, 2016). The Remain camp, however, only focused on one aspect, which is the economy. According to Wodak (in Cooper, 2016), they highlighted the uncertainty of what would occur if the UK left the EU. Furthermore, 5% of the people who voted Leave in contrast to 40% of the Remainers indicated that economy influenced their vote, whereas around 25% of the brexiteers and 1% of those who voted Remain wanted to influence the immigration policy with their votes (Vasilopoulou, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 114).

The UK Independence Party (UKIP) is a political party that was not part of the official Leave campaign, but it did have the same interests. UKIP had one main policy, i.e. leaving the EU, which was said to be the answer to many issues, such as immigration in particular (BBC, 2016). Not only did the party receive the third-largest vote total in the 2015 national elections in the UK (Beauchamp, 2016), but UKIP has evolved into one of the ‘leading standard bearers of Euroscepticism’ of the EU between 2010 and 2015 (Pareschi & Albertini, 2014). UKIP won over voters by underlining the threat from EU migration as well as from outside the European Union (Beauchamp, 2016). Furthermore, Nigel Farage, UKIP’s figurehead is, according to Natalie Fenton (2016), one of three men who used a ‘xenophobic rhetoric’ during the EU referendum campaign. The others were Michael Gove and Boris Johnson, about whom further information will follow below.

As mentioned before, the rhetoric of the right was considerably racist during the EU referendum campaign. A clear example of this is a poster that was published by UKIP during the campaign and that shows migrants who enter the EU and who are walking in a long and wide queue (Safdar, 2016). Many people thought the poster resembled Nazi-propaganda.
Farage, however, underlined that they only intended to show the connection between the refugee crisis and the migration flows into the UK (Hall, 2016).

1.2.3 The popular press

According to Bennhold (2018), the popular press are convinced that the ideas covered in their articles are only the reflection of their readers’ thoughts and fears. It is said, nevertheless, that they influence their readers with biases and deceptive stories. In addition, tabloids have published a substantial number of hostile anti-immigration front pages during the six months before the referendum, with the Daily Mail publishing 30 and The Sun 15. The latter, for example, covered a story about child refugees who entered the UK, saying that they were lying about their ages and that the government should introduce tests with X-rays of their teeth (Bennhold, 2018). Hate speech in articles by the popular press is said to have become so common that the United Nations strongly urged the UK to do something about it in 2016, after The Sun published a column that compared migrants to the norovirus and vermin (Bennhold, 2018).

Stories that later appeared to be misleading, were corrected in the newspaper it was published in at first. The corrections, however, did not attract the necessary attention for people to forget the original story, as they were often hidden at the bottom of an article (Ponsford, 2016). An example of a corrected story is one that was published by the Daily Express on 16 May, 2016, explaining how teaching migrant children costs three billion pounds, not taking into account that the sources used were based on government figures that included children that had one British parent and a parent from another EU country. Those figures would, however, encompass Nigel Farage’s children, as his wife is German and therefore the author of the article misinterpreted the figures. A correction of the article was published later on (Ponsford, 2016).
1.2.4 Gove and Johnson

Despite the former prime minister David Cameron supporting the Remain camp, half of the members of his center-right Conservative Party opposed his view, two of whom are Michael Gove and Boris Johnson (Beauchamp, 2016), who both worked as journalists before entering politics (Cohen, 2016). Nevertheless, according to Cohen (2016), their political approach reflects their history in journalism, as they offered leaving the European Union as a simple solution to the immigration issue. This kind of simple answer to a problem resembles the kind of answer a journalist would give in an article.

Boris Johnson, former mayor of London and former British Foreign Secretary, used to work for The Daily Telegraph as a correspondent in Brussels in the 1990s. He is said to have invented eurosceptic coverage of the EU (Bennhold, 2018) and according to Fletcher (in Bennhold, 2018) ‘Boris campaigned against the cartoon caricature of Brussels that he himself invented’. Bennhold (2018) argues that Johnson tends to deliver his own version of the truth, as he was dismissed by the London Times for devising a quote.

Gove was Theresa May’s opposing candidate in the leadership battle following the EU referendum (John, 2016). According to InFacts, Gove has spread eight misleading facts during the Leave campaign, containing anti-immigrant speech. He is said to have claimed that even people with a criminal record can effortless enter the UK, which is untrue, as the country can refuse immigrants if they pose a threat to national security (Schickler, 2016).
2. Theory

This chapter will no longer give background information, but theory from previous research will be explained. The first section focuses on how the press influences its readership, on the difference between quality and popular press and on opinion pieces. Further the press presentation of minority groups will be elaborated, discussing studies that deal specifically with press coverage of immigration, studies that deal specifically with Brexit and immigration and discussing de-humanisation.

2.1 The Press

2.1.1 Influence of press on readership

In general, the press influences its readers through the ‘bidirectional and dynamic’ relation between the press and its readership (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008, p.8), misleading facts and agenda-setting. First, according to Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 8), as newspapers need to make a profit, they have an interest in reporting on themes that their readers are interested in. The readers, in their turn, only read those papers that express the same opinion they hold themselves. Fleras (2011 in Lawlor & Tolley, 2017, p. 969) agrees with the idea of Gabrielatos and Baker, arguing that the media adapt their theme choice and writing style to the norms of the intended audience.

Second, the misleading facts published by the media influence the readers’ ideas because the media’s view of society differs from reality. The influence of the press was a contributing factor in the results of a survey that was conducted in 2014 and that concluded that the British people are convinced that 20% of British citizens are Muslim and 24% are immigrants, while the real figures are 5% and 13% (Fenton, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 57). Emphasising the number of immigrants as in the example above or emphasising an individual’s religion can be seen as a pejorative reference, which is to be avoided according to Clause 12 of the Code of Practice issued by the Press Complaints Commission in the UK. The Clause specifies that the press cannot use pejorative or prejudicial references to someone’s colour, race, religion and
gender, among others, and that details about it should be avoided unless it is relevant to the story (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008, p. 13).

Third, the increasing number of articles covering immigration, is setting the agenda, which is due to the framing of topics. Framing, defined by Entman as to ‘select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating context’ (in Brouwer et al., 2017, p. 103), means that the concept not only focuses on topic choice, but also on how the issue is written about. That includes, for example, whether the author uses certain keywords or certain stereotypes and where he finds his information (Brouwer et al., 2017, p. 102). As previously mentioned, the media also influence public opinion (Esses et al., 2013, p. 520), given that the discourse used by the media might construct the idea of migrants as criminals, exploiters, etc., which is said to shape public opinion and influence legislative responses to immigration (Brouwer et al., 2017, p.101).

The previously mentioned ways in which the press influences its readership can be applied to the Brexit referendum campaign, as ‘press reporting might have had some bearing on the Referendum outcome’ (Wring, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 12). In addition, Dr Rowinski (2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p.52) argues that the referendum was the first time that newspapers had such a substantial impact on people’s fears, hopes and prejudice against the European Union. Those ideas equalled the ones of the Leave camp and because newspapers covered their story more frequently, the media played a considerable role in influencing the voting (Berry, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 14).

According to a report written by the House of Commons Treasury Select Committee the British public was being misled by both camps with untrue claims made during the UK referendum campaign, (Flinders, Jennings & Renwick, 2016, in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 31). The camps were each supported by certain national newspapers, which, in the opinion of Hugo Dixon, founder of InFacts, published a large number of inaccurate stories (Barnett, 2016 , in Jackson, Thorsen & Wring, p. 47). The following table shows which newspapers supported Remain and which ones Leave (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, pp. 3-4).
| Remain | The Times  |
|        | the Guardian |
|        | the Observer |
|        | the Financial Times |
|        | the Independent |
|        | the Mail on Sunday |
|        | the Mirror |
|        | the New Statesman |
| Leave  | the Sun |
|        | the Daily Mail |
|        | the Daily Express |
|        | the Sunday Express |
|        | the Daily Telegraph |
|        | the Sunday Telegraph |
|        | The Sunday Times |
|        | The Spectator |

*Table 1: Newspapers Remain and Leave*

Although the number of national newspapers supporting both camps is equal, some promoted their camp’s opinion more than others. The Leave camp received more support from newspapers, not only because the combined readership of the pro Leave newspapers is substantially larger than that of the Remain camp, but also because they spent more time and money on promoting their view. An example that elaborates on this view, is that the Sun and the Daily Mail frequently published two front pages and/or editorials that covered their opinion on the same day (Firmstone, 2016, pp. 36-37).
2.1.2 Quality vs popular titles

Quality and popular newspapers are the two main categories in which the British newspapers can be subdivided. They are also called broadsheets and tabloids, terms that refer to the paper format they used to be printed in (Bastos, 2016, p. 2). The Guardian, Telegraph, Times, Financial Times and Independent belong to the former category, while The Daily Mail, Express, Mirror, New Day and Sun are examples of the latter (Oxford Royale Academy, 2016). There are some important differences between the two publication types. First, articles in broadsheet newspapers are written in a more sober tone, contain fewer pictures and longer texts (Preston in Bastos, 2016, p. 2), whereas tabloids are more focused towards sensationalism and populism and include more photos. Second, broadsheets seem to focus more on ‘substantive issues’ than on the ‘life style themes’, such as sport and celebrities, tabloids focus on (Rowe in Bastos, 2016, p. 2). Sparks (in Akkerman, 2011, p. 933) agrees with that idea, saying that the popular press covers stories that are ‘of direct concern to the mass of the people’, whereas the quality press normally writes about themes that are further away of the reader’s daily life. That is why the former publishes more articles about immigration than the latter (Akkerman, 2011, p. 933). Third, quality newspaper journalists tend to check their sources more and they provide a more detailed story than writers for popular newspapers (Bastos, 2016, p. 3). Further, quality and popular newspapers are appealing to different kinds of people as tabloid readers tend to be younger and less educated than people who read quality newspapers.

However, according to Lefkowitz (2016) popular and quality newspapers are ‘increasingly resembling one another’. They are now using the kind of language the other category normally used. This is part of tabloidisation, which has become a common phenomenon, as the quality press is increasingly becoming more sensation-seeking. This evolution also involves that broadsheets are increasingly quoting ordinary people and tabloids more elite sources, such as the government.
2.1.3 Opinion pieces

Biber (in Alonso Belmonte, 2007, p. 1) defines newspaper opinion texts as ‘(…) opinionated genres intended to persuade the reader’. In addition, Alonso Belmonte (2007, p. 1) states that both broadsheets and tabloids publish opinion texts. In this study, newspaper opinion pieces and editorials will be treated as one, since the chosen vocabulary and style is used to persuade the reader. There are, however, researchers who say there are some clear differences between opinion pieces and editorials (Morley and Murphy, 2005, Murphy 2005 and Virtanen 2005 in Alonso Belmonte, 2007, p. 2).

Opinion pieces are said to ‘comment on recent events and accomplish the reader’s agreement or alternatively, to corroborate a pre-existing consensus through a series of meticulously crafted textual strategies’ (Alonso, 2004 and Alonso and Maddalena, 2007 in Alonso Belmonte, 2007, p. 2). Editorials, on the other hand, give the newspaper’s opinion rather than the opinion of an individual author (Alonso Belmonte, 2007, p. 2). Alonso Belmonte (2007, p.2) adds that opinion pieces and editorials ‘perhaps more than any other type of writing, reflect national styles regarding modes of persuasion’ (Connor, 1996, in Alonso Belmonte, 2007, p. 2).

2.2 Theorising the press presentation of minority groups

2.2.1 Studies that deal specifically with press coverage of immigration

This section will provide an overview of information obtained from studies that deal specifically with press coverage of immigration. First, Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 5) studied the discourse used to describe RASIM, which is an abbreviation for refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants and migrants. For their study Fleeting, sneaking and flooding. A corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press they used a corpus that consists of 140 million words retrieved from press articles published in the United Kingdom between 1996 and 2005. According to Van Dijk (in Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008, p. 5) RASIM seem to be introduced in a rather negative way, which is why Gabrielatos and Baker examined how RASIM are defined linguistically, which topics were frequently mentioned with
regard to RASIM and which tone is used while covering immigration (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 8). Gabrielatos & Baker (2008, p. 13) state that when certain collocates are frequently used, readers might associate those collocates directly with RASIM. In addition, the choice of collocates is said to show the writers’ or the newspapers’ view toward immigration, especially when the words used do not resemble the usual definition of the term. By using the collocates frequently and consistently in a new context, the author might change or broaden its meaning. Even if the writer only frequently repeats what other people have said about RASIM, the prosody of the collocates used might be strengthened. This way, the press can exercise its power to influence the people’s vocabulary (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 14). Gabrielatos & Baker (2008, p. 21) group collocates of RASIM in eight different categories, including words that are used to describe the provenance or destination of RASIM, their number, their way of entering the country, the economic problems they might provoke, their residence, their return, their legality and finally, their plight. While covering immigration, the words used might be of considerable influence, but it is not the word itself we remember, as we only save our interpretation of those words in our memory. That is why the frequency with which the collocations are used and the meaning they communicate is pivotal in influencing what people remember.

Furthermore, the following studies also specify common collocates for immigration. Brouwer et al. (2017, p. 113) found that one of the most frequently used collocates of illegals is criminal and that journalists tend to focus regularly on numbers on the subject of immigration. A study conducted by The Migration Observatory (2013, p. 3) also lists the focus on numbers as a common descriptor. Their report shows that illegal is the most common descriptor for immigrants. Other frequently used descriptors are their place of origin, words referring to movement, family words, economic words, nationalities and collocations with water that can be used as a metaphor for migration. Additionally, one of the report’s key findings is that the EU and Eastern Europe are the geographical places that are used the most in collocations with immigrants and migrants, which, in particular, is clearly visible in the popular press (The Migration Observatory, 2013, p. 24). Lawlor and Tolley (2017, p. 972) add in Deciding who’s legitimate: news media framing of immigrants and refugees that journalists indeed focus on the economic issue concerning immigration, as the refugees are presented as ‘takers rather than givers’, which means that their cost is underlined, but their contributions to society are minimalised or forgotten.
Another report by The Migration Observatory (2016): *A decade of immigration in the British press* studied developments in the language used in newspaper articles and looks at how they relate to politics in the UK. The report identifies six important trends. First, journalists are no longer simply reproducing what other people, e.g. politicians, say, but they frame the problems themselves and therefore play a vital role in how immigration is framed in the media. Second, there is a trend of blaming politicians for increasing EU migration numbers (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 2). Politicians not only receive the blame for issues but they also receive the credit for successes (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 15). Third, newspapers have covered substantially more stories concerning immigration since the 2010 elections, when the Conservatives came to power, as they introduced measures to decrease the number of immigrants (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 2). From 2010 until 2015 the average number per month of articles mentioning immigration has more than doubled (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 4). Furthermore, another prominent tendency is that the legal status of migrants is now less discussed than before, whereas the number of immigrants is mentioned increasingly from 2009 onwards (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 2). While covering the scale of EU migration, journalists tend to associate migration less with criminality and they blame migrants less (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 19). Further, after 2013, migrants from the EU were mentioned more frequently, with a peak in 2014 when Eastern European workers were allowed to work in the United Kingdom (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 2). Finally, between 2006 and 2015 there has been a sharp increase in the number of times Syria was referred to as a modifier of refugee, as a result of the Syrian refugee crisis (The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 2).

The fifth trend identified by The Migration Observatory (2016, p. 2) shows that important occurrences might cause the media to talk about immigration more often. In other words, ‘the media’s coverage of refugees tends to be episodic’ (Lawlor & Tolley, 2017, p. 972), which means that there is a tendency of the media to pay more attention to refugees when more immigrants enter the country, when international conflicts occur or when, in this case, there is a referendum. Additionally, we are able to say that there is a greater focus on immigration problems in times of crisis, as people might feel insecure (Lawlor & Tolley, 2017, p. 972). Further, Brouwer et al. (2017, p. 101) argue that when more attention than normal is paid to immigration, it might provoke stricter and more repressive governmental actions.

Furthermore, as previously explained in section 2.1.1, journalists are able to influence their readers through the content of their products. Lawlor & Tolley (2017, p. 973) agree with that
idea, stating that ‘the framing, tone, and focus of news stories about migration reinforce hierarchical distinctions between immigrants and refugees’. Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 8) share the same opinion, saying that the media can influence how their readers or listeners think about minority groups. In addition, newspapers are said to have the highest impact on their readers, when it comes to race problems or immigration. According to The Refugee Council, the influence of the media, while reporting on immigration, is a form of ‘social power’, which is ‘the control exercised by one group or organisation (or its members) over the actions and/or the minds of (the members of) another group, thus limiting the freedom of action of the others, or influencing their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies’ (Van Dijk, in Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 8). This power can be connected to racism, as the influence can have such an impact that it might cause people to react in a racist way. There are, however, two types of racism: the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ racism (Teo, 2000, p. 7). On the one hand, the old racism would be the form of racism we all know, with verbal or even physical abuse of an ethnic group, such as Apartheid in South Africa. New racism, on the other hand, is more subtle. People who practise this form say they are not racist, but they distance themselves from the other ethnic minority group and they say that the minority groups are responsible for their own cultural disadvantages (Teo, 2000, p. 7).

2.2.2 Studies that deal specifically with Brexit and immigration

As mentioned previously, this paper elaborates on a study by Moore and Ramsay (2017), which was the first study to cover all articles that were published during the 10-week campaign preceding the EU referendum. The authors state that the themes that were reported on the most were the economy and immigration. The coverage of immigration was notable in six ways. First, a proportional number of articles was published with immigration as main theme and the alleged issue was covered persistently. Second, Leave campaign leaders tended to refer to migration many times. Third, the comments of those people were frequently covered. Further, the news outlets did not only report on what politicians said, but they also consulted other sources. Fifth, news outlets and campaign leaders blamed migrants for many problems and the hostility towards the latter grew increasingly (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 64). The final notable tendency is that some nationalities were more frequently covered in a negative way (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 65).
Regarding the first tendency about the prominence and persistence in which the immigration theme is covered, just around one hundred newspaper front pages were dedicated to immigration during the 10-week EU referendum campaign. To be able to assess this number, it can be compared to the fourteen front page articles published in the same number of weeks before the general election in 2015. No less than 76% of the 99 front page leads appeared in four newspapers: the Daily Express, Daily Mail, Daily Telegraph and the Sun, with 21, 20, 21 and 13 front pages in particular, all of which supporting Leave. Furthermore, the immigration issue was covered increasingly from week five of the campaign onwards and the coverage was persistent, as there were more than 250 articles that referred to immigration every week of the campaign (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 65).

Furthermore, the leaders of both parties, Leave and Remain, had their own way of discussing immigration (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 66). On the one hand, Leave leaders emphasised immigration from the beginning of the campaign onwards. Several MPs who supported the Leave campaign, e.g. Michael Gove, Iain Duncan Smith and Priti Patel, underlined the harmful effect of immigrants on health care, education, housing, culture and crime statistics. Sometimes, the Leave leaders seemed to ‘coordinate’ the subject of their speech with news events. Priti Patel, for example, addressed parents during a speech saying that immigrants are the cause of the primary school shortage on the day the parents would learn whether their first choice primary school was allocated to them (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 67). Sir Lynton Crosby explained how highlighting immigration could be a major advantage for Leave as only 41% of the British indicated they would vote Leave at the beginning of the campaign, but 52% said leaving the EU would be advantageous for the UK’s immigration system. To change the odds, they needed to emphasise the immigration issue (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 66). Remain leaders, on the other hand, highlighted the negative economic effects of a possible Brexit, while not mentioning immigration very often. Remain acted rather defensively than positively, i.e. they pointed out the measures taken to stop Muslim extremism instead of explaining how Britain can benefit from immigration (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 68).

Usually, newspapers particularly report on what campaign leaders proclaim, but during the EU referendum campaign, some newspapers initiated new negative stories about immigration that had not been referred to by politicians first (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 73). They almost purely sought out negative stories about immigrants instead of a balanced number between positive and negative stories (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 74 and The Migration Observatory, 2016, p. 12). Journalists not only initiated immigration claims, they also tended to take stories out of
their original context. The Daily Mail, for example, published an article that said that ‘more than 80 EU nationals are arrested in London every day’. With this kind of information and without figures about arrests, the reader could not judge whether 80 is a high number or not (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 74). Because of this kind of articles a link between immigration and crime is said to have been established in the minds of the readers (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 75).

Moore and Ramsay (2017) focused on several perspectives of considerable interest for this thesis with the aim of describing how immigration is illustrated in the articles, such as the vocabulary and migrant blaming. As the words used in an article determine how the text is connotated, the authors examined which vocabulary was used and what they can be associated with. During the EU referendum campaign, there was a tendency of using words that relate to epidemics, catastrophes or natural disasters. The more this vocabulary was used, the more readers related immigration to disasters (Moore and Ramsay, 2017, p. 78). The authors used different terms: migrants, refugees and asylum seekers, which seemed to be interchangeable, for instance this example from the Daily Express ‘Horrors of Calais migrant camp exposed as Brits told way to tackle crisis is to leave EU’ (Moore and Ramsay, 2017, p. 83). The camp in Calais is, in fact, a refugee camp and not a migrant camp.

Furthermore, there was a tendency to blame migrants for the issues in the UK. Migrants were often seen as benefit tourists or as job stealers. Additionally, migrants were also blamed for many of the political, social and economic problems of the UK. The list in Appendix 1 gives an overview of the problems migrants were blamed for. It is, however, not a comprehensive list (Moore and Ramsay, 2017, p. 77).

Moore and Ramsay (2017) covered two more themes, i.e. the justification for how immigration was covered and how certain nationalities were covered. First, Leave leaders and the papers that supported this camp highlighted on a regular basis that it is ‘justified to’ report on immigration issues, as such a large number of people showed their concern about the topic. Some of those leaders and papers argued that the ‘elites’ and the ‘Establishment’ were trying to make sure that the immigration issue was not debated on (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 84). Further, certain nationalities were used frequently instead of using the general term ‘migrants’, including some EU countries, such as Poland, Romania, Bulgaria and Hungary, and EU candidate countries, Albania and Turkey. All of those countries, except for Hungary, were
foremost covered negatively and additionally, all evaluative statements about Albania were negative.

Another study that deals with Brexit and immigration is *UK press coverage of the EU referendum* by Levy et al. (2016). They discussed more than 3400 articles about the referendum (Levy et al., 2016, p. 4), originating from four quality newspapers and five popular newspapers, being The Times, Guardian, Financial Times, Daily Telegraph, the Sun, Daily Mail, Daily Star, Daily Express and Daily Mirror (Levy et al., 2016, p. 7). A clear difference between this study and that of Moore and Ramsay is that migration is said to be the third most important issue that was covered with the economy and sovereignty occupying the first and second place (Levy et al., 2016, p. 20). Levy et al. also studied the tone of Leave messages focusing on migration. Slightly more than 60% of them were negative compared to around 4% neutral and approximately 24% positive (Levy et al., 2016, p. 24). Berry (2016, p. 14) agrees with the primarily negative view on immigration. He argues that the popular press covered immigration in an extremely negative way. Berry is one of the academics who gave their opinion on immigration in the *EU referendum analysis 2016: Media, voters and the campaign*. Berry (2016, p. 14) adds that not only the messages sent during the EU referendum campaign had a substantial effect on the British voters, but also the messages published in the years preceding the referendum, as the view of the readers is shaped on a long term basis. (Berry, 2016, p. 14).

2.2.3 De-humanisation

De-humanisation can be defined as to, ‘make a human unhuman’, which should be interpreted as a metaphor, as the person who de-humanises another person is not really depriving the latter of his or her human parts literally (Stollznow, 2008, p. 183). While de-humanising a person, the fact that all people belong to the same species is being ignored (Stollznow, 2008, p. 183) and the agent ‘denies full humanness to others’ and ‘excludes them from the human species’, while he or she treats the person or group who undergoes the action as if they ‘have not risen above their animal origins’ (Haslam in Esses et al., 2013, p. 522). The person who is de-humanised is said to not be refined, moral, civil, self-controlling and sophisticated (Esses et al., 2013, p. 522). Furthermore, the agent who de-humanises another person will not call his own actions de-humanising, as it is a negative label. In contrast, the person who is de-
humanised or a third party are the people who, in general, use this term (Stollznow, 2008, p. 178). The vocabulary used to de-humanise someone, might lead to racism and unequal treatment, which will be explained in the results section.

De-humanisation, as well as demonisation, has been used by people or even governments to identify the de-humanised person as a bad person to make people believe that the agent is a good person or group (Stollznow, 2008, p. 187). It can be said that de-humanising someone ‘involves viewing others as less than human’ (Vaes et al., 2012, p. 64). This othering principle was, for example, used by the Nazis before and during the Second World War to distance themselves from the Jews, who they named rats (Kellow & Steeves, in Vaes, 2012, p. 70-71).

Although de-humanisation is well-known as a tool for war propaganda, it might also be found in everyday life, where it is less obvious but not less de-humanising. An example is calling women ‘dogs, cows and horses’ (Stollznow, 2008, p. 192).

Leyens et al. (in Esses et al., 2013, p. 522) identify the denial of having complex emotions as a form of de-humanisation, which means that the target is viewed as having primary emotions, such as fear and pleasure but not as experiencing hope, remorse, etc. This form of de-humanisation predicts that immigrants of Muslim descent will be rejected in Europe (Leyens et al., in Esses et al., 2013, p. 522). Additionally, de-humanisation can be seen as ‘an ultimate form of intolerance of otherness, in which immigrants and refugees are not even permitted entry into the human ingroup’ (Esses et al., 2013, p. 522).
3 Methodology

3.1 Corpus

This study examined 25 opinion pieces that were published in the UK quality print and online press during the ten-week official EU referendum campaign and the week following the referendum, or more precisely, between 14 April 2016 and 30 June 2016. The articles were drawn from The Guardian, The Independent, The Times, The Sunday Times and the Daily Telegraph. In the analysis, these newspapers are referred to using the following abbreviations: G (The Guardian), I (The Independent), T (The Times), ST (The Sunday Times) and DT (Daily Telegraph). For example, the second article that was drawn from The Guardian is named G2.

The first step of compiling the corpus was searching for opinion pieces dated from four weeks before the referendum until the referendum on 23 June 2016 in quality titles, that deal substantially with the EU referendum and immigration (at least 30% of the text). It became clear that not many opinion pieces were published on these themes during the initial time period so we broadened our search to ten weeks before and one week after the referendum. This last week was chosen to compare opinion pieces that were published before and immediately after the referendum. However, the number of articles that were published in that week and that meet the requirements was too small to be representative. Therefore, these articles were not examined in detail. Then, we copied every article found into word documents to compare the total word count of each article to the number of words that talks about immigration. Only articles in which at least 30% of the text concerns immigration were integrated in our corpus, as the treatment would be less in-depth with a smaller share of words concerning immigration and as this thesis is gauging what might be subtle changes in treatment, which are more likely to be present in pieces that concentrate on the theme. Before counting the words, all advertising and links to other articles that do not belong to the article itself were deleted from the word document, as they appear in different pages of the newspapers’ website and are thus not an inseparable part of the article. The third step involved reading all articles thoroughly and determining which stance towards immigration the authors adopt, i.e. is the author pro or contra-immigration or does he or she remain neutral?

To decide in which category an article is to be placed, we examined whether the following properties were present in the articles of each category. First, authors that are pro-immigration
either say that immigration is positive, try to persuade their readers of the usefulness and necessity of immigrants or state reasons why the problems are not due to immigration. From now on, this category will be called the Main Point Of View – Pro (MPOV-P) category. Additionally, this category also includes articles, such as I2 and I3, that are written by immigrants and in which they defend immigration. The author of article G9, for example, is pro-immigration, as he says he is one of the people who tries ‘to persuade voters they are wrong to fear immigration’ and that ‘newcomers add more to our society than they take out, that they keep our public services going, that they enrich the country and its culture.’ He adds that he believes in a ‘liberal, open Britain’ (G9, 2016). Similarly, in article T2, the author clearly has a positive view towards immigration. He states that the ‘free flow of labour is vital to the success of the British economy’ (T2, 2016).

Second, a number of the authors were contra-immigration, or actually, against immigration or the immigration system as it was when the article was written. Mandelson (G1, 2016) argues in G1 that ‘people in Britain- and elsewhere in Europe, for that matter- are rightly concerned about current levels of migration and the impact these have on our way of life and on public services.’ Mandelson unequivocally shows that he is contra-immigration. In contrast, Field (G10, 2016) only wants ‘more control of immigration’ but he does not want to end immigration in general. After Brexit, he would still want to welcome the ‘dedicated medical professionals who keep our NHS on track’ and other immigrants who are needed economically in the UK. He also wants to help refugees who run ‘from the world’s trouble spots’. He is, however, part of the contra group, since he is against the immigration system as it is today. We call this category the Main Point Of View - Contra (MPOV-C) category.

Third, the Main Point Of View – Middle (MPOV-M) category contains articles that do not belong to the MPOV-P or MPOV-C category and that do not overall exhibit a clear pro or contra stance. In T1, for instance, a more objective summary is given of positive and negative arguments concerning immigration. Collins offers a solution to the so-called immigration problem without expressing his own opinion about immigration. Likewise, the author of G5 (2016) describes the Leave and Remain campaign without expressing his opinion on immigration. Furthermore, McKenzie reports on how working class people feel about Brexit and immigration in G12 (2016). She, however, refers to working class communities with ‘their’, which demonstrates that she distances herself from them and that she might not share the same opinion.
The table below shows the number of articles per MPOV category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MPOV-P</th>
<th>MPOV-M</th>
<th>MPOV-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: Number of articles per MPOV category*

Further, we are focusing on the individual article rather than on whether the overall stance of the newspaper is left or right, as the newspapers seem to provide a more objective view in the opinion pieces they publish and the writers of these pieces sometimes tend to be people with a different view on immigration. Future research might focus on a closer examination of the difference between newspapers.

The full corpus with the analysis can be found in the electronic Appendix.

3.2 Method

3.2.1 Theoretical background

We have used Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) to analyse the data. According to Van Dijk (in Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 7) CDA is ‘a type of discourse analytical research that primarily deals with the way social power abuse, dominance and inequality are enacted, reproduced, and resisted by text and talk in the social and political context. With such dissident research, critical discourse analysts take explicit position, and thus want to understand, expose and ultimately resist social inequality.’ Vadai (2016, p. 3) agrees with Van Dijk, saying that CDA analyses how ‘discourse produces and maintains social and political inequality, power abuse and domination.’ Critical Discourse Analysis uses a problem-oriented approach (Wodak & Meyer, in Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 8), as it analyses social phenomena (Montesano Montessori et al. in Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 8), such as dominance and inequality (Van Dijk, 1993, p. 252).

Power is of major importance in CDA, as language use can demonstrate which person or institution is the more powerful force (Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 10). It is not the language itself
that holds power, but its possible usage for changing the perception of reality (Wodak in Caballero Mengibar, 2015, p. 40). Another important principle is that texts are not just the work of a single person, but they show how much power individuals have in society (Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 11). Furthermore, CDA also carries out research into social inclusion and exclusion. An example of this is the way in which discourse shapes racism (Van Dijk in Vandenbussche, 2014, p. 12), which means that the words used in a text can cause the reader to act or think in a racist way. Power not only is very important in CDA, but it also is essential in this study, as the quality print and online articles we have analysed might use the power of their words to influence their readers’ opinion, whether the readers are aware of their influence or not. It might be the case that the quality press extends existing stereotypes but masks it behind seemingly reasonable discourse.

Within the field of CDA we have chosen to analyse the data by using framing theory, the basis of which is that ‘a frame selects some aspects of a perceived reality and makes them more salient in texts, in such a way as to promote a particular causal interpretation (Khosravinik, 2014, p. 286). Arowolo (2017, p. 1) adds that the news media emphasise certain occurrences and links them with frames, i.e. abstractions used to structure the meaning of the text. In addition, frames can not only organise the text, but they can also link stories to a greater whole (Arowolo, 2017, p. 1), which resembles how this study has linked separate articles from different newspapers to immigration as a main theme. Further, there are two types of frames: generic and specific. The former are more general and can thus be applied in various cases in various contexts (Valkenburg et al. in Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007, p. 300), while the latter are only suitable in certain contexts (Shah et al. in Vliegenthart & Roggeband, 2007, p. 300). For this study, we chose to use issue-specific frames that were established through a qualitative pre-study.

This qualitative pre-study includes reading the corpus and highlighting important themes that are similar to themes that were used in previous studies, such as those by Moore and Ramsay (2016), Lawlor and Tolley (2017) and Gabrielatos and Baker (2008). Then, frequently occurring themes were adapted to the research questions of this study and listed. This list can be found in section 3.2.2.
3.2.2 Analysis

As was pointed out in section 3.2.1, the table below shows the frames we have used to analyse the corpus. Subjective researcher input was involved throughout the analysis as the analyst had to decide which frames would be used and had to identify the different frames.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NEGATIVE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>De-humanisation</td>
<td>(Im)migration, emigration, free movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labelling: term used to describe the group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scale: number of immigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Motion: water metaphor, epidemic, catastrophe, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human But Negative</strong></td>
<td>Negative attitude to race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blaming</td>
<td>Pressure on services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure on economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure on culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure on security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSITIVE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Humanisation</td>
<td>Plight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family-individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Economic advantages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cultural advantages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3: Methodology based on theory section*

As can be seen in the table above, we have analysed both negative and positive views on immigration, with the former containing de-humanising as well as human but negative frames and with the latter containing frames in which RASIM are seen as people. The different frames are explained below.
3.2.2.1 De-humanisation

The following labels and frames contribute to the de-humanising of immigrants as they are viewed as ‘less than human’ (Vaes et al., 2012, p. 64). By using these frames, the author no longer talks about immigrants as human beings, instead they are now labelled or the writer refers to them as numbers or by using a metaphor.

(Im)migration, emigration and free movement

The table below shows the definitions for these terms that were found in the online Oxford Living Dictionaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migration</th>
<th>Movement from one part of something to another.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>The action of coming to live permanently in a foreign country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigration</td>
<td>The act of leaving one's own country to settle permanently in another; moving abroad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free movement</td>
<td>The right or ability to travel, or to move goods, services, or capital, from one area or country to another without legal impediment or restriction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4: Definitions (im)migration, emigration and free movement (Oxford Living Dictionaries, 2018)*

Labelling: RASIM

The abbreviation RASIM was previously used by Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 6). The definitions below elaborate on the table Gabrielatos and Baker included in their study, which can be found in Appendix 2.
Refugee: Someone who has been forced to leave their country due to political or religious reasons and who is allowed to stay in another country following a successful asylum application.

Asylum seeker: Someone who has been forced to leave his or her country due to political issues and who seeks asylum in another country.

Immigrant: Someone who has moved to another country to live there permanently.

Illegal immigrant: Someone who lives in another country than his own without permission.

Migrant: Someone who has moved to another country for work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5: Definitions of RASIM (Gabrielatos &amp; Baker, 2008)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Labelling: Other and the group

In addition to the RASIM labels, there are two other labels in the de-humanisation category: other and the group. Collocations such as ‘Turkish Muslim citizens’ and ‘Albanian criminals’ (G1, 2016) are part of the other label that includes references to the immigrants’ country of origin and all labels that do not belong to any of the other categories. Furthermore, the group label consists of terms that refer to immigrants in general, e.g. ‘foreigners’ (I3, 2016) or ‘Johnny Foreigner’ (G3, 2016).

Number of immigrants

According to Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 21), refugees are primarily referred to with words that show their large number. Words that are commonly used are, for example, ‘thousands’ and ‘million’ (The Migration Observatory, 2013, p. 2). By describing immigrants as merely numbers, the author de-humanises immigrants, since they are no longer seen as people. Not only numbers are used, but also words, such as ‘influx’ or ‘scale’. In article G2 (2016), for
instance, the author says the government ‘massively underestimated the influx’ and in G4 (2016) Portes argues that he doesn’t ‘believe the government is trying desperately to conceal the true scale of immigration to the UK.’

Metaphors

Authors tend to use metaphors that refer to water, epidemics, catastrophes, etc. to describe immigration (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 78), with examples of the former being that immigrants are ‘flooding’ the country (Esses et al., 2013, p. 520) or that there is a ‘wave of refugees’ (Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 22). Esses et al. (2013, p. 518) adds that immigrants are sometimes portrayed as spreaders of diseases and that journalists describe them in that way to augment anxiety and panic (Esses et al., 2013, p. 520). Van der Valk (in Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008, p. 15) explains that the metaphor of water refers to diminished control of immigration.

3.2.2.2 Human but negative

During the EU referendum campaign, immigrants were often explicitly blamed for several economic, cultural and social issues by campaign leaders and the media. A more detailed description of the negative attitude to race frame and the blaming frames analysed in this study follow below.

Negative attitude to race

Authors might refer to hatred towards immigrants. Mandelson (G1, 2016), for example, refers three times to this kind of hatred with words or phrases such as ‘xenophobia’, ‘anti-immigration rhetoric’, ‘anti-foreigner’ and ‘hatred of other people’s countries’.

Pressure on services

Migrants are frequently portrayed as benefit tourists who take advantage of the British social services (Moore & Ramsay, 2017, p. 78). Lawlor and Tolley (2017, p. 976) describe this frame
as ‘the access to and use of state services by immigrants/ refugees’, an example of which is the sentence ‘No other aspect of the temporary foreign worker program carries that benefit for low-skill jobs.’

Pressure on economy

According to Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 21), this frame contains words or phrases that describe especially asylum seekers, immigrants and migrants as a ‘financial burden because they receive state benefits’ or as ‘a financial threat because they compete for jobs with existing citizens’. Mason (2016) provides an example in article G2 explaining what should be done to ‘meet the downward pressure on wages from eastern European migration’.

Pressure on culture

Authors might mention a possible pressure on domestic communities, a certain change of identity or habits that are changing due to immigration. Alexander (G11, 2016), for instance, mentions ‘fractured communities and a loss of identity’ in article G11.

Pressure on security

The security frame can be described as the ‘possible threats to security on account of the admission of immigrants/ refugees.’ An example of this is ‘The department’s priority at the time was to target unsuccessful refugee claimants who were on the run rather than criminals, because that way the deportation numbers were higher’ (Lawlor & Tolley, 2017, p. 976). Additionally, Esses et al. (2013, p. 519) state that the media often portray refugees as possible terrorists. Furthermore, the Migration Observatory (2013, p. 2) includes words such as ‘terrorist’ and ‘suspected’ in this frame. For example, Sriskandarajah (G7, 2016) says in article G7 that ‘Nigel Farage would have us believe that this is a choice between sexual assault by hordes of immoral invaders, or the chance to reclaim a kind of idyllic homogeneity.’ Another example is that the Daily Telegraph has ‘repeatedly highlighted concerns about Britain’s border security.’
3.2.2.3 Humanisation

In contrast to the de-humanising frames and labels, the following frames do not contribute to viewing immigrants as less than human. By using the humanising frames, immigrants are presented as humans, which certainly is a positive presentation.

Plight

According to Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 21) the plight frame contains four types of references. First, it includes ‘references to the situations that necessitated their leaving their country (e.g. fear, forced, persecution).’ Second, plight also incorporates references to ‘the manner of their leaving (e.g. escape, fleeing) and third, references to ‘their current/ recent state (e.g. displaced, homeless)’. Finally, references to ‘their current needs’ are also included (‘e.g. aid’).

Names

Calling an immigrant by his or her name, humanises that person and makes its easier for the reader to empathise with immigrants. Talking about John Smith instead of an immigrant would make the story more human.

Family-individual

Mentioning family relationships compared to the situation of only one individual humanises the subject. Depicting four people as a couple and their two sons humanises the family.

Economic advantages

Instead of blaming immigrants for economic problems, some authors praise them for making the economy prosper. Portes (G4, 2016), for instance, uses this frame in article G4 and argues that ‘it would confirm that the economic and fiscal benefits to the UK – the positive impact on growth and the public finances - are even greater than we thought.’ Portes tries to persuade his voters that immigration is beneficial to the UK economy.
Cultural advantages

With this frame, authors highlight the cultural advantages of immigration. They can literally say that there are cultural benefits or they can list several cultural advantages. In article G9 (2016), an example of the first option can be found: ‘Either they try to persuade voters they are wrong to fear immigration – that in fact newcomers add more to our society than they take out, that they keep our public services going, that they enrich the country and its culture’.

3.2.2.4 Analysing the corpus

While analysing the corpus, the research questions below were taken into account.

(1) How are immigrants presented in opinion pieces in the quality print and online press in the run-up to the EU referendum?

(2) What are the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between pro and contra-immigration stances?

During the analysis we first counted how many times the different frames could be found in each article. We thus started with a quantitative content analysis and we later added a qualitative analysis as some results needed further explaining. Furthermore, to answer the first research question, we used all information obtained from the analysis of all articles, whereas we divided the data in three groups in accordance with the stance of the author towards immigration to answer the second research question. In other words, articles of which the author seemed rather pro-immigration were compared to more neutral articles and articles that are rather contra-immigration.

To count how many times the frames are present, we drew up several guidelines. First, one argument is one complete idea, which can be one or more linked sentences in which a relevant idea is presented or even a clause that on its own refers to a complete idea. In other words, we counted each complete idea that could be connected to a certain frame. We worked with individual terms only for labelling. Second, certain linked sentences can contain multiple frames or labels. In article G1, for instance, the author writes ‘In a disturbing echo of Ukip’s last party political broadcast, which told numerous untruths about Turkey, Gove asserted that
77 million Turkish Muslim citizens would soon be using the NHS, and Albanian criminals were about to flood Britain’ (G1, 2016). The part of the sentence from ‘Gove’ onwards belongs to the number of immigrants frame, as well as the pressure on services frame. ‘Turkish Muslim citizens’ as well as ‘Albanian criminals’ both belong to the other group and ‘to flood Britain’ is a water metaphor. The sentence thus contains four different frames or labels.

The Excel file that was used to count the frames and labels in each article and to create the figures in the result section can be found in the electronic Appendix.

Third, in terms of quotations, we decided to include them in our analysis, which means that we will also analyse the parts of the articles that are not written by the author of the article himself, but that are a quotation of what someone else has said. We include them because they too can influence the readers’ opinion as much as the rest of the text does. Furthermore, while counting the number of times the terms immigration, migration, emigration, free movement and the labels were used, compounds were also counted, as the reader can be influenced by these words whether or not they are part of a compound. Finally, we determined whether the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement are used in a negative, positive or neutral context. A context is positive if the words around the term provide a positive idea, e.g. ‘we need more immigration because it’s good for the country’ (T1, 2016). The context is negative when it is determined by words such as restrictions, to lower, to reduce, anti- or with a Leave context, for example ‘A vote for leave has become a vote to slash immigration to solve Britain’s multiple problems’ (G6, 2016). The context is neutral if it is neither positive nor negative, for instance when the term is a compound with net, system or policy and the context is not clearly positive or negative. Smith’s sentence ‘I know how the immigration system works’ (G3, 2016) is an example of a neutral context.

Furthermore, while analysing the results for the corpus, different figures were used. The old figures can be found in Appendix 3, whereas the new figures can be found in chapter four. At first, the figures showed the results for the MPOV categories per label, but now the results can be found for the labels per MPOV category. The old figures showed for each label or frame how many of the cases could be found in each of the MPOV categories, whereas the new figures show how many occurrences there are for each label or frame in a certain MPOV category. For example, for Figure 8, this means that the old figure shows that 58.2% of the migrant labels can be found in the MPOV-P category. In contrast, the new Figure 8 shows that 41% of the labels in the MPOV-P category are migrant labels. The figures have been changed because the
new figures show the results this thesis intends to examine, as this study compares the word use of authors who adopt different stances towards immigration. Another important change was removing the exact number of occurrences and only showing the percentages. That change provides a clearer view on the proportions.

In addition, the following hypotheses will help us study the way in which the positive and negative frames are distributed across the MPOV categories.

a) MPOV-C articles will have more negative mentions than MPOV-M and MPOV-P articles.
b) MPOV-P articles will have more positive mentions than MPOV-M and MPOV-C articles.
c) MPOV-M articles use a similar number of positive and negative mentions of immigration.
d) MPOV-C articles will have more negative mentions than positive mentions.
e) MPOV-P articles will have more positive mentions than negative mentions.

These hypotheses are based on logical reasoning, as authors who adopt a pro-immigration stance are expected to use more positive frames and labels because they don’t see immigration as a problem. In contrast, MPOV-C articles are expected to contain more negative frames and labels.
4. Results and discussion

In this chapter, the results of this study are presented and discussed. Indeed, they provide answers to the main research questions of this thesis.

(1) How are immigrants presented in opinion pieces in the quality print and online press in the run-up to the EU referendum?

(2) What are the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between pro and contra-immigration stances?

To analyse the results, it is important to consider the three main point of view categories (MPOV) that were mentioned in section 3.1. The first one, MPOV-P, contains the articles in which the author’s main point of view towards immigration is positive. The second category, MPOV-M, contains the more neutral articles, whereas the last one, MPOV-C, consists of the articles in which the author adopts a more negative stance towards immigration.

4.1 Overview

The following figures provide an overview of the different categories.

Figure 1: General overview
Figure 1 shows that only 15 of 556 labels are humanisation labels, while the rest are negative labels. In Figure 2 similar results can be seen, as in each of the MPOV categories, more than 95% of the labels are negative. These negative labels are the de-humanisation labels and the human but negative frames, whereas the positive labels are the humanisation frames. Statistically, the overall results for the MPOV categories are almost the same, but the results in the following figures will show a more detailed breakdown of the different negative labels and of the positive labels.

When using these results to answer the first research question, one can state that the overall reporting on immigration in the corpus is very negative, with 541 negative frames and 15 positive frames. For the second research question, the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between the three MPOV categories is studied and the results from Figure 2 show that in the articles from the three MPOV categories mainly negative frames are used and the difference between MPOV-C, MPOV-M and MPOV-P is negligible.

Extra figures with the total number of occurrences for each of the categories and the proportions between categories can be found in Appendices 4 and 5.
4.2 De-humanisation

4.2.1 De-humanisation: (im)migration, emigration and free movement

This section provides an overview of the results for the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement.

Figure 3 shows how many times the terms migration, immigration, emigration and free movement are used in the whole corpus and whether the terms are placed in a positive, negative or neutral context. The vertical axis represents how many times the terms appear in total and the horizontal axis shows the different categories. The first category contains the terms (im)migration, emigration and free movement in a positive context, the second the terms in a neutral context and the third in a negative context.

As illustrated by the data in Figure 3, the terms migration, immigration, emigration and free movement are used extremely rarely in a positive context. The terms were used in a positive context in only 8.0% of the cases. In contrast, neutral and negative contexts are much more common, with 49.2% of the terms occurring in a neutral context and 42.9% in a negative context.
As we need separate figures for the MPOV categories to be able to answer the second research question, Figure 4 indicates how many times the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement occur in each of the MPOV categories.

![Figure 4: (Im)migration, emigration, free movement/MPOV](image)

As shown in Figure 4, in none of the MPOV categories is there a high number of the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement used in a positive context. The highest amount of the terms in a positive context, i.e. 14.9%, is present in MPOV-C. In MPOV-P and MPOV-M only 7.1% and 4.6% of the terms are in a positive context. Furthermore, each of the MPOV categories contains a relatively high percentage of the terms in a neutral context, with 53.2%, 51.9% and 37.3% for MPOV-P, MPOV-M and MPOV-C. Finally, 39.7% of the terms in MPOV-P, 43.5% of them in MPOV-M and 47.8% in MPOV-C are used in a negative context.

It is important to observe that there are twice as many labels in a positive context in the MPOV-C category as in the MPOV-P category.

As the title is the first part a person reads, the words used in the main titles are of proportional importance. Figure 5 shows how many times the terms migration, immigration, emigration and free movement are mentioned in the main titles of the articles in the corpus. They are subdivided in different categories according to their positive, neutral or negative context.
Figure 5 displays that in the main titles, the terms migration, immigration, emigration and free movement are never used in a positive context. Furthermore, 60.0% is used in a neutral and 40.0% in a negative context.

The results for the terms in the whole corpus are relatively clear, but it still remains interesting to look into the separate results for the MPOV categories. The results for these categories can be found in Figure 6.
The most striking conclusion that can be drawn from Figure 6 is that none of the main titles in the corpus contains the terms immigration, emigration, migration or free movement in a positive context. Approximately a third of all occurrences of these terms in the MPOV-P category can be found in a negative context and the other two thirds in a neutral one. The proportions in MPOV-M are 57.1% for a neutral context against 42.9% for a negative context. Furthermore, the terms in a neutral and negative context are equally weighted in the MPOV-C category. In addition, the number of labels in a negative context in the MPOV-M category is rather high. These results are similar to the overall results for the labels migration, immigration, emigration and free movement, except for the results for positive contexts. None of the labels in titles were found in a positive context, whereas labels in the whole articles do contain labels in positive contexts.

The figures in 4.2.1 show that the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement can be used to present immigrants. The contexts in which those terms occur are mainly neutral and negative. They are rarely used in a positive context. The results for the same terms in the main titles of the articles show a similar tendency, as they do not occur in a positive context. Furthermore, an interesting contrast in the presentation of immigrants between the MPOV categories is that twice as many labels in a positive context were used in the MPOV-C category as in the MPOV-P category. In addition, it is surprising that none of the main titles from the MPOV-P articles contains one of the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement in a positive context and that more than thirty per cent of the occurrences in the MPOV-P category can be found in a negative context.

4.2.2 De-humanisation: Labels

The figures in this section provide a graphic representation of the RASIM labels, the other label and the group label. An overview of the results for the whole corpus is given below, followed by separate figures for each MPOV category.

First, Figure 7 indicates how many times the de-humanising labels are used in the corpus.
As can be seen in Figure 7, there is a substantial difference in the number of occurrences of each label. The labels migrant and immigrant are used extensively. Of all labels used in the corpus, migrant was used in 44.4% of the cases and immigrant in 34.7%. The other label appeared in a more modest 14.5% of the total number of occurrences. Less than a tenth of the overall number of labels belong to the group label, the refugee label and asylum seeker label together, with only 4.8% for the group label and 1.6% for the refugee label. Moreover, the label asylum seeker is never mentioned in the corpus.

Second, Figure 8 presents the results for the labels broken down in the MPOV categories.
Figure 8 shows that immigrants and migrants are the labels that are mentioned the most in the MPOV-P category, since they account for 47.4% and 41.0%. The percentages for the other label and the group label are 5.1% and 6.4%. The authors who are pro-immigration do not mention refugees in the articles that are included in the corpus.

In the MPOV-M category, the migrant label occurs the most, with 58.6%. The immigrant and other label are each mentioned five times, which makes 17.2% of the total MPOV-M category. The refugee label and the group label are both used in 3.4% of the cases.

Furthermore, in the MPOV-C category, the differences between the different labels are larger than in the other MPOV categories. The other label is used the most (52.9%), followed by the migrant label (35.3%). The immigrant label and refugee label are both used once (5.9%).

From the results in Figure 7, it can be deduced that immigration is presented using the migrant label and the immigrant label. These two labels were used proportionally more than the other labels. In addition, the asylum seeker label is not used in the corpus articles. Furthermore, the results for Figure 8 indicate that there are several contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between the three MPOV categories. While the other label is used the most in the MPOV-C articles, immigrants and migrants are the labels that occur the most in the MPOV-P category. In addition, the migrant label occurs the most in the MPOV-M category.

4.2.3 De-humanisation: scale and motion

In this section, the results for the number of immigrants frame and the motion frames are given. The figures for the whole corpus are presented first, followed by the figures for the MPOV categories.

Figure 9 shows how many times the scale and motion frames are used in the corpus.
The frame in which the number of immigrants is depicted, represents 74.4% of all scale and motion frames. The remaining part, i.e. 25.6%, are water metaphors. The epidemic and catastrophe frames do not occur in the corpus.

Furthermore, Figure 10 shows the scale and motion data broken down in the MPOV categories.

Figure 9: Total de-humanisation

Figure 10: De-humanisation: Scale and motion/ MPOV
In each of the MPOV-categories in Figure 10, the number of immigrants frame is used proportionally more than the water metaphors. The proportions for the MPOV-P category are 86.4% to 13.6%, whereas the proportions for the MPOV-M and the MPOV-C category are almost identical, as the number of immigrants frame accounts for approximately 60.0% in both categories. Furthermore, Figure 10 shows some unexpected results, as only 60% of the labels of scale and motion in the MPOV-C category are labels that refer to the number of immigrants, whereas in the MPOV-P category 86.4% are.

The results for the de-humanisation frames of scale and motion show that in 75% of the cases the number of immigrants frame was used, whereas the epidemic and catastrophe frames were not found. Furthermore, in each of the MPOC categories, the number of immigrants frames are used substantially more than the water metaphors. These results are to be expected. Nevertheless, a substantial proportion of water metaphors might indicate a tendency towards negative representation. One might expect that water metaphors are used more often in MPOV-C articles.

4.2.4 De-humanisation linked to the research questions

To be able to answer the first research question, the overall numbers for each frame were studied. First, in opinion pieces that were published during the EU referendum campaign, immigrants are presented using the terms migration, immigration, emigration and free movement. These terms, however, are only very rarely used in a positive context. Neutral and negative contexts are much more common. Second, in titles, the terms are not used in a positive context. Next to the different terms, labels are also used to present immigrants. Two labels were used substantially more than the other ones: the migrant label and the immigrant label. Additionally, the label asylum seeker does not occur in the corpus. Third, almost 75% of the scale and motion frames are number of immigrants frames, whereas the rest of them are water metaphors. The epidemic and catastrophe frames were not found.

The results for the different MPOV categories can be used to describe the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between pro and contra immigration stances, which is the second research question. Most of the terms (im)migration, emigration and free movement are used in a negative context. It is surprising that the highest amount of terms in a
positive context can be found in the MPOV-C category. In the MPOV-P and MPOV-M category, most labels are used in a neutral context, whereas in the MPOV-C category, the number of labels in a negative context is the largest. In addition, the percentage of the labels that can be found in a positive context is twice as high in MPOV-C articles as in MPOV-P articles, which is the opposite of what one might expect. Furthermore, immigrants and migrants are the labels that are mentioned the most in the MPOV-P category. In the MPOV-M category, the migrant label occurs the most and the refugee label and group label are barely used. In the MPOV-C category, the other label is used the most, followed by the migrant label. The immigrants label and refugee label are used in less than 6% and the group label was not found in the articles from this category. Finally, in each of the MPOV categories, water metaphors are clearly used less than the number of immigrants frame, even though one might expect that MPOV-C articles contain a relatively large amount of water metaphors.
4.3 Human but negative

4.3.1 Results for human but negative

In this section, the results for the negative attitude to race frame and the blaming frames are presented.

Figure 11 displays the figures for the negative attitude to race frame.

![Negative attitude to race/MPOV](image)

*Figure 11: Negative attitude to race/ MPOV*

In the complete corpus, 23 examples of the negative attitude to race frame have been found. Most of them, that is 16 are in the MPOV-P category, while only 4 are in the MPOV-M category and 3 in the remaining category. It might be surprising that most of the negative attitude to race frames can be found in the MPOV-P category, but they are actually used to introduce the problem to the reader and not to give a racist view on immigration. All of the negative attitude to race frames were checked and all of these frames that were found in the corpus introduce the problem or talk about the contra-immigration stance of certain groups without using racist words in the article itself.
As can be seen in Figure 12, the pressure on services frame accounts for more than half (53.3%) of the blaming frames in the whole corpus. The other half is divided among the economy frame (26.7%), the security frame (16.7%) and the culture frame (3.3%).

The frame below deals with the same labels as in Figure 12, but it divides the numbers among the MPOV categories.
There are clear differences in the number of occurrences of the blaming labels in each of the three MPOV categories. In the MPOV-P category, the pressure on services frame and the economy frame are both used in approximately 45% of the cases. The culture frame accounts for the remaining 10%, while the security frame does not occur in this category.

The MPOV-M category has different proportions than the previous category, since the pressure on services frame accounts for 41.7%, the security frame for 33.3% and the economy frame for 25.0%. No examples of the culture frame have been found in this category.

The pressure on services frame is used considerably more than the other frames in the MPOV-C category, as the frame accounts for 85.7% of the MPOV-C category. The security frame is used in the remaining 14.3%. Neither economy frames, nor culture frames are present in this category.

4.3.2 Human but negative frames linked to the research questions

A way to present immigrants is by using a negative attitude to race frame, of which 23 examples have been found in the corpus. Furthermore, four different frames are used to present immigrants in texts that were published in the run-up to the EU referendum: the pressure on service frame, the pressure on economy frame, the pressure on security frame and the pressure on culture frame. More than half of the occurrences of the blaming frames in the corpus are pressure on services frames. The culture frame, on the other hand, can be found in less than 5% of the total amount of blaming frames.

The various ways to present immigrants were used differently in the three MPOV categories. Almost seventy per cent of the negative attitude to race frames, for example, can be found in the MPOV-P category, while only 17.4% are in the MPOV-M category and 13.0% in the MPOV-C category. Furthermore, the different blaming frames can be found in different proportions in the MPOV categories and in each of the categories another frame is missing. In the MPOV-P category, the pressure on services frame and the economy frame are both used in 45% of the occurrences, 10% are pressure on culture frames and no security frames were found. In the MPOV-M category, on the other hand, the pressure on services frame does occur. More than forty per cent of the blaming frames are the pressure on services frame. While the pressure on economy frame and the pressure on security frame do occur, the culture frame does not
occur. Lastly, in the MPOV-C category, there are no economy frames or culture frames. The pressure on service frames are again the largest.

This section is followed by the results for the humanisation frames. In contrast to the de-humanisation frames, the humanisation frames can be used to present immigration positively.

4.4 Humanisation

4.4.1 Results for humanisation

This section provides figures for the four frames that authors use to humanise immigrants. After describing the results for the full corpus, separate figures for each MPOV category will be given. It is important to remember that only 15 humanisation frames were found in the corpus as opposed to 541 de-humanisation labels and frames and human but negative labels and frames.

![Figure 14: Total humanisation](image)

As can be seen in Figure 14, there are no examples of either the plight frame or the family/individual frame. The economic advantages frame accounts for 86.7% of the occurrences and the cultural advantages frame for the remaining 13.3%. Furthermore, it is
important to underline that for the de-humanisation frames and the human but negative frames, more than 500 examples were found in the corpus, whereas Figure 14 shows that only 15 humanisation frames were found. The missing categories show that there is no reporting on the human drama in the corpus, as plight frames and family/individual frames could be used to show how families immigrate from one place to another or which family relationships there are between different immigrants. These frames will be discussed in more detail in chapter five.

Since examples of the plight frame or family/individual frame have not been found, these categories have been left out of Figure 15, which shows the same frames as Figure 14, but per MPOV category.

As shown by the data in Figure 15, the economic advantages frame is much more common than the cultural advantages frame. The economic advantages frame accounts for 88.9% in the MPOV-P category, for 75.0% in the MPOV-M category and for a 100% in the MPOV-C category. Although 100% of the humanisation frames used in MPOV-C articles are economic advantages frames, this does not mean that these articles emphasise the economic advantages of immigration. Only one economic advantages frame was found in the MPOV-C articles.
4.4.2 Humanisation linked to the research questions

Immigrants can also be presented with humanisation frames. There are, however, no examples of the plight frame or the family/individual frame in the corpus. The economic advantages frames account for more than 85% of the occurrences and the cultural advantages frame for the remaining part, but one has to bear in mind that the humanisation figures make up only a small proportion of the overall figures. The proportions between the different frames are similar in each of the MPOV categories, as in each category, the economic advantages frames is used in more than 75% of the cases and the cultural advantages frame in the remaining cases.
5. Discussion

5.1 Discussion of the results

This section provides a closer examination of the results in chapter four, discussing individual results that are surprising or expected or focusing on general similarities.

5.1.1 Overall

The overall results in section 4.1 confirm the first two hypotheses and the fourth one but refute the other hypotheses. There are indeed more negative mentions in MPOV-C articles than in MPOV-M articles and MPOV-P articles, as 98.1% of all frames in the MPOV-C articles are negative, but the difference between the three MPOV categories is negligible. Further, the results for the MPOV-P articles are similar to the results for the other MPOV categories because a larger part of the occurrences in the MPOV-P category are positive mentions but the difference with the other categories is negligible. Furthermore, in the MPOV-M articles the authors clearly use more negative frames than positive frames even though one would expect them to use a similar number of positive and negative mentions of immigration. As was expected in the fourth hypothesis, the MPOV-C articles in the corpus contain more negative mentions than positive mentions. The hypothesis for the MPOV-P articles, however, cannot be confirmed, as more than 95% of the occurrences in the corpus are negative.

The general results for the whole corpus can be connected to new racism (Teo, 2000, p. 7) as de-humanisation frames and human but negative frames were used more than five hundred times, whereas humanisation frames were only used fifteen times. The different de-humanisation frames and human but negative frames are not used for clear racist statements, but when the author of an article uses these frames, he or she introduces ideas that are negative too in a more subtle way than the old racism.
5.1.2 De-humanisation

5.1.2.1 De-humanisation: Immigration, emigration and free movement

Section 4.2.1 shows multiple interesting results about the use of the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement. As expected, these terms can be found primarily in a neutral context, since articles from each MPOV category and not only articles from the MPOV-M category contain more neutral, objective parts. Writers who show their opinion clearly in the articles they write, do still write parts that are rather neutral, which results in a high number of the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement in a neutral context. Moreover, one would expect a writer who is pro-immigration to use a large number of the terms in a positive context, but more than 50% of the occurrences in the MPOV-P category are neutral, almost 40% are negative and only around 7% are positive. In addition, only around 50% of the terms used in MPOV-M articles can be found in a more neutral context. That would not be unusual, if the remaining cases would be divided approximately equally between negative and positive contexts. The terms, however, are not divided equally between these contexts, as more than 40% are in a negative context and only around 4% are in a positive one. Once more, many words in a negative context are used, even though the author takes a more neutral position in the complete article. These are remarkable results.

In contrast, at first glance, the results for MPOV-C do correspond to our expectations, as 47.8% of the terms in these articles are in a negative context, 37.3% in a neutral and 14.9% in a positive. It seems normal that an author who is contra-immigration uses the terms in a negative or neutral context rather than in a positive context. It is, however, surprising that almost 15% of the terms (im)migration, emigration and free movement in MPOV-C articles are in a positive context, whereas only 7% of the terms in MPOV-P articles are. In other words, the terms in a positive context are twice as common in the MPOV-C category than in MPOV-P. This is a clear contradiction that shows that the way in which authors write about immigration does not always reflect their main point of view. An example of the term immigration in a clearly positive context in an MPOV-C article is ‘After all, Boris Johnson used to talk of the ‘massive’ benefits of immigration and […]’ (G1, 2016). The word ‘benefits’ is the reason why it can be said that the term ‘immigration’ is in a positive context. In contrast, ‘this is despite the reality,
that immigration is hugely beneficial for our nation’ (G14, 2016) is an example of the same term in a positive context in an MPOV-P article.

As stated in section 4.1.1, words in titles are of considerable importance, since the title is the first part of an article a person reads. The overall figures for the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement in titles show that 60% of the terms are in a neutral context and 40% in a negative context. These figures are noteworthy, as the terms in the titles are never in a positive context, not even in MPOV-P articles, where a certain number of the terms in a positive context might be expected. Furthermore, the number of terms in the titles that can be found in a negative context in the MPOV-M articles is quite high, i.e. more than 40%, considering that the author seems to have neither a positive, nor a negative view towards immigrants.

5.1.2.2 De-humanisation: Labels

Further, the migrant, immigrant and other labels are the de-humanisation labels that appear the most in the complete corpus, followed by the group label. The refugee label and group label, however, are barely used and the asylum seeker label is not present at all in the corpus. This is peculiar, as asylum seekers and refugees have been a major topic in the news media for years now.

5.1.2.3 De-humanisation: Scale and motion

Another unexpected result in the de-humanisation categories is that the epidemic frame and catastrophe frame are not mentioned in the full corpus, whereas the water metaphor does appear in more than 25% of the cases. Even though the results that are presented earlier on in this section show that authors that belong to any of the MPOV categories use many terms in a more negative context, the extremely negative catastrophe and epidemic frames are not used. In addition, the results for the scale of immigrants are opposite to what might be expected, given that referring to the scale of immigrants is more common in MPOV-P articles (86.4%) than in MPOV-C articles (60%).
Furthermore, as can be seen in Figure 9, many of the de-humanisation frames of scale and motion can be found in a positive context, but at the same time, while using these frames, the author reduces the immigrants to a statistic. There is, thus, a disjunction between authors adopting a stance in favour of immigration in their article and the same authors using de-humanisation frames that reduce the people they seem to accept in their overall article to a mere statistic.

5.1.3 Human but negative

With regard to the human but negative category, the results for the negative attitude to race frame correspond with our expectations. We might reasonably expect that authors who are pro-immigration talk more about xenophobia, as they might want to oppose people who are hostile towards immigrants, because that is not how they think about immigration. However, we have to bear in mind that the corpus contains more articles that belong to the MPOV-P category than to the other two MPOV categories.

Further, the figures for the blaming frames in the complete corpus are 53.3% for the pressure on services frame, 26.7% for the economy frame, 16.7% for the security frame and 3.3% for the culture frame, which is a rather low number. It does not seem extraordinary that the pressure on services frame is the most common in the corpus, but the expected percentages for the economy frame and the security frame might have been higher, as the economy and security were two of the main themes during the EU referendum campaign. Additionally, the figures for the culture frame are rather low compared to the other blaming frames.

As the economy and security were such an important themes, it is interesting to examine the results for the blaming frames for each MPOV category. The figures for the blaming frames broken down in MPOV categories show a clear disjunction between the literal content and the overall message, a pattern that is repeated throughout the results of this study. In the MPOV-M category, more neutral vocabulary to talk about immigration is expected, but more than 30% of the blaming frames in this category are security frames, whereas less than 15% of the blaming frames in the MPOV-C category are security frames. In other words, writers with a more neutral view towards immigration use a relatively high number of frames that normally depict a negative stance towards immigration. These findings refute the third hypothesis.
concerning MPOV-M articles in which it was expected that a similar number of positive and negative mentions of immigration would occur.

The figures for the MPOV-P and MPOV-C categories are also interesting. During the EU referendum campaign, the Remain camp focused on the economy and the Leave camp on immigration (Wodak in Cooper, 2016). As a result, MPOV-C authors focusing on the pressure on services and security seems logical, because authors who are contra-immigration and who share the same opinion about immigration as the Leave campaign, focus on the same themes.

Furthermore, the pressure on services frame can be linked to the economy, as people might be afraid that there is not enough money available to pay for the different services, such as education and healthcare. In the MPOV-P articles, there is as much emphasis on the pressure on services as on the pressure on economy. The MPOV-M articles also show more balanced proportions, but the MPOV-C articles underline the pressure on services. The difference between the three MPOV categories is not entirely in line with the idea of humanisation and de-humanisation in those categories. You might expect authors who are pro-immigration to use more humanisation frames and that authors who are contra-immigration are more apt to use de-humanisation frames. Pressure on services frames, however, are closer to the human dimension, whereas the economy is a more abstract dimension. Examples for pressure on services frames in MPOV-C articles and MPOV-P articles can be found in G10 and G11. In the former, the author states that a ‘post-EU regime can support our public services, expand our economy and also deliver humanitarian objectives, but because it will be under our control there won’t be unexpected and excessive pressures on our schools, hospitals and public infrastructure’ (G10, 2016). The author clearly emphasises the pressure on services in the second part of the sentence. The author of the latter talks about ‘the housing crisis’ and ‘overcrowded A&E departments’ (G11, 2016), which also is a clear example of a pressure on services frame.

5.1.4 Humanisation

Further, it is remarkable that there are only 15 occurrences of the two humanising frames, while the de-humanising frames occur 167 times in total. In addition, no examples were found of the plight frame nor of the family/individual frame. The humanisation frames can also be analysed
using the comparison with the two camps in the EU referendum campaign. The high percentage of the economic advantages frame might be thanks to the Remain camp emphasising the economic benefits of remaining in the European Union. Additionally, the expected situation would be that mostly MPOV-P authors use humanisation frames, which corresponds to the results for the corpus, as there are 9 in MPOV-P, 4 in MPOV-M and 2 in MPOV-C. The difference is, however, not particularly large, certainly not if you consider that the corpus contains more articles that are pro than middle or contra.

Furthermore, the low number of humanisation frames can be linked to the idea of Lawlor and Tolley (2017, p. 972) arguing that journalists focus on the economic issue concerning immigration rather than on the contributions by immigrants. The many blaming frames, in particular, underline the cost of immigration, but only twelve economic advantages frames and two cultural advantages frames are used in the corpus to emphasise the contributions to society.

5.1.5 Articles after the EU referendum

We found two articles, G14 and T4, that were published after the EU referendum on 23 June 2016 and that meet the conditions that are explained in the methodology in chapter three. G14 belongs to the MPOV-P category and contains 2 terms, i.e. immigration, migration, emigration or free movement, in a positive context, 3 in a neutral context and 3 in a negative context. Furthermore, the negative attitude to race frame can be found six times in article G14 and the labels migrant and immigrant five and four times.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total pos</th>
<th>Total neutral</th>
<th>Total neg</th>
<th>Neg attitude to race</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
<th>Immigrant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 6: Figures for article G14*

In contrast to G14, T4 belongs to the MPOV-C category. There are 2 terms (immigration, migration, emigration or free movement) in a neutral context and 10 in a negative context. One of the ones in a neutral context can be found in the main title. In addition, there is also 1 migrant label in article T4.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total neutral</th>
<th>Total negative</th>
<th>Neutral in title</th>
<th>Migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 7: Figures for article T4*

The two categories that were published in the week after the EU referendum on 23 June, 2016, are from different MPOV categories. We had expected to find more sources in this time frame, but only few articles meet the conditions. Comparing two articles with the rest of the corpus, might lead to unrepresentative results, which is why we cannot compare them. It might, however, be interesting to perform a more direct comparison between articles that were published before and after the EU referendum in future studies.

5.1 Discussion of specific language use in the corpus

As can be seen in section 5.1, authors who show in their article that they are pro-immigration, do not use mainly positive frames. They tend to use a large number of terms in a negative context or de-humanisation labels or frames. In article G4, the author adopts a positive position towards immigration but he still uses a de-humanisation water metaphor, a frame that is not always used in a negative way, but most of the time it is. Portes, the author of article G4, explains that the British government is said to ‘withhold data about the true scale of immigration’ (G4, 2016). He says that the data ‘might indicate that migration flows from Europe, particularly for work reasons, have indeed been higher than we thought.’ He later explains the benefits of immigration, which can be combined with the water metaphor as he does not use it in a negative way.

Jonathan Freedland also uses negative labels while clearly adopting a pro-immigration stance. As pointed out in the methodology of this study, the author of the article confirms his stance towards immigration by saying that he agrees with the idea that ‘newcomers add more to our society than they take out’ and by saying that he believes in a liberal, open Britain’ (G9, 2016). Even in the title, immigration sounds like a problem: ‘Remain needs to change tack on immigration – or risk Brexit’ (G9, 2016). The title might refer to the idea that the remain camp did not focus on immigration during the EU referendum campaign and to the need to persuade voters to stay in the EU. As they want to win over voters and because immigration is viewed
as an issue by many people, the change probably refers to making the immigration policy stricter and putting this idea forward in the campaign. In the article, Freedland uses the emigration, (im)migration and free movement labels only once in a positive context, four times in a neutral context and 12 times in a negative context. It is particularly interesting to see how a writer whose opinion towards immigration in the overall articles is positive, uses such a large amount of negative vocabulary and, in addition, talks about anxiety: ‘They could say that they have heard the British people and understand their concern – and that, as it happens, plenty of other European voters share Britons’ anxiety (which they do)’ (G9, 2016). Freedland adds a water metaphor after the preceding quotation, saying that ‘free movement remains a cardinal principle, but that they will look again at how that principle can work in practice in the era of globalisation and mass flows of people’ (G9, 2016). In contrast, a more neutral way of using flows can be found in article G7, where the author says that the ‘demographic, political and economic drivers all point to more flows, in more directions, in the coming decade’ (G7, 2016). In that example, ‘flows’ is an objective way to say that large groups of people move from one place to another.

The water metaphors feature in articles that belong to the three MPOV categories. In the MPOV-P category, water metaphors are used to refer to a large number of immigrants that go from one place to another or to refer to people that move to another place for work. The water metaphors in the articles of the MPOV-C category combine the large groups of immigrants with a negative context, as in, for example: ‘Gove asserted that 77 million Turkish Muslim citizens would soon be using the NHS, and Albanian criminals were about to flood Britain’ (G1, 2016). Articles that belong to the third category, MPOV-M, all point to ‘flows of people’ (G7, 2016). It can thus be said, that the MPOV-M authors use the water metaphors in a more objective and neutral context.

Finally, the author in article G2, Mason, belongs to the MPOV-M category, but he does not use an equal number of more positive and more negative contexts for the labels emigration, migration, immigration and free movement. Instead, he uses the labels only once in a positive context, 10 times in a negative context and 2 times in a neutral context. These figures show once more that even though the stance of the writer in the whole article is not negative, a large part of the labels he or she uses have a negative connotation.
6. Conclusion

The aim of this thesis is to examine the way in which immigrants are presented in quality press opinion pieces published during the Brexit referendum campaign. The following research questions have been examined:

1. How are immigrants presented in opinion pieces in the quality print and online press in the run-up to the EU referendum?

2. What are the similarities and contrasts in the presentation of immigrants between pro and contra immigration stances?

To answer those research questions, 25 opinion pieces published in the UK quality print and online press during the official EU referendum campaign and the week following the referendum were studied using Critical Discourse Analysis and framing theory. Each of the articles was placed in one of the MPOV categories according to whether the author is pro- or contra-immigration or adopts a more neutral stance towards immigration.

In addition to the main research questions, five different hypotheses were examined to be able to study the way in which the positive, the humanisation frames, and negative frames, the de-humanisation frames and the human but negative frames, are distributed across the three MPOV categories:

a) MPOV-C articles will have more negative mentions than MPOV-M and MPOV-P articles.
b) MPOV-P articles will have more positive mentions than MPOV-M and MPOV-C articles.
c) MPOV-M articles use a similar number of positive and negative mentions of immigration.
d) MPOV-C articles will have more negative mentions than positive mentions.
e) MPOV-P articles will have more positive mentions than negative mentions.

Overall, 541 negative frames and labels were found as opposed to 15 humanisation frames, which means that authors of the different MPOV categories seem to be using a proportional number of negative words to describe immigration, even though authors in the MPOV-P category are expected to use more positive words and the MPOV-M authors are expected to be
more neutral and objective. In other words, regardless of stance, the overall impression from the coverage is of negative representation and de-humanisation. Also human but negative outweighs humanisation, which creates the primary impression of migrants being problems and objects rather than human individuals. In addition, in each of the MPOV categories a similar proportion between negative and positive frames can be found, as more than 96% of the mentions in each of the MPOV categories is negative. The overall results can be connected to new racism (Teo, 2000, p. 7), as the de-humanisation frames and human but negative frames are not used for obvious racist statements, but for more subtle negative comments on immigration.

The general results seem to indicate that although writers think in a particular way about immigrants and immigration, the words they use might indicate the opposite. The writers of newspaper opinion pieces do not always adopt the same stance as the newspaper itself, but the writers still have to attract readers and the newspaper and writer both have an interest in reporting on the themes their readers are interested in. The results in section 4.1 support hypotheses a and b to an extent, confirm d, but contradict the other two hypotheses. The MPOV-C articles do contain more negative frames than the other MPOV categories, but the difference is negligible. Furthermore, similar results for the second hypothesis have been found. The results for the third hypothesis clearly show the opposite of what was expected: MPOV-M authors use more negative than positive frames even though it was expected that a similar number of positive and negative mentions would be used. Further, hypothesis d seems to be confirmed, considering that the MPOV-C articles contain more negative frames than positive frames. Finally, the last hypothesis, however, is refuted, as more than 95% of the occurrences in the MPOV-P articles are negative.

The following frames and labels can be used to present immigrants and their usage in the corpus articles was examined in this study. First, the labels immigration, migration, emigration and free movement are used to present immigration. Then, different labels such as migrant, immigrant, asylum seeker, refugee, the group labels and the other labels are also used to present immigration. Further, there are frames of scale and motion too, i.e. number of immigrants frames, water metaphor frames, epidemic frames and the catastrophe frame. The previous frames and labels are part of the de-humanisation section, while the following frames, the blaming frames and negative attitude to race frame are part of the human but negative section. Four different blaming frames can be distinguished: the pressure on services frame, the pressure on economy frame and the pressure on security frame. Finally, a very small number
of humanisation frames were found: the plight frame, the family/individual frame, the economy frame and the security frame.

The results for the terms immigration, migration, emigration and free movement also appear to show that there is a contradiction between how authors write about immigration and their main point of view. A writer who is pro-immigration is expected to use a considerable number of terms in a positive context. However, more than half of the occurrences in the MPOV-P articles are neutral, almost 40% are negative and approximately 7% are positive. In contrast, 15% of the terms in the MPOV-C articles can be found in a positive context. The terms are thus rarely used in a positive context. In addition, none of the main titles contains these terms in a positive context.

Furthermore, for the presentation of immigration other de-humanisation labels and frames were also used. The immigrant and migrant label were used substantially, but the refugee label was barely used and no asylum seeker labels have been found in the corpus, which is extraordinary, as asylum seekers and refugees have been an important theme in the media for some years. Further, the de-humanising frames of scale and motion are another way to present immigration. Three quarters of these frames are the number of immigrants frame and one quarter water metaphors. Additionally, it is surprising that the former frame is more commonly used by MPOV-P authors than by MPOV-C authors.

Alongside the de-humanisation frames and labels, human but negative frames are part of the negative frames and labels. The largest part of the negative attitude to race frames can be found in the MPOV-P category. Further, the usage of the pressure on services frame can be linked to the economy, because people might be worried that there is not enough money to pay for services, such as healthcare and education. MPOV-P and MPOV-M articles show more balanced proportions between pressure on services frames and pressure on economy frames, but the MPOV-C articles stress the pressure on services. There clearly is a disjunction in how articles that are pro-immigration use both human dimensions and more abstract dimensions and in how contra-immigration articles underline the human dimension.

Finally, considering the humanisation frames, it is surprising that no plight frames and family/individual frames were found and that most of the mentions were economic advantages frames and only a small part were cultural advantages frames. In addition, the economic advantages frame was the most common frame in all of the MPOV categories, which includes
the articles in which the author is pro-immigration. In the articles written by those authors, one might expect a more human dimension, but the results show that the opposite happens.

All in all, the most surprising result is that MPOV-P articles contain a large number of negative mentions, while one might expect that most articles written by authors that adopt a positive view towards immigration use mainly positive frames. There clearly is a disjunction between the general message of the articles and how the author states his ideas. It also seems that there is very little interest in the cultural side in both the de-humanisation part and the humanisation part, as pressure on services frames is more stressed than pressure on culture frames and of the de-humanisation frames, the economic advantages frames occur much more frequently than the cultural advantages frames and the frames that show the circumstances in which the immigrants travel or live. In contrast, the pressure on the economy frames and the economic advantages frames are used regularly.

This study has some limitations and therefore, suggestions can be made for further research. As only 25 opinion pieces that comply with the requirements were found, the corpus is rather small and therefore, it might be better to repeat this study with a larger corpus, made up of articles that were published in a broader range of newspapers. To study whether authors use de-humanising frames and labels while adopting a pro-immigration stance, it might be interesting to study articles that were published about a different theme, even in a different country. For example, the use of de-humanisation frames and humanisation frames in the election campaign of Trump might be an intriguing theme to cover. Furthermore, there is a proportional difference in the number of articles for each MPOV category. In future studies, it might be better to ensure that there is a similar number of each of the MPOV categories. Additionally, it might be interesting to examine the difference between newspapers in detail, as this study focused on individual articles rather than on the newspapers as a whole. Finally, a future study might examine the difference in use of negative and positive frames and labels in articles that were published before and after the EU referendum. This was not possible for this master thesis, as only two articles were found that meet all requirements and that were published in the two weeks after the referendum.
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<td>The Times. (28.06.2016). Boris in Denial; After a referendum campaign tarnished by flimsy assertions by both sides, it is time for serious negotiations based on reality, especially over immigration. The Times. Retrieved from <a href="http://academic.lexisnexis.eu/?lni=5PJX-XGG1-JBVM-Y52R&amp;csi=10939&amp;oc=00240&amp;perma=true">http://academic.lexisnexis.eu/?lni=5PJX-XGG1-JBVM-Y52R&amp;csi=10939&amp;oc=00240&amp;perma=true</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 1: What migrants are blamed for (not comprehensive)
(Moore and Ramsay, 2017, p. 86)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant blames</th>
<th>British impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creating a housing crisis</td>
<td>Putting British firms out of business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pushing property prices up, and deepening the homelessness problem</td>
<td>Overwhelming the NHS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking British jobs</td>
<td>Increasing the wait for hospitals and GP surgeries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking British benefits</td>
<td>Costing a fortune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taking British benefits</td>
<td>Traffic congestion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressing British wages</td>
<td>Crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a schools crisis</td>
<td>Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depriving Britain’s schools of money and resources</td>
<td>Terror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Primary school places from British children</td>
<td>Importing organised crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking Secondary school places from British children</td>
<td>Smuggling terror weapons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaining council houses ahead of British applicants</td>
<td>Putting unsustainable pressure on prisons/ costing a fortune to detain/ imprison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putting unsustainable pressure on local public services</td>
<td>Reducing quality of life and social solidarity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strains on maternity services due to immigrants</td>
<td>Threatening green-belt land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing anti-semitism</td>
<td>Bringing diseases to Britain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefitting from cheaper weddings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2:  RASIM definitions (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008, p. 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Someone who has been forced to leave their country, especially during a war, or for political or religious reasons.</td>
<td>One who, owing to religious persecution or political troubles, seeks refuge in a foreign country. A runaway; a fugitive from justice, etc. rare. Someone driven from his home by war or the fear of attack or persecution; a displaced person.</td>
<td>Someone whose asylum application has been successful and who is allowed to stay in another country having proved they would face persecution back home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>Someone who leaves their own country because they are in danger, especially for political reasons, and who asks the government of another country to allow them to live there.</td>
<td>A person seeking refuge, esp. political asylum, in a nation other than his or her own.</td>
<td>Someone who has fled persecution in their homeland, has arrived in another country, made themselves known to the authorities and exercised the legal right to apply for asylum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>Someone who enters another country to live there permanently.¹³</td>
<td>One who or that which immigrates; a person who migrates into a country as a settler. An animal or plant that has migrated into a given area, esp. one now living there; also, an animal (esp. a bird) that regularly or occasionally migrates into a given area.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illegal immigrant</td>
<td>Someone who comes to live in another country without official permission.</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>Someone who goes to live in another area or country, especially in order to find work.</td>
<td>That migrates; characterized by migration. Also (occas.): wandering, nomadic. A person who moves temporarily or seasonally from place to place A person who moves permanently to live in a new country, town, etc., esp. to look for work, or to take up a post, etc.;</td>
<td>Someone who has moved to another country to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emigrant</td>
<td>Someone who leaves their own country to live in another.</td>
<td>One who removes from his own land to settle (permanently) in another.</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Contrasting Definitions of RASIM Terms

¹² Refugee Council
¹³ Someone who enters another country to live there permanently.
Appendix 3: Old figures

### MPOV/Label

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
<th>MPOV-P</th>
<th>MPOV-M</th>
<th>MPOV-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>migrants</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10,91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>immigrant</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refugee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the group</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>40,91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MPOV/De-humanisation: scale and motion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
<th>MPOV-P</th>
<th>MPOV-M</th>
<th>MPOV-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale number of immigrants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31,25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water metaphor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
<th>MPOV-P</th>
<th>MPOV-M</th>
<th>MPOV-C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale number of immigrants</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>31,25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water metaphor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18,18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 4: Total number of occurrences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th># Occurrences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total pos</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total neutral</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total neg</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos in title</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg in title</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg attitude to race</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale number of immigrants</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water metaphor</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epidemic</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catastrophe</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressure on services</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economy</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>culture</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plight</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/ Individual</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic advantages</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural advantages</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of occurrences</td>
<td>4,3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total neutral</td>
<td>26,6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total neg</td>
<td>23,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pos in title</td>
<td>2,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neg in title</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg attitude to race</td>
<td>4,1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>9,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>7,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>0,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scale number of immigrants</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water metaphor</td>
<td>3,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>epidemic</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>catastrophe</td>
<td>1,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pressure on services</td>
<td>0,0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>economy</td>
<td>2,9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultural advantages</td>
<td>0,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of occurrences</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Total number of occurrences categories

- **Total pos**: 4 occurrences (4,3%)
- **Total neutral**: 148 occurrences (26,6%)
- **Total neg**: 129 occurrences (23,2%)
- **pos in title**: 4 occurrences (2,2%)
- **neg in title**: 12 occurrences (1,4%)
- **Neg attitude to race**: 8 occurrences (4,1%)
- **Migrants**: 23 occurrences (9,9%)
- **Immigrant**: 55 occurrences (7,7%)
- **Asylum seeker**: 9 occurrences (0,4%)
- **Refugee**: 2 occurrences (0,0%)
- **Other**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **The group**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **scale number of immigrants**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **water metaphor**: 9 occurrences (3,2%)
- **epidemic**: 11 occurrences (6,9%)
- **catastrophe**: 18 occurrences (11,1%)
- **pressure on services**: 6 occurrences (3,2%)
- **economy**: 32 occurrences (20,0%)
- **culture**: 11 occurrences (6,9%)
- **security**: 2 occurrences (1,2%)
- **plight**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **Family/ Individual**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **Economic advantages**: 0 occurrences (0,0%)
- **cultural advantages**: 2 occurrences (1,2%)
Appendix 5: Proportion between categories

Proportions between categories

- **Proportion between categories**
  - **(Im)migration, emigration, free movement**
  - **In title (Im)migration, emigration, free movement**
  - **Neg attitude to race**
  - **Labels**
  - **Dehumanisation**
  - **Blaming**
  - **Humanisation**