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**Abstract**

This research provides an analysis of the frame used by the United Kingdom Independence Party (Ukip) for migrants coming to the United Kingdom from Romania and Bulgaria, with a focus on Romanian and Bulgarian citizens coming after January the 1st, 2014, when the previous regulations regarding the access to UK’s job market for migrants coming from Romania and Bulgaria came to an end.

Then, the research provides data concerning the fact that a certain type of framing is used not only by the Ukip, but also by mainstream media. I analyse, specifically, articles from the newspapers The Daily Mail, The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph.

The reason why I did this research is because I find it interesting to analyse how a political party makes use of the topic of migration in its political discourse, and how it moulds the image of a specific target group (in this case, Romanian and Bulgarian migrants) through the usage of a certain framing. Political parties and mass media have an extended influence on the public opinion regarding issues of public interest, such as, in this case, immigration. If a political party provides a certain type of frame for a specific target group, and part of mainstream media as well, then chances are high that public opinion will be consequently influenced, and part of it might begin to share the same vision upon the matter at hand.

I decided to analyse the Ukip because of its fame of being quite a controversial party, but which is growing in popularity among Britons. Its statements and points of view on issues such as EU membership, immigration and welfare system access, renders the Ukip’s political discourse interesting material for framing analysis, which I develop through the careful reading of the party’s official texts and speeches, highlighting the relevant statements, problem represented, keywords and solutions provided, concerning specifically immigration from Romania and Bulgaria after January the 1st, 2014.

I also go beyond the Ukip’s discourse, and analyse mainstream media as well in order to highlight whether is the Ukip only to provide a certain framing for immigrants from Romania and Bulgaria, or there is a common ground with mainstream media as well. I conduct this research through the gathering of a certain number of articles, carefully reading them and abstracting the parts concerning the topic of immigration from Romania and Bulgaria after January the 1st, 2014, analysing what is the problem represented to b and the keywords used.

What I found out is that there such share, and that the framing used by the Ukip have much in common with the framing used by mainstream media as well, in particular The Daily Mail and The Express, and The Telegraph. The Guardian, on the other hand, takes its distance from such framing and provides a more detached and critical approach towards the matter I choose to focus on, which is immigration to the UK from Romania and Bulgaria, and the end of work regulations after January the 1st, 2014.
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***Sold Out!***

***A framing analysis of the United Kingdom Independence Party and British mainstream media.***

1. **Introduction**

In this thesis I analyse the political discourse of the United Kingdom Independence Party, in particular the use made of the immigration topic and the way immigrants are depicted as “benefits tourists”, through the creation of a link between migration and the financial problems of the country.

I will analyse how the United Kingdom Independence Party frames migrants, in particular Romanian and Bulgarian migrants. Starting from Autumn 2013 (more specifically September, October, November and December) I will analyse the party’s political discourse about immigrants from Romania and Bulgaria, highlighting how the two groups are depicted by the Ukip, what is the frame they are put in and how is the framing characterized and proposed.

Then, the same analysis will be applied to mainstream media, in particular the newspapers The Daily Mail and The Express, as well as The Guardian and The Telegraph.

I will analyse the party’s official documents (official website, manifesto) and the press (interviews and reports from The Guardian and The Daily Mail, along with The Telegraph and The Express) and how the two groups of migrants (Romanian and Bulgarian) become a target population as a whole. I will highlight how the migrants from the two Eastern European countries become a target group in the Ukip’s discourse and in mainstream media, analysing the framing (What is the problem? How is it presented? What are the solutions? What is the diagnosis, therefore how is the Ukip’s policy agenda adapting to the problem presented?).

I will present Ukip’s arguments when the transitional rules regarding the freedom of movement from Romania and Bulgaria to the UK fell in January the 1st 2014.

The concern was that Romanians and Bulgarians were ready to start a mass emigration from their low-wage countries to the UK, where the minimum wage is way higher. The Ukip threatened a mass immigration once the transitional laws would cease to be the rule, with migrants from Romania and Bulgaria waiting to take advantage of that, coming to the UK and steal jobs and benefits, putting in danger the very economical situation of UK itself.

I find it particularly interesting to analyse the United Kingdom Independence Party’s discourse in relation to the theories of framing and target groups creation. It is interesting to notice what is the political discourse of the party, which are the main points that remain present throughout time when it comes to the issue of migration? How are the immigrants from Romania and Bulgaria framed? What is the problem and what are the solutions proposed by the party?

I will make use of theories by more scholars, like Wacquant, Goffman, Banting & Kymlicka, for analysing the framing of the issue of migration, as well as for the analysis of mainstream media texts.

This study is structured in the following way: Introduction followed by the methodology section where I look at the secondary quantitative and qualitative data related to my topic. Quantitative data include the presentation of ‘hard’ statistics regarding migration to the UK after the country entry in the European Union and a specific reference to the Romania and Bulgaria economic situation and unemployment levels. The methodology chapter will also introduce to the frame analysis, which I use to analyse the UKIP’s official documents (manifesto, agendas, programme), framing analysis in The Daily Mail and The Daily Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph articles, focusing on key issues such as migration from Romania and Bulgaria, analysis of the creation of the target group.

The third chapter of the thesis is the theoretical chapter. Here I introduce to the work of Goffman (1974) and Entman (1993) and to the theory of social insecurity developed by French sociologist Loic Wacquant (2007). The theory will also include a section on the construction of ‘target groups’ mainly referring to the work of Ingram, Schneider & Deleon’s theory of target groups’ formation (2007). The work and approach of Canadian scholars Banting & Kymlicka’s (2006) will also be mentioned.

The chapter four, the analysis, is divided into two main parts: the analysis of the Ukip’s Romanian and Bulgarian migrants’ framing, and the analysis of the mainstream media’s framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants.

I will first provide an overview of the United Kingdom’s welfare system, a presentation of the benefits and the rules to access the welfare system for non-British citizens, followed by an analysis of the immigration patterns to the country since its entrance to the European Union as a Member State.

I will then present the case of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants, analysing quickly the two countries’ economic situation and levels of unemployment, defining the characteristics that might have acted as push factors.

The analysis will then continue with a presentation of the United Kingdom Independence Party, its view on immigration and its Euroskepticism, followed the analysis of migrants’ framing, the one enacted by the Ukip, what is the problem presented, how are Romanian and Bulgarian migrants framed and what are the solutions provided by the party.

To follow, I will analyse the framing used by mainstream media (The Daily Mail, The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph), how is the problem represented, how are Romanian and Bulgarian migrants framed by part of the British press.

**2. Methodology**

I have chosen to use for my research both secondary qualitative and quantitative data.

I will use quantitative data to present the Ukip progression in terms of popularity and votes obtained throughout the years, and I will use this research to quickly show the Ukip’s situation in terms of popularity as a party in the UK.

As source of secondary quantitative data I will use the website ukpollingreport.co.uk, where data concerning Britons’ voting intention is gathered, along with data concerning past elections; I will also use yougov.co.uk/opi/, a website that measures public opinion in the UK, and consumer behaviour, and [www.bbc.co.uk/](http://www.bbc.co.uk/), where the latest politics’ opinion polls are available.

As for the secondary qualitative data, I will use data concerning the party’s framing of immigrants from Eastern Europe, agenda, and press release, along with public declarations and interviews. According to Bryman, the most used methods for conducting a qualitative research are interviewing, conversation analysis, focus groups, participant observation and ethnography, discourse analysis and document analysis (Bryman, 2008). The methods I will use are framing analysis and document analysis, therefore I will make use of textual data and analyse the party’s speeches and interviews (the majority of which come from the Ukip’s leader, MEP Nigel Farage), along with articles published by The Guardian, The Telegraph, The Daily Mail and The Express.

I will use the Ukip’s official website ([www.Ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org) and www.Ukipmeps.org/) as source of data regarding the party’s manifesto, infos and updates. I will use material from the website to describe the Ukip’s ideals and politics’ main focus points, which policies they want to present, which are UK’s issues for the party and what solutions are presented. My main focus will be migration and European Union, therefore I will use data from the website concerning those two topics and the Ukip’s attitude towards them.

The website is also a source of polls, statistics and public opinion. I will use this data, but with caution since it is gathered for the party’s official, therefore reliability might be an issue.

The reason why I will use both the Ukip’s official documents (such as their manifesto) and their declarations to the press and interviews, is that unlike a manifesto or any other official document published, interviews and public statements are often more direct, clear and more focused on the issue at hand. As for this issue, I will focus my attention on the topic of migration and how migrants from Romania and Bulgaria are framed in the Ukip’s discourse.

As the scholars K. Benoit, M. Laver and John Garry state in their work (2003) regarding the difference between analysing speeches and manifestos:

“[…] manifestos are typically comprehensive documents addressing a wide range of policy issues, while speeches tend to be much more restricted in focus.” (Benoit, Garry & Laver, 2003: 327)

I will also analyse articles written about the issue of immigration from Romania and Bulgaria and the forthcoming end of rules regarding work in the UK on January the 1st, 2014.

The main sources for those articles will be The Express and The Daily Mail, The Guardian and The Independent.

The first two I mentioned are newspapers whose opinion about the issue of migration are quite strong and seem to be in favour of the Ukip and its agenda, while The Guardian and The Telegraph are more detached from a sensationalist sort of press. The reason why I choose two newspapers for each side (more sensationalist, The Daily Mail and The Sun – and not, The Guardian and The Telegraph), for analysing the press and the media cover of the issue (migration and framing of the two groups of migrants, Romanian/Bulgarian) is to present the “two sides of the coin”, avoiding to use sources which are biased and improve data’s reliability.

The interviews and quotes I will be using are transcribed from direct speech, therefore it is unlikely that the journalist who wrote a specific article forged it into something different in terms of words and meaning.

As for the time frame for the data collection, the majority of articles and speeches are dated in 2013 (September, October, November and December), the year right before the restrictions regarding work for Romanian and Bulgarian migrants were about to end (January the 1st, 2014). I will also analyse articles and speeches published after this date, to highlight how the party has dealt with the outcome of the end of those regulations and how facts turned out to be in reality, beyond their previous predictions.

I will conduct the analysis focusing on how the target population (Romanians and Bulgarians) are framed and how the problem is presented, with consequent solutions.

Regarding this sort of analysis, Carol Bacchi[[1]](#footnote-1) theorized how governments work in terms of policy-making, and how this depends on the creation of a problem.

“Commonly governments are seen to be *reacting* to ‘problems’ and trying to solve them. The rethinking proposed here highlights that specific proposals […] impose a particular interpretation upon the issue. In this sense governments *create* ‘problems’, rather than *reacting* to them, meaning that they create particular impressions of what the ‘problem’ is.” (Bacchi, 2010: 2)

Therefore, in the case of migrants’ framing of the Ukip and mainstream media, *how is immigration from Romania and Bulgaria after January 1st 2014 represented as a ‘problem’?*

 *Consequently, what are the solution proposed?*

According to Bacchi’s theory, the three effects of framing:

* Discursive effects, what is discussed and what not
* Subjectification effects, how people are seen and how they see themselves
* Lived effects, the impact on life and death

Specifically for my analysis, the discursive effect is the focus put on migrants as them being an issue for UK’s resources (welfare system, benefits, housing, health system, education and criminality).

The subjectification effect is how Romanian and Bulgarian migrants are seen as a ‘problem’ and how they see themselves consequently.

The lived effect is how the policy might change in order to adapt to the represented situation and solve the ‘problem’ and how migrants might have problems in everyday life because of the negative framing proposed.

I will search for the keywords for the analysis of the frame (welfare system, country’s economic resources, unemployment, benefits, hordes, invasion, etc.), and I will use the method of analysis divided into two parts: the analysis of the Ukip’s framing of Bulgarian and Romanian migrants, and the analysis of the framing of the mainstream media of the group of migrants (The Daily Mail, The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph).

In the analysis, I will make use of the theories of framing analysis and target group creation, how the problem is formulated by the Ukip and mainstream media, what is the diagnosis and what are the solutions presented. I will make use of those theories (presented more in depth in the chapter “Theory”) in my analysis since I am basing it on framing analysis (in the discourse of the Ukip and mainstream media), I will dissect how the problem is presented, its effects and the solutions proposed. In this case, more in concrete, how a target group is presented (Romanian and Bulgarian migrants coming to the UK), how is the problem formulated (what is the concrete issue with those immigrants), its effects (e.g. stress on welfare system, benefits tourism, criminality) and at last what are the solutions presented to face the problem.

Before this, I will I will then present the specific case of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants and the situation of the two Eastern European countries, focusing on the economic situation, GDP and employment data.

By doing so, I try to highlight the push factors for migrants to leave the two countries. Also, the Ukip mentions the economic situation of the two Eastern European countries in its political discourse as an explanation for the “massive invasion” they forecast to happen after Janaury 1st, 2014.

In the analysis, I will first present an overlook over the United Kingdom welfare system, with a focus on the possibilities of accession to it for European Union citizens, followed by data concerning the development of migration to the country since the accession to the EU.

To follow, I will dedicate a paragraph to the Ukip and the issue of migration for the party, what they stand for and what they propose in relation to the problem.

The analysis will continue with the case of the Ukip and Romanian and Bulgarian migrants. I will analyse the framing the party creates for the two groups of migration in its agenda, manifestos and official material, followed by the analysis of the framing mainstream media use for the group of migrants. Specifically, I will analyse articles from The Daily Mail and The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph.

To collect the material, I gathered a number of articles throughout Autumn 2013 (September, October, November and December, the months right before January the 1st, 2014).

As for the specific articles chosen for quotation, after carefully reading them, I have chosen those with the most refraining definitions and keywords (this means, the definitions that I have found occurring more in the material analysed), and where the statements were the most clear. In a way, I have chosen the most representative text for quoting and citing.

As for the analysis of the Ukip’s framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants, and the mainstream media’s one, I will develop the analysis in two steps:

* Qualitative content analysis. I will go through the selected texts to abstract the broad content, obtaining a platform from which the most salient parts can be taken and highlight what is the problem, what is the problem represented to be (the parts that are relevant to the analysis I am conducting).

It is important to understand the text as a whole, analysing the context, in order to provide the focus on relevant parts with a context. According to the scholar Johnston[[2]](#footnote-2):

“The first reading allows the text to be seen as a ‘holistic construct’ […] as the text is the central empirical referent in micro-discourse analysis, and its integrity should be maintained” (Johnston, 1995: 221-222)

* Selection of relevant section of text. I will select the passages that are more relevant to answer my research question (Ukip and mainstream media immigration framing analysis, in relation to Romanian and Bulgarian migrants). The selected sections are then analysed in their content, keywords (what are the most used terms in the framing process), presenting the framing’s characteristics, what is the problem and what is the solution.

The passages selected are those where the author of the text (for the mainstream media, the journalist who wrote the specific text analysed, and for the Ukip discourse, the member of the party releasing the speech/public declaration) states explicitly the issue on which I am focusing on (migration from Romania and Bulgaria, welfare system and benefits tourism).

This selection will be done through a careful reading of the material collected, selecting and then quoting the articles whose abstracts are the most clear and “representative”, which means I will quote the articles that express most clearly the most occurring statements regarding migration to the UK from Romania and Bulgaria.

1. **Theory**

In this chapter I will introduce the theories that will help me through the analysis of the framing the Ukip’s uses in relation to immigration from Romania and Bulgaria, as well as the mainstream media’s one.

Then, due to the relation the Ukip’s creates between immigration and employment, and multiculturalism and welfare, I will present studies conducted on the topic by Banting and Kymlicka (2006).

Relevant for my analysis are Wacquant’s theory of social insecurity and Goffman’s and Entman’s theories of framing.

As for Goffman, I will use its theories and analysis of framing processes and target group creation, how the Ukip applies those to its discourse and how they frame migrants. Also, I will use the author’s definition and description of framing processes to analyse how the target groups are created by the Ukip and how is the framing evolving when passing from one target groups to another (e.g. from Bulgarians and Romanians to Southern Europe’s citizens).

The theory of framing is important since it is what my analysis is based on. I will analyse the Ukip’s framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants coming to the UK, what are the characteristics conveyed of the target group, what is the problem and what are the solutions proposed by the party.

As for Wacquant, I will use his theory about the social insecurity and how it applies to the UK and its citizens, how the Ukip’s discourse puts a stress on precise fears running through the British population and how they plan to provide a solution to them, how they will ensure social and economic stability by harshening the regulations of migration and migrants’ access to the welfare system, in order to protect British nationals against the threat migrants supposedly pose. I decided to make use of it since it is important to understand what might be one of the aims of conveying a certain framing of a target group in politics. It can be helpful in order to understand why is the Ukip trying to communicate a specific idea of a target population, why is the party framing Romanian and Bulgarian migrants in a certain way, what is the problem and what are the solutions, and how all of this is beneficial to the party’s image.

As for Banting & Kymlicka, I will make use of their studies on multiculturalism policies and the claim that those and welfare systems cannot coexist. They analyse different claims according to which policies aimed to ensure multiculturalism peaceful presence in any society and the principles of a welfare state are contradictory, making it a problem to ensure recognition and distribution at the same time. I will present this theory since the Ukip uses those arguments quite on a regular basis in its discourse, as the analysis will show, and state that free access to the country and most importantly to the job market weakens the host country’s economic resources and stresses the welfare system, bringing harm to the host country’s nationals.

Goffman’s definition of framing, from his work published in 1974[[3]](#footnote-3), states as follows:

“[…] definitions of a situation are built up in accordance with principals of organisation which govern events […] and our subjective involvement in them; frame is the word I use to refer to such of these basic elements as I am able to identify.” (Goffman, 1974: 10)

Basically speaking, a frame defines the section of reality where the focus is directed, cognitive structures that directs the perception, independent from our consciousness. What are we looking at and how. The way Goffman describes the concept of frame is by defining it as an interpretative design used every day by the individual, as a way to reduce the complexity of the information (received through perception from the reality around us).

Therefore, *to frame* means to select a segment of reality to focus on, highlighting it in our perception.

In his work published in 1974, *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*, Goffman defines four different types of frameworks:

* Primary frameworks. The most basic, which takes an aspect of a scene with no meaning, and makes it meaningful, e.g. a natural framework, a situation in the natural world with no human interference (e.g. in the essay, the weather)
* Social framework. It depends on the individual and on society, the aspect of the scene is explained in connection to humans (e.g. in the essay, the weather presented by a meteorologist).

More related to media studies, Entman’s work (1993)[[4]](#footnote-4), defines the action of framing as follows:

“[…] to frame is to select some aspects of a perceived reality and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation.” (Entman, 1994: 52)

In media studies, framing has become an active process, done in full consciousness, while for Goffman the act of frame is unconscious. Other scholars have define framing as a conscious process, such as Reese (2001)[[5]](#footnote-5), who states that framing implies every time a perfectly active process. Same as Tankard (2001)[[6]](#footnote-6), who studies more in depth the concept of framing adapted to journalism, stating that journalists do sometime divulge certain frames to deceive an audience.

In their work from 1992, Snow & Benford, frames are like a scheme which helps the individual to define what happens, “selectively punctuating and encoding objects, situations, events, experiences, and sequences of actions within one’s present or past environment” (Snow & Benford, 1992: 137). Frames present what to look at and what is important.

In my analysis, I will make use of framing analysis to highlight what the Ukip looks at, what they want the audience to look at, what is the problem. Then, how is the problem presented and what is the diagnosis, what are the solutions suggested by the party.

The same process will be applied in the analysis of media framing, therefore what is the problem for mainstream media, how it is presented and what are the solutions, if any.

Note: For mainstream media, though, I will present the solutions only if present. The Ukip, as a political party, surely presents solution to the problem at hand, but media (such as The Daily Mail and The Telegraph, e.g.) are only presenting a problem, as a news, but not necessarily a solutions.

L. Wacquant published in 2007 his work on the connection between social insecurity and the culture of blame (in this case aimed at the poor level of society) in the U.S., Punishing the Poor – The Neoliberal Government of Social Insecurity. He highlights the changing in penal policies in neoliberal economies towards a specific layer of the society, the poor one made my less wealthy people and immigrants. Wacquant defines the common features:

1) The purpose of ending a problem, e.g. crime, urban disorders, public nuisances caused by a part of society, through State’s intervention.

2) Growth of the number of laws to face supposed crimes, organization of a cooperation with police forces, mapping of the offences and criminal profiling.

3) What follows is an extended use of the media to convey the sense of danger and thus the need of such changes. As Wacquant describes it as an “alarmist, even catastrophist discourse on “insecurity”, animated with martial images and broadcast to saturation by the commercial media.” (Wacquant, 2007: 2).

4) Repression and stigmatization, designing the minority or any other target as vectors of offences and cause of unrest.

5) On the carceral front, rehabilitation is presented as the best way to follow as well as a privatisation of detention facilities.

6) As a consequence of implementing punitive policies, a rise on the number of population imprisoned.

“[…] the tenacious blurring of crime, poverty, and immigration in the media as well as by a string of interrelated social changes: the dislocations of wages work, the crisis of the patriarchal family and the erosion of traditional relations of authority among sex and age categories, the decomposition of established working-class territories […]. It follows that penal severity is now presented virtually everywhere and by everyone as a healthy necessity, a vital reflex of self-defense by a social body threatened by the gangrene of criminality, no matter how petty.” (Wacquant, 2007: 3)

As Wacquant points out, analysing the changes in discourse and policies in both the U.S. and Western Europe, there were no real changes in the rate of crimes and offences. The change was essentially “*the gaze that society trains on certain street illegalities,* that is, in the final analysis, *on the dispossessed and dishonoured population* (by status or origin), that are the presumed perpetrators”. (Wacquant, 2007: 4)

Creation of a target group:

According to Ingram, Schneider & Deleon (2007), a target group is a segment of the population upon which a specific aura is projected. The group is framed, pictured, with either positive or negative characteristics, with the outcome that the specific group might benefit or be damaged.

When it comes to politics and the use in its discourse of the issue of benefits and welfare system, and here I refer specifically to the Ukip political discourse, migrants become a target group with negative characteristics, therefore undeserving of benefits claiming and dangerous for the welfare system of the country.

“[…] social construction of target populations as part of policy design helps explain why public policy, which can have such a positive effect on society, sometimes – and often deliberately – fails in its nominal purpose, fails to solve important public problems, perpetuates injustice, fails to support democratic institutions, and produces an unequal citizenship” (Ingram, Schneider & Deleon, 2007: 93)

In their work *Social Construction of Target Populations: Implications for Politics and Policy* (1993)[[7]](#footnote-7), Schneider & Ingram define the construction of target populations as a political phenomenon, which has been overlooked but is quite important.

“The theory contends that social constructions influence the policy agenda and the selection of policy tools, as well as the rationales that legitimate policy choices.” (Schneider & Ingram, 1993: 334)

As the two scholars quote from Edelman (1964, 1988), constructing a target group means to characterize in a positive or negative light a specific group, by means of metaphors, stories and/or symbolic language.

The way I relate this theory to my thesis is through the importance of the target group I am focusing on (Romanians and Bulgarians) in Ukip political discourse and presence in mainstream media in late 2013 (right before the end of the previous work regulations, on January the 1st, 2014).

The Ukip (and mainstream media as well) put the two countries’ migrants into one single target group, building a problem and providing a solution. The creation of a target group has an impact of the party’s policy agenda and policy design, as I will show in the analysis and as theorized by Ingram & Schneider:

“There are strong pressures for public officials to provide beneficial policy to powerful, positively constructed target populations and to devise punitive, punishment-oriented policy for negatively constructed groups.” (Ingram & Schneider, 1993: 334)

The construction of a target groups is made through:

* The recognition of characteristics that are shared by a certain population and meaningfully distinguish them as a target group
* The attribution of certain values, images and symbols to the characteristics.

A social construction is a stereotype of a particular group, created by culture, politics, media, religion, etc.

“Social construction of target populations are measurable, empirical, phenomena. Data can be generated by the study of texts, such as legislative histories, statuses, guidelines, speeches, media coverage, and analysis of the symbols contained therein.” Ingram & Schneider, 1993: 335)

In the analysis, I will highlight how the Ukip creates a target group out of the migrants coming from the two countries, how it builds a problem and associates the target population with negative characteristics and how their policy agenda adapts to it, by proposing a set of solutions.

As for the mainstream media (The Daily Mail and The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph), I will analyse how they create a target groups as well, associating it with either negative or positive characteristics, to also highlight whether is the Ukip only to convey a certain type of framing of Bulgarian and Romanian migrants, or the mainstream media as well.

Migration and welfare:

About the issue of migration and welfare in the UK, Banting & Kymlicka report the study of Wolfe & Klausen, about the beginning of the British welfare state, back in the 40s and 50s quoting “people believed they were paying the social welfare part of their taxes to people who were like themselves. […] If the ties that bind you to increasingly diverse fellow citizens are loosened, you are likely to be less inclined to share your resources with them” (Wolfe and Klausen 2000: 28)” (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006: 11).

As the main point in Ukip’s political discourse is framing migrants as benefits tourists, Banting & Kymlicka’s study on the relationship between welfare state and racial heterogeneity provides an overlook about both the debate according to which multiculturalism weakens welfare states and the authors’ opinion of it being inconclusive.

Banting & Kymplicka study the different arguments regarding the cause, and formulate the so-called “heterogeneity/redistribution trade-off” hypothesis[[8]](#footnote-8), according to which a heterogenic society has difficulties in sustaining redistributive policies. It is assumed that in those societies is also harder to create a sense of National solidarity that goes beyond ethnic/racial differences, and it erodes the welfare state.

As it will be shown further on in the analysis, the argument that a lack of restrain in admission to the country weakens its welfare state and thus erodes the country’s financial resources is often used by the Ukip in its political discourse, putting stress on public’s fear of the policies created to help new comers, regarding the thought that those policies are made to accommodate ethnic groups and pose a threat to national solidarity.

“The underlying hypothesis here is that there is a trade-off between recognition and redistribution; the more a country embraces the ‘politics of (ethnic) recognition’, the harder it is to sustain the ‘politics of (economic) redistribution’. […] The redistributive state has been under pressure in recent decades from a number of economic changes: globalisation, technological change, demographic trends and the ageing of society, shifting ideologies. Should we add growing ethnic diversity, and claims for its accommodation, to this already lengthy list” (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006: 4-5)

The authors outline three main headings about the mechanisms according to which a multicultural society struggles to ensure a welfare state.

1. “The crowding-out effect”, when the State’s pro-redistribution coalition are weakened by the need of time, money and energy to ensure recognition. Instead of focusing on redistribution, the leaders are absorbed by the task of dealing with multiculturalism.
2. “The corroding effect”, which implies less solidarity among the citizens and therefore less support to redistribution.

“Citizens have historically supported the welfare state, and been willing to make sacrifices to support their disadvantaged co-citizens, because they viewed these co-citizens as ‘one of us’, bound together by a common identity and common sense of belonging. […] Multiculturalism Policies tell citizens that what divides them into separate ethnocultural groups is more important than what they have in common, and that co-citizens from other groups are therefore not really ‘one of us’”. (Banting & Kymlicka, 2006: 11)

1. “The misdiagnosis effect”, where the people are led by the policies pro-multiculturalism to think that the issued with minorities derive from cultural misrecognition, therefore they are led to think that the solution is a bigger state of recognition. The claim is that those policies distort the perception of ethnic groups’ real needs.
2. **Analysis**
	1. Accession to the United Kingdom’s welfare system for EU nationals

The access to the welfare system in the UK is based on residence. Any citizen coming from any European Union member state and living in the United Kingdom has the same right to claim benefits as British citizens, independently from the amount of taxes paid to the country. Getting the residence is automatic once the migrant starts to work, self-employed or not, and it’s also based on the intention of stay rather than how long has the migrants stayed in the country, which means that what matters is the individual’s intention of staying in the UK, rather than how much time has he/she already spent in the country. Workers have automatic right to access the welfare system, from the very first day of work. EU nationals who are unemployed who are residents and able to proof that they are actively looking for a job have the same right to claim benefits as workers and UK nationals. The only benefits they are not entitled to are Support Allowance, income-related Employment and Special Pension credit.

The ways to demonstrate such intention is through different means, such as:

* Work contract
* Proof of accommodation
* Coming with family/joining family already resident
* Having children registered

Once registered as residents, it is possible to claim benefits such as:

* Housing/Social Housing benefit (EU nationals are treated by law the same as British citizens when it comes to claiming housing benefits)
* Income support
* Council Tax benefit
* Income-related employment
* Support allowance
* Child Tax Credit and child benefit
* State pension credit
* Working Tax credit

The initial right of residence for EU nationals in the United Kingdom is three months. This time frame can be extended for those who are seeking employment, students, self-sufficient or self-employed people.[[9]](#footnote-9)

* 1. The United Kingdom and migration since the accession to the European Union

According to [www.migrationwatchuk.com](http://www.migrationwatchuk.com), migration to the United Kingdom has fluctuated from an outflow of 11,000 to an inflow of 24,000 (from 1993 to 1998)[[10]](#footnote-10). Net migration in 2013 to the UK was of 212,000 people.

MigrationWatchUK issued a research made though the analysis of the number of National Insurance Numbers (required by employers) to Romanians and Bulgarians. In 2007, before the entrance of the two countries to the European Union and the EU labour market, the number of NIN issued was 6,000 a year. Since 2007, though, the number grew at a fast pace reaching 35,000 per year.

One more research was conducted through the analysis of the population of Romanian and Bulgarian citizens in the UK. According to MigrationWatchUK, the number of Bulgarians living in the UK increased, between 2004 and 2011, by 33,000, while the Romanian population increased by 70,000 during the same frame of time.[[11]](#footnote-11)

As for EU nationals’ children, they have the right to access the education system in the United Kingdom and get the right, once enrolled in school, to stay in the country until the completion of their studies (18 years old), regardless their parents’ ability to sustain themselves.

* 1. The case of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants

Both Romania and Bulgaria joined the European Union on January the 1st, 2007. Even though fully Member States, the two countries faced restrictions regarding their Nationals’ right to work in some EU countries, such as the United Kingdom (along with Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Malta, Spain and the Netherland). Such regulations were supposed to last up to seven years (as requested by the Accession Treaty[[12]](#footnote-12)).

According to the transitional rules, Romania and Bulgaria’s citizens had the right to travel to the UK without a visa, but low-skilled migrants had to respect a sort of work card, being restricted to quota schemes in the sectors of agriculture and food processing.

Such regulations ended on January the 1st, 2014, and therefore workers coming from Romania and Bulgaria have now the same rights as the host country’s nationals to work and claim benefits, such as NHS care.

Besides the difference in terms of population of the two countries (7 million people in Bulgaria, and 21 million in Romania), the two countries have many characteristics in common when it comes to history and economy. Both former Communist regime countries, they have two of the lowest GDP in Europe, as well as high unemployment rate.

Romania’s GDP (280.7 billion US $, ranked 48th in the World), grew by only 2% in 2013, and the unemployment rate reached up to 22.7% of people between 15 and 24 years old in the same year.

As for Bulgaria, with a GDP of 104.6 billion (2013) which grew by only 0.5% in the same year, youth unemployment reached 28.1% (2013)[[13]](#footnote-13).

As for the United Kingdom, the GDP is 2.378 trillion US $ (2013), with a growth in the mentioned year of 1.4%. The unemployment rate, though, is up to 21% for people aged between 15 and 24 years old (2013).

The mentioned statistics can explain why young skilled migrants migrate from Romania and Bulgaria to a country with such a high GDP as the UK, especially when combined with the difference in wages.

* 1. The United Kingdom Independence Party’s Euroskepticism and the migration issue

In this part, I will present the United Kingdom Independence Party’s history, focusing on the party’s ideology and statements on the issues of migration, welfare and how does this connect to their euroskepticism.

The United Kingdom Independence Party (Ukip) was funded in 1993, his current leader for the second mandate in a row (since 2006) is the MEP Nigel Farage.

The party’s was funded by members of the Anti-Federalist League (including Farage himself), a party funded in 1991 as a reaction to the Maastricht Treaty, with focus on withdrawing the United Kingdom from the European Union.

During the last county council elections (2013), the party reached its best in local government elections, with 147 elected councillors, becoming the third party of the UK,[[14]](#footnote-14) and a total of 35,081 members in 2014, with 2,500 members having joined in 2014 alone.[[15]](#footnote-15)

According to the Ukip’s written constitution, the party is presented as democratic and libertarian, and believes that the governance of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should be conducted only and exclusively by the United Kingdom sovereignty. The only laws that should apply in the UK are those decided upon entirely by the country’s Parliament. Therefore, Ukip’s euroskepticism is defined by the willing to cease the UK’s membership to the European Union, interrupting any adhesion to treaties that surrender a part, or more, of the United Kingdom’s sovereignty.

United Kingdom Independence Party’s euroskepticism has been made clear from the very beginning of the party’s history. The main point used against the Union is borders’ control. Ukip’s claims the country’s right to control its own borders and the access to the country independently from any other institution. The party’s discourse regarding the access to the country is then linked to the access to benefits and to the welfare system, to how migrants who come to the UK stress the country’s economic resources by claiming benefits without paying taxes, or having paid any taxes, therefore without having really contributed in any way.

According to the Eurobarometer survey, the UK is a country with quite the relative majority of euroskeptic citizens (according to Eurobarometer statistics, Autumn 2013 national report, 39% had a negative image of the EU), and people surveyed expressed concern regarding the membership to the European Union and the issue of immigration, because of the EU policy of freedom of movement and free access to EU countries for EU citizens. The Ukip is putting pressure on this point to attract more voters, by promising a referendum regarding UK’s membership itself and the issue of the country’s borders control, and creating specific target groups according to current debates and issues. The promise of the Ukip regarding a referendum to exit the EU is strongly linked with the issue of uncontrolled migration often presented in the party’s discourse, as the EU has imposed its policies of freedom of movement to the UK. One of the point of the Ukip’s manifesto is regaining control on UK’s borders and on who accesses the country, and also under which conditions.[[16]](#footnote-16)

The two main arguments present in Ukip’s anti-immigration discourse, regarding the membership of the United Kingdom to the European Union, are that once the membership is revoked the UK will be able to stop the payments to Brussels and regain control over its own borders. Ukip’s argument is mainly of financial nature, stressing the country’s economic situation and how damaging the EU is in this field, due to the policies regulating labour and access to welfare.

This means that with the freedom of movement guaranteed to potential migrants by the EU treaties, and the right to claim benefits (linked to the right of every EU citizen to be treated as the host country’s nationals), the economy is the UK will have to suffer, forced to provide to people who have never contributed through tax payments to the welfare system. (Source: Ukip 2014 manifesto)

The United Kingdom Independence Party’s main points when it comes to policies proposed aim to ensure benefits for the genuinely needy, giving them protection while allowing who seeks to better his/her personal situation to be able to do so. This point is the first one present in the webpage of the party’s official website ([www.Ukip.org/page/constitution-of-the-uk-independence-party-Ukip](http://www.ukip.org/page/constitution-of-the-uk-independence-party-ukip)), rendering cleat how important the maintenance of the country’s welfare system is important for the party. Strongly attached to this is the party’s statement about borders control. Among the other points of the party’s constitution (diminishing the State’s role, lower taxation for businesses and individuals, guarantee the essential freedoms to all UK’s citizens), one is to control properly the United Kingdom’s borders. This point is linked to the party’s euroskepticism around the issue of treaties and freedom of movement. According to the European Union treaty, EU citizens have the right to move freely in the Countries Members and to claim the same benefits as the host country’s citizens. For the Ukip, this freedom should be more regulated, as well as the rights of the immigrant in the host country (in this case, the UK) and access to the welfare system.

According to the YouGov’s analysis, 59% of Ukip’s voters are worried about economy and 51% of them are worried about immigration (while only 31% of voters as a whole worry about it).[[17]](#footnote-17)

On the party’s manifesto the issue of migration is the first to be mentioned right after the issue of the laws imposed by Brussels.

Under the title “Lost Control of Our Borders”, the points regard the rules imposed by the EU according to which “anyone in the EU can come to the UK and live, claim welfare and government services they have not contributed to.”[[18]](#footnote-18)

The issue of migration from the EU Member States is mentioned immediately further on in the text, mentioning the 1st January 2014 opening of UK’s borders to Romanian and Bulgarian citizens.

“The government admits it cannot control the numbers of migrants from other EU countries. The other parties are still committed to the EU expanding to include Turkey, Albania, Moldova and many more. Under EU rules, all their citizens would become entitled to live and work in the UK. Mass immigration has coincided with soaring youth employment and stagnant wages that have not kept pace with the cost of living.” (Source: www.migrationwatchuk.com/Briefingpaper/document/48)

Further on, it puts stress on public schools, strain on the NHS (National Health System) and threatens to the green areas posed by over-development caused by mass immigration.

* 1. The Ukip’s frame of migrants from Romania and Bulgaria
* Problematisation and discursive effects – What is being discussed?

Following Bacchi’s formulation “What is the problem represented to be?”, as January the 1st, 2014 was approaching the Ukip’s discourse started to target the Eastern countries’ population in their rhetoric, drawing the attention towards the forthcoming end of work regulations and problematising the possibility of a *massive invasion* from Eastern Europe.

Therefore the problem is the forthcoming immigration from Romania and Bulgaria after January the 1st, 2014, and is represented to be as a “massive invasion” that will bring with it a series of problems for the United Kingdom.

So what is being discussed by the Ukip is the large number of immigrants that will come to the UK ones the work regulations will come to an end, and how this will:

* **Bring more criminality**
* **Pose a threat to the employment level of the country**
* **Stress the welfare system** (Housing, National Health System, Benefits, Education)

When the two countries joined the European Union back in 2007, according YouGov, the British government predicted an influx of 15,000 migrants from Romania and Bulgaria per year. The facts turned out quite differently, with a million and a half coming to the UK.

Using this figure as a strength point, Ukip posed the question “How many migrants will come now when there are no more restrictions, if one million and a half came when there still were restriction for them?”

Ukip stated on their website [www.Ukipmeps.org](http://www.ukipmeps.org) that the British government was even afraid to make the prediction regarding the number of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants, because of the underestimation it made in 2004 for that time’s new Member States in Eastern Europe.

“It predicted fewer than 20,000 Eastern Europeans would arrive but Office of National Statistics figures show more than 600,000 were working in Britain last year.” (See footnote 13)

In the article, it is also clearly said that:

“Already, statistics have shown that Romania’s population has fallen by more than 12 per cent since 2001 as hundreds of thousands leave a property-stricken nation for richer countries such as Britain”.

Immigration from the two Eastern European countries is problematised by depicting it as a *massive* one, with heavy consequences on the country’s economic resources, employment and criminality rate.

* Problematisation and subjectification effects – How are people seen?

Further on, Romanian and Bulgarian migrants are depicted, seen, as contributors to rise of **criminality** and as **benefits tourists**, coming to the UK only to drain its economic resources and access its welfare system.

Following the issue of the number of migrants foreseen to come to the UK, it is possible to find the problem of criminality.

Pressure Group Migration predicted that 50,000 would come to the United Kingdom every year until 2019. According to the data collected by the Office of National Statistics, in July 012 there 94,000 Romanians living in the UK and 47,000 Bulgarians.[[19]](#footnote-19) Ukip started already in 2012 to try to direct the attention of the public towards the issue. On their website [www.Ukipmeps.org/news](http://www.ukipmeps.org/news), an article published on November the 6th (2012) states “UK cannot afford Bulgarian and Romanian immigrants”[[20]](#footnote-20):

“In 2014 there will be an unprecedented crime wave in Britain if we do not stop Romanian and Bulgarian citizens having open door access to British borders, claims Ukip MEP Godfrey Bloom on Public Service Europe.” (www.Ukipmeps.org)

In the abstract, it is possible to notice the use of some of the terms that defined Ukip’s framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants, such as:

* *Unprecedented*
* *Wave*
* *Open doors*
* *Crime*

The article does claim crime as the worst effect of the so-called “invasion”, but also the negative outcome in terms of job market, **employment** and **welfare system**:

“If just five per cent migrate here, that is a potential new labour market of 1.5 million looking for work. When we have one million youth unemployed rate and a general unemployment rate of 8.4 per cent, that is 1.5 million potential job and benefit seekers. We cannot afford the benefits, we cannot afford more British joblessness, we cannot afford the extra housing […].”

In this abstract, it is possible to find the use of the verb *afford*, used quite often by the Ukip’s to convey the idea of the country having to spend money for each individual that enters it, to stern concern in the British citizens that the United Kingdom will have to *pay* for each migrants and because of the *massive invasion* that’s coming, the state’s resources will find themselves in major distress.

The stress is put on the large number of immigrants that will supposedly coming to the UK in 2014 and the major problems they will create for job seekers (more competition), benefits seekers and housing (same reason).

The article “Romanian and Bulgarian immigration – the True Story” (published on the website www.Ukipdaily.com), on January the 2nd, 2014, ends with a consideration upon the level of unemployment in the UK and the potential “damage” immigration might cause.

“I have no doubt that the majority of them are honest and hardworking. But since there are currently 2.39 million people unemployed in the UK, is it responsible to allow a further influx of people? Unemployed British people need training and encouragement – not more competition.” (www.Ukipdaily.com)

On the party’s official website, [www.Ukip.org](http://www.ukip.org), in the section titled “get INFORMED”, migration appears clearly as an issue and right after the part concerning unemployment.

“Unemployment is too high. The NHS and state education strain under a population increase of 4 million since 2001.

Another wave of uncontrolled immigration comes from the EU (this time Bulgaria and Romania).”[[21]](#footnote-21)

It possible to notice another word that convey the idea of a major number of incoming migrants:

* *Uncontrolled*

In the Ukip political discourse, migration and financial distress are strongly linked. The rise of unemployment in the UK, as it is possible to notice from the previous abstract of their website, is caused by a distress on the country’s resources created by the *uncontrolled* immigration that’s been affecting the country. The rise of the population mentioned in the website is not caused by growth in births, but by the *uncontrolled* arrivals from the EU. Immigrants come to the UK in mass (according to the website, at the moment the main sources are Romania and Bulgaria), take over jobs that would have otherwise gone to Britons, and stress the **welfare system** by abusing the right to benefits.

Other terms majorly used by the party in their framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants aim to convey the idea of a wave of large proportion hitting the United Kingdom’s borders once the lift of work regulation will be lifted.

* *Massive invasion / Large influx*
* *Wave*
* *Flood / Floodgate*
* *Hords*

From the Ukip’s website www.Ukipdaily.com[[22]](#footnote-22), the British party exposes its view about the migrants coming from the two Eastern European countries.

In the article written by the Ukip activist Gary Robinson, examines the aftermath of January the 1st, 2014.

“Well in 2013 newspapers such as as the Mail and Express warned that there would be a large influx of immigrants in the New Year when work restrictions on them expired.

This morning, left-leading Twitter users have delighted in posting pictures of empty airports, quiet bus terminals and empty streets to mock these claims.

But in reality, no one was seriously expecting hordes of Romanian and Bulgarians to suddenly appear on the British mainland on January 1st. Let me explain. Bulgarians and Romanians gained the right to visa-free travel to the UK in 2007. Since then, Romanians and Bulgarians have been making use of the over 40 airports and over 150 ferry ports in the UK.” (www.Ukipdaily.com)

Robinson then quotes BBC statistics, that report 94,000 Romanians and 47,000 Bulgarians are living in the UK in July 2012 (Office of National Statistics).

He also claims that it is not possible to see immediately the inflow of migrants, and not from a single access point to the UK:

“The truth is, we are going to have to wait several months before we get reliable statistics on Bulgarian/Romanian migration into the UK. But whatever the number that comes to the UK is, the fact remains that as members of the EU, we are powerless to restrict it.”

* 1. Solutions offered by the Ukip

According to the party’s official website, the welfare system should be “*a safety net for the needy, not a bed for the lazy”* (see p. 25). For the issue of benefits claiming, the United Kingdom Independence Party’s statement on the matter is that each immigrants should have the right to claim benefits only after having lived in the UK for at least 5 years, to avoid having people entering the country and claim the benefits right away (the so-called “benefits tourists”), without ever having worked and/or paid any taxes to the State, therefore without ever having contributed economically to the country, and also that there should be an introduction of a points-based work-permit “visa” system.

Further on in the website, under the title “Issues”, and “What we stand for”, the negativity of the UK’s EU membership with consequent freedom of movement is designating as one of the key ideas of the party.

“Regain control of our borders and of immigration – only possible by leaving the EU.

Immigrants must financially support themselves and their dependents for 5 years. This means private health insurance (except emergency medical care), private education and private housing – they should pay into the pot before they take out of it.

A points-based visa system and time-limited work permits.

Proof of private health insurance must be a precondition for immigrants and tourists to enter the UK.” (From [www.Ukip.org/issues](http://www.ukip.org/issues))

By constructing a target group Ukip creates a sense of more extended awareness of who has the hegemony, who are the “deserving”, and who are the “un-deserving”, dividing citizenship into a sort of 1st class and 2nd class division, “us” who have a natural right to benefits and access to the welfare system, and “them”, who have no such rights yet they claim it.

“Policy designs shape the experience of target groups and send implicit messages about how important their problems are to the government and whether their participation is likely to be effective.” (Ingram, Schneider and Deleon, 2007: 96)

According to the Ukip, the UK must give priority to nationals, to its own citizens, and they can do so only by changing the regulations regarding the free access to the country “imposed” by the EU and controlling to benefits demand.

In the party’s official website, under the title “Health Insurance”, it states again the need to set clear rules for newcomers:

“Prioritise social housing for people whose parents and grandparents were born locally.

[…]

Make welfare a safety net for the needy, not a bed for the lazy. Benefits only available to those who have lived here for over 5 years.” ([www.ukip.org/issues](http://www.ukip.org/issues))

* 1. Framing analysis of The Daily Mail and The Express:

[I will now analyse the framing of Romanian of Bulgarian migrants of the newspapers The Daily Mail, The Express, The Guardian and The Telegraph.

The reason why I choose to analyse some of the UK mainstream media as well, along with the Ukip’s material, is to highlight whether there is any “backup” of the Ukip’s framing by the mainstream media. So the question is: “Is the Ukip only to convey a certain framing of the Romanian and Bulgarian citizens coming to the UK, or are the mainstream media also?”

I have chosen The Daily Mail and The Express as representatives of a more “sensationalist” part of the British press, and The Guardian and The Telegraph as representatives of a more “detached” part, aiming to analyse and present more than one source per side of the tale and, by doing so, increase the research’s reliability.]

The Daily Mail: Problematisation and discursive effects – What is being discussed?

The newspaper issued an article on their website at the beginning of the year 2013 (27th January), “Thousands of Bulgarians and Romanians ‘plan to flood UK in 2014’ as employment restrictions relax”.

The problem is represented to be, like in Ukip’s discourse, a “massive invasion” from Romania and Bulgaria after January the 1st, 2014.

Throughout the article, it is present the use of terms such as:

* *Flood*
* *Hordes*
* *Record numbers*

They all outline the major risk of huge number of incomers.

“Hordes of Romanians and Bulgarians are already preparing to head for Britain in search of work, according to a Mail on Sunday investigation.

Employment restrictions will be relaxed on December 31, and the UK will throw open its Jobcentres and benefit offices to what pressure group MigrationWatch predicts could be as many as 70,000 people a year for the next five years.”

What is discussed in the article is the issue of the “mass” immigration that will soon come to the UK, with a large number of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants ready to land on British soil.

There is clearly a repetition of the Ukip’s framing of the two Eastern European groups, with the usage of the same terminology and rhetoric, such as “flood” and “hordes”, and the idea conveyed of a bug quantity of immigrants preparing to leave their home countries to come to the UK as soon as the year 2014 starts.

* Problematisation and subjectification effect – How are people seen?

The Daily Mail’s article ends up with mentioning the **welfare system**, the benefits and how easy it is for migrants to access them, putting the country’s resources on a strain and undermining the UK Nationals access to them.

“The Department of Work and Pensions confirmed to The Mail on Sunday that visitors from the European Economic Area who demonstrate that they ‘have or retain worker status may be able to claim income-based jobseekers’ allowance, income support, housing benefit, council tax benefit, income-related employment and support allowance, and state pension credit’.

Furthermore, the article states the European Union as the reason and cause of such easiness to claim benefits:

“We are obliged under EU law to pay some income-related benefits to EEA workers, self-employed people and jobseekers’, said a spokesman.

From January 1, 2014 that will also include the Bulgarians and the Romanians.”[[23]](#footnote-23)

As January 1, 2014 approached, the exclamation “Sold out!” has become one of the landmarks for a part of the UK press, such as The Daily Mail.

On December 30, 2013, on The Daily Mail website is possible to read “Sold out! Flights and buses full as Romanians and Bulgarians head for the UK”.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The number exposed in the article, as well as the facts, indicate the upcoming of a huge number of immigrants from the two countries as soon as the restrictions are lifted.

“Almost all flights from Romania to England are full – even though one airline doubled the number to meet demand – with one-way tickets selling for up to 3,000£ each. And all tickets for seats on buses leaving the Bulgarian capital of Sofia until January 9 have been snapped up. […] When controls imposed in 2005 are lifted tomorrow, 29million from the two countries will gain the right to work in Britain.”

As the articles continues, the attention is drawn from upcoming wave of migrants, ready to come to the UK in huge numbers, to the risk they pose to the welfare system. The article states clearly that many of the newcomers are plan to claim benefits, once in the UK.

“While some of those coming here have expressed a desire to find ‘any job they can’, messages on internet forums show others making inquiries about benefits.

One user of a popular website wrote: ‘My husband and I want to have a child in the UK. We want know what kind of benefits we can apply for. We are interested in receiving a council house.’ A mother described how she is hoping to move her family to the UK in the hope of claiming child tax credits – while a man spoke of his desire to be given a house.

[…] A pregnant woman wrote: ‘Can I give birth in the UK for free given that neither my husband nor I have the correct papers? Will we get British citizenship for our child?’”

The Express: Problematisation and discursive effect – What is being discussed?

The Express’ article conveys the same idea of a major “invasion” coming to the UK. What is being discussed in the articles I analysed is again the concept of a large number of immigrants ready to cross UK’s borders.

A piece published on 5th December 2013 with the title “New report estimates at least 385,000 Romanians and Bulgarians will flock to UK”[[25]](#footnote-25), showing the picture of the UK border in an airport, crowded with what seem to be thousands of people waiting to cross it, and quoting a new report made by Democracy Institute:

“The report by the North America based Democracy Institute, which describes itself as a politically independent public policy research organisation, was unveiled in Brussels today.

They said previous findings by other researchers had been ‘insufficiently alarmist’.

Its findings were ‘astonishing’ and were the result of its ‘proprietary econometric migration model’. […] Ukip MEP Roger Helmer said after reading the report: ‘If 385,000 people from Romania and Bulgaria as estimated by the Democracy Institute actually come to the UK it will put unbearable pressure on our health, welfare, and education system. ‘It will also make getting a job much harder for our one million unemployed young people.”

The article highlights the risks of such major income of migrants for the state’s resource, such as the benefits, housing and education, as well as referring to the level of unemployment among British population, through the use of words such as:

* *Unbearable pressure*
* *Harder / Unemployed*

The article presents the Ukip’s member’s reaction upon reading the report, and states what are the intentions of the party about it:

“UKIP are calling on the government to contradict EU law and unilaterally block free labour market access in the UK to Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants.”

* Problematisation and subjectification effect – How are people seen?

On January the 1st, 2014, when the temporary regulations concerning the access of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants to the United Kingdom came to an end, the Daily Express published an article titled “Benefits Britain – here we come!”[[26]](#footnote-26), stating the benefits of the **welfare system** as the main reason for migrants to move to the UK, posing a serious threat for British citizens and the economy of the country. The subtitle of the article says: “BRITAIN will today be hit by the first wave of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants keen to take advantage of our generous taxpayer-funded benefits.”

The article frames migrants as benefits tourists, creating a comparison between the huge number of tourists that visit the UK every day to visit the countries attractions and the number of migrants that come to the UK to visit its welfare system.

There are used of terms that convey again the idea of the proximity of a forthcoming *invasion,* such as:

* *Sold out*
* *Exodus*
* *Hundreds*

“Visa restrictions on low-skilled nationals from the two eastern European countries ended at midnight. The first sold-out flight from Romania is due to land at 7.40am today. […] one operator predicted that nearly 1,000 a day would come here over the next seven days. The Daily Express has found evidence of an exodus from hundreds of impoverished communities across Romania. […] Jobless Nicoleta, 43, who receives a £10-a-month child support, has paid £100 for coach seats to London. She said: “I don’t have a job but the standard of living is good for Romanians in BRITAIN – we know it is where you make money.” (See footnote 2)

Here the target presented by the article is not only Romanian immigrants ready to pack and leave for the UK, but parents who have their children coming along with them, therefore they are creating the picture of a family of migrants who will for sure ask for benefits, as they have children to look after. The article, furthermore, states clearly how much does the woman interviewed, Nicoleta, get monthly as child care support: 10£ only.

It results clear that the reason they will migrate to the UK is because it is easier for “jobless” Nicoleta to fix her problem of unemployment, earn more money (“we know it’s where you make money”) and the benefits offered by the welfare system of the country.

From the article above-mentioned:

“Toni Samdu, 40, sleeps in a freezing room with his wife Mia, 38, four children, Marcus, 14, Laurentiu, 10, Jacob, eight, Denisa, six, and grandparents Elena Moise, 64, and Vasile Dumitru, 63. […] I know it is a rich country and people get more help from the state to support children; that is something we expect there. […] Britain is a different world, a different life to us. There people have the power to live, so it’s paradise. We will leave as soon as possible.”

In this part of the article the person interviewed, Toni Samdu, states clearly the benefits as the main reason to come to the UK. It ends with a sentence that could sound almost like a threat (“We will leave as soon as we can”). The make the image of Romanian and Bulgarian as benefits tourist ore clear, the article clearly writes “Bulgarian migrants are being given advice on how to sponge off Britain’s benefits system” and ends with the sentence:

“The latest analysis by Migration-Watch estimates 350,000 Romanian and Bulgarian migrants will arrive here in the next five years. They will be entitled to join council housing waiting lists, send their children to oversubscribed state schools, claim out-of-work benefits, and access free NHS care. Councils have been forced to draft in scores of interpreters to cope with the new flux of foreign migrants. […] Ukip leader Nigel Farage said:” Never before has the country seen the volume of immigration it has experienced in the past 15 years. “It has changed the country in unprecedented ways.”

* 1. Framing analysis of The Telegraph and The Guardian:

The Telegraph: Problematisation and discursive effects – What is being discussed?

What The Telegraph articles discuss is the quantity, again, of migrants coming to the UK from Romania and Bulgaria after January the 1st, 2014. But the newspaper discusses it in a bilateral way, without sustaining only one side of the story.

The articles I collected where both regarding a “massive” incoming, as well as a more “balanced” one, with people forecasted to come to the UK in 2014 but not in such large number as other mainstream media have predicted.

The Telegraph has issued an article on November 29th 2013, entitled “Eastern European immigrants ‘overwhelming benefit UK economy’”[[27]](#footnote-27), where it exposes the benefits such migration brings to the UK economy.

“”Free movement of people is a cornerstone of EU integration – an indispensable functional building block of a truly integrated Single Market”, said the foreign ministers of the so-called Visegrad Four (V4).

The ministers said migrants from central and Eastern Europe, whose ranks Cameron puts at about a million people, had been hugely beneficial to the British economy.

“They are younger and economically more active than the average British workforce; they also contribute to UK national revenues far in excess of the social benefits they use”, the ministers said.”

Another article, though, written on November the 6th, 2013 by Steven Swinford and published on The Telegraph’s website, entitled “Migrant add 5.8m to bulging Britain”, uses the argument of *overcrowding*.

The article claims that the Office of National statistics predicted the population of the UK to rise by 9.6m by 2037[[28]](#footnote-28) and in the fifth paragraph mentions migrants from Romania and Bulgaria.

“It comes amid growing concerns about a new wave of migrants from Bulgaria and Romania next year, when restrictions are being lifted.

The new wave of migration could lead to 50,000 people a year moving to this country. Observers fear Britain is facing an ‘unsustainable’ influx of immigrants.” (See footnote 28)

* Problematisation and subjectification effect – How are people seen?

It is possible to find in the article the use of words that channel the idea of invasion, of something ready to be falling upon the country and the danger the economy of the country is put in, such as:

* *Wave* (referred to the incoming migrants)
* *Unsustainable* (referred to the income of migrants but with a stress on the country’s capacity of sustaining then. Note: the word was put into brackets the article)

The article ends with a mention of the *stress* a major income of immigrants would put on the UK’s resources, especially on the job market and on the education system.

The idea of the competition and overcrowding is given through the use in terms such as:

* *Crisis point*
* *Lack*

“Leading academics warn that the education system is at crisis point because of the lack of primary schools places. […] Earlier this week a review commissioned by the government found that migrants were filling a fifth of jobs in key industries because of a lack of skilled British graduates.”

(See footnote 28)

In The Telegraph, the stress is put on the forecasted “invasion” from Romania and Bulgaria, and on the pressure it puts on the country’s education system, which is reportedly not able to sustain the inflow of such large numbers of incomers.

The Guardian: Problematisation and discursive effect – What is being discussed?

The Guardian, though, proposes a different story. Out of four newspapers I have chosen to analyse, three of them sharing a very similar choice of words (as highlighted by my analysis so far), The Guardian has a more detached approach to the issue.

The words used are:

* *Hysteria*
* *Paranoia*
* *Imaginary*

The use of those words point to a more prudent approach towards attempting any prediction about the incoming number of migrants.

In the article “Challenging hysteria over Romanian and Bulgarian immigration statistics, published on [www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com)[[29]](#footnote-29) on August 16, 2013 by Carlos Vargas-Silva, takes some distance from the sensationalism other mass media have shown in connection with the end of work regulations for Romanian and Bulgarian migrants on January 1st, 2014:

“The new ONS figures are certainly useful, and they confirm that there has been a consistent increase in the number of Romanian and Bulgarian workers in the UK every year for the past seven years. That doesn’t mean imaginary floodgates in Sofia and Bucharest are currently primed to be opened on 1 January.” (See footnote 29)

At the beginning of 2013 (30th of January), The Guardian published on its website an article entitled “Romanians aren’t about to ‘invade’ Britain – so stop the negative campaign”, stating that the lift of the transitional rules regarding immigration to the UK from the two Eastern countries are unlikely to cause any “mass-invasion”.

Regarding the estimated number of migrants, the article provides a deeper analysis as to why the predicted number of immigrants who will come to the UK after 1st of January 2014 is so high:

“Campaign groups such as MigrationWatch have predicted that 250,000 will come from both countries over the next five years, although these figures are disputed. One Tory MP, Philip Hollobone, has claimed that Romanian and Bulgarian communities will treble to 425,000 within two years.

There figures have been questioned by experts, because they are based upon the numbers of Poles and Czechs who moved to Britain in 2004. Then, only three countries opened their borders. This time, all of the 25 EU states will lift Labour market restrictions.”

The article talks mainly about the immigration from Romania and about how the numbers reported by certain politicians and a certain part of the UK press is overblown.

“Out of a population of roughly 20 million, it is estimated that up to 2.5 million already work abroad, having emigrated after the country’s EU accession in 2007. In other words, most of those who wanted to leave Romania have already done so. […]”

* Problematisation and subjectification effect – How are people seen?

The “negative campaign” the article mentioned at page 44 reports is an initiative some ministers took to try to keep Eastern European migrants away from the EU, depicting Romanian and Bulgarian migrants as ready to pack and come in mass to the UK because of the belief that streets in England are “paved with gold”.

On an article published on the website of The Guardian, “Immigration: Romanian or Bulgarian? You won’t like it here” (27th January 2013), reveal the intentions of ministers to launch a negative campaign in Romania and Bulgaria regarding life in the UK.

“The plan, which would focus on the downsides of British life, is one of a range of potential measures to stem immigration to Britain next year when curbs imposed on both countries’ citizens living and working in the UK will expire.

A report over the week end quoted one minister saying that such negative advert would ‘correct the impression that the streets here are paved with gold’”.

Romanian and Bulgarian migrants are not depicted, in The Guardian, as a “horde” ready to reach Britain as soon as 2014 begins. The action of entitling an article “Stop the negative campaign” is a clear indicator of the newspaper’s different framing of the groups of migrants.

Another article published on [www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com) on December 31st, 2013 entitled “Romanian and Bulgarian migration stirs up ancient, dark parts of the brain”[[30]](#footnote-30), by Paul Quinn, states clearly:

“Populist politicians’ attempts to fan the flames of hatred rely on our hardwired suspicion of outsiders. […] for months the British media have been running alarmist reports about the imminent influx from these countries. […] The Ukip leader Nigel Farage has recently spoken of a ‘Romanian crime wave’ on its way to the UK.” ([www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com))

 In the mentioned article as well The Guardian proposes a more careful approach to the issue, mentioning Ukip’s leader usage of the term wave and mentioning the relation between immigration and rise in criminality, but only to take a distance from this.

Another article published by The Guardian that proposes a different approach to the matter than The Daily Mail, The Express and The Telegraph, is entitled “Britons ready to welcome migrants from Bulgaria and Romania, poll finds” and reports a survey conducted by the agency Ipsos Mori, showing that 72% of people aged 35-44 support rights of east European workers to live and work in the UK[[31]](#footnote-31):

“In spite of a surge of anti-immigrant rhetoric from leading politicians, British people are happy to accept migrants from east of Europe who learn English, get a job, pay taxes and become part of their local community” ([www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com))

The polls revealed, though, a concern regarding the welfare system of the country. 63% of the surveyed would ask for a tightening of the welfare system, and 45% expressed their opinion that the minimum wage should be first enforced, to stop business from “undercutting British workers by paying European workers less.” ([www.theguardian.com](http://www.theguardian.com))

It is possible to notice a net difference between The Guardian framing of Romanian and Bulgarian migrants. There is actually no framing intended as usage of terms such as “hordes”, “invasion”, “crime”, etc. if not only to report other articles from other newspapers or citations.

The coverage The Guardian offered on the matter is that of a detached picture of the matter, mostly taking its distance from sensationalism and forecasting of what will happen in 2014.

1. **Conclusion**

As stated in the chapter 4.3, on January 2014 the rules regarding the access to work for Romanian and Bulgarian migrants came to an end, and Romanian and Bulgarian citizens would have free access to the UK job market.

In the months right before this date (January the 1st, 2014), the Ukip has portrayed an almost catastrophic future outcome of this change in regulations, stating that an unsustainable number of Romanian and Bulgarian would access the UK, putting an unbearable stress on the country’s finances.

The frame presented for Romanian and Bulgarians migrants is that of an *overwhelming amount of migrants* coming to the UK seeking better wages and life conditions, ready to claim benefits, since the economic situation of their home countries is not at the high level of the UK, and the terms most used in the framing of Romanian and Bulgarian immigration are: Exodus; Hundreds/Thousands; Unsustainable; Pressure; Massive invasion; Wave; Hordes; Record numbers; Floodgates.

As for the adjectives more used, we find: Unprecedented; Uncontrolled; Unbearable; Unsustainable.

The reality post-January the 1st, 2014 turned out to be quite different from what the Ukip has predicted in the previous months (2013). No *hordes* came and no *invasion* happened.

An article published on [www.debatingeurope.eu](http://www.debatingeurope.eu), entitled “”Where is the ‘tidal flood’ of Bulgarian and Romanian migrants?”[[32]](#footnote-32), mentions the Ukip and the predictions the party made regarding the massive inflow from the two Eastern European countries for 2014:

“Last year, the UK Independence Party (UKIP) predicted that Romanians and Bulgarians would surf into Britain on an ‘unprecedented crime wave’, bringing with them a ‘tidal flood of new immigrants’. The opening of the floodgate would apparently come after working restrictions on citizens of both countries were lifted on 1 January 2014.”

The article begins with summarizing in a short presentation what the Ukip has predicted to happen in 2014, using into brackets the words used by the party when referring to Eastern Europe emigration, the same description that can be find in my previous analysis.

Further on, the articles states the facts concerning the actual outcome of the lift of work regulations for Romanian and Bulgarians, and what actually happened after the beginning of 2014.

“[…] now the floodgates have been opened in Britain and seven other EU Member States for almost two months, and a recent survey of airlines and coach companies operating between the UK and Romania and Bulgaria has found no change in the numbers coming from either country. In fact, Romanians and Bulgarian migrants tend to prefer other EU countries to Britain: with 96 per cent of Romanian migrants choosing destinations other than the UK.”

 The Ukip and part of the mainstream media (The Telegraph, The Star, The Sun, Daily Mail and Daily Express) perpetuated a sort of anti-immigration coverage, designating migrants as *benefit tourists*, ready to come in mass to the UK and live a life based on the country’s welfare system.

Politician, policy-makers, mould the image of a specific group, designating a target towards which project concern and upon which build their political discourse. The Ukip has built big part of its political discourse upon targeting specific groups of the population in the UK, raising concern of the public opinion. By creating a target group, creating alarm and consequently offering a solution, the political party created an efficient electoral strategy, trying to attract the attention of concerned Britons.
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