AALBORG UNIVERSITY

STUDENT REPORT

Department of Language and International Studies
Kroghstræde 3
DK-9220 Aalborg Øst

Title:

Polarised Perspectives: Media Framing of Syrian and Ukrainian Refugees in International Contexts

Keystrokes:

170.151

Author:

Cecilie Kongerslev Jakobsen

Supervisor:

Trine Lund Thomsen

Student number:

20194571

Project period:

01/02-2024 to 31/05-2024

E-mail:

ckja19@student.aau.dk

Date of hand-in:

30/05-2024

Abstract

The growing political polarisarion has affected the media internationally, especially on significant issues such as refugees, where a divide can be found between political party-supported media and the country of origin of the refugee. This study investigates the relationship between media polarisation, refugee framing, and international legal frameworks in mainstream media from the United Kingdom and the United States of America. The thematic frameworks lay a foundation for researching how or if there is Islamophobia, prejudice and/or imaginative geography in the polarised media, as well as analysing through Entman's framing theory to investigate the impact and ways of the media's framing of refugees from Syria and Ukraine. Through a methodological approach of thematic analysis, using intersectional and comparative approaches, of qualitative data taken from diverse media in the United States of America and the United Kingdom utilising both opinion pieces and news articles, the research wants to investigate the complex relationship between the polarised media's portrayal of Syrian refugees and Ukrainian refugees. The analysis uncovers international patterns between liberals and conservatives, political narratives, and national contexts of the framing. The conservative media, in both the United Kingdom and the United States of America, appears to show restraint and a critical view on Syrian refugees, yet are ready to welcome Ukrainian refugees with open arms and an open mind. The conservative media often use Islamophobic frames and frames with prejudice towards Syrian refugees whilst using frames of sympathy and empathy towards Ukrainian refugees. The liberal media, however, show a more nuanced view of the refugees and also a more extensive disagreement in their framing. The United Kingdom's liberal media appears more factual, whereas the United States has a more emotional framing. There is disagreement internationally when it concerns Ukrainian refugees in the liberal media, where the United Kingdom takes a more open stance, the United States of America is more critical and criticises the West of hypocrisy due to the differential treatment of refugees. Yet, there is agreement among the liberal media concerning the Syrian refugees, where they show concern towards the lack of educational opportunities Syrian refugees have, claiming a lack of fundamental human rights. This study shows the impact of political polarisation on mainstream media, the importance of analysing media polarisation, and how it impacts the framing of refugees. By researching the relationship between the polarised media, the framing of refugees, and international legal

frameworks, this study contributes to conversations and studies about political polarisation in the media, refugee framing, and human rights advocacy.

Table of content

1. Introduction

Should all refugees be described equally? Political polarisation has affected mainstream media, separating media into conservative and liberal media, with differences in reports on refugees and differences in opinions on international laws concerning refugees. It has, therefore, become more difficult for consumers to know where to place their faith. Two of those countries where political polarisation has affected media reporting on refugees, are the U.S. and the U.K., two major players in Western media consumption and international politics, where there are differences in reports on two types of refugees: Ukrainian and Syrian, two of the biggest refugee crisis in newer time.

The choice in media consumption varies greatly depending on the individual's political opinions, which has resulted in news sites becoming more apparent in their political affiliation, and a more significant divide can be seen between conservative media, Fox News and the Daily Mail, and liberal media, CNN and the Guardian, when it comes to reporting on refugees. This is why I would like to analyse reports from the different media concerning Syrian and Ukrainian refugees to see how they show their political affiliation and how the reports on Syrian and Ukrainian refugees differ depending on the news outlet to see if there is a difference in how polarised the countries are, and how, if evident, the media covers refugees in accordance to international law, as well as how the countries differ in polarisation.

This project aims to determine whether the polarised media's reporting on refugees differs depending on the source's political affiliation. The analysis will focus on articles written by the polarised media for online consumers.

I will use articles written online, both on Syrian and Ukrainian refugees, from all four media to see if there is truth to the claim of polarised media writing about refugees differently depending on their country of origin as well to investigate an international trend in polarisation in media to see how that differs internationally. This will be done using Entman's theory of framing in media, how journalists can use media to set an agenda and exercise political power, and theories of political polarisation in media. Using these theories will help answer how political polarisation becomes evident in media and if there is an international trend of using the same frames or if it differs depending on the country.

The U.S. and the U.K. have both had events that show an increasing trend of political polarisation with the election of former president Donald Trump and Brexit, which makes these two countries favourable subjects for this study. Articles from the last ten years have

been chosen to see how the initial response was to the refugee crisis, both the Syrian and the Ukrainian, to be able to analyse the difference in response.

The research question that will be answered throughout this study is:

How does media polarisation influence the framing of Syrian and Ukrainian refugees in mainstream media outlets in the U.K. and U.S., and to what extent do these frames reflect an international trend of media polarisation, as well as align with relevant international legal frameworks?

This research question serves to investigate the differences in media's framing depending on their political affiliation to set a specific agenda concerning Syrian and Ukrainian refugees.

2. Literature review

This literature review will focus on three aspects of how media operates and uses different tactics to push a particular political view. “Western societies have become more polarised over the last decade” (Norris & Inglehart, 2019), and this trend has also become visible in the media. People becoming more polarised means they will be drawn to media and news sites representing their side of the pole. This trend is visible in both American and British media sites.

In 2020, Pew Research studied what media different partisans trusted in. They found that partisans trust and rely on entirely different sources for political information (Jurkowitz et al., 2020). This, therefore, shows the trend of partisans becoming more polarised. Moreover, Pew Research also investigated what sources are trusted by whom. They found that Republicans/Conservatives only trust eight of the thirty sources Jurkowitz et al. (2020) asked about. One source that was trusted most among Republicans was Fox News, whereas Liberals/Democrats relied primarily on CNN, yet they trusted more sources than they distrusted (Jurkowitz et al., 2020). Fox News is trusted as a source of reliable information by around 65% of the Republican partisans (Jurkowitz et al., 2020). There is, therefore, a difference between Republican and Liberal voters in America, where there is a more considerable distrust in sources from Republicans and a clear distinction in the sources the two different partisans rely on: Fox News and CNN.

Regarding media sources and reliability, certain institutes, like MBFC (Media Bias/Fact Check), research to look into the reliability of those sources, such as foxnews.com and CNN. Regarding Foxnews.com, they are rated right-biased (n.a., 2023a), meaning that the sources from Foxnews.com will most likely try to steer the reader towards a Republican point of view and will be reporting it from that, too. Moreover, their reliability could be better due to false claims in some headlines and texts, promoting propaganda and conspiracies, and using poor sources in their reporting (n.a., 2023a). It can, therefore, be claimed that using sources from foxnews.com will have a framing promoting Republican politics. CNN, however, leans left; this is seen in the fact that they lie by omission or omit important news if it does not fit their political beliefs; furthermore, reporting on Republicans and their politics is often with a negative tone (n.a., 2024). However, they do use the same sort of framing when reporting. Both sources use emotionally loaded headlines and phrases in their reporting to promote their politics (n.a., 2023a and n.a., 2024).

British media is not as polarised; however, there are still tendencies that different

partisans exhibit when choosing their news sources. British media is less polarised than American media, yet more polarised than Swedish and German media (Fletcher, 2022). Therefore, particular polarisation is still visible in British media. Where Republicans choose Fox News as their primary source of information, British right-leaning partisans choose Daily Mail, as well as the leftist America chooses CNN, and the leftist United Kingdom chooses The Guardian (Fletcher, 2022).

Like American news, MBFC also looks into British media, specifically The Guardian and Daily Mail. The Daily Mail is rated as leaning right due to them being a "Known supporter of the Conservatives" (n.a., 2023b) as well as having low factual reporting, which includes fake news and, like foxnews.com, promoting propaganda and conspiracy (n.a., 2023b). The Guardian is the British equivalent of CNN in terms of political sway. The Guardian leans mostly left due to how they frame their news and failed fact checks concerning reporting on the Conservatives (n.a., 2023c). Much like American news, British news also uses emotionally loaded headlines and phrases to frame the news (n.a., 2023b and n.a. 2023c).

Based on the information in this introduction, the literature review will cover three topics: framing, polarisation, and racism.

2.1. Framing theory

Framing theory is essential when studying the media as it analyses whether a certain media has an agenda through its framing. Whilst Goffman, Kahnemann, and Tversky are seen as early developers of the theory of framing within their studies, Robert Entman is seen as the person who carried it through to analysing mass media, i.e., studying news articles and journalistic agenda-setting (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018).

Entman (2004) defines framing as "Selecting and highlighting some facets of events or issues, and making connections among them to promote a particular interpretation, evaluation, and/or solution". The media frames their news to fit their agenda. Entman's definition describes the manipulation or agenda-setting one might see in the news or subconsciously take to mind. Entman focuses on what is not there or how certain things are described in a way that fits an organisation. The description of people, organisations and so on is his focus, i.e. stereotypes. Entman describes this as a way for the news to exercise

political power over the consumer, as the journalists frame the news with a narrative that matches their organisation (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018).

However, before discussing journalistic framing more, the history of the theory will be discussed to show its evolution and inclusion in different studies. The theory of framing is used in many studies by many scholars, and there, therefore, is not an agreed-upon definition. However, Entman's definition is typically referred to (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018). However, he was not the first to come up with the concept. Goffman, as previously mentioned, is one of the people who have studied and identified the framing theory. Goffman's field of study was sociology, and saw frames as a helpful tool to reduce complexity for people in their everyday life (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018). His definition of framing differs from Entman's by focusing on its helpfulness rather than how it is used to manipulate situations. Goffman's definition of a "frame" is: "a situational definition that follows certain principles of organisation, and as such, it controls both the events and the subjective commitment of the individual within the situation" (Persson, 2022). While Entman and Goffman have similarities in their definitions, there are also variations. Goffman believes framing and frames to be helpful, whereas Entman argues that they manipulate the consumer regarding media framing. However, Goffman also argues for manipulation in framing. In what he calls "impression management", he argues that the framing that happens from person to person is used by one to control the narrative and perception that person has of one; thus, he argues that one can exercise power over another by controlling their perception (Persson, 2022). This is similar to Entman's definition, as they both argue for manipulating frames.

Two other scholars who have contributed to the development of the theory are Kahnemann and Tversky, whose study is psychology (Lecheler and de Vreese). Where Goffman focuses on social constructivism and the social aspect of the theory, and Entman focuses on the power that media can exercise over one, Kahnemann and Tversky focus on how it is perceived psychologically. Kahnemann and Tversky argue that the information received by people will differ depending on the type of frame applied to the information; a gain frame has a different effect than a loss frame (Lecheler and de Vreese). This argument is supported, amongst others, by Wenzel and Żerkowska-Balas (2019), who wrote: "Framing based on fear (...) is more effective than that based on sympathy". Therefore, journalists wanting to frame news and information given to the general public experience more success if they frame it in a way that frightens people. This can be through descriptive words such as crisis, threat, danger, emergency, etc. These words are more likely to have the desired effect of the journalist on the consumer.

While there are many supporters of the theory, there are also critics and criticisms. One of which has already been mentioned is that framing theory has no agreed-upon definition. There is a favoured definition, Entman's, yet not all agree with this, and therefore, scholars often disagree with other scholars using the theory. One of these is that Entman himself states that people confuse what a frame is with "trends", and most people who claim to use framing use "trends" as their analysis (Entman, 2004). Same, or alike, criticism is seen in Cacciatore et al., who argue that the term is used too broadly and that scholars often do not distinguish their usage of frames within the bounds, i.e. equivalency framing and emphasis framing (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018). This paper follows Entman's definition as well as emphasis framing. Emphasis framing includes data having different logical content, phrased differently, but potentially relevant considerations, whereas equivalency framing is the same logic but different framing (Lecheler and de Vreese). As this paper researches polarisation in mass media, the logic behind the sources used will be different yet relevant for its consumers.

In this paper, I will use Entman's definition of framing and how I use it. This will be discussed more in the theory section, where I will explain how I use the theory.

2.2. Political Polarisation

Political polarisation is a term and theory used in many studies, from sociology to communication to political science. However, different from framing is that there is an agreed-upon definition; however, its' usage and' effect differ from scholar to scholar. "Defined as the increasing divide between groups" (Kubin & von Sikorski, 2023) is the definition of polarisation in social groups and social identities. When applied to politics, it means that the parties, which can be separated into liberals and conservatives, are growing further and further apart in their ideologies. Unlike the chapter about "framing", this chapter will not focus on scholars but rather on the evolution of the theory and how scholars have applied it differently through time.

Political polarisation is a theory and phenomenon that has risen in popularity for scholars and relevancy for studies in the U.S. specifically and the rest of the Western world since the 1970s (Canen et al., 2020). However, one has to look further back to post-war America for its origin. After the Second World War, in the 1950s and 1960s, Western politics was driven by a desire for unity. During this time, political parties became more unified and

often had overlapping ideologies and politics (Yang, 2023). Scholars were interested in the development of politics after that time to see what trends would happen. As it turned out, people wanted the same, more or less, and the politicians were the same. The politics at that time was mostly about creating solidarity, unity, and peace.

However, the political trends changed a couple of decades after its beginning. From the 1970s into the 1980s, there was the opposite effect. Parties became more polarised and separated, largely due to the Vietnam War and social movements establishing and becoming more popular (Yang, 2022). So, trends or things in society affect politics and the parties. Liberals and conservatives have different opinions on social movements and how to handle them; BLM is an example of a party divide in social movements. The study of polarisation, therefore, changed from studying how parties overlapped in politics to parties being more divided and polarised due to societal effects.

After the 1980s, there was another change in the study of political polarization. From the 1990s to the 2000s, scholars changed from studying polarisation to studying the causes and reasons behind political polarisation (Yang, 2023). A reason scholars found why polarisation was occurring and why it divided people so much was due to "societal changes". Terrorism, migration, and refugees became more common in the 1990s in the Western world, dividing people politically into liberals and conservatives (Yang, 2023; Benedetto et al., 2023); this will be discussed later in this section.

Another change that came in the 1990s up till now was access to the internet and the whole world. Moreover, as media influence has increased in the last decades, so has polarisation (Prior, 2013; Robison & Mullinix, 2015). Globalisation has, along with polarisation, been able to spread using the internet. Anyone can connect with anyone, no matter where they are. This, however, has harmed polarisation as it has increased it. Due to the accessibility to the world's news and international coverage, people are much more likely to lean on what they believe in and know. This has created what is called "echo chambers", which is defined by Yang (2023) as "Individuals are exposed to viewpoints that align with their pre-existing beliefs". These echo chambers contribute to an "us-versus-them" thought process, which will be discussed later as the media will cultivate group competition, meaning that the in-group, liberals, will grow hatred for the out-group, democrats, and vice versa (Norris and Inglehart, 2019 Iyengar & Westwood, 2014).

When it comes to media being polarised, the shaping of the echo chambers is being looked into. Furthermore, I will investigate how polarised media discuss different cases of refugees. Therefore, the shaping of the polarised media and how it is visible that a particular

news page is polarised is essential to discuss. “Theories of communication emphasise the growth of partisan polarisation in the legacy news media” (Norris & Inglehart, 2019). However, while polarisation can be enhanced through media, some scholars find it hard to pinpoint precisely how it is communicated (Robison & Mullinix, 2015). A way this happens can be through framing. Elite polarisation often has a negative tone; polarised news coverage often criticises other beliefs and ideologies and has a negative tone describing what they disagree with (Robison & Mullinix, 2015); as previously discussed, negative frames are more effective than positive frames. Although polarised news media uses both, depending on the topic, the negative tone would benefit the consumers in that group more. Polarisation in the media happens as it can change and shape news coverage according to political beliefs, filling the consumer with that same ideology (Yang, 2023). Therefore, framing and political polarisation go hand-in-hand and are interconnected through how the polarisation happens and why frames are used.

Nevertheless, polarisation in media has/is also being criticised. Kubin and von Sikorski (2023) state that scholars have different views on the effect of polarisation in mass media; they claim that there are three different groups of scholars when it comes to studying polarisation in media: those that believe it helps de-polarise the public, therefore do not have visible polarisation or any, those that think media is neutral when it comes to polarisation, and lastly those, like this paper, that argues for the polarisation in media and that it escalates polarisation. Due to this critique, the theory section will thoroughly explain how media polarisation is viewed in this paper.

2.3. Racism

In this paper, I will investigate how different groups of people are covered in the polarised news. Therefore, I will in this section use racism as an “umbrella term” and explain different kinds of racism that will be used in this paper to explain the inequalities people experience as refugees based on their gender, race, and country of origin. Moreover, this section will cover the different forms of racism to let the reader know why and what is used in the paper. A brief definition of racism will also be provided here.

Racism is when people of colour (POC) are treated less than others, oppressed, diminished, ridiculed, and so on (Braveman et al., 2022). Whilst this definition is brief, it

covers the principle of racism: treating people less than or differently based on the colour of their skin. Moreover, racism can be systemic and structural, meaning that the laws and politics in a country can be racist; Jim Crow and slavery are examples of systemic racism (Braveman et al., 2022). It means that some regions of society are off-limits or limited for POCs. Systemic racism still exists in the Western world; however, it is not as visible anymore: unequal pay, being judged pre-interview for a job based on one's name, and so on.

2.3.1. Prejudice

Like racism, prejudice has deep roots in the Western world. Bonilla-Silva wrote in 2001 that prejudice means "attitudes toward an entire group of people" (Tuttas, 2014). Prejudice is how people perceive others who do not look the same. POCs fall under the category of racial prejudice. Prejudice is the cognitive attitude people experience towards another group; this takes the form of discriminatory "stereotyping and categorizing" (Tuttas, 2014). However, I believe this to be oversimplifying the issue of prejudice; as stated in the beginning, prejudice is deeply rooted in Western societies. I argue that prejudice is more than people's attitudes towards people; it is something social and rooted in culture. Furthermore, it is a part of structural racism and is integrated into various systems in the Western world. Therefore, I work with the definition that prejudice is the stereotyping and categorisation within society towards certain people, taking partisan support and social identity into the context of prejudice.

Racial discrimination and prejudice have been studied intensively and are a topic of interest ever since Allport's publication "The Nature of Prejudice" in 1954 (Gawronski et al., 2008). The study has since been developed, and prejudice has as well. During the last century, prejudice and its expression have changed quite a bit. There are three phases of prejudice, which are "old-fashioned" racism, modern racism, and aversive/implicit racism (Gawronski et al., 2008). Whilst I, in this paper, will use "old-fashioned" racism to show overt racism, the others are still important to discuss and to discuss why those are not used in this paper.

"Old-fashioned" racism is, as stated, overt and blatant racism; it shows in discriminatory stereotyping and categorising (Gawronski et al., 2008). Moreover, it stems from the belief in slavery, oppression, and segregation (Gawronski et al., 2008). This has been chosen for this paper, as I set out to show how the polarised media frames different

refugee camps. In this, I will look at the stereotyping and categorising of refugees. Therefore, overt and blatant racism is used in this paper as it includes being obvious with racist frames.

Modern racism is seeing POCs getting the same opportunities as non-POCs and being angry over it; it is the anger towards the attention POCs are getting as they do not feel like POCs deserve that attention over them (Gawronski et al., 2008). However, whilst I agree that this definition of modern racism makes sense, to argue the thinking in it, I will point out systemic racism; whilst POCs are getting more and more equality, there are still issues deeply rooted within the system to diminish POCs and slow down the process of equality.

Aversive racism can also be called sub-conscious racism. Aversive racists are people who have negative views on POCs yet have egalitarian views, which leads to them avoiding or fearing POCs rather than hating them (Gawronski et al., 2008). Aversive racism, therefore, happens because one has been raised or surrounded with negative views on POCs, yet they want equality for all. This leads to them avoiding POCs but not hating them, as they also stand against racism and oppression. I argue that this racism occurs due to systemic racism, as the "system" policies in schools, jobs, and governments influence the egalitarian person.

2.3.1.1. Islamophobia

Islamophobia is a term with a long history, yet its first usage is unknown (Iqbal, 2020a). Moreover, its definition is as disputed as its origin. However, "Islamophobia has traditionally been defined as both a prejudice and hostility toward Muslims" (Elman, 2019). This definition will be used in this paper as well, as it falls under "old-fashioned" racism and the definition of prejudice that has been given. This definition of Islamophobia can be traced to a series of studies from 1997 made in the U.K. where they uncovered and studied the prejudice Muslims face (Elman, 2019; Mondon & Winter, 2016)

Muslim migrants have fueled and added to Islamophobia in Europe, where Muslims are branded as "terrorists, traitors, non-democrats and threats to social cohesion and global peace (Elman, 2019) as well as being fuelled by the 9/11 attacks in the U.S. and the 2015 Paris attacks (Mondon & Winter, 2016). The War on Terror has, therefore, fuelled the idea of all Muslims being terrorists and propagandised them as villainous and evil. Nevertheless, its roots go way further back. Islamophobia can be traced back to Islam's beginning in the 7th century; Christians saw them as a threat to their religion and territory (Iqbal, 2020a). Muslims were then branded like they are today, yet their branding was different back then. "Followers of (...) Islam (...) were, then, characterised a 'people with the wrong religion'" (Iqbal, 2020),

and this branding can be traced to have continued until and after 1745 when Broughton's Dictionary of All Religions labelled it as a false religion (Iqbal, 2020a). Islamophobia can, therefore, be traced back a long time, yet the view on Muslims has changed from being a "wrong" religion to being viewed as terrorists and barbaric.

However, there is much disagreement over the term Islamophobia. The term Islamophobia is controversial as "phobia" means fear of, and several scholars argue that it should be called "Muslim-hate" instead as they find it more fitting (Mondon & Winter, 2016). However, I argue that "phobia" or fear is fitting because the frames used for Islamophobia often include aligning Muslims with words that frighten people: terrorists, barbaric, and wild, which can and does invoke fear in many people, hence "fear of Muslims". I argue that the first form of Islamophobia can be defined as "Muslim hate" as it started with hatred for another religion and people other than Western Christians. However, as the term has developed, I believe that there has been a change in the framing of Muslims to view them as something fearful and to be afraid of.

2.3.2. Othering

Othering is described as "the process of labelling and defining those we perceive to be in a different group as somehow 'deviant'" (Zwet et al., 2020). Othering, therefore, determines that there are two groups: those who perceive and those who are perceived. These "groups" create an "us-versus-them" dynamic (Silva, 2017). This happens as one group looks with disdain or judgement upon the other group, thus having the "us" be against or judge the "other". However, the idea of othering has not always been present in social studies and was, as many of the other terms, created by or stems from, Edward Said's famous work "Orientalism", in which he states that the West have given Islam and Muslims the label as the "other" and themselves as "us" (Iqbal, 2020b). However, the term was not coined by Said but by Gayatri Spivak (Iqbal, 2020b).

Othering refers to a particular power struggle between the "us" and the "them". The ones creating the dynamic are the marginalised group "us", which gives an identity and category for the "them", which often leads to stereotyping and racialisation (Modood and Thompson, 2021). The "them" does not have a say in the "us's" evaluation and judgement of them and does not have the power to change the identity given to them by the "us" as the

“us” is the marginalised group and has the most power in this dynamic. The “us” in this process also creates their own social identity through the diminishment and judgement of the “other” (Iqbal, 2020b), meaning that the “us” have the power to create their own identity whilst the “them” does not. However, it should be critiqued here that there are other factors than “just” a marginalised group giving an identity to a minority group. As previously mentioned in this literature review, culture and history are important factors in determining these identities and groupings, meaning there is more behind the labelling than “just” a power dynamic. That dynamic has not appeared out of nowhere but has been cultivated through history and societal factors.

This identification and labelling can be seen in the way Western media presents Muslims. Muslims are often related to terrorism and stereotypes in Western media, making them the “other” (Iqbal, 2020b). This is also seen in how Western media presents the “us”, which would be the Western world. Western media has a tendency to label Muslims and only focus on the negative actions of some Muslims but grouping them all together, whereas negative news about the “us” is often omitted or made less severe (Silva, 2017) to represent the “us” favourably and innocently but the “other” as dangerous and villainous.

2.3.3. Imaginative geographies

Imaginative geographies come from a theory by Edward Said in his, as previously mentioned, famous work “Orientalism” (Dawson, 2013). From Said, the idea of imaginative geographies comes from seeing geography as a socially constituted space (Dawson, 2013), which means that people have socially constructed all countries, borders, labels, names, and so on. It has been invented and enforced because “we” people have decided it should be so. Said claims that the world looks like it looks because we have decided it should.

However, imaginative geography is more than the world is socially constructed. Imaginative geography does not make up places and countries; it is the images people correlate to certain areas and the images one gets when thinking of certain areas (Garijo-Serrano, 2021). Therefore, the imagery people use to describe places or the images one gets when thinking of certain places determines the imaginative geography. These images become the identification of certain areas and the labelling of certain areas. As Garijo-Serrano (2021) stated, imaginative geographies “separate known space against

unknown space," where one knows how the known space looks and if the unknown is just that.

Framing and imaginative geographies are linked (Mahadevan et al., 2017); this happens because of how imaginative geographies are perceived, yet more so because of how they are written and talked about. In the Western world and media, the Middle East is often seen as one big imaginative geography, where its inhabitants are framed as terrorists, barbaric, exotic, and wild (Garijo-Serrano, 2021; Mahadevan et al., 2017).

Said argues that imaginative geographies happen due to Western or European superiority (Dawson, 2013). However, I would argue his point against his point. If the imaginative geographies are "the unknown" and images are linked to that place, it happens globally, and everyone participates in it. However, in this paper, imaginative geographies will be used to see how Western societies look at the unknown refugee camps and countries of origin of the refugees.

3. Theory

In this part of the paper, I will explore the theories from the literature review and describe them as they will be used in this paper.

3.1. Framing

Framing, as previously mentioned, is present in different aspects of society. This paper will focus on media framing and how the polarised media frames partisan views. Framing has gone through many stages. We are currently in the fourth stage, social constructivism (Scheufele, 1999), meaning that people construct all frames and partisan views. These have meaning and power due to how people view the framing.

There are certain ways to identify framing in the news. Lecheler and de Vreese (2018) state that according to Cappella and Jamieson, there are four criteria for a frame to be that: conceptual and linguistic features must be identifiable, must be commonly observed in that media's writing, it must be distinguishable and stand out from other frames or other media's frames, and others must recognise the frame for it to have representational validity. However,

for these qualifications, one must recognise and identify frames. Gamson and Modigliani gave, in 1987, five framing devices which help to identify frames; if the frames include one or more of the following identifications, there is a higher chance of that being a frame; “metaphors, exemplars, catch-phrases, depictions, and visual images” (Lecheler & de Vreese, 2018).

A frame seen in the media is a substantial frame. Substantial frames cover political events, issues, and actors by making them problematic, suggesting remedies or improvements, or conveying a particular moral judgement (Entman, 2004). Different media, especially polarised media, will have different moral judgements on the same issue. Many frames in media are about political events or actors, and the frames often have gaps in the information (Entman, 2004). They will convey different sides of the story, and different things will be omitted in different media.

In this project, framing is used to show how the polarised media, both sides, describe refugees and refugee camps. This is to show what kinds of frames they have used and their effect on the story they are telling.

3.2. Polarisation

Polarisation is, as stated, a political trend where the parties go further left and right and thus become more divided. There are two different frames under which polarisation goes: value frames and strategic frames (Robison & Mullinix, 2015). In this paper, I will be working with strategic frames. Strategic frames are defined as being “born out of ideological commitments by elite partisans” (Robison & Mullinix, 2015), meaning, in the context of media, that politicians are promoting certain media to push a narrative fitting their benefit often to an audience that votes for that party.

Moreover, a way to analyse polarisation in media is to investigate what sort of effect the source wishes to promote (Kubin & Von Sikorski, 2023), what is the message in the news and how that alters from other news on the same issue. This makes polarisation a comparative study (Torcal et al., 2023). This means that sources nationally can be compared with one another to show the trend in that country; however, international sources can also be compared to see how it trends globally or how different countries differ (Torcal et al., 2023). This will be used in the analysis and discussion, where the U.S. will be compared to the U.K.

to show whether those two countries are alike or different.

Lastly, a way to determine political polarisation is to determine how it divides people into “us-versus-them”; certain cultural issues, such as war, refugees, and immigrants, divide people and different parties, and polarised media respond differently (Norris & Inglehart, 2023). By analysing how the media responds to certain cultural issues and, as such, analysing how and who is divided into “us-versus-them,” political polarisation becomes more evident and shows what politics the media wants to narrate and promote.

In this paper, polarisation will be used to analyse trends in different political news regarding Ukrainian and Syrian refugees. It will show how politics affects news nationally and analyse and determine whether that is an international, U.K., and U.S. trend or exclusive to one of the two.

3.3. Prejudice

Prejudice is a societal issue that can be seen in everything. A study has shown that there is “a relationship between television news watching and stereotyping” (Melican & Dixon, 2008). This means that the news consumed in television, and could be assumed on the internet, affects how people view others. That study shows that if one watches certain news, stereotypes of different groups are more likely to be enhanced. This is also shown in the fact that white Americans support certain racial stereotypes, which will only be enhanced through selective exposure, i.e. only watching and reading news one thinks aligns with one’s beliefs (Melican & Dixon, 2008).

As discussed in the literature review, there are three forms of racism; this paper will focus on “old-fashioned” racism. That category falls under ‘explicit prejudice’, meaning that the prejudice will be more apparent and visible (Gawronski et al., 2008). This is the focus as it makes the differences in the news media analysed more visible and shows a more significant divide between polarised news using this.

However, whilst it might be visible, some tools still exist to find prejudice. Prejudice is seen, amongst others, in how people are described and what stereotypes and categories are given to some people that are discriminatory (Tuttas, 2014). Therefore, finding and analysing prejudice lies in how people are described and talked about. Are they or their situation being described negatively or positively, which can also be seen in the frames used by the sources,

In this paper, I will use prejudice and prejudice to show the divide in how people are described. I will use it to show how certain media are discriminatory to what is foreign to them and to what does not align with their political views. This will be compared to descriptions of the same group from a different source to see whether it is an acknowledged description for all polarised media or if there is a difference.

3.4. Islamophobia

Islamophobia is a term that lies under prejudice. As discussed in the literature review, there is a disagreement about using the term and its name. In this, Islamophobia is used as the analysis will focus on the communication in news media surrounding Muslims and Syrians. The conversation around Muslims and Syrians in the media has had negative connotations, which has led to some members of the public and polarised news to relate Muslims and Syrians to terrorists and barbaric people, as well as showing hatred and fear for the 'dangerous other' (Elman, 2019).

"Analysis of Islamophobia points to the ways in which individuals are 'bombarded by the biased media' and with stereotypical images of Muslims" (Elman, 2019), which means that the way to analyse Islamophobia and what will be used in this paper is to investigate what connotations the media makes when it comes to Muslims and Syrians. Now, I have put Muslims and Syrians in the same category as some scholars argue that Islamophobia is more cultural and religious (Iqbal, 2020a), and some even argue that it is a race term (Mondon & Winter, 2016). I use it in this paper as a cultural term since the biased media does not care about religion but colour and country of origin, yet gives Syrians the same connotations as Muslims.

Islamophobia will, in this paper, be investigated on a dialectal level, i.e. how and what is written about Muslims in the biased media, which will be analysed by looking at the "use of anti-Muslim rhetoric and statements" (n.a., 2021). Islamophobia and prejudice are, therefore, closely aligned, yet Islamophobia specifically looks at the way Muslims are talked about.

In this paper, Islamophobia is used to uncover and analyse the difference in how Syrian/Muslim refugees are talked about compared to Ukrainian refugees. Islamophobia will help provide a better tool to analyse the rhetoric used for and around Muslim/Syrian refugees.

3.5. Othering

As mentioned in the literature review, othering leads to “us-versus-them” or in-groups and out-groups. In Western media, series, movies, news, and games, Muslims have been made the “them” or out-group to the West, where they are labelled as terrorists, evil, and dangerous, linking fear and violence to Muslims (Silva, 2017; Iqbal, 2020b). This means that Muslims are made the “other” in Western society, where there are only negative connotations linked to them and their religion. Meanwhile, the “us” is not made negative and is often set in a superior light of the “them” (Silva, 2017). Clean vs. dirty, terrorist vs. democrats, and so on are some views that the Western media might push when it comes to Muslims versus Westerners.

Othering and “us-versus-them” can include what is called ‘schadenfreude’ which is taking pleasure in someone else’s pain (Cikara et al., 2011); if the in-group has enough hatred or fear for the out-group, it might lead to the in-group taking pleasure in the out-groups pain. When it comes to the “them” in Western society, it has long been Muslims where they are seen as a threat to society and seen as having a negative effect and view on human rights (Modood & Thompson, 2021). The framework in the Western media and politics has been to set the “us” in a different light than the “them”, making “us” the freedom fighters and as being heroes (Green, 2018). This will help the analysis and provide valuable tools to see the difference in the treatment of refugees from Ukraine or Syria.

In this paper, I will use othering and “us-versus-them” to analyse how refugees are portrayed in the Western media. Furthermore, I will use them to analyse whether Ukraine is seen as a part of “us” because it is a Western country despite Ukrainians’ status as refugees compared to Middle Eastern country refugees and to see if there is a difference in the “us-versus-them” depending on where the refugee is from.

3.6. Imaginative geography

Imaginative geography is linked to “us versus them” or “us over them” as it describes the West’s fantasy of the East or what has been known as the “Orient” (Ganijo-Serrano, 2021). Therefore, the way to analyse imaginative geographies is closely aligned with othering; however, there is a difference in what is being looked at.

As Ganijo-Serrano (2021) states in his work “Constructing Imaginative Geographies in Genesis”, the analysed and looked upon part is the geography or imaginative geography as borders are not taken into consideration; rather, the space is, and the images created with that space are. That means that the stereotypes and categories bound to a country or space determine how the imaginative geography is looked at. Is it represented as a clean and peaceful space or a dirty and barbaric space?

Imaginative geography is a “poetic process with imaginative and figurative values related to naming and emotions” (Kofoed & Haldrup, 2020). This means that the descriptive words linked to a place determine how we view it. The connotations associated with words determine whether a space is viewed positively or negatively.

In this paper, I will use imaginative geography to investigate how the polarised news describes and writes about different refugee camps based on where the refugees are from, Ukraine and Syria. This will be done to confirm or rebuke that refugees are treated/talked about differently depending on their country of origin.

4. Methodology

4.1. Philosophy of science

4.1.1. Social construction

The philosophy of science used in this paper is social construction. Social construction is “the process by which people jointly construct their understanding of the world” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009a). Meaning that social construction is the way we collectively understand the world and find meaning in the world. Therefore, it can be said that social construction is the way we, individually and collectively, view the world. It is, therefore, an interaction between structuring and subjectivity, meaning that social construction is how meanings are moulded and structured through one’s own experience (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009b).

Social construction and the field in which it is studied, communication, have two more relevant elements, which will be explained here. The first element is “the central assumption that people make sense of experience by constructing a model of the social works and how it works” (Littlejohn and Foss, 2009a). This means that people construct the social

world through their experiences and make meaning of this. The second element is; “the emphasis on language as the most important system through which reality is constructed” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009a). This means that the words we use, how they are applied, and what meaning we bestow it shape people’s perception of reality. Therefore, different people can have different interpretations of the social world.

An example of this is ‘Corona’ and how the meaning of the word has changed; five years ago, most people associated ‘Corona’ with beer, parties, and fun; four years ago, that changed when the pandemic of ‘Corona’ broke out, this definition was four years ago related to fear, anxiety, lockdowns, and sickness in the whole world, four years later the definition has changed as there was made a vaccine which helped get the pandemic to lessen; therefore, the word ‘Corona’ is today, mostly, seen as common influenza that does not provoke fear or lockdowns. ‘Corona’, the word and not the virus itself, is an example of social construct and how words have meaning because people attribute meanings to it. Alternatively, as Pricopie (2020) described, “communication serves as a human instrument for creating the world”.

Continuing on the importance of language and our use of it, I will further explain its’ importance for and on social construction. As stated by Littlejohn and Foss (2009a) “naming things gives them substance”. This means that giving a thing a name or inventing a new word gives it meaning in the social world; the definitions of the naming give it substance. However, a word is not universally recognised as meaning the same; each language and culture (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009a), as shown with ‘Corona’, have different meanings and origins; therefore, one’s culture and language also help shape the social world. In the last decade, media has become a way for the social world to take shape (Pricopie, 2020). Due to this social construction can be applied to the study of communication as it helps analyse “on the microlevel (specific words, images, actions) to examine a macroprocess (or structure, or institution)” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009a). Therefore, it can be applied to this study, as the microprocess, the words used in the media, can show a macroprocess of polarised media and how they use the media to show their political affiliations.

Lastly, an unavoidable effect of social construction is my role as the researcher in the study: “Social construction has implied reflexivity” (Littlejohn & Foss, 2009a). As I, too, am a part of the social world, I am not immune to societal norms and cultural values, as well as having my own personal experiences which shapes my opinions and perceptions on issues such as politics and the portrayal of refugees in media. It is important to recognise, that whilst this research will be done as objectively as possible, my own viewpoints, experiences, and preconceived knowledge is intertwined within the analysis process and the process of doing

this research as a whole. Whilst the focus will be on how the polarised media, frames refugees from different countries, it is important to note that my interpretation may be impacted by personal perspectives. Striving for objectivity, yet in subtle and unconscious ways my perspectives and experiences may shape and change the interpretation, compared to how some other people would do it; both in chosen data, chosen themes, and the interpretation of the data.

In this paper, social construction will be used to investigate what words are used by different media and why when it comes to refugees from both Ukraine and Syria. This will then be used to see if there is an overriding trend in the polarised media internationally and how their way of describing refugees reflects on their political affiliation.

4.1.2. Abductive reasoning

The abductive reason will also be applied to the analysis. Abduction reasoning has been seen as "a middle ground between inductive and deductive methods" (Thompson, 2022) by aiming for a conclusion that is both logical and useful (Thompson, 2022). That means the reasoning aims to use both a theoretical and empirical perspective without relying on one more than the other.

Moreover, abductive reasoning has a hermeneutical approach. This means that the researcher has to be open to other analysis possibilities and reflect upon what has been discovered to develop that (Rinehart, 2020). That means the analysis method is not going in one line; it is more like a spiral shifting between findings/analysis and interpretation. It is an active process for the researcher as they must reflect on their findings every time something new is discovered. Rinehart (2020) describes this as "what sense is made, meanings assigned, and from which new knowledge is presented".

Three conditions need to be met to make an analysis using abductive reasoning. First, the researcher needs to familiarise themselves with the data being analysed (Rinehart, 2020), which means reading through the data, taking notes, and then doing it again. Notably, in this step, which is mentioned above, which is to avoid jumping to conclusions but to be open to new discoveries during the familiarisation. The second condition is that "researchers need to be open to notice" (Rinehart, 2020); this goes hand-in-hand with familiarisation, yet it happens afterwards. The researcher needs to be receptive and open to new ideas and information during the analysis, which may challenge what has already been written, yet that furthers the study even more. The third condition is that the researcher must use "evidence to

indicate a path to any new knowledge" (Rinehart, 2020). The researcher must reflect on what has already been written and either develop or disprove their theories. Important for abductive reasoning is to keep looking back to what has already been written to develop and improve the study at hand.

4.2. Research design

The purpose of this study is to uncover how the polarised media talks about refugees from both Ukraine and Syria and how media discuss the subject compared to other media sources; this will be done through the data collected to make the analysis possible, which consists of two sources from Fox News, two sources from CNN, two sources from the DailyMail, and two sources from the Guardian. This will be done through framing devices and thematic analysis, where the words and descriptions used by the media will be scrutinised closely. I have chosen to do this study as I see a more and more polarised world, as discussed, and would like to see more studies on how it affects people in the same situation, yet from different countries, as I see a lack of specific focus on this in the research available now.

Thematic analysis is a sturdy methodological approach for this study to investigate the influence of political polarisation on media's framing of Syrian and Ukrainian refugees in media from the U.K. and the U.S. Thematic analysis allows the researcher to be flexible in data collection, meaning that the researcher can analyse news articles and opinion pieces, which are both being covered in this paper. Using thematic analysis allows the researcher to uncover trends and patterns in the polarised media nationally and internationally and to see where they differ in themes, enabling the researcher to analyse the influence of political polarisation in U.K. and U.S. media concerning Syrian and Ukrainian refugees. Through coding and theming of the textual material, thematic analysis allows the researcher to identify specific narratives, shared perspectives, and different ideologies. The thematic analysis identifies how media polarisation shapes the narratives and conversations surrounding refugees from different countries.

Furthermore, I have chosen this study based on my experiences in a polarised world. I see extremist views from both sides more frequently now than I did ten years ago before Brexit and the election of former president Donald Trump. This trend of more extreme views and political polarisation has transferred to the consumed media, whether online, in this case,

or through television. From my experience in the last years, I have seen a trend of using certain rhetoric from right-winged media to describe Middle-Eastern and Muslim refugees as terrorists and a threat to the democratic world. In contrast, I theorise that the rhetoric used when it comes to Ukrainian refugees is the opposite and sympathetic. Therefore, I wanted to research whether there was this presumed difference and how it is written. Furthermore, I wanted to examine whether the rhetoric used for different refugees is the same across poles and international, which is why I chose to focus on the U.K. and U.S. These countries are obvious choices for the research due to Brexit and the election of Donald Trump, which both show a trend to be more right-leaning and a fear of refugees/immigrants.

This is why social construction and abductive reasoning will be applied to the analysis. These methods will show the reader how the analysis will conclude. Moreover, these are applied as I can not ensure that the findings will be objectively true for everyone. However, it will be the most logical and reasonable finding I can find in the study, which is what abductive reasoning and social construction are sound at. Furthermore, as I focus on the study of words and how certain events are described, my data set will be qualitative, and the media used for this will be news articles from the polarised media. Intersectionality will also be applied as a method, as it can help link different groups together. Nevertheless, it is also because I will investigate different groups with an intersectional feature to discuss how Syrian refugee women differ from Ukrainian refugee women, as an example.

Due to this, the study will also be comparative, as I aim to look for differences in descriptions of refugees depending on their country of origin, yet also because the sources will be compared. This will be done more politically, where the right-winged articles will be compared to the left-winged articles; moreover, the sources will be compared to the national media and international to see if there is a trend in the polarised world and how the polarisation affects it nationally. Therefore, the left-wing will be compared to the left-winged, and the same will be true for the right-winged as this better shows the international trend in polarisation.

4.3. Data collection

To compare Liberal and Conservative media from the U.K. and the U.S., two polarised media from each country have been selected, and two articles from each source, resulting in eight sources for the analysis. The selected data is two from CNN, two from Fox News, two from

Daily Mail, and two from the Guardian. Furthermore, the data chosen ranges from 59 lines to 109 lines; the range in length is deliberate as the longer articles are more about fear framing, and the shorter articles are more about success framing.

The articles chosen for the analysis are chosen based on how they reflect their polarised views. Moreover, they are chosen as they have both success and fear frames depending on what they are writing about and their opinion on the matter. Furthermore, they were chosen due to their differences in writing style, political opinions, and personal opinions on the matter discussed in each article.

Furthermore, the article will have a diachronic focus as the articles range from 2015 to 2022; this allows me to look into the view on refugees in 2015 and the 2010s compared to 2022 and how it has changed and corresponds with the polarised media's political stance on immigrants and refugees. Furthermore, I can use this to investigate if time has changed the views or if it depends on the refugee and their country of origin, if there are signs of polarisation and differences.

The articles chosen for this analysis are seven articles, one opinion article, and one article with an unnamed journalist. The reason for having seven regular articles and one opinion article is to examine whether it is a personal opinion from the journalist or if it corresponds with what is written in the regular articles making it possible to analyse whether it is an international and/or national political trend or if it is that journalist's individual and original political opinion. The article with the unnamed journalist was chosen as the source names themselves as the author, and therefore, what is written in that article reflects the views of the media and not the individual, making it able to do the same as the opinion article where it better allows to be compared for the polarised trend in media.

Now, the articles and the reason for choosing them will be explained. The first article, "Amanpour: What my son and I learned at a Syrian refugee camp", was written by Christiane Amanpour for CNN in 2017, taken from https://edition.cnn.com/2017/02/24/middleeast/amanpour-darius-syrian-refugee-camp-jordan/index.html. This article was chosen because it is not labelled an 'opinion article' but an 'article,' meaning that what Amanpour experienced and wrote about concerning a Syrian refugee camp aligns with CNN's political views, allowing the analysis to investigate CNN's opinions on Syrian versus Ukrainian refugees.

The second article, "The gross hypocrisy of the West's refugee response, " was written by Arwa Damon for CNN in 2022, taken from https://edition.cnn.com/2022/03/07/opinions/europe-refugee-response-ukrainians-syrians-da

mon/index.html. The article was chosen from CNN due to its left-leaning tendencies. Moreover, it was chosen due to the strong emotional headline that shows CNN's political stance on the treatment of refugees. The article concerns Ukrainian refugees and how they are treated, yet also criticises how the same people and states treated Syrian refugees.

The third article is called "How many more can Kos take? Thousands of boat people from Syria and Afghanistan set up migrant camp in popular Greek island - with holidaymakers branding the situation 'disgusting'" written by an unnamed journalist for Daily Mail in 2015, taken from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3099736/Holidaymakers-misery-boat-people-Syria-Afghanistan-seeking-asylum-set-migrant-camp-turn-popular-Greek-island-Kos-disgusting-hellhole.html. This article was chosen due to its headline having a lot of negative and emotional frames. Moreover, it was chosen due to its' original headline, where the journalist referenced Kos as a hellhole due to refugees. It was also chosen because an unnamed journalist wrote the article, which means that it reflects the Daily Mail and their political opinion.

The fourth article, "You're safe now, little one: Young girl looks out onto the Polish refugee camp as she becomes one of 875,000 Ukrainians who have escaped Russian invasion" was written by Charlotte McLaughlin for Daily Mail in 2022 taken from https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3099736/Holidaymakers-misery-boat-people-Syria-Afghanistan-seeking-asylum-set-migrant-camp-turn-popular-Greek-island-Kos-disgusting-hellhole.html. This article was also chosen for the headline, which is emotionally heavy. Moreover, it was chosen due to its content concerning refugee children, like the article written by the Guardian. However, it is utterly different content concerning how the child is treated, which shows a difference in how children are treated depending on where they are refugees from.

The fifth article, "Refugee children praise ISIS, vow to 'crush' apostates, videos from Syrian camp show", written by Hollie McKay for Fox News in 2019, https://www.foxnews.com/world/disturbing-videos-surface-of-refugee-children-praising-isis-and-vowing-to-crush-apostates-raising-questions-over-growing-radicalization. This article was chosen due to its strong headline and because the so-called video mentioned in the headline does not seem to appear on non-Islamophobic pages and this article. Moreover, the only media outlet out of the four has reported on this video. Furthermore, it is chosen due to the framers shown in the headline and throughout the article in its descriptions of Syrian refugee children and women.

The sixth article is called "Ukraine refugee crisis: scenes of suffering, lessons in

beauty" by Edgar Sandoval Sr. for Fox News in 2022, taken from https://www.foxnews.com/opinion/ukraine-refugee-crisis-scenes-suffering-lessons-beauty-edgar-sandoval. This article was chosen due to the success frames in the headline. Moreover, it was chosen due to Fox News right-leaning tendencies. The article was also chosen due to it being an opinion piece, which shows the individual political opinions on Fox News's journalists, which can help show the tendencies of the journalists writing for Fox News, allowing me to look into the trend of polarisation in Fox News and compare it to the other news media chosen for the analysis.

The seventh article is "Adults before their time, Syria's refugee children toil in the fields of Lebanon", was written by Kareem Shaheen for the Guardian in 2015, taken from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/jul/26/children-syria-bekaa-isis. This article, again, was chosen due to its emotionally strong headline. Moreover, it was chosen due to its content, which concerns Syrian refugee children and what their life is like in refugee camps and as refugees. The article concerned itself with child exploitation and was chosen due to this.

The last article is called "As 1.3 million people flee, Ukraine's refugee crisis is only just beginning" and was written by Annie Kelly, Rosie Swash, and Katy Fallon for the Guardian in 2022, taken from https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2022/mar/05/ukrainians-head-west-as-un-warns-refugee-crisis-is-only-just-beginning. This article was chosen due to the Guardian's left-leaning tendencies and an emotionally strong headline. Furthermore, it was chosen as it is an analysis of Europe's refugee response to Ukraine whilst also criticising Europe's refugee response to Syrians and Iraqis. Furthermore, it is labelled an article whilst being an analysis; therefore, what is written in the analysis must reflect the Guardian's political opinion.

These eight articles will contribute to the research question and help provide an answer to the polarisation in media and how it affects the views and reporting on refugees depending on their country of origin.

4.4. Method of analysis

4.4.1. Thematic analysis

Thematic analysis (TA) is a term developed by Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke in 2006, where they sought to put a definition to the term (Terry et al., 2017). Thematic analysis, as stated in the name, refers to analysing themes from the dataset. However, there are many different schools and definitions for how to do the analysis method and what it adds to the study; one of these schools is Clarke and Braun (Terry et al., 2017), which is also the school that will be used in this paper, and therefore, I will only define this school.

An aspect of Clarke and Braun's school is that the researcher's subjectivity is essential; "The analysis is seen as something created by the researcher" (Terry et al., 2017). Terry, Hayfield, Clarke, and Braun claim that the analysis has no predefined or objective answer. The subjectivity and interpretation of the researcher are crucial to providing a TA. Furthermore, themes and codes are necessary to do a TA, and for this, Terry et al. (2017) state, "coding and theme development are assumed to be subjective and interpretive process", meaning that to develop a TA, the researcher has to be immersed with the data from the beginning and interpret the data before the analysis has begun where the subjectiveness of the researcher also comes into play as people will interpret the same data differently depending on their research question, but also their social world.

When doing a TA, the researcher has some choices, including how to develop the codes and themes from the text. This includes determining whether to use latent or semantic codes and themes. Semantic codes and themes are more explicit; the codes are selected on a more surface level, whereas latent codes and themes are more implicit, where meaning or concepts make up the codes where and can consist of either a few words or a phrase (Terry et al., 2017). In this paper, both will be used interchangeably, yet there will be more focus on latent themes, where the themes will consist of either the theme's name or words and phrases that mean the theme. An example of this can be a Syrian refugee woman with a child who will be able to fit under the theme of 'mothers'.

According to Clarke and Braun, there are six phases to do a TA (Terry et al., 2017). These six phases will also be used in this paper and explained here. The first two phases are familiarisation and coding (Terry et al., 2017); this means reading and re-reading the text to a point where the researcher has a good idea of the contents of the data, allowing the researcher to get to phase two, coding. Coding means "Labels attached to specific segments of the

dataset" (Terry et al., 2017); this is the initial part of the analysis where the 'specific segments' of the dataset will be those relevant to answering the research question, and therefore not all the text needs to be labelled, but the relevant data does.

Phases three, four, and five are theme development and reviewing and defining themes (Terry et al., 2017). These phases include using the codes to look for patterns in the text and seeking out what is relevant to the study, where the themes must fit across two or more datasets to have a pattern (Terry et al., 2017). Therefore, the themes developed here are the basis of the analysis and what the researcher will use to determine what is relevant to the study and what is not. Furthermore, the development of subthemes might appear here (Terry et al., 2017); subthemes are themes that are not big enough to have their theme yet share a likeness to a theme that it can go under. An example of a subtheme in this paper is Islam and Christianity, where both themes can go under a main theme called religion.

The last phase is writing the analysis (Terry et al., 2017). While this phase might seem obvious, there are still some choices the researcher must make regarding how to work with the dataset. The researcher can use an illustrative or analytical writing style, which is often used; the illustrative style means using data to illustrate points in the story, whereas the analytical style uses data to support specific claims in the analysis (Terry et al., 2017). I will primarily use the analytical approach as I will use the data to support my claims of differential treatment and reporting based on where a refugee is from.

4.4.2. Comparative

"Virtually all empirical social research involves comparison of some sort" (Ragin, 2014), yet there are differences in the usage and size of the comparative part of an analysis. A comparative analysis means, as implied in the name that cases and/or results will be compared with each other in the study. Comparing cases means looking for similarities and differences in the text that can help answer the research question and further the study.

Comparative analysis and using it as a method is contested by many scholars as, as stated, most social studies use comparisons in some way or another. Therefore, some scholars have tried to define when a comparative analysis is used. This definition lies in the fact that when comparisons are used in studies that contain multiple countries or cultures, it is seen as a method. Yet, this definition is contested as some studies within the field can argue that the

method should be used even though it is a national research (Ragin, 2014).

Yet, in this paper, the definition of two or more countries and/or cultures being compared fits; therefore, that is the working definition in this study. This study uses the comparative method to compare a few different things, such as national polarisation, international polarisation, and news coverage of Syrian refugees compared to Ukrainian refugees, with different categories within each group of refugees. Due to these comparisons, an intersectional method will also be applied in this paper.

4.4.3. Intersectional

"Intersectional scholars recognize that the socially constructed dimensions of difference are interrelated, impacting each other, and impossible to untangle" (Misra et al., 2020). Intersectionality is, therefore, who we are and who we are shape our experiences in the world; this happens through who we are, women and men, colour and race, religion and ethnicity; all these things define and shape us. Both who we are and how we are perceived, a middle-aged white man with no children might have a different experience than a middle-aged white woman with no children, and a black man might have another experience than a white man. Therefore, all the things that define us define who we are, how we are perceived, and our experiences in life.

Intersectional studies centre around "six core ideas: inequality, relationality, power, social context, complexity, and social justice" (Misra et al., 2020). Intersectionality, therefore, works with how social inequality is multidimensional and how to address it in a way that both emphasises it and seeks to end it by researching how societies can be more inclusive and equal.

This study has applied this method to analyse whether refugee treatment is differential based on where they are from. This will be done through TA, where the themes will be about things that can show the inequalities the refugees might experience based on their ethnicity and other factors, such as being a child, woman, or mother.

4.4.4. Themes

4.4.4.1. The West framing device

This framing device has been made into a central theme, as many codes in the chosen data pertain to the West and Western media. The overall theme “The West” also has its’ own category which will encompass when the West is mentioned either through Western politics, geography, or the Westerners, the people in the West and their opinions on refugees and the reception Westerners have given refugees from different countries. As this theme is broad, there are a few subthemes, which will include the EU and the U.S.. These themes are chosen as they will help provide a look into how the West describe Syrian and Ukrainian refugees from a more political standpoint.

4.4.4.2. Appearance framing device

This theme will be separated into two: personal appearance and geographical appearance. The personal appearance will focus on the physical attributes of the refugees as well as the clothing they are in and how this is described. This is to uncover any prejudice and differential descriptions in how refugees are described in appearance and how that changes the framing and narratives of the news media. The second subtheme of geographical appearance will focus on how the places the refugees are in when the article is written is described. This theme will help uncover any imaginative geography that the polarised media has made up for their consumers, and to uncover the differences or similarities in these imagined geographies across media and refugees.

4.4.4.3. Family framing device

This framing device will investigate how family members are described, as the text's coding contains descriptions of mothers, fathers, and siblings. This framing device will focus mainly on the description of mothers, as that is a recurring theme in most of the data, whereas siblings and fathers are not mentioned as much, yet still enough to fit into subthemes of their own. This framing device has been chosen to investigate how family members are described and if there are differences depending on their country of origin.

4.4.4.4. Children framing device

This framing device has also been made into a main theme with subthemes. This theme was chosen as the coding in the text revealed that reports on refugee camps often include children and their well-being. This theme has three subthemes: teenagers, girls, and kids. These three subthemes have been chosen as different rhetorics are used for them. These three categories are essential to see how Western media frame refugees depending on their country of origin, as the rhetoric used to describe them varies greatly depending on the source.

4.4.4.5. Religious framing device

This framing device includes any time that any religious reference is made. It will be split into two parts: Islam and Christianity. This framing device has been chosen to investigate how the "us-versus-them" rhetoric plays into Western media when reporting on Muslim refugees versus Christian refugees, and to investigate any religious bias concerning Muslims and Christians.

5. Empirical data

In this chapter, I will summarise the different parties in the U.K. and the U.S. refugee and immigration policies that the polarised media support. So, for the U.S., it is Democrats and Republicans; for the U.K., it is the Conservative Party and Liberal Democrats.

5.1 The U.S.

There are some overlaps between what the Republicans and Democrats believe in their policies, which is why this will focus on liberal Democrats and conservative Republicans, the two that are most different and can help answer the research question about the polarised media.

Republicans and Democrats have different views on what is essential as a refugee policy in their parties; Republicans would like to have more border security and deport illegal

immigrants, whereas Democrats would like to find a path to make illegal immigrants legal and integrate them into the American society (Oliphant & Cerda, 2022). Therefore, there is a big difference in what the parties believe should be done to immigrants who have entered the country illegally, which shows that Republicans are stricter on immigration issues.

However, "majorities in both parties say that taking in refugees from countries where people are fleeing war and violence is an important goal" (Oliphant & Cerda, 2022). However, 85% of Democrats believe this, whereas it is 58% of Republicans (Oliphant & Cerda, 2022). While both parties believe it necessary, there is still a clear difference in how many support helping refugees into the U.S.

Furthermore, Liberal Democrats and Conservative Republicans are the people with the least in common, whereas Conservative Republicans are more likely to support and promote stricter refugee and migration laws. In contrast, Liberal Democrats are more likely to support inclusive immigrant goals (Oliphant & Cerda, 2022). There is, therefore, a difference in how refugees and migrants are viewed depending on one's political views in the U.S. As Fox News is more Republican, they will most likely mirror these views and the same for CNN and Democrats.

5.2. The U.K.

In the U.K., the Conservative and Liberal Democratic parties are more different than a like and do not share many of the same views.

The Conservative Party is strict in its view on refugees. The British Prime Minister, Sunak, plans to stop the boats and send immigrants to Rwanda (Macaskill & Piper, 2024). The Conservative Party can, therefore, be argued not to be as inclusive and seeking integration as they would instead send refugees and immigrants to Rwanda. Furthermore, Sunak stated that the British government wants to help refugees, as it agrees with international laws. However, they do not believe immigrants who claim to have fled war and persecution, therefore being refugees, instead think they are lying to enter the U.K. for economic reasons (Macaskill & Piper, 2024). This shows that the Conservative Party has a deep distrust for immigrants and refugees, as well as that they might want an excuse to reject appliers based on their bias. However, this could also be a problem for international law as this could become a problem with R2P (Responsibility to Protect).

However, Liberal Democrats have another view on migrants and refugees. Liberal Democrats believe that a safe and legal route should be created for refugees (Liberal Democrats, 2023) so that they do not have to sail across dangerous water and risk dying fleeing from war and persecution. Moreover, they state, “The UK has a proud and long-standing tradition of opening its arms and providing sanctuary to those in need of protection” (Liberal Democrats, 2023). Liberal Democrats, therefore, want to help refugees and have the U.K. be a place where refugees can find safety and peace while their country is at war.

These policies from the two parties are reflected in the Daily Mail and the Guardian, which will help provide a look into how the polarised media describe refugees and why they differ.

5.3 R2P

As mentioned, there is a fear of the Conservatives breaking international laws, among them R2P. This same fear can be applied to the U.S. and, therefore, needs to be explained.

R2P stands for “Responsibility to Protect” and is an international law governed by the UN. The R2P consists of three principles: 1. each state has a responsibility to protect its citizens, 2. if a state cannot uphold principle one, it is the other state's responsibility to remind the state that it has a responsibility for their citizens, 3. if the reminder does not work and the state still cannot protect its citizens it is other states responsibility to protect them in their country (Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect, n.a.). This means that if someone flees a war or persecution, political, religious, ethnic, or other forms of persecution, it is the international community's responsibility to protect and take care of them.

This will help answer the problem formulation as it will provide an answer to how the polarised media portrayals of refugees are affected by the R2P or if they choose to ignore the R2P in their portrayals, stating that the refugees are on their own.

6. Analysis

The analysis will focus on specific points made by the polarised media to prove or disprove the hypothesis that polarised media portray refugees differently depending on their country of origin.

6.1. The West

The "The West" theme will cover many topics, so sub-themes have been created to cover this theme adequately. However, the way the West is mentioned in CNN as the "West" or "Western" will be analysed as an introduction to this chapter as this will show an ongoing theme for the liberal media.

In CNN's coverage of a Syrian refugee camp, they mention the West's failure to respond and help the Syrian people: "the West is still giving them the cold shoulder" (app. 1, l. 6). By doing this, CNN shows that they are dissatisfied with the way the West has responded to the Syrian refugee crisis, in the way that they have not responded. Furthermore, as this is only line 6 in the article, it shows that CNN is going to use words that are emotionally strong or adding them to sentences, such as declaring that the West is ignoring and mistreating Syrian refugees. CNN claims that the West ignores the suffering Syrian people and further goes on to claim a certain ignorance amongst Western people: "And despite what many Westerners might think, globally fewer than 1% of refugees are settled" (app. 1, ll. 49-51). CNN, thereby, shows strong support for Syrian refugees and claims what Westerners believe is untrue, whether that is due to media reporting or ignorance is not further expanded on; however, they do strongly suggest a failure by the West to respond and report Syrian refugee's situation as they turn the cold shoulder. Furthermore, by adding facts and statistics to their article, it gives them a stronger argument in claiming that Syrian refugees are being mistreated, showing that there is preferential treatment of refugees, which might be because of prejudice or Islamophobia.

In CNN's report on the Ukrainian refugee crisis, they, compare Ukrainian and Syrian refugees' experience in the Western media: "The gross hypocrisy of the West's refugee response" (app. 2, l. 1) as evident in the title of CNN's article, which are emotionally framed by using words such as 'gross' in relation to 'hypocricy'. By comparing these cases, CNN shows a difference in how the Western world responded differently. However, it also shows how CNN wants equal treatment of refugees, which is also demonstrated by their reporting of Muslim refugees being "deemed 'the other' by many in the Western world" (app. 2, ll. 45-46). CNN claims that refugees from the Middle East are being othered by Western people,

which does not happen to Ukrainian refugees as they can relate more to them. As well as stating, that there is a tendency of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ in Western governments, leading to some refugees being treated better than others, which shows a clear prejudice towards refugees from Muslim countries. This is further shown in CNN’s claim about the Western media, where it is stated: “It’s not just the western media that is biased; it’s the western world” (app. 2, ll. 21-22). So, whilst CNN does claim that the media is biased, they do not see that as the main problem; instead, the fact that the Western world is biased means different treatments for different refugees. However, they do mention biased media, which can stem from polarisation, as there is a difference in how political parties and politically motivated news media cover refugees. Moreover, they add to this that it is not only in the governments that there is a tendency of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ but also in the Western population, leading to prejudice towards Muslim refugees. By calling these issues out CNN shows that they want more inclusive policies and minds concerning Muslim refugees, for them to not be mistreated by the media, government, or population.

However, by reporting on cases like this, the liberal media is also biased in their reporting. By focusing more on Syrian refugees and their treatment, they disparage Ukrainian’s experience and the difficulties that they have experienced in fleeing their country. Whilst their demand for equal treatment of refugees is noble, they also seem to make Ukrainian refugees' troubles less than and paint a picture of their way out of the country and into another Western country as easy and without problems, which may be embellishing the truth to fit their narrative better.

6.1.1. Europe

While Europe, or large parts of it, is part of the Western world, athemes must be distinguishedbetween the West, Europe, and the U.S. mo understand the differences in different media. This psectionwill include two liberal media sources and one conservative media source.

As previously mentioned, CNN compares Syrian refugees and Ukrainian refugees, which is also apparent in the way Europe and European countries are described in their articles. CNN chose to focus a lot on how Ukrainian refugees have had it more accessible at European borders than Syrian refugees did: “Back then, crowds crushed against concertina wire on the Greece-Macedonia border” (app. 2, ll. 9-10), claiming that Ukrainians were just

let through the borders whereas Syrian refugees were like sardines in a can, meaning that they were forced together in big crows with no way in or out, which is also emotionally strong supporting their frames of pitying Syrian refugees and calling out preferential treatment of refugees. Moreover, they attribute this issue to: “anti-refugee rhetoric from European countries and populations back then, shrouded in fears that ISIS would infiltrate, that those on the road were ‘too different’” (app. 2, ll. 39-41). CNN states that since they were the ‘other’ or ‘different', they were treated differently. In contrast, it implies that Europeans can relate to Ukrainians and see them as ‘us’ instead of ‘them’, making Europeans and European governments react differently. And also tries to, again, back their statements up with factual evidence, making their arguments stronger and their framing more successful.

Differently, however, is Daily Mail’s report on Syrian refugees finding refuge and shelter in Kos. This article written by Daily Mail confirms some of the claims made by CNN as Syrian refugees being viewed as the ‘other’. Daily Mail reports on how Syrian refugees are ruining an island that survives off tourism with their presence: “Thousands of boat people from Syria and Afghanistan have set up a migrant camp in the popular Greek island of Kos - with holidaymakers branding the situation ‘disgusting’” (app. 3, ll. 14-16). The reporter from Daily Mail made a few choices, showing their political leaning and views on refugees from Syria and Afghanistan. By calling the refugees ‘boat people’, they dehumanise them by not acknowledging the dangers of international water or them as refugees and people who come out of desperation and not will as well as showing a certain prejudice towards Muslim refugees.. Furthermore, the reporter has chosen to call the refugees ‘migrants’, which follows their political leaning as the British conservative party does not believe that all that claim refugees are refugees. Furthermore, they too use emotionally strong words or descriptors, ‘disgusting’ yet they do it differently, where CNN used that to call out hypocrisy, the Daily Mail uses it to spread prejudice and hate towards the Muslim refugees. Lastly, it is evident from this that the Daily Mail thinks that their presence in Europe, Kos, cheapens the value of the place, which is further shown in their inclusion of a quote that states: “They can’t stay in Greece” (app. 3, l. 70), which shows that there, from their perspective, is no refuge for Syrian and Afghani refugees in Europe. As well as referring to them as ‘they’, the Daily Mail shows a tendency to see Muslim refugees as a part of ‘them’ and not ‘us’, which should affect, according to them, their asylum and integration opportunities in Western societies. As well as showing a clear political affiliation and showing that the U.K. media is polarised, at least to the right.

Yet when reporting on refugees from Ukraine, the Daily Mail’s attitude towards their

presence in Europe changes. When it comes to Ukrainian refugees, Daily Mail reports on the beauty of solidarity and in Europe opening its' arms and borders to refugees: "When Putin began his onslaught, Poland opened its doors to anyone to come in" (app. 4, l. 4). The Daily Mail praises Poland and their way of handling the Ukrainian refugee crisis that broke out due to way, yet Syrian refugees are not welcomed the same although it is both from the Daily Mail. The Daily Mail, here, furthers an emotional framing in calling it Putin's 'onslaught' provoking emotions of sympathy towards Ukrainians and hatred towards Putin. Furthermore, contrary to their report on Syrian refugees, the Daily Mail praises Poland for inviting the refugees in, showing that they view Ukrainians as a part of 'us', which could be attributed to the fact that they are white Europeans, and therefore the Daily Mail deems them more worthy as refugees. Furthermore, whilst the Syrians were not accepted by the place or the people vacationing or living there, there was a different response to Ukrainian refugees that the government did not just welcome but also the people: "Volunteers are also providing help and care" (app. 4, l. 15). Daily Mail, therefore also, reports on the people's response differently where, now, the people are filled with sympathy and pity wanting to help, yet before they were filled with disgust. This shows that the reaction from people and reporting from the Daily Mail differs depending on whether the person is a Ukrainian or Syrian refugee.

The Guardian also reported on the Ukrainian refugee crisis and Europe's response; however, they had a different tone. Whilst the Guardian does report on how Ukrainians have been received in Europe after the war broke out, they also criticise the treatment of other refugees and even some countries' reaction to Ukrainian refugees: "The UK's response has been markedly different from that of its European neighbours. [...] The UK immigration minister Kevin Foster suggested, [...] Ukrainian refugees could apply to be fruit picker" (app. 8, ll. 53-60). The Guardian reports on how the UK has offered Ukrainians the chance to enter their country as long as they are migrant workers. This goes against the other mentions of Ukraine and Europe in the other sources as they paint a picture of Ukrainians having had it easy as refugees, yet this shows that Ukrainians have also been met with prejudice and difficulties, according to the Guardian. Moreover, it shows that there is a general tendency to label refugees as 'them' no matter their ethnicity, yet in different ways, where Syrian refugees are not allowed in, Ukrainians are on the basis that they must contribute to society. Yet, like CNN, the Guardian also reports on how Syrians have had it more difficult by writing: "Humanitarian experts have raised concerns about the future of [...] other refugees stuck at other European borders who have not been part to the same solidarity and hospitality being shown to Ukrainians" (app. 8, ll. 63-65). So, whilst the Guardian reports on difficulties for

Ukrainian refugees, they also, like CNN, report that they have had it more manageable as refugees than Syrians. By bringing up humanitarian experts, they also give the claim more substance as they have expert sources claiming Syrians and other refugees are treated differently than Ukrainians.

This shows that both liberal media sympathise with Syrians, yet where one paints a perfect picture of Ukrainian refugees, the other points out difficulties and condescending tendencies in some countries toward Ukrainian refugees, as stating that refugees can be fruit pickers, takes away possible education and careers of the refugees and limits them to low-paying jobs. Compared to the Daily Mail, there is a clear difference in the reporting of Syrian refugees as the liberal media show sympathy and empathy towards them, the Daily Mail shows empathy and sympathy to the European people near them. However, CNN and the Daily Mail are close in their reporting of Ukrainian refugees and their experience crossing the Ukrainian border.

6.1.2. The U.S.

This theme will be short as the U.S. is only mentioned in one source. However, it does give a better idea of American refugee policies and views on refugees.

CNN, in their report on Syrian refugees, mentions the U.S. and how difficult it is for refugees to enter the country. CNN report on American laws that make it difficult to get asylum as a refugee in the U.S. as a Syrian refugee: “The original version banned all Syrian refugees from coming to America, indefinitely” (app. 1, ll. 9-10). This shows that the U.S. generally has stricter laws than other countries. Furthermore, it shows a prejudice and hatred towards Muslim refugees, specifically, making them the ‘other’ that are not allowed to even get refugee status in the U.S. Whilst the U.K. does not believe all refugees are actually refugees avoiding R2P through that, the U.S. does not allow refugees they believe to be refugees into the country as they are: “Muslim” (app. 1, l. 8), making them different and the ‘other’ in their minds, showing a level of Islamophobia as the basis of not taking in Syrian refugees is their religion.

This also goes along with how the different parties are international, as the American right appears to have stricter laws not taking any refugees in than the British right, claiming not all refugees are refugees. Whilst, in essence, it might appear the same, the U.K. does not

go against its international obligations in the same way the U.S. does by finding a loophole in R2P and not 'just' refusing to uphold it.

6.2. Appearance

This theme will be split into two parts: personal appearance, i.e., how the appearance of refugees is described, and geographical appearance, i.e., how the appearance of the space occupied by refugees is described.

6.2.1. Personal appearance

The way the refugees are described says a lot about the polarised media and their biases on the different refugees. As this theme has much to cover, it will be separated into Ukrainian and Syrian refugees, comparing the two throughout the analysis.

6.2.1.1. Ukrainian refugees

Starting with how the liberal media describe Ukrainian refugees, CNN describes how their situation has forever changed their lives and how that is visible in their faces: "I see faces frozen in shock, etched with lines of trauma that will never fully fade" (app. 2, ll. 5-6). This shows that CNN has sympathy and empathy for the Ukrainian refugees and acknowledges their situation and how it has affected their lives and looks. Furthermore, again, utilises words with strong emotional ties and phrasing it in a way to further the framing of sympathy towards refugees and the hardships they go through.

However, CNN cannot recognise their hardships without also acknowledging how 'easy' they have had it when it comes to getting settled in Europe due to what they claim is caused by their likeness to the rest of Europe: "Ukrainians are a 'prosperous middle-class people," 'the family next door," "civilized." As if [...] a human worth saving is identified by the color of their skin" (app. 2, ll. 24-26). Yet again, although acknowledging trauma, CNN brings it back to Syrian refugees, which in a way ruins their first statements containing empathy by stating 'yes, but' and 'however', showing that they have more sympathy with Syrian refugees and what they have gone through. And furthers their framing of the Western world having an 'us' versus 'them' tendency when it comes to coverage on refugees and

policy implementation, that affects how a refugee is treated. It furthers their framing of Syrian refugees being mistreated due to religion, colour of skin, and other defining features, that means that the Western world cannot mirror themselves in their situation, resulting in lack of support and help.

The Daily Mail and the conservative media have sort of the same approach as CNN when it comes to describing Ukrainian refugees, without the involvement of Syrian refugees also, showing a lot of empathy and sympathy for their situation: “Looking exhausted” (app. 4, l. 10) and “tears in her eyes” (app. 4, l. 29). By doing this the Daily Mail acknowledges that, although they might have found safety, it is still taking a toll on them as people and just because they might be welcomed they are still traumatised and upset about having to leave their homes and flee into the unknown. It shows an emotional framing, where the Daily Mail wants to provoke sympathy in their reader as well as furthering the support Ukrainian refugees have experienced from the Western people. It also shows a framing of Ukrainian refugees being victims and therefore, in need of help from the consumers.

However, the Daily Mail also humanises the Ukrainian refugees in a way that CNN did not. The Daily Mail paints a picture in which the reader can imagine being with the refugees in a way that makes the consumer more sympathetic toward the Ukrainian refugees: “She [young Ukrainian girl] can be seen pushing against the window of a coach in a pink top with blue dungarees looking out at a scene that is chaotic” (app. 4, ll. 13-14). The Daily Mail makes her more human and also forces the consumer to imagine a little girl caught in chaos whilst wearing ‘cute’ clothes, making Westerners picture themselves as this young girl or someone they know as this young girl, which makes them more empathetic for their situation. Again using an emotional fraiming and phrases that furthers their message, by describing the chaos of the scene, also trying to make an imaginative geography for the reader, something they can picture and therefore, sympathise.

Fox News has the same approach and also the same vocabulary when describing Ukrainian refugees: ”Exhaustion was written across their faces” (app. 6, ll. 14-15). This shows a tendency in the conservative media to sympathise with Ukrainian refugees and make them appear frail as victims. Using the same emotional framing of describing the refugees like being exhausted and it being visible on their faces. This shows that Fox News has a framing of sympathising with Ukrainian refugees and wanting to help them and support them. Whilst CNN also had a like-minded attitude, they still painted Ukrainian refugees as having it easy and Syrians and Muslims as the real victims.

Moreover, Fox News does a similar thing as the Daily Mail in humanising the

refugees and making the consumer relate to the refugees: “He [old man] leaned against one of the barriers and pointed at the sky, his clothes covered in mud, his body frozen by grief and unable to go on” (app. 6, ll. 5-6). Fox News makes the consumers picture themselves, their dad, or their granddad as victims of war by describing him as just an older man, without naming him, which makes it more relatable for the consumer and makes the consumer more sympathetic. Furthermore, by using an ‘old man’ they use emotional framing as people tend to have more sympathy towards old people and children. They again, try to show him as a victim of war and in need of help, showing that their framing and agenda is to support and help Ukrainian refugees.

There is, therefore, a clear difference in how the liberal and conservative media discuss the appearance of Ukrainian refugees. Whilst they all can agree on being sympathetic, there is a tone in the liberal media that wants the consumer to feel guilt and compassion for Syrian refugees more than Ukrainian refugees. Moreover, the conservative media show that they both sympathise with Ukrainian refugees, even using the same language in describing them. This indicates that, depending on the polarisation, the media has a different way of describing Ukrainian refugees.

6.2.1.2. Syrian refugees

The liberal media chosen for this analysis, does not describe or go into Syrian refugees' appearance. This might be because of the way they are described as refugees, and their appearance should not affect how the consumer perceives them. This might be to avoid islamophobia and people’s prejudice against Muslim people and their traditionally and religiously worn garments.

Conservative media, however, does describe Syrian refugees’ appearance. When it comes to the Daily Mail, they are very critical of the appearance of Syrian and Afghani media and talks about it as an eyesore for Westerners and for the Western space they settled in: “Straggly migrants” (app. 3, l. 38) and “Young Afghan mothers in head scarves [...] share the promenade with tourists who sit uncomfortably on the beachfront” (app. 3, l. 43-45), The language used to describe what they call ‘migrants’ is entirely different from the way they describe Ukrainian refugees. They have to relate the women and mothers to their religion and how their garments make Westerners uncomfortable, which implies islamophobia and how their different religion makes them the ‘other’ that ruins the space for Westerners. Moreover, the British media, again, refers to what can be assumed to be refugees as ‘migrants’, which

shows their political affiliation and that they, too, do not believe all who claim to be refugees are that. Moreover, they paint a picture of the space they occupy, creating an imaginative geography for their consumers, which is to fit into an agenda of them not belonging in that picture as well as ruining the scene for the tourists. This shows an 'us' versus 'them' agenda where the Middle Eastern refugees are shown to not fit into Greece or any Western society as they 'ruin' the peacefulness and serenity of the tourist spot showing their political affiliation.

Moreover, the Daily Mail again describe how a young child appears, yet the tone is slightly different this time: "Barefoot toddlers in filthy clothes" (app. 3, ll. 40). The Daily Mail described the children, this time, as filthy and as disgusting ruining Kos and the cleanliness of the place. This shows that Syrian refugee children are seen, by the Daily Mail, as a bother instead of someone to help. The Daily Mail, this time, does not show the same level of empathy and sympathy that the same paper showed the Ukrainian refugees. Yet also frames it emotionally in a way that reflects bad on Middle Eastern refugee parents, as they described the children as being covered in 'filth' thereby furthering an idea of them not fitting into Western society and framing them as 'dirty'.

Fox News also describe the women in a religiously worn garment like the Daily Mail; however, Fox News are more extreme in its tone relating the women to terrorism: "group of black burqa-clad women beside an ISIS flag" (app. 5, ll. 14-15). Whilst Fox News does not say 'Muslim refugee women are terrorists', it is implied by stating 'burqa-clad' as burqas are traditionally Muslim and by relating them to ISIS, they relate them to terror. This shows a degree of islamophobia in Fox News's report on Syrian refugees. Whilst Fox News gave Ukrainian refugee women sympathy and empathy, Syrian refugees are met with prejudice and islamophobia, showing a polarised view of the refugees as well as a bias toward the 'other' in Western media.

6.2.2. Appearance of space

Ukrainian refugee space is not fully described by any of the media, which is why this part will focus on how the geography where Syrian refugees are is imagined by the polarised media.

The conservative polarised media, the Daily Mail, described a refugee camp set up on the Greek island of Kos: "Penniless refugees have set up camp, sleeping on rubbish-strewn cardboard boxes the harbour side" (app. 3, ll. 6-7). The Daily Mail wants the consumer to

imagine the geography as poor Syrians laying on trash, which makes it appear as if they are trying to be sympathetic to the situation; however, they follow that statement up with: “summer break has turned into a nightmare” (app. 3, l. 23) and “It’s really dirty and messy here now” (app. 3, l. 27). Whilst the first statement creates compassion when mixed with the two others it instead creates disgust and anger. By stating that the refugees are the reason the place has become ‘nightmarish’ and ‘dirty’, they make the consumer not want the refugees in their country to do the same thing, as well as becoming angry at them for turning a holiday island into what they describe as a nightmare.

Fox News does not have the same framing of Muslim refugees’ space as the Daily Mail, which shows an evident polarisation. However, they have another framing that also shows evident polarisation. Fox News too makes a statement that creates compassion for refugees at this particular camp: “The squalid al-Hol camp has swelled to more than 70.000 displaced persons - some 30.000 over capacity” (app. 5, ll. 68-69), the inclusion of the word ‘squalid’ which means dirty and disgusting makes the consumer imagine the camp as somewhere dirty with too many people, which might make people sympathetic. However, the following statement by Fox News changes that perspective: “filled with both those belonging to ISIS families and those who were victims” (app. 5, ll. 69-70). This instead appears to want the consumer to think ‘they deserve it’ and lose the compassion the first statement might have created. They also use ‘fear framing’ in associating the refugees with terrorists, installing fear in the consumers for Syrian refugees, which shows an agenda and framing of Islamophobia and Syrian refugees not deserving of a more humane treatment as refugees. Moreover, it makes people fear and become Islamophobic, fearing the people residing at the camp are terrorists and that there cannot be made a distinction so no one knows who is a victim and who is a terrorist.

6.3. Family

This part of the paper will examine how the polarised media frames family members, separated into three groups: mothers, fathers, and siblings.

6.3.1. Mothers

As this part is also quite big, it will be divided into Ukrainian refugee mothers and Syrian refugee mothers, with a comparison throughout the text.

6.3.1.1. Ukrainian refugee mothers

The Liberal media does not appear to have any writing about Ukrainian mothers. This could be because the framing they use is that Ukrainian refugees have had it easy, and Syrian refugees are victims and, therefore, do not need a story of a Ukrainian mother to contest that framing.

However, the conservative media have written about Ukrainian refugee mothers. The Daily Mail frames Ukrainian refugee mothers as heroes and saviours of their families, praising them for leaving Ukraine with their children: ”Packing in a rush with only some documents and clothes for her two teenage sons” (app. 4, l. 34). The Daily Mail frames the mother as doing what is necessary to save her children, making her a saviour, whilst also portraying her as someone strong enough to flee whilst also being a victim of the war itself. This shows a strong support for Ukrainian refugees from the Daily Mail.

Fox News has the same framing as the Daily Mail and portrays the Ukrainian refugee women as strong matronly figures who show strength in an imaginable scenario: “I saw so many mothers carrying babies and young children. [...] utterly worn out by the trip, the weight of the unknown future, and [...] having to leave behind husbands, fathers, brothers and older sons” (app. 6, ll. 14-17). The conservative media, therefore, have the exact framing of the mothers by portraying them as strong women who have had to leave everything behind to save themselves and their children. The usage of the same framing shows an international trend for the conservative media to support and empathise with Ukrainian refugees, as both the U.K. media and U.S. media use the same framing.

However, Fox News also has another frame when it comes to the Ukrainian refugee mothers in which they are also portrayed as victims of war: “hugging their mothers or kissing their cheeks to bring comfort in that rare moment when the women’s steely composure would slip.” (app. 6, ll. 35-36) This framing from Fox News is to make the women appear less supernatural and instead human women who have been through something terrifying and traumatising, showing them as victims who merely put on a brave face for their children to make them less afraid of the unknown. This makes the consumer more compassionate toward

the women as they appear more human and have the consumer picture that it is their mother or their children in that situation who are gaining sympathy and compassion for Ukrainian refugees.

6.3.1.2. Syrian refugee mothers

Starting with the liberal media, CNN writes about Syrian refugee mothers; however, it is mentioned in their article about Ukrainian refugee women. This, again, shows that they believe Ukrainian refugees to be treated better than Syrian refugees as they feel the need to mention how Syrian refugee mothers had it: “Back then, crowds crushed against concertina wire on the Greece-Macedonia border. A mother cradled her baby under a plastic tarp in the pouring rain” (app. 2, ll. 9-11). This framing of the Syrian refugee mothers is the same framing the conservative media had about Ukrainian refugee mothers: strong survivors saving their children whilst also being victims. It shows strong support for Syrian refugees; however, the inclusion of this in the article on Ukrainian refugees shows that CNN wants the Western consumer to feel guilty about their support of Ukrainian refugees instead of pride and happiness for helping them, as Syrian refugees have a different story. It sensationalises Ukrainian refugees whilst making the consumer feel guilty for supporting some refugees and not all.

Whilst the conservative media’s framing of Ukrainian refugees was supportive and full of praise, their framing of Syrian refugees is slightly different. Syrian refugee women are by the Daily Mail framed as mothers who cannot take care of their children: “One elderly man handed a breastfeeding mother in a headscarf 10 euros” (app. 3, ll. 56-57), which is in stark contrast to their framing of Ukrainian refugee women. The Daily Mail, by writing this, describe the mothers as needing help to take care of their children, portraying them as weak and bad mothers. Furthermore, by describing them as unable to provide and care for their children, they further their framing of them not belonging in Western society and not being able to contribute economically.

Moreover, they frame them as dirty and disgusting: “The harbourside has become an unofficial washing line with baby clothes and grubby-looking scarves laid out along the shoreline.” (app. 3, ll. 46-47) So, instead of being strong mothers and strong women leaving their country for the safety of their children, they are bad mothers. Again furthering an idea of them not fitting into Western society in the way they wash clothes on the shoreline and ‘airing’ their dirty laundry which the public will witness. It shows a prejudice from the Daily

Mail towards Muslim refugees, and shows a difference in how refugee mothers are described depending on their country of origin. Another detail is that they do not use the word 'mother' to describe them. Instead, they are 'women with children', which takes away from the sympathy they might receive as one cannot imagine a mother in that situation, so leaving that out makes the consumer less sympathetic to their situation. Moreover, the mothers are not described without the inclusion of their religion. By including that they wear headscarves and call them 'disgusting', they appear Islamophobic as they connect 'grubby-looking' and religious-worn scarves together.

Fox News has a like-minded framing of Syrian refugee mothers; however, whilst the Daily Mail's Islamophobic framing was more discreet, Fox News is not. Fox News uses 'Jihadoscope' as their source and support to their claim. The two sites together say that some Syrian refugee women who are mothers are raising a new generation of terrorists: "The women also made note of the fact that they are raising the 'cubs,' the next generation of ISIS fighters." (app. 5, ll. 40-41) While they do not claim all Syrian refugee mothers are a part of this, they still want to breed fear of the refugees in the camp by stating that the children are being raised to be terrorists. By associating the Syrian refugee mothers with terrorism, Fox News tries to spead Islamophobia in their consumers, making them fear Syrian and Muslim refugees, which means the consumers would be less likely to want them to get asylum in their country. Like the Daily Mail, they also differentiate between the mothers, depending on the country of origin. Furthermore, Fox News removes relatability and sympathy by calling them 'women' instead of mothers, like the Daily Mail also did, which also furthers an idea of them not being caring and providing and therefore not fitting for Western society.

This shows a difference in the framing in liberal media and conservative media, as the liberal media frames them as victims, and the conservative media frames them as dangerous and dirty women who cannot properly take care of their children. However, the support CNN shows Syrian refugee mothers is the same Fox News and the Daily Mail show Ukrainian refugee mothers, which CNN does not. That also indicates a bias from the liberal media, and that, whilst they might support Ukrainian refugee women as well, it does not support the agenda they wanted the news to have.

6.3.2. Fathers

‘Fathers’ are not as big a theme as ‘mothers’ were. This could be because women are seen as ‘weaker’ and easier to fit into the respective paper’s agenda. However, there is still framing surrounding ‘fathers’ and how they fit into being refugees from Syria and Ukraine.

One type of framing that appears in multiple papers, across nationality and polarisation, is the framing of the fathers having to stay behind or being left behind whilst the women and children flee. However, this has been done in two different ways. The American liberal news media CNN writes about a horrific event a teenage boy experienced: “Mohammed told him how terrifying it was back in Syria [...] and of the horror of seeing his father shot to death in front of him” (app. 1, ll. 21-23). CNN, by doing this, wants to frame the son as a victim of war and his father as a victim of terrorists, wanting to show the consumer that Syrian refugees also are victims and not the villains, which can be seen from Fox News and a more Islamophobic agenda. This shows a framing from CNN of wanting to support and help Syrian refugees, and the importance of seeing them as a different entity as terrorists, as they too are victims of war and terrorism and not extremists themselves.

Fox News has a framing that appears to be the same as CNN; however, theirs is not about Syrian refugees but Ukrainian refugee fathers; they want to portray strong men who fight for their country and freedom by showing that they have to stay in Ukraine and cannot flee: “leave behind husbands, fathers, brothers and older sons” (app. 6, ll. 16-17). The framing Fox News seems to be going for here is that the men are also victims, yet they are strong men who, too, have had everything taken away from them, yet they are fighting to get it back. This framing from Fox News is to get sympathy for what Ukrainians are going through where they have to leave their families behind. And whilst it is the same as the one CNN used for Syrian refugees, it changes due to the origin of country, where Fox News frames it in a way that is to establish relatability in the Western consumer, garning more sympathy for the Ukrainian refugees.

The Guardian, the British liberal media, has the same framing concerning fathers as the American conservative media, i.e. the men are staying back to fight and have had to see their family flee: “fathers kissing their children goodbye through car windows” (app. 8, l. 9). The Guardian also wants to portray the Ukrainian fathers as strong men who have to fight for freedom and their families. This framing wants the Western consumer to support Ukraine and feel sorry for the men who have to stay back, which will further the sympathy Ukrainian refugee women and children will get, as well as for the men staying in Ukraine and fighting.

It is the exact same framing that Fox News use for Ukrainian fathers, which shows that there are tendencies, across the polarised media, to have some of the same framing. It also shows that although two media are polarised to the same side, it does not mean that the framing is the same and there therefore can be differences internationally, thereby also showing that there is not an international trend, concerning liberal media, when it comes to Ukrainain refugees.

However, Fox News and CNN also have another frame concerning fathers. Instead of 'just' being warriors and fighting for their countries' freedom, they are compassionate creatures who care for their children. Fox News wrote: "Bogdan's father was unbelievably tender with son, and I could see the love between them. [...] A beautiful love amid the pain" (app. 6, ll. 41-45). Fox News wants the narrative of a compassionate father taking care of their son amidst the chaos of fleeing their country. This furthers the sympathy one has toward Ukrainian refugees and makes people more empathetic. Moreover, they romanticise the pain by stating that there is beauty amidst it all, making people happy for those who successfully fled Ukraine. Furthermore, this is strongly emotionally framed, in the way Fox News has an example using a family whohave just had to flee their country, furthering and stregnthening their frames of sympathy towards Ukrainian refugees.

CNN has sort of the same framing in their report of Ukrainian refugees; however, they write about Syrian refugee fathers and not Ukrainians. CNN writes: "a father held up his listless feverish little girl" (app.2, l. 11). CNN does this to gain sympathy for Syrian refugees whilst reporting on Ukrainian refugees. By showing a father taking care of their sick daughter, they want to make people sympathetic towards them whilst also being angry at the West for treating Syrian refugees differently than Ukrainian refugees using emotional frames. However, they are in the same situation, as they are all refugees, and by acknowledging one's struggle and not the other, shows what 'side' they are on and that they support Syrian refugees more, which does not make them better than Fox News or the Daily Mail as they only acknowledge one side as well, showing that there is a clear polarisation in all of these media. The only media acknowledging all refugees as the same, giving the same respect and sympathy is only seen in the Guardian.

This shows that there is a difference in how the British and American liberal media report; where the British media finds a place to acknowledge Ukrainian refugees' problems, the American media wants to focus on the Syrian refugees. Moreover, this shows that, across media and cases, the media chooses many of the same frames, albeit using them differently. Still, they all want to show the men as strong warriors who keep their families safe.

6.3.3. Siblings

Siblings or the words ‘brothers’ and ‘sisters’ are not used as much in the news about Ukrainian refugees as in the ones about Syrian refugees. Therefore, this will analyse how the news covers siblings or words aligned to ‘siblings’ in the Syrian media coverage.

The liberal media, both in the U.S. and the U.K., use the same framing concerning ‘siblings’ in their debate on Syrian refugees. As some have had to leave their fathers behind, or their fathers have been killed, CNN reports on the job of the brothers in the families: “his mother and sisters rely on him to be the man of the house” (app. 1, ll. 25-26). CNN wants the consumer to know that teenagers and children have been forced to grow up too soon as their family is not taken care of and, therefore, have to rely on the boy in the home to take care of them in the refugee camp by securing food and getting water, as well as keeping them safe.

The Guardian has the same report of the children having to take care of the family and to provide them with necessities to survive: “$4 for each shift. The money goes to support his parents and six siblings in their refugee settlement” (app. 7, ll. 49-50) and “Aisha works with two of her sisters [...] their parents are too old to labour now” (app. 7, ll. 83-85). The Guardian reports on how children are forced into migrant labour, underpaid, to support their families. The Guardian’s framing of this is to make people angry at the West and the rest of the world for not providing a safer and better situation for Syrian refugees so that children do not have to work to support their siblings and parents.

According to R2P, this responsibility should not fall upon the children of refugee families but instead upon the state in which they reside. This, therefore, shows that for CNN and the Guardian, the countries responsible for the refugees where the camps lie are breaking their international commitments and promises to protect those who require it.

Fox News, in their coverage of Syrian refugees, does not mention siblings in a familiar kind of way; instead, they do it to make people afraid of Syrian refugees and fear that they are all terrorists: “The women also offer a shout-out to their ‘brothers in the prisons,’ insisting they remain both ‘faithful’ and ‘pure’” (app. 5, ll. 23-24). Fox News, with this coverage, wants to frame Syrian refugee women as terrorists who show support to the ISIS members who have been captured. By doing this, they want to spread Islamophobia and hate for Muslims in the West, more precisely the U.S., by framing them as terrorists who will never be able to be integrated into Western society as they have extremist views.

There is, therefore, a clear difference in how the different polarised media reports on ‘siblings’ or words meaning ‘siblings’ where the liberal media frames them as victims and being forced into child labour and migrant work, and the conservative media frames the refugees as terrorists.

6.4. Children

This part of the paper will investigate how children of refugees are framed in polarised media. To properly investigate this, there will be three subthemes: teenagers, girls, and children in general.

6.4.1. Teenagers

Teenagers and their experiences are reported in both liberal and conservative media; however, where the conservative media focuses on both Syrian and Ukrainian refugees, the liberal media solely focuses on Syrian teenagers. Therefore, this part will start by investigating and comparing Ukrainian refugee teenagers with Syrian refugee teenagers.

The Daily Mail frames Ukrainian teenagers as victims who want freedom and to return home to peace: “the teenager is already longing to return home” (app. 4, ll. 25-26) and “Another of those who fled was 17-year-old Alexei who echoed the thoughts of many [...] ‘We want to live in our country, free, without the Russian army’” (app. 4, ll. 58-60). The Daily Mail does this to show that all ages have been impacted and that the youth, often used to get sympathy, want to live in their own country but in peace. This might also be due to the British immigration and refugee laws and the stance many have on refugees; if they want, and intend, to return home, then a short stay in the U.K. will not harm its citizens. This also can show prejudice, or assumed prejudice from the Daily Mail, in the Britons and their fear of people who are not them or who are the ‘other’, which in this case would be the Ukrainian refugees. There is a different in the framing of Muslim and Ukrainian refugees, where, although both seen as the ‘other’, Ukrainian refugees are still ‘allowed’ and welcomed into the U.K.

Fox News has a different framing than the Daily Mail concerning Ukrainian refugee teenagers. Fox News frames a teenager as frail, who needs sympathy, support, and help from

Western countries: “his 16-year-old son Bogdan, who has special needs. It was clearly a struggle for them to take this journey” (app. 6, ll. 37-39). By doing this, Fox News wants the consumer to be welcoming towards the Ukrainian refugees who had to flee, as it was difficult for many of them. Moreover, it makes the Ukrainian refugees appear more human to the Western consumer, as they explain Bogdan’s difficulties and report on him rather than an idea or concept of victims of war. Again framing Ukrainain refugees as victims and in need of being taken care of by the West, which would make Western people more welcoming to them and more positive about them seeking asulym in the U.S. or the West in general.

Fox News, however, has a different framing when it comes to Syrian refugee teenagers. Where the Ukrainian teenagers should be met with sympathy and support, Syrian teenagers are painted as being unfit for the Western world due to them being terrorists and uneducated, wanting to frame Syrians as unable to integrate into a Western society: “teen would often appear in segments focusing on training camps where children were readied for combat” (app. 5, ll. 37-38) and “11,000 children at the camp between the ages of 6 and 18 have not been to school at all in the past five years” (app. 5, ll. 52-53). Fox News frames Syrian teenagers as ISIS members and as being indoctrinated into terror, choosing to learn how to fight over going to school. This is entirely different from their reporting on Ukrainian refugees, as the framing of them was that they should be invited into the Western world and get help. However, when it comes to Syrian refugee teenagers, Fox News want to spread Islamophobia and fear of terror, making their consumers believe that Syrian refugee teenagers are a danger to Western society.

Focusing on Fox News' claims of Syrian teenagers being indoctrinated by ISIS and growing up to become the next generation of terrorists, CNN has a different perspective and frame on this issue. CNN claims that Syrian refugee teenagers want to be a part of Western society and want a better future for themselves and their families: “A 16-year-old boy [...] speaking English, he told us: ‘The price of success is hard work” (app. 1, ll. 31-32). CNN states that teenagers want success, which includes exiting refugee camps and being integrated into a new society. Furthermore, by including that he speaks English, CNN wants to show their consumers that they can be integrated into the Western world and already know a recognisable language that the teenager can use to navigate in a Western country. This furthers, that CNN frames Syrian refugees as able to integrate and as victims as well, needing help from the West and to be allowed to seek asulym and refuge in Western countries. CNN’s claim goes directly against Fox News claims, which show that there are two poles, where they each belong to one. Fox News’ claims correspond to their more strict take on

immigration and refugee laws, whereas CNN's show a less rigorous and more open take on immigration laws.

Fox News also claimed that Syrian refugee teenagers do not go to school to get an education. The Guardian gives another reason for this: it is not due to indoctrination. The Guardian claims that refugee teenagers are forced to work migrant and child labour to survive in the camps: "he ran off after a dozen other teenage labourers" (app. 7, l. 14). The Guardian, therefore, offers a theory as to why Syrian refugee teenagers might not show up at school, which is that they have to work to provide for their families. It is, therefore, not out of want or indoctrination but because it is necessary for survival that they work instead of going to school. The British left polarised media thus, like CNN, also shows a different view than Fox News, corresponding to their political party of support. This also shows a framing of Syrian refugees being mistreated and forced to 'leave their childhood behind' as they do not have the economy or means to take care of themselves. It shows that the Guardian are supportive of Syrian refugees, and believes that the West should help them to a better future.

6.4.2. Girls

When it comes to focusing specifically on girls as their own category, only the Daily Mail and CNN have reported on girls in both their Ukrainian and Syrian/Middle Eastern articles.

CNN, again, shows pity and sympathy for Syrian refugees and not Ukrainian refugees. In their report on Syrian refugees, they write about how young girls end up being sex trafficked for their parents to have enough money to survive through child marriages: "young girls who have been married off, partly so their poverty-stricken families have one less mouth to feed, and partly because their families believe a married girl is safer than a single one" (app. 1, ll. 59-61). CNN wants its consumers to feel outraged about the economic and dangerous situations Syrian refugees are in, leading them to sell their children due to the failures of the West. Moreover, CNN wants people to pity Syrian refugees and make them want to change the situation for the young girls who are married off. It is also emotionally frames, as they write about how it is better for the girl to be married than to be stuck in poverty, as well as using an example like this to provoke sympathy for Syrian refugees, and outrage for their situation, which is to make the Western consumer want to help them more. This narrative fits their political alignment with the U.S. liberals wanting a looser view on

refugees.

CNN, however, also want their consumers to acknowledge and see the strength of Syrian refugee girls by writing about their resistance to child marriages: “a determination to end this cycle of victimhood and reach for a good future” (app. 1, l. 67). This is to show the West that the girls want to enter the Western world and establish a better future for themselves where they do not have to be child brides. Moreover, it is emotionally framed as well, as they use the word ‘victimhood’ to show that right now they are in an unfortunate situation, yet they are fighting to escape it. Furthermore, it shows that the girls can integrate into the Western standard of marriage as they show they do not agree with nor want to be married off as a teenager to a much older man.

However, CNN again shows Syrian refugees much more support and sympathy in their articles as they, in their Ukrainian articles, write about a Syrian refugee girl who is sick: “listless feverish little girl” (app. 2, l. 11). Whilst this is to further or invoke sympathy for Syrian refugees, it also takes away from Ukrainian refugees experiences. CNN and the American liberals are known for being more inclusive and wanting less strict refugee and immigration laws than what is currently there; CNN picks and chooses the refugees they want those policies to support based on their moral judgement, choosing to view Syrians as the most critical refugees to help to take away from the help Ukrainian refugees also need and want. Using emotional frames, to further that agenda, in the example of a sick girl who do not get help. This is to draw a line between the two situations, to show the hypocrisy of welcoming one and rejecting the other, yet it is done in a way that appears as if Ukrainian refugees have had it ‘too easy’.

The Daily Mail also portray Middle Eastern refugees as weak, however, in a different manner. In their article on Middle Eastern refugees, they write: “One group of Afghan girls sitting on dismantled cardboard boxes that are their beds” (app. 3, ll. 51-52), and whilst that appears as to wanting sympathy and support for Middle Eastern refugees the text was written right after stating: “while British and Dutch families queue for ice-cream” (app. 3, ll. 49-50). Therefore, they take the clean Western families on vacation, the ‘us’, and put them against the dirty and poor refugees, the ‘other’. They write it in a way that shows that refugees are not welcomed in Europe when they do not have money and ruins the experiences for the middle-class white European people wanting a lovely scenery and instead getting poor Middle Eastern refugees. This narrative supports their political agenda, which is that refugees should be sent to Rwanda and there should be stricter refugee laws. It is also a completely different report on refugees than CNN wrote, which was about integration and sex trafficking,

showing that there is a difference in the polarised media.

However, the Daily Mail are less strict in its article about Ukrainian refugees than Middle Eastern refugees. When it comes to Ukrainian refugees, the Daily Mail has an entirely different framing than in their articles on Middle Eastern refugees. The Daily Mail write about Ukrainian refugees in a way that should make their consumers proud of being Westerners and helping those in need. They write about the safety and security Ukrainian refugees feel due to the Western world: “Refugees like this young girl have found safety in Przemysl” (app. 1, l.5) and “Looking exhausted, the girl stands as an example of how many have found safety in Przemysl” (app. 4, ll. 10-11). The Daily Mail wants the Western conservative consumer to be proud of being a part of saving children from war and giving them refuge in Europe. However, this report on Ukrainian refugee girls is entirely different. Their articles show a framing of ‘us’ versus ‘them’. And they see Ukrainians as a part of ‘us’. They get preferential treatment and reporting. As they are a part of ‘us’, they are protected by the rest, whereas the ‘other’ is dirty and ruinous for the ‘us’.

However, in their reporting, they show resistance to R2P; whilst they acknowledge the need to support and help Ukrainian refugees, they, like the political party they are aligned with, show that they do not think Middle Eastern refugees fit in the Western world, to which the conservative British party has a solution to; sending them to Rwanda.

6.4.3. Children

This chapter will analyse how children are mentioned across the sources, where the age and gender of the children do not impact the story or are not mentioned. As this part will include all eight sources, it will be separated into Ukrainian and Syrian refugees, and the sources will be compared at the end.

6.4.3.1. Ukrainian refugee children

Starting with the liberal media, they have two different frames used for Ukrainian refugee children where CNN, the U.S., focus on glorifying their journey and making it appear as if Ukrainians have had it much easier than Syrian refugee children, and the Guardian, the U.K., focus on how hard it was for the children to flee.

CNN writes about how Ukrainian refugee children were met with welcoming arms

and received help from the West: “Ukrainian women and children filing on the waiting buses, and I am so relieved for their sake that their refugee story is different” (app. 2, ll. 64-65). CNN writes about how happy they are for Ukrainian refugee children to be helped and finding refuge in the West, showing support and empathy that the rest of the media also give to Ukrainian refugees. Moreover, using emotional frames by describing their own emotions, and how the ‘scene’ is affecting themselves. It shows a narrative of Europe helping Ukrainian refugees and making sure that they are treated well.

However, CNN shows this support but takes it away in the same breath by writing: “Some children born in the camps have never known a real home. [...] I juxtapose those memories with what is happening across the world today” (app. 2, ll. 81-83). So, whilst showing happiness for Ukrainian refugee children and support, they also want the consumer to feel guilt about the differential treatment of refugees depending on their ethnicity. And again uses emotional framing in how the children have ‘never known a real home’, pushing a narrative that they have been mistreated and are still struggling to get the help that Ukrainians are getting.

CNN keeps referring to Syrian refugees in their sources to remind their consumers of where the West and the world failed, either to make the consumer want to change the past so that refugee laws are less strict or to make their consumers feel guilty for supporting Ukrainian refugee children more. However, as CNN writes in the same article: “No matter where they are from, the refugees’ emotions are so similar” (app. 2, l. 92), as to say that all refugees should be treated the same as they are in the same situation. Taking a humanitarian stance, in stating that all people should be treated equally. However, CNN itself show a bias in their article by reporting on Syrian refugees through Ukrainian refugees, which diminishes the story of the Ukrainian refugees.

The Guardian frames the story of Ukrainian refugee children differently. Whereas CNN reports on a success story, the Guardian’s framing is more tragic in its origin, reporting on how difficult it was for Ukrainian refugee children with this quote from a Ukrainian refugee: “I’m afraid for my life and the life of my child” (app. 8, l. 30). The Guardian’s framing shows that there is fear amongst Ukrainian refugees for their present and their future. The Guardian’s reporting shows that it is important to support and help Ukrainian refugees as they do not know what their future brings, which is in agreement with the political party they are aligned with, which is the British liberal party. Yet, whilst both CNN and the Guardian are liberal media, they frame Ukrainian refugees differently; where one reports on a success story, the other focuses on a more tragic framing, which shows that there is a difference in the

polarised media depending on which country they are from.

The conservative polarised media also has different frames concerning Ukrainian refugee children. The Daily Mail frames a success story amongst a tragedy. Writing about how the Ukrainian refugee children support and comfort each other: “Hundreds of refugees, mostly with children, hugged and comforted each other” (app. 4, l. 48). This shows a certain humanity amongst Ukrainian refugee children, which the Western consumer can relate to. Moreover, it makes the Western consumer happy with how the West reacted and helped refugee children. Whilst this is not in alignment with the conservative British party, as they want stricter refugee laws, it does show a specific reaction to seeing refugees that are ‘alike’ to themselves, as the Daily Mail wants to portray them as human, which provokes more sympathy in the consumer.

Fox News, on the other hand, reports on how it is not new for Ukrainian refugee children to be in a war zone: “Even before Ukraine’s war, nearly 426 million children already lived in conflict zones” (app. 6, ll. 21-22). Fox News wants to frame the conflict in Ukraine as a long-going war that has put many children’s lives at risk. And by using statistics or factual numbers, their argument grows stronger, as they have data to back up that Ukrainian children are and have been in harm's way for a long time and, therefore, should be helped by the West now. As well as wanting to grow support for Ukrainians in the war against Russia, to unite their consumers for a common cause.

This is to show that Ukrainian refugee children need the help of the West to provide a better future, a future where they are not at war and at risk for ending up like the Afghanis as they compare the two cases to each other: “things have gotten so bad that we’ve heard of parents making the unthinkable choice to sell on of their children” (app. 6, ll. 27-28). Fox News does this to tell the consumer that we cannot let that happen to Ukrainian refugees; however, they also do it to portray Muslim refugees as weak and European refugees as strong, as they started by reporting on the length of the Ukrainian conflict that put many children at risk. Yet, they have not ‘heard’ of any Ukrainian refugees selling their children. This is to further an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ narrative where the ‘us’ are strong and brave and the ‘them’ are barbaric, trafficking their children. Moreover, Fox News show that they do not have a source for their claim by stating that it is something they ‘heard’, which does not give credence to their claim.

Between the two conservative polarised media, there is, when it is boiled down, not that big of a difference. They both want to frame Ukrainian refugee children as strong and

brave. The only difference is Fox News' inclusion of Muslim refugees comparing the two cases.

6.4.3.2. Syrian refugee children

The liberal media has, when it comes to Syrian refugee children, both chosen to use loss frames and write about them in a way that is meant to provoke sympathy in the consumers.

CNN writes about how these Syrian refugee children want nothing more than an education to support themselves and their families to ensure a better future outside of a refugee camp: "Children yearning for education" (app. 1, l. 58) and "Darius met kids his age who yearn for the kind of education and opportunities he is lucky enough to have" (app. 1, ll. 68-69). CNN wants its consumers to pity the situation these refugee children are in. They use emotional framing in using the word 'yearning' to describe how Syrian refugee chil

Furthermore, CNN reports on the lack of opportunity to get a proper education, which furthers their claim that Syrian refugees are being mistreated by having a basic human right, the right to get an education limited. Furthermore, by including the reporter's child 'Darius' and writing: "They don't have the kind of regular entertainment our kids do" (app. 1, ll.70-71), the reporter and CNN want to humanise Syrian refugee children, and make the consumer feel guilty for being able to enjoy and play with things that Syrian refugees do not. Again, this shows excellent support from CNN to improve Syrian refugees' lives.

The Guardian has the same frame, including a lack of education, yet it presents it differently. The Guardian write about the exploitation of children through child labour, as they are forced to work to survive in the refugee camps: "Syria's refugee children toil in the fields of Lebanon" (app. 7, ll. 1-2) and "Thousands of Syrian children have become farm labourers" (app. 7, l. 19). The Guardian frames Syrian refugee children as being forced to work and therefore have to put their education on hold: "they miss out on years of education" (app. 7, l. 29). The Guardian hence, like CNN, frames Syrian refugee children as not being able to get their fundamental human rights, as they have to work all day, making enough money for their families to survive in the refugee camps. The two liberal media in both the U.S. and the U.K. have the same framing of Syrian refugee children not being able to be children but forced to be adults. This is to gain empathy from their consumers, as they show that Syrian refugee children are suffering due to someone else's war and are innocent victims, yet still punished by lack of education and child labour.

The conservatives have different frames when it concerns refugee children or children

near refugees. The Daily Mail does not write about Syrian refugee children. Yet, they do write about white British people visiting an island that has turned into a refugee camp: “Kos is particularly popular with families taking their kids away” (app. 3, l. 12), which paints Kos as a cosy and lovely vacation island where it is family-friendly, which is intended to make the consumer full of outrage due to what they write next: “yards away scores of migrants have set up camp, sleeping on cardboard boxes with rubbish strewn everywhere” (app. 3, ll. 18-20). The Daily Mail, therefore, takes the clean British families on vacation ‘us’ and puts them against the dirty refugees ‘them’. This is to show further that Muslim refugees do not belong in Western society as they are not ‘clean’ enough and cannot fit into a ‘nice’ holiday island without making it appear dirty and disgusting. This opinion and text show that the Daily Mail is polarised and supports the conservative British party as they share the opinion of Syrian/Muslim refugees not belonging to the Western world.

Fox News has another view on Syrian refugee children in their article, where they use a fear frame to make their consumers fear Syrian and Muslim refugees as Fox News associate them with ISIS, i.e. terrorists, anti-democracy, and anti-West: “‘We will stand on the heads of the apostates and crush them one by one. By the will of Allah, Islamic State caliphate remains,’ five young boys and one little girl chant” (app. 5, ll. 8-9). Fox News tries to further Islamophobia amongst its readers by associating Syrian refugee children with ISIS; furthermore, they want to make their consumers fear Muslims by including ‘by the will of Allah’ as that is the Muslim god. Fox News further want to spread fear by writing: “Until the children are properly de-programmed, they remain threats to everyone” (app. 5, ll. 92-93). By writing that they are threats to everyone, Fox News wants to spread fear of Muslims amongst their consuming thereby, growing the Islamophobia in America. Moreover, by stating that they are threats to everyone, Fox News claims that they will not be able to become integrated and functioning members of Western society as they cannot be trusted. This shows that Fox News is polarised as it is a right-wing American view on refugees, which aligns with the wanted policies of the conservative party, which is stricter refugee and immigration laws.

6.4.3.3. Comparison

As this chapter was quite comprehensive, I will, instead of comparing in text, make a comparison here at the end, where the liberal media will be compared to each other, the conservative media will be compared to each other, and the media will be compared with their national counterpart.

The liberal media agreed with their report on Syrian refugees, where they wrote about the lack of education and lack of opportunities due to their status as refugees. The Guardian adds another dimension: child labour, where CNN adds compassion and humanity. Therefore, it appears that the Guardian writes more facts, hoping to pull on heartstrings, whereas CNN writes more emotionally, hoping to do the same. When it comes to their report on Ukrainian refugee children, they differ. CNN wants the consumer to constantly be reminded of how Ukrainian refugees are treated better than any other refugee and the bias of the West. In contrast, the Guardian wants the consumer to know they still had difficulty fleeing their countries. This again shows a difference in how emotional and factual the two write; where CNN wants the consumer to feel anger towards the West for its treatment of Syrian refugees, the Guardian wants the consumer to show support for the Ukrainian refugees.

The conservative media does the same as the liberal media when it comes to Ukrainian refugee children where the American media is more matter-of-fact in their report, including how Ukrainian refugees are stronger than Syrian refugees, making the consumer support Ukrainian refugees more, the British media write about how the Ukrainian refugees support each other, and therefore, is a more emotional report. However, when it comes to their report on Syrian refugee children, they are entirely different. Where Fox News write about how Syrian refugees' children are indoctrinated into terror, the Daily Mail write about the horror for the Western families to be near Middle Eastern refugees. This shows a difference in their views on Muslim refugees; as one wants to spread Islamophobia, the other shows a prejudice towards them.

The British liberal and conservative media are not that different when it comes to their articles on Ukrainian refugees. They both agree that their consumers should show sympathy towards them. However, their articles on Syrian refugees are entirely different. The Guardian writes about how Syrian refugee children are exploited and forced to labour, and the Daily Mail write about how they ruin a holiday island. This shows an evident polarisation in their views of the ‘other’ where one focuses on everyone’s fundamental human rights and the lack of them Syrian refugee children get. In contrast, the other focuses on how Middle Eastern refugees are dirty and do not belong in the West, showing prejudice towards them.

The American media are more different in their views than the British media and more polarised than them. When it comes to Ukrainian refugee children, Fox News focus on how the West should help them, and CNN focuses on the bias the West has towards Syrian refugees, which is more apparent now due to their treatment of Ukrainian refugees. Moreover, when it comes to their views on Syrian refugee children, CNN writes about how

they are mistreated due to how the world reacted when they fled, leading to the loss of fundamental human rights and being forced into child labour, wanting to get an education and integrate into another society to create a better future. Fox News, on the other hand, write about how Syrian refugee children cannot possibly be integrated into Western society and are a danger to everyone due to their ties to ISIS. There is; therefore, a clear difference between the American polarised media, where one supports those who are a part of 'us' and spreads Islamophobia due to the 'other', and the other media calls out bias and prejudice due to treating 'us' differently than the 'other' is treated by Western societies.

6.5. Religion

This chapter will focus on two religious movements, Christianity and Islam, to analyse how those factor into the polarised media's articles on Syrian and Ukrainian refugees. This will also show if there is an 'us' versus 'them' because of religion taking a Christian nation's refugees against a Mulsim nation.

6.5.1. Christianity

There are three mentions of Christianity. Two of the media write about how that changes an experience for a refugee, and the last uses a Christian phenomenon to explain a situation.

The conservative media both use Christianity to further their agenda. Fox News writes about how Christianity is about helping those in need as well as God's presence in times of tragedy: "As Christians, we know that God is present in the pain" (app. 6, l. 51), including their Christian audience in what they write next: "Matthew 25:35: 'For I was hungry and you gave me something to eat, I was thirsty and you gave me something to drink, I was a stranger and you invited me in…'" (app. 6, ll. 54-55). Fox News includes this quote to remind their audience about how it is the Christian thing to be welcoming to those in need, which is the Ukrainian refugees who had to flee a war. This is to show that Ukrainians need the help of the West and the Christian people.

However, as CNN writes, there might be an explanation as to why Fox News only mention Christianity and helping people in their article on Ukrainian refugees: "As if what is defined as a human worth saving is identified by the color of their skin, the language they

speak, the religion they practice or where they were born" (app. 2, ll. 25-27). CNN claims a 'us' versus 'them' tendency in the West, where, because Ukraine is a Christian white nation, they get preferential treatment over Middle Eastern refugees. This could explain why Fox News only mentions Christianity in their Ukrainian article, as they view Ukraine as a part of 'us' and, therefore, worth saving. This also shows a polarisation in the American media, where the conservative media wants to save those whom they can mirror themselves, and CNN wants equal treatment for all refugees.

This tendency of 'us' versus 'them' can also be seen in the Daily Mail's article on Middle Eastern refugees. In that article, the Daily Mail references the presence of refugees as making it a 'hellhole' which is a Christian reference as the Islam phenomenon of 'hell' is called 'Jahannam' where the Christian word is 'hell': "this article made reference to Kos as a 'hellhole'" (app. 3, ll. 107-108). This shows that the Daily Mail view Middle Eastern refugees as a burden to the island. By referencing it as a hellhole, they want their consumers to associate Middle Eastern refugees with the worst place imaginable, furthering that they cannot become integrated into a Western society, which follows the British conservative party that also believes that refugees from Middle Eastern countries do not belong in their society.

6.5.2. Islam

When it comes to mentions of Islam and Muslims, there are no mentions involving religious clothing in this chapter as that has been discussed; only the media from the U.S. mentions it. However, both polarised media have mentions of Islam. This will help in answering how the media is polarised in their views.

The conservative media from the U.S. has one specific frame they use when it comes to Islam and Muslims, which is fear frames. Fox News wants to relate terrorism and Islam together in a way that spreads Islamophobia and hate for Muslims amongst their consumers: "The sun arose on the Islamic State; believers have come from all corners of the world in order to join the glory of Jihad" (app. 5, ll. 16-17) and "to you enemies of God, do you really think you will get away with what you did in Baghouz?" (app. 5, ll. 29-30). Fox News wants their consumers to fear Muslim refugees and fear that they will start a religious war in the countries they will get refuge in, spreading Islamophobia and hatred, as well as making their consumers not want Muslim refugees in the U.S. out of fear.

CNN has an explanation as to why the conservative media might have a more Islamophobic approach to Syrian refugees, which can be found in their affiliated political party: “the Trump administration is preparing a revised executive order that blocks people from seven Muslim nations entering the country” (app. 1, ll. 7-9). CNN reports on a conservative government showing Islamophobic tendencies in their policies as they want to block Muslims from entering. This does not only show that CNN is against the conservative government and on the opposite side of the polarisation, but it also offers an explanation as to why Fox News reported on Muslims as terrorists. This shows an evident polarisation in the U.S. media, where Fox News is on the conservative side with stricter views on refugees and being Islamophobic, whereas CNN is liberal, wanting Syrian refugees to be treated like one of ‘us’ as Ukrainians are. However, it also shows that CNN has bias and prejudice towards the West, accusing them of being hypocritic and showing preferential treatment.

7. Discussion

7.1. Which country has the most polarised media, based on the data applied to the analysis?

The state that has the most significant differences in their media is the U.S. This is seen in their differences of view on both Ukrainian and Syrian refugees and how extreme they are in their reporting.

The most significant difference is how they frame ‘us’ versus ‘them; the conservative media furthers the discussion on ‘us’ versus ‘them’, whereas the liberal media criticises the tendency of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ in the Western world. This is seen in the conservative media’s opinions on Ukrainians and how we should help and support them as ‘good Christians’. In contrast, Muslim refugees are seen as a threat to Western society and as terrorists.

The articles on Ukrainian refugees show a polarised American view. Fox News write a lot about Christianity, which will be a point further down, and helping people. However, CNN wants to focus on how Syrian refugees were not treated the same as Ukrainians, calling out hypocrisy in the West and claims of bias and preferential treatment based on the colour of their skin and the religion they practice. This shows that CNN is more aligned with liberal politics, as studies have shown that liberals care more about ethnic and racial diversity than

conservatives (Doherty, 2014), which can lead to the conclusion that they also care more about equal treatment for refugees. However, this also shows a bias in CNN as they do not treat Syrian and Ukrainian refugees either as they sensationalise Ukrainians' stories and do not report on the hardships of fleeing as Fox News does.

However, they changed the framing when it comes to Syrian refugees. Here, CNN reports on how Syrian refugees are mistreated, Syrian refugee children lack education, and that life in a Syrian refugee camp is difficult. Fox News also, in a way, acknowledges that life in a Syrian refugee camp is complex, yet not something that is not deserved. Fox News applies a fear frame when it comes to the Syrian refugees in an attempt to spread Islamophobia and hate. Fox News writes about how Syrian refugees are not able or willing to integrate into Western society. In contrast, CNN writes about the complete difference and a willingness to do whatever is needed to enter and integrate into Western society, only to be met with red tape. This shows a clear polarization in American media, and whilst the British media has a hint of the same frames, they do not have it to the extent of Islamophobia and being on a completely different spectrum like the American media.

As mentioned, Fox News uses religion to defend its stance on Ukrainian refugees as a crutch to why Ukrainian refugees need help. CNN also uses religion. However, they do it to explain Western bias. Religion is a big part of the U.S. polarisation, which also becomes evident in how the conservative and liberal media differ in their reporting. Conservatives in the U.S. care about religion, Evangelical, and it affects their policies and what they want to change in society; this is where they disagree with liberals, as they do not mix Christianity in their politics the same as the conservative party, which means they have different opinions on issues such as abortion and the LGBTQ+ (Campbell, 2020), and also on refugees. This also proves a polarisation in the media as it is evident Fox News uses Christianity to base their claims on, whereas CNN criticises them, discreetly, for doing that.

However, that is not to dismiss polarisation in the U.K. media. Whilst the U.S. differs on all points in their polarised media, the U.K. does not, which is why the U.S. appears more polarised. However, whilst the U.K. use the same frame for Ukrainian refugees, i.e. helping and supporting them when it comes to Syrian refugees, they are ghastly different. The Guardian reports on child labour and lack of education, whereas the Daily Mail writes about how they are dirty and disgusting. Moreover, whilst the U.S. appears to spread Islamophobia, the U.K. is not as extreme in its prejudice, yet still wants to spread prejudice for Muslims. So, whilst the U.S. are more extreme in their views, there is still evidence of polarisation in the

U.K. when it comes to Muslim refugees where the conservative media use the ‘us’ versus ‘them’ frame, the liberal media wants to spread sympathy, empathy, and awareness.

7.2. What differences are there between the polarised media?

7.2.1. U.K. conservative versus U.S.

One of the most significant differences between the U.S. and the U.K. conservatives is the inclusion and importance of religion in their frames. Whilst the U.K. does still include religion in their frames, such as writing differently about Muslim refugees compared to Ukrainians and referring to Muslims as making a place a ‘hellhole’, there still is a difference. The U.S. conservative. more visibly uses Christianity and Islam to support their frames than the U.K. does. Moreover, whilst the U.K. has still been a Christian country, historically, less than half of the population would call themselves Christian. In contrast, the U.S. has more than half their country and has twice as many people declaring that religion is significant to them and their lives (Pavely, 2023). This is also seen in the data provided, where it becomes apparent that Fox News builds a lot of its frames and narratives on religion, whereas the Daily Mail uses a clean versus dirty frame.

Another big difference between the conservative media is the framing of Middle Eastern refugees. While their frames have similarities, such as exclusion and inability to integrate, they use different reasonings for why. There is a difference between being a pest versus a threat, where the U.K. conservative writes about how they view Muslim refugees as dirty, disgusting, and unfitting for Western society, and the U.S. conservative writes that Syrian refugees are indoctrinated as terrorists. There is also a difference in prejudice and Islamophobia, showing that U.K. conservatives are more likely to be prejudiced and spread this. At the same time, the U.S. are more likely to be Islamophobic and spread fear, showing a clear difference in the conservative media across nations.

There are specific differences in their frames or reasonings concerning Ukrainian refugees, but there are more similarities than differences. The most significant difference discussed is the importance of religion.

7.2.2. U.K. liberal versus U.S.

The U.K. liberal and the U.S. liberal are the two like-minded media that are the most different in their frames; whilst their Syrian refugee frames are the same in the way they both want to get sympathy for Syrians, they use different methods. The U.K. liberal media writes about child and migrant labour and having to do what is necessary. The U.S. have the same frame, yet they use the sex trafficking of Syrian girls to prove this point. They use different methods while trying to end up in the same frame, where the U.K. is more factual and gets to the point quickly, while the U.S. are more emotional in including sex trafficking and how those stories affect the reporter's son.

The most significant difference between the U.K. liberal media and the U.S. is how they frame Ukraine and the Western world's reaction. Whilst the U.K. liberal media write about Ukrainian refugees in a way that is meant to provoke sympathy and empathy as well as pride over one's nation's response to the crisis, the U.S. uses this crisis to call out hypocrisy in the West, claiming that the West view Ukrainians differently because they are Christian rather than Muslim. This again shows a difference with religion; where the U.K. does not mention Christianity, or Islam for that matter, the U.S. use Christianity to criticise the West for protecting some but not all, which for them shows a 'us' versus 'them' frame in Western politics and people.

7.2.3. U.K. versus U.S.

There are multiple differences between the like-minded media, yet there are differences between U.K. and U.S. reporting in general. Starting with religion, the U.S. views religion differently, and they can use it to further their frames and reasoning. The U.K. media does not use religion to further their frames or how they reason those frames. The U.K. conservative uses a religious word to describe an imagined geography, yet does not use it as a religious phenomenon in which to further their points, which both the U.S. media do.

There is also a difference in the countries' vocabulary and how they word their frames. The U.K. is less emotional in its wording and does not use words meant to provoke fear and sympathy like the U.S. does. This is seen in the U.S.' inclusion of "terror", "threat", "hypocrisy", "my son", and so on. The U.S., therefore, relies more on emotions to further their frames, whereas the U.K. relies more heavily on facts and writing the events, and the U.S. appears to make more of a story out of what they are reporting on. This also shows that

the U.S. is more polarised in how it relies on its consumers to feel the same or experience its stories in a way that provokes outrage, fear, and sympathy.

The last big difference between the countries is their polarisation. As discussed, the U.S. is more polarised than the U.K.; the U.K. media agrees on more points and does not use fear tactics to further its frames, which the U.S. does. The polarisation and political affiliation is much more apparent in the U.S. media than it is in the U.K. media, especially when it comes to Syrian refugees, where there is disagreement between all media when it comes to Syrian refugees, the biggest is found in the U.S. where the difference is between Islamophobia and sympathy, which is not as extreme in the U.K.

7.3. What similarities are there in the dataset?

7.3.1. U.K. conservative versus U.S.

The U.K. conservative and U.S. conservative have one area where they agree. While their approaches may differ, they both agree on supporting Ukraine, being proud of the West's response, and helping Ukraine's refugees in the future. They both frame the story as Ukraine needing 'our' help in this crisis. Whilst there is a difference in chosen frames, such as religious versus empathy/sympathy, the two conservative media still agree on the message of their frames.

As discussed, there is a difference in framing regarding Middle Eastern refugees, yet there is also a similarity. Whilst the conservative media describe Muslim refugees differently, they still have the same message for their consumers: Muslim refugees cannot and should not be integrated into the Western world. Both the conservative media want to spread this idea to their Western consumer, even encouraging them not to follow the R2P either by claiming that they are lying about their status as a refugee or because they are Muslim. This shows that whilst one is more extreme than the other, there still is a similar trend in the conservative media of not wanting Muslim refugees in their country,

This also shows a clear 'us' versus 'them' trend in conservative media. The conservative media sees Ukrainians as a part of 'us', either due to religion, proximity, or the colour of their skin, and Muslim refugees as 'them' again for the same reasons. It can, therefore, be determined that in the conservative media, there is a difference in how refugees are perceived, as well as an international trend of not wanting to welcome Muslim refugees.

7.3.2. U.K. liberal versus U.S.

The liberal-leaning media are the ones with the least similarities, especially concerning Ukrainian refugees. Whilst they both agree that Western help is needed, CNN frames it quite differently than the Guardian, where the message changes from Ukrainians to Syrians.

However, that does not mean that there are no similarities between the two liberal media. Whilst their reasoning for Syrian refugees was different, the frame was, in the end, the same. Both liberal media state that there has been a lack of help and sympathy for Syrian refugees, which has ended them in precarious situations where they must do whatever to survive. They both agree that there is a lack of education and human rights in the Syrian refugee camps. However, more importantly, opposite from the conservative media, both the liberal media yearn for the Western world to act upon the injustice Syrian refugees are in, both writing about their willingness and ableness to become integrated into Western society.

This also shows that, unlike the conservative media, the liberal media does not have an ‘us’ versus ‘them’ framing in their writing; they instead see humanity as ‘us’ and state that we all need to help each other, especially those who need it most.

7.3.3. U.K. versus U.S.

There are few similarities between the U.K. and the U.S. polarised media. There is an overall international agreement on supporting and helping Ukrainian refugees, with the only media sticking out being CNN. However, the U.K. media agrees much more on this situation than the U.S. media does, showing that there is more polarisation in the U.S. concerning all matters, whereas the U.K. is closer when it comes to Ukrainian refugees.

However, this is also where the similarities end; there are no national agreements on Syrian refugees, how to treat them, frame them, or view them. This, therefore, shows a few things. Firstly, when it concerns matters of Muslim refugees, there is evident polarisation internationally, which is seen in how the media frames Muslims. Secondly, it shows that conservative and liberal media have a clear difference in what frames they use and what they want their consumers to believe. In general, it shows an international trend of polarisation, not concerning all refugees, but specifically Muslim refugees.

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, this paper has discussed differences in political polarisation concerning Syrian and Ukrainian refugees internationally and nationally and argued that there are some significant differences in both that affect the media's framing of the refugees and international legal frameworks.

From the analysis and discussion, the U.S. is more apparent in their political polarisation in the media concerning refugees, with the most significant differences being seen nationally here. This is seen in their articles concerning Ukrainian and Syrian refugees, where the media does not agree on one statement or concern surrounding the refugees.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that the liberal media is the most different internationally, with little agreement in U.K. and U.S. liberal media. This is seen in articles on both Syrian and Ukrainian refugees, where the U.S. liberal media is the only media across all political aspects and national borders that does not show the same level of support towards Ukrainian refugees. As well as the U.S. media has a more emotional framing concerning Syrian refugees, whereas the U.K. media appears to want to stick to the more factual side. However, there is some agreement here, where they both report on the lack of education for Syrians, breaking a human right.

It can also be concluded that the conservative media is the most like-minded across nations, both showing support towards Ukrainian refugees and resistance towards Syrian/Muslim refugees. Yet a difference is found in their reporting on Syrian/Muslim refugees; the U.S. is much more extreme in their framing, spreading Islamophobia and calling Syrian refugees terrorists, whereas the U.K. is more prejudiced, calling them dirty and disgusting. Thus, there is a difference in their framing, although they both want to do the same, which shows that Syrian/Muslim refugees cannot be integrated, encouraging their consumers not to want to follow R2P.

Moreover, it can be concluded that the conservative media appears to follow the politics of the conservative parties when it comes to Syrian refugees but is much more relaxed concerning Ukrainian refugees. In contrast, the opposite is true of the U.S. liberal media. The U.K. liberal media is the only media that appears to follow the politics of their associated party throughout all their reports.

Lastly, the most significant difference concerning the framing of refugees in media appears in the framing of Syrian refugees, where there is a big divide. This boils down to one side, the liberal, wanting to support and integrate them into Western society, whereas the

conservative side does not. This difference between Syrian/Muslim refugees and the framing of Ukrainian refugees can be found in the 'us' versus 'them' framing and tendencies in the conservative media, which appears to want to support refugees who look like them and follow the same religion.

To answer the research question: *How does media polarisation influence the framing of Syrian and Ukrainian refugees in mainstream media outlets in the U.K. and U.S., and to what extent do these frames reflect an international trend of media polarisation and align with relevant international legal frameworks?* The reports on Syrian and Ukrainian refugees are influenced heavily by the political party the media is associated with, showing a clear difference in conservative and liberal media concerning both groups of refugees. An international trend in the conservative frames is apparent; however, the liberal media does not share the same tendency, which shows that Western conservatives appear more like-minded across borders than Western liberals.

Bibliography

Benedetto, Andrea Di, Wieners, C. E., Dijkstra, H. A., & Henk T.C. Stoof. (2023). Media preference increases polarization in an agent-based election model. Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and Its Applications, 626, 129014–129014. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physa.2023.129014

Braveman, P. A., Arkin, E., Proctor, D., Kauh, T., & Holm, N. (2022). Systemic And Structural Racism: Definitions, Examples, Health Damages, And Approaches To Dismantling. Health Affairs, 41(2), 171-3. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2021.01394

Campbell, David E. (2020, July). The Perils of Politicized Religion. American Academy of Arts & Sciences. https://www.amacad.org/publication/perils-politicized-religion

Canen, N., Kendall, C., & Trebbi, F. (2020). Unbundling Polarization. Econometrica, 88(3), 1197–1233. https://doi.org/10.3982/ecta16756

Cikara, M., Botvinick, M. M., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Us Versus Them: Social Identity Shapes Neural Responses to Intergroup Competition and Harm. Psychological Science, 22(3), 306–313. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25835370

DAWSON, A. (2013). EDWARD SAID'S IMAGINATIVE GEOGRAPHIES AND THE STRUGGLE FOR CLIMATE JUSTICE. College Literature, 40(4), 33–51. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24543185

Doherty, C. (2014, June 12). 7 things to know about polarization in America. Pew Research Center; Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-read/2014/06/12/7-things-to-know-about-polarization-in-america/

Elman, M. F. (2019). Islamophobia. Israel Studies, 24(2), 144-156. https://doi.org/10.2979/israelstudies.24.2.12

Entman, R. M. (2004). Projections of power : framing news, public opinion, and U.S. foreign policy. University Of Chicago Press.

Fletcher, Dr. Richard. (2022). Have news audiences become more polarised over time? Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism. https://reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk/digital-news-report/2022/have-news-audiences-become-more-polarised-over-time

Garijo-Serrano, J. (2021). Constructing imaginative geographies in Genesis. Hervormde Teologiese Studies, 77(2)https://doi.org/10.4102/hts.v77i2.6969

Gawronski, B., Peters, K. R., Brochu, P. M., & Strack, F. (2008). Understanding the Relations Between Different Forms of Racial Prejudice: A Cognitive Consistency Perspective. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34(5), 648–665. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207313729

Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protects (n.a.). What is R2P? - Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect. https://www.globalr2p.org/what-is-r2p/

Green, T. (2018). Us Versus Them: The United States, Radical Islam, and the Rise of the Green Threat. The American Journal of Islamic Social Sciences, 35(1), 119-123. https://www.proquest.com/scholarly-journals/us-versus-them-united-states-radical-islam-rise/docview/2010640907/se-2

Iqbal, Z. (2020a). Islamophobia: history, myths facets. In Islamophobia: History, Context and Deconstruction (First Edition ed., pp. 1-52). SAGE Publications Pvt Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9789353287863

Iqbal, Z. (2020b). Othering as islamophobia. In Islamophobia: History, Context and Deconstruction (First Edition ed., pp. 241-255). SAGE Publications Pvt Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9789353287863

Iyengar, S., & Westwood, S. J. (2014). Fear and Loathing across Party Lines: New Evidence on Group Polarization. American Journal of Political Science, 59(3), 690–707. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12152

Jurkowitz, M., Mitchell, A., Shearer, E., and Walker, M. (2020, January 24). U.S. Media Polarization and the 2020 Election: A Nation Divided. Pew Research Center's Journalism

Project. https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/01/24/u-s-media-polarization-and-the-2020-election-a-nation-divided/

Koefoed, L. & Haldrup, M. (2020). Orientalism. Elsevier EBooks, 19–24. https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-08-102295-5.10203-3

Kubin, E., & von Sikorski, Christian. (2023). The Role of Media in Political Polarization| The Complex Relationship Between Media and Political Polarization: Understanding How the Media Can Affectively (De)Polarize Citizens—Introduction. International Journal of Communication, 17(0), 16. https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/21876/4293

Lecheler, Sophie, de Vreese Claes H. (2018). News framing effects theory:An integrative view. (2018, September 3). Taylor & Francis; Taylor & Francis. https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/oa-mono/10.4324/9781315208077-1/news-framing-effects-theory-sophie-lecheler-claes-de-vreese?context=ubx&refId=a4a9e176-9b0e-4f8d-890b-d95b4b01b833

Liberal Democrats (2023). A Better Alternative on Small Boats. Libdems.org.uk. https://www.libdems.org.uk/news/article/a-better-alternative-on-small-boats

Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2009a). Social construction of reality. In Encyclopedia of Communication Theory (Vol. 2, pp. 892-894). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412959384

Littlejohn, S. W., & Foss, K. A. (2009b). Constructivism. In Encyclopedia of Communication Theory (Vol. 2, pp. 180-183). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781412959384

Macaskill, A., & Piper, E. (2024, January 18). Weakened UK PM Sunak survives Conservative asylum law rebellion. Reuters. https://www.reuters.com/world/uk/uk-pm-sunaks-authority-faces-test-showdown-over-rwanda-asylum-plan-2024-01-17/

Mahadevan, J., Kilian-Yasin, K., Ilie, I. A., & Müller, F. (2017). Expecting “the Arab world”: imaginative geographies as dominant diversity frames. Equality, Diversity and Inclusion: An International Journal, 36(6), 533-550. https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2017-0112

Melican, Debra Burns, & Dixon, T. L. (2008). News on the Net. Communication Research, 35(2), 151–168. https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650207313157

Misra, Joya, Curington, Celeste Vaughan & Green, Venus Mary. (2020). Methods of intersectional research, Sociological Spectrum, 41:1, 9-28, DOI: 10.1080/02732173.2020.1791772

Mondon, Aurelien & Winter, Aaron. (2017). Articulations of Islamophobia: from the extreme to the mainstream?, Ethnic and Racial Studies, 40:13, 2151-2179, DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2017.1312008

n.a. (2021, February 23). Countering and Dismantling Islamophobia: A Comprehensive Guide for Communities and IndividualsISPU. Institute for Social Policy and Understanding. https://www.ispu.org/countering-islamophobia/

n.a. (2023a). Fox News (foxnews.com) - Bias and Credibility. Media Bias/Fact Check. https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/fox-news-bias/

n.a. (2023b). Daily Mail - Bias and Credibility. Media Bias/Fact Check. https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/daily-mail/

n.a. (2023c). The Guardian - Bias and Credibility. Media Bias/Fact Check. https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/the-guardian/

n.a. (2024). CNN - Bias and Credibility. Media Bias/Fact Check. https://mediabiasfactcheck.com/left/cnn-bias/

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2019). Introduction. Cambridge Core, 1–84. https://www-cambridge-org.zorac.aub.aau.dk/core/books/cultural-backlash/introduction/AED55DF53D990B3920F0FDAB7E1B9C40

Oliphant, J. Baxter and Cerda, Andy. (2022, September 8). Republicans and Democrats have different top priorities for U.S. immigration policy. Pew Research Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2022/09/08/republicans-and-democrats-have-different-top-priorities-for-u-s-immigration-policy/

Paveley, Rebecca. (2023). Religion more important to faithful in US than those in UK. Churchtimes.co.uk. https://www.churchtimes.co.uk/articles/2023/11-august/news/world/religion-more-important-to-faithful-in-us-than-those-in-uk

Persson, A. (2022). Frame analysis. Routledge EBooks, 119–130. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003160861-12

Pricopie, V. (2020). Social construction of reality. In The SAGE International Encyclopedia of Mass Media and Society (Vol. 5, pp. 1594-1595). SAGE Publications, Inc., https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483375519

Prior, Markus. (2013). Media and Political Polarization. Annual Reviews. https://www-annualreviews-org.zorac.aub.aau.dk/doi/10.1146/annurev-polisci-100711-135242

Ragin, C. C. (2014). The comparative method : Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies. University of California Press.

Rinehart, K. Earl. (2020). Abductive Analysis in Qualitative Inquiry. Qualitative Inquiry, 27(2), 107780042093591. https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800420935912

Robison, Joshua and Mullinix, Kevin J. (2015). Elite Polarization and Public Opinion: How Polarization Is Communicated and Its Effects. Political Communication. https://doi.org/10.1080//10584609.2015.1055526

Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a Theory of Media Effects. Journal of Communication, 49(1), 103–122. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x

Silva, D. M. D. (2017). The Othering of Muslims: Discourses of Radicalization in the “New York Times”, 1969–2014. Sociological Forum, 32(1), 138–161. http://www.jstor.org/stable/26626064

Terry, G., Hayfield, N., Clarke, V., & Braun, V. (2017). Thematic analysis. In The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology (pp. 17-36). SAGE Publications Ltd, https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526405555

Thompson, J. (2022). A Guide to Abductive Thematic Analysis. The Qualitative Report, 27(5), 1410-1421. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2022.5340

Thompson, S., and Modood, T. (2022). Othering, Alienation and Establishment - Tariq Modood, Simon Thompson, 2022. Political Studies. https://journals-sagepub-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/doi/10.1177/0032321720986698

Torcal, M., Reiljan, A., & Zanotti, L. (2023). Editorial: Affective polarization in comparative perspective. Frontiers in Political Science, 5. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2023.1112238

Tuttas, C. A. (2015). Perceived Racial and Ethnic Prejudice and Discrimination Experiences of Minority Migrant Nurses: A Literature Review - Carol A. Tuttas, 2015. Journal of Transcultural Nursing. https://journals-sagepub-com.zorac.aub.aau.dk/doi/full/10.1177/1043659614526757

Wenzel, M., & Żerkowska-Balas, M. (2018). Framing Effect of Media Portrayal of Migrants to the European Union: A Survey Experiment in Poland. East European Politics and Societies: And Cultures, 33(1), 44–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/0888325418777058

Yang, J. (2023). How Mass Media Influences U.S. Political Polarization— A Comparison Study of CNN and Fox News. SHS Web of Conferences, 178, 02005–02005. https://doi.org/10.1051/shsconf/202317802005

Zwet, Arno Van Der, Leith, Murray Stewart, Sim, Duncan & Boyle, Elizabeth. (2020). Brexit, Europe and othering, Contemporary Social Science, 15:5, 517-532, DOI: 10.1080/21582041.2020.1851393