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Abstract

This research paper asks the question, *how are global media sources covering Donald Trump’s position on the issues of immigration and refugees? How might reader’s perceptions of Donald Trump be impacted by this coverage?* By conducting a comparative, qualitative framing analysis of three international newspapers, *El Universal, El País,* and *Pakistan Today,* this project attempts to better understand how popular Mexican, Spanish and Pakistani news sources are framing Trump’s campaign in regards to immigration and refugee issues. Articles from the 18 months of Donald Trump’s presidential campaign were analyzed for content as well as common frames. Overall trends from all three sources show that the majority of articles focused on the topic of immigration broadly, while sometimes adding in content specifically regarding refugees. The focus on immigration broadly supports the agenda setting theory. In addition, the news sources analyzed most frequently framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration negatively. Finally, I argue that the framing of Trump’s immigration rhetoric in foreign news sources may give insights into potential international public perceptions of Donald Trump.
Introduction

Presidential democratic elections have become a major focus in the media in the past few decades, with good reason. Each election creates the potential for great political change extending past the four to eight years a president will hold office. In a globalized world, an election in one country has the capability to impact the entire world’s political, economic, and social systems. The 2016 United States Presidential election is no exception to major international impact and media attention. In fact, the election process starting in 2015 garnered unprecedented media attention around the globe, which mainly focused on the rhetoric and comments shared by billionaire businessman, reality show star, and Republican Party presidential candidate, Donald Trump.

Trump received record-breaking media attention, so much so that Mediaquant, a media analysis group, found that Trump gained over two billion dollars in free media coverage over the first year of his campaign starting on June 16th, 2015 (Confessore & Yourish, 2016). No other Republican candidate can compete with this coverage; Trump’s closest competitor, Ted Cruz, trailed far behind with only 300 million dollars worth of free coverage (Confessore & Yourish, 2016). Trump’s claim to the spotlight seemed to be spurred from his already prominent celebrity status and controversial, unfiltered commentaries.

At the beginning of his campaign, Trump set immigration issues and the current refugee crisis high on his political agenda, which reflected similar global media sentiments. The international refugee crisis has risen to an all time historical high with over 65 million people classified as refugees as of June 2016 (Ritzen, 2016). Debate over where to resettle refugees has grown tense as anti-immigration sentiments spread throughout the European Union and the United States. In June 2016, Britain voted to leave the EU due in part to the perceived economic
threat that immigrants pose to native workers (Taub, 2016). However, Middle Eastern nations have taken in millions of refugees over the past few years; Turkey and Pakistan rank among the countries to house the majority of refugees from war-torn regions like Syria and Afghanistan.

In June 2015, Trump announced his “revolutionary” plan to “Make America Great Again” by erecting a wall across the Mexican border to prevent “criminals and rapists” from entering the United States (Brand, 2015). In December 2015, Trump made claim that if elected he would ban all Muslims from entering the United States (Diamond, 2015). This sentiment was furthered after the mass shooting of Americans at an LGBT club in Orlando in June 2016 (Berenson, 2016). Trump’s campaign reflects extremely strong nationalist and anti-immigration sentiments, which have been controversial in the United States and surrounding nations.

World leaders did not remain silent in the wake of Trump’s campaign claims and plans for “making America great again.” In response to Trump’s plan to erect a wall along the Mexican border, Mexico’s deputy minister for migration, Humberto Roque Villenueva, referred to Trump as an “emergency” that Mexico must face after further analysis (John, 2016). Similarly, Mexico’s president Enrique Peña Nieto declared that Trump’s rhetoric against Mexican immigration and Mexican people has already damaged the diplomatic relationship between the U.S. and Mexico (Zaru, 2016).

Trump’s claims that he would ban Muslims from entering the United States prompted leaders around the world to speak out against this policy as hate rhetoric. The head of Pakistan’s Ulema Council of Muslim clerics, Tahir Ashrafi, condemned Trump’s remarks for declaring a false war between Islam and Christianity (Walters, 2015). As a response to Trump’s ban on Muslims, *El País*, a Spanish newspaper published a satirical letter from King Philip II to Trump that mockingly suggested Trump reignite the Inquisition (Bilefsky, 2016). These commentaries
and responses by world leaders and journalists are only a fraction of the commentaries shared in U.S. media that globally question Trump’s political policies and claims against immigrants and refugees. Other media outlets have framed Trump in a different light, showing him as a new political face that can get things done and protect Americans from external threats.

Previous research, which will be discussed and cited in the following literature review, strongly links media frameworks to public perceptions of foreign nations, leaders and issues. Likewise, past research supports the Agenda Setting Theory, which broadly states that issues more frequently covered in news are perceived to be more important in society, whether or not that issue actually is more important is still debatable. Research suggests that the way in which an issue is framed in the media is an important factor in understanding how the readers of these sources will perceive connect to several important questions: 1) Do the international news sources studied differentiate between immigration and refugee issues? 2) If so, is one topic covered more frequently? 3) What might the implications of these findings be based on Agenda Setting Theory? 4) How are global media sources framing Donald Trump’s position on the issues of immigration and refugees? 5) What can these frames tell us about how readers of these sources may perceive Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees?
Literature Review

In many ways, political communication is its own beast. Throughout the history of the United States, political communication has changed quite significantly. In the early years of the nation, political communication was reserved almost exclusively for elites, who at the time were educated, wealthy, white men. Changes in social structure and technology have expanded the reach of political communication, which today relies heavily on mass communication shared through media sources in print, online, television, and radio. Now, everyday citizens become part of the political communication process, however, many communication researchers would argue that the power still lies with elites who control the flow of information to the media and elites who control what information the media release to the public. The power lies with elites who control the media because they ultimately get to decide how to frame political issues, which influences the public’s perception of their nation and the world. The following literature review examines multiple studies related to framing theory, political communication, global media, and celebrity politicians with the purpose of finding gaps in the research that can be filled.
Framing Theory

Foundations of framing theory. Framing theory is a major theory that has been applied to learn about the creation and effects of messages in mass media. The overall concept of framing theory is that information shared by media is rarely the full picture of an event or issue. This concept has been viewed as both a threat to reality and an inherent necessity of journalism. Entman (1993), a prominent researcher of framing theory, first described framing as selecting aspects of reality and highlighting these aspects to make them seem more important than other aspects of reality. Many other communication studies scholars have since used this definition of framing, with slight variation. Iyengar (1996) adds to the definition that framing is really a choice; however, he does not clarify whether that choice is conscious or not. Iyengar’s work does seem to favor the idea that journalists and elites actively choose their frames, however, later research questions this notion. Other scholars, like Lecheler and de Vreese (2011) do agree that framing is really about portraying reality with certain stresses, while de-emphasizing other aspects.

Scholars seem to agree that studying framing is important because frames have an impact on perceptions of reality. Entman (1993), found in his research that frames impact perceptions of power in society. In his work, Entman (1993) argues that creating frames and thereby impacting perceptions of power gives power to the elites who control such frames. In a related study, Iyengar (1996) found that the framing of issues influences perceptions of responsibility. The research conducted by Iyengar (1996) tested whether different issue frames would result in different perceptions of who or what was responsible for a social issue. In a long-term experiment that tested frame effects over time, Lecheler and de Vreese (2011) found that frames impact perception long-term. More specifically, frames that resonate with personal beliefs and
attitudes will persist over time and often impact how one frames future perceptions of similar issues. Yet again, research finds that framing impacts perception.

While Entman (1993) and Iyengar (1996) viewed framing as having great power with the potential to be used in harmful ways, other research has questioned this mentality. In his book, *Making sense of media and politics: Five principles in political communication*, Wolfsfeld (2011) argues that framing primes the audience to understand issues in a certain way that is often the way a majority of society would understand the issue. This argument adds a component of necessity to framing theory, meaning that framing is often needed by society members to help them understand complex issues. This argument is backed by research conducted by Callaghan and Schnell (2005). In their experiment, Callaghan and Schnell (2005) found that framing actually helps create understanding of an issue and that framing can be an aid to learning. Their findings show that framing isn’t necessarily bad, because frames can be used to benefit the public by aiding understanding (Callaghan and Schnell, 2005). However, these findings can also be viewed as a threat to reality. While framing does make issues easier to digest, it also neglects complexities, warping the public’s perception and ability to debate an issue in depth.

Understanding the manner in which frames are created to simplify the complexity of reality is another important facet of framing research. Much of the research done on framing looks at framing effects, however, other studies focus on the types of frames that seem to exist. Scheufele (1999) identified two types of frames: individual frames and media frames. Individual frames are held by one person and are based on personal experience, whereas, media frames are created by media and can influence how masses of people may interpret an issue or create their individual frames. For the purpose of further research, this paper is more interested in examining media frames. Within the realm of media frames, Wolfsfeld (2011) identifies two main frames
used in political communication. The first frame is the strategic, also known as “horse race” frame, in which politics is framed as a competition. In this frame media coverage of politics focuses on who is “winning” and what their strategies for winning consist of. The second common frame is the issue frame, which is used less frequently in today’s media. This frame focuses on candidates and politicians views and positions on issues. This is often discussed via voting records, upcoming legislation or speeches on certain topics but is often simplified for consumers.

Finally, Iyengar (1996) identified the episodic and thematic frames. Episodic frames focus on one event and do not tie this event to larger societal meaning or implications. However, the thematic frame is viewed as more complex and ties together themes from an event to a larger issue in society. While all of these scholars identified various themes, their research did have one finding in common: typically two frames create opposing dualities and one frame is usually dominant over the other. This has major significance in the field of communication because framing has been found to impact perception, thus frames that are most dominant have more power to impact perception. It becomes increasingly important to understand which themes are being portrayed in the media and then identify which themes are dominant and therefore hold more power to impact perception.
Campaigns, elections and politics. Within the study of political communication, several larger debates have arisen between scholars. This debate centers on the idea of democracy led “by the people for the people”, as is a common American political belief. This belief supports the idea that democracy is meant for the participation and input of everyday citizens; however, scholars question if participation is genuine if the information citizens rely on is simplified via framing. This debate has sparked further research into the effects as well as the potential harms and benefits of framing. Researchers still have yet to come to a consensus on whether framing is inherently harmful to democracy.

While Carpini (2005) recognizes that frames most likely occur because of time and space limits in media, he also recognizes that overly simplified frames may detract from citizen’s political understanding of complex issues. In a case study of the 1988 presidential election, Carpini (2005) found that the media overemphasized personality and strategy, which he believes led to a decline in public trust and civic involvement because citizens were not given enough information to make informed political decisions. Thus, simplified strategic frames actually disempowered citizenship, which goes against the principles of democracy (Carpini, 2005). In the study, Carpini (2005) also found that the media focused significantly on the power and voice of elites in politics, which established distance between everyday citizens and the elites. This pattern also impacted participation in politics and caused citizens to disengage because they weren’t considered part of the elite powers.

Carpini (2005) and Entman (1993) seem to agree that framing in the media can give power, but it can also disempower people in society. Fridkin and Kenney (2005), conducted a content analysis to assess the manner in which power is distributed to various candidates in the media. The study found that incumbent candidates have more power to frame the campaign
contest in their terms (Fridkin and Kenney, 2005). In addition, media outlets were more likely to accept the frames incumbent campaigns shared (Fridkin and Kenney, 2005). This finding implies that political media gives certain candidates and politicians more power to frame political issues, thus power is unequally distributed. However, not all political communication research views media frames as a purely negative mass communication tactic.

Kinder and Nelson (2005) argue that frames are actually necessary in political communication because frames allow citizens to understand and form an opinion on political issues. In their study, Kinder and Nelson (2005) tested whether citizens’ ability to express an opinion on a topic was influenced by the way a question was framed. The results showed that unframed issues resulted in more “I don’t know” responses, which was taken to mean that frames are often familiar to citizens (Kinder & Nelson, 2005). Frames that are familiar help citizens to identify their position on an issue. Ultimately, the findings of this research signify that frames are necessary for creating common understanding. However, Kinder and Nelson (2005) did warn that frames on issues are often polarized and don’t allow citizens to think of issues in other terms.

Overall, scholars researching frames in political communication and mass media do not have a clear answer as to whether the power and misuse of framing is inherently bad for democracy. This is part a larger debate as to what the misuse of framing actually is, since this would be subjective. Likewise, scholars have not researched how framing of politics differs in foreign nations. Scholars have yet to answer how frames in foreign media impact the global perception of American democracy. In other words, can framing have an impact on how American democracy is portrayed globally?
International and comparative studies. While framing research has yet to specifically study the understanding and portrayal of American democracy internationally, scholars have studied framing theory in a broader global context. Past studies have looked into the scope of framing, the types of frames used globally, and how issue frames differ across the globe. Imison and Schweinsberg (2013) found that when domestic media in a nation frames a global issue, the frame usually focuses on a specific geographic location. In the same study, Imison and Schweinsberg (2013) found that global issues are often framed in a way that neglects components of the issue that fall outside of the specific geographic focus of the news piece. Phrased more generally, international issues may not be connected to a larger global context, and are simplified to make the concept more digestible by the public.

The work of Imison and Schweinsberg (2013) reflected similar findings to the conclusions Kostadinova and Dimitrova (2012) observed in their own study the year prior. Kostadinova and Dimitrova (2012) found that global issues in the media were often framed as episodic events, meaning that the events and issues were not connected to a larger global context or issue. However, a unique finding of the study showed that specialized media sources more frequently used thematic frames that connected economic events to larger economic themes around the world (Kostadinova & Dimitrova, 2012). According to Kostadinova and Dimitrova (2012), citizens with a higher need for information and global context have the means to acquire such knowledge if they read certain specialized sources. This finding supports the notion that citizens can challenge the frames of mainstream media, which gives some power back to citizens.

Cawley (2012) examined Irish print media to determine of how the 2008 economic crisis was being framed. Like Kostadinova and Dimitrova, Cawley (2012) found that frames in
mainstream media were simplified, whereas, media that specialized in economics provided specific, detailed information. The study also noted that even with more information, frames were still fairly homogeneous but still differed (Cawley, 2012). According to Cawley (2012) the slight differences of framing are attributed to amplification variations, meaning that dominant frames are similar overall but certain aspects will be slightly more prominent in various sources. Cawley’s homogeneous frames support Wolfsfeld’s (2011) claim that the media seem to perpetuate certain frames as being dominant or more common. While some sources seem to provide more information, often that information still fits within a dominant frame. This leads to a neglect of other perspectives and non-dominant frames.

The study of different media sources and dominant news frames was furthered by Guzman’s (2015) research of United States media coverage of the 2011 Egyptian revolution. Guzman (2015) found that the way media framed the conflict differed based on the sources’ political affiliation. More specifically, Guzman (2015) found that the framing of enemies and allies to the United States was portrayed differently by CNN and FOX news. This finding is significant because the way a conflict is portrayed by a news source gives insight to the way consumers may perceive the conflict. For example, it is more likely the FOX viewers will perceive the Egyptian protesters as irrational because that is the way the protesters were framed by FOX news. In contrast, CNN viewers would be more likely to perceive the protesters as rational and peaceful because of the frame CNN shared.

Imison and Schweinsberg (2013) support the theory that frames differ source to source. Imison and Schweinsberg (2013) found that variations between frameworks are often the result of journalists tailoring news events to a specific culture or the target audience. Target audiences are determined by media corporations to attract consumers by catering to their beliefs and
attitudes. While there are dominant frames in media overall, the variation in the frames occurs because certain aspects of the dominant frame are amplified to appeal to consumers in various target audiences.

Overall, the compilation of research shows that understanding the way framing differs is important to understanding the way in which consumers perceive world events. This is a prominent idea Guzman (2015) demonstrates in his qualitative study that questioned the understanding of the frame itself. Guzman (2015) looks at the way a frame is constructed, and the manner in which frames differ and may potentially impact perception. However, his research does not look at the way frames may differ from culture to culture. In fact, none of the studies mentioned compared frames from different nations, and so there is still much to learn about how frames vary between cultures. Likewise, there is much to learn about what varying frames can share in regards to global perception.

Agenda Setting Theory

Agenda setting theory is a major part of mass media studies because agendas, like frames, have the potential to impact public perception. Agenda setting theory is based on the concept that news media must prioritize which stories, events, and issues they cover due to time and space constraints. Thus, the stories a source chooses to cover create the media agenda. The major complication of this theory is the fact that many stories are left out of the agenda because they are determined to be less important or less lucrative. Modern research involving agenda setting theory has tested what the significance and effects of media agendas may be.

One effect that has been linked to agenda setting is the perception of importance. Wanta, Golan, and Lee (2004) found that on a basic level more coverage creates a higher possibility that
items of the agenda will be perceived as more important. Specifically, their study found that in the United States the more a foreign nation was covered in the media, the more important citizens perceived that nation (Wanta, Golan & Lee, 2004). The same study found that the manner in which a nation is covered in the agenda matters as well (Wanta, Golan & Lee, 2004). This was especially true for negative coverage: the more negative coverage that appeared in the agenda correlated with a negative perception of a nation (Wanta, Golan & Lee, 2004). Overall, this study showed that the manner in which foreign nations are covered by foreign media matters because it can impact perceptions of importance and negativity (Wanta, Golan & Lee, 2004).

York (2013) also found that agendas filled with negativity have a strong correlation with negative public perception. This was found to be most significant in political media agendas. The study found that the more a negative political incident was covered, the higher the consumers’ negativity rating of the involved actor became (York, 2013). These studies signify the importance that frequency and negativity play in the effects media agendas.

York’s (2013) study was also significant to the study of agenda theory and perception. The content analysis found that certain genres of news seem to impact perception to varying degrees (York, 2013). Consumers believe certain news sources are more important and therefore are more likely to perceive those sources’ agendas as more important. More specifically, York (2013) found that cable news’ agendas have the strongest impact on consumers’ perceptions, in comparison to non-mainstream media agendas. The same study found that political beliefs and affiliations also have an influence on the degree of impact a news source is on perception (York, 2013). Overall, there are many variables that play a role in how influential a media agenda is on an individual’s perception of reality. However, there is no clear-cut way to determine the way
one individual will react to a certain media agenda; however, a vast number of studies have found that despite the many variables, perception is very highly linked to media agendas.

Zhang, Shoemaker, and Wang (2013) also studied the concept of foreign media agendas. Instead of looking at the impact on perception, their study compared media agendas of the United States to media agendas in China, specifically with regards to the coverage of terrorism. The study found that certain international topics rank differently in the national media agendas (Zhang, Shoemaker & Wang, 2013). According to Zhang, Shoemaker, and Wang (2013), the most likely reasons agendas differ are culture and government. This means that the ranking an issue receives on a national agenda is often the result of how the culture perceives certain issues and what the culture believes is important. In addition, this means that forms of government and government leadership may influence how an agenda is set based on political priorities or demand for control. This finding is also important to keep in mind for future research regarding international media because the frequency a topic is covered can tell scholars how important or relevant the media and government perceive the issue.

In addition to agenda setting theory, there is also second-level agenda setting. According to Golan and Wanta (2001), the difference between agenda setting and second-level agenda setting is that agenda setting focuses on issues; whereas, second-level agenda setting focuses on attributes of people who are primarily elites. In the study, Golan and Wanta (2001) found that media impacts perception. In the case of second-level agenda setting, media coverage impacts which attributes of an elite a consumer perceives are most important or prominent. For example, the more stories a media source shares on a candidate and a specific issue, the more likely a consumer is to view that particular issue as important to the candidate’s platform (Golan & Wanta, 2001). Or the more a media source focuses on a specific personal characteristic of a
candidate, for example their family, work experience, physical experience, the more likely a consumer is to view that attribute as important to the candidate’s persona (Golan & Wanta, 2001). These findings are important because they show that media content, and the frequency of content can impact how an elite person is perceived by everyday citizens.

However, the research did find that there are limitations as to what perceptions the media can influence. The study found that the perception of winning an election or primary is not linked to media coverage (Golan & Wanta, 2001). Also, the perception of morality is not linked to media coverage, probably because morality is a very personal belief that varies significantly from person to person (Golan & Wanta, 2001). This research relates back to issue and strategic frames. For example, if a media source uses a strategic frame as their main agenda, then the consumers are less influenced by the frame and are less likely to believe that candidate portrayed as the “winner”, will actually be the “winner.” However, if a media source uses an issue frame for their main agenda, then their consumers are more likely to view that issue as important to the election. Additionally, the specific candidate who is covered more frequently in relation to that issue is viewed as more important.

Overall, agenda setting and second-level agenda setting are key theories to understand in political communication research because these theories help to explain perception and the importance of recurring stories and themes on perception. Yet, there are still gaps in agenda-setting research. None of the studies discussed compared media agendas from other nations. Further research looking at the frequency and framing of an issue in a nation’s media can tell communication scholars more about what agenda that nation views as important.
International Media Theories

Domestication theory. To compare news frames and media agendas from various nations, it is important to understand several theories regarding international news. The first theory is domestication theory, which according to Alasuutari, Qadir and Creutz (2013) is based on the idea that journalists will frame an international event in a way that makes the story more relevant to their home nation’s culture and society. In short, this theory means that international event coverage is tailored to a specific audience and therefore international news is framed differently in every nation.

Alasuutari, Qadir and Creutz (2013) found that the way an event is framed is, in fact, influenced by the culture of the target audience. More specifically, frames are influenced by the current situation of domestic politics and issues (Alasuutari, Qadir & Creutz, 2013). For example, if media in “Nation One” frequently links domestic terrorism to religion, then the media in “Nation One” is likely to use the religious-terrorist frame for international terrorist events, even if the global community doesn’t frame terrorism in the same manner. The significant implication of this finding is that international events are framed differently because culture varies and that means that perception will vary as well.

In the same study, Alasuutari, Qadir and Creutz (2013) found that countries that lack the resources to send their local journalists abroad have to rely on news frames from other nations’ news organizations. By relying on other sources, the home nation is accepting frames from other cultures, which can impact the public’s perception. In addition, stories that are written from a different cultural frame can be problematic in other cultures and may not be accepted. Another outcome is that the international event is not covered at all due to a lack of resources. In relation to agenda setting, if an event isn’t covered, there is higher probability that the public will
perceive other events as more important when in reality the event was neglected due to the lack of resources. Alasuutari, Qadir, and Creutz (2013) identified that countries in conflict or countries with low GNP are most likely to be lacking media resources. The concept that resources impact media coverage is also prominent in the world systems theory, which will be discussed in the following section.

**International news flow and world systems theory.** World systems theory is a model that divides all nations in the world into three categories: core nations, semi-periphery nations and periphery nations. Core nations are typically developed, capitalist, Western nations like the United States, Canada, Germany and many other countries in Europe that exploit periphery nations. Periphery nations are generally not as developed and are easily exploited by dominant core nations which periphery nations are dependent upon for capital. Semi-periphery nations have some dominance but are also exploited by “stronger” capitalist nations. The categories created by the World Systems theory can be used to describe international economic, political, and social relationships. In relation to communication studies, world systems theory can be used to discuss international news flow, which is the way information is passed from one nation to another.

Golan and Wanta (2010) used world systems theory to understand international media coverage. In their study, Golan and Wanta (2010) analyzed how factors related to world systems theory can predict whether or not an election abroad is important enough to be covered in American news. Golan and Wanta (2010) found that elections in other core nations were more likely to be covered in U.S. news. U.S. news to cover non-core nations, that foreign nations had to either have power within the UN, a recent conflict, or high immigration rates to the U.S.

---

1 However, for the purpose of this study Golan and Wanta (2010) focus only on core and non-core nations. “Non-core nations” combine all semi-periphery and periphery nations.
(Golan & Wanta, 2010). Non-core elections also garnered more media attention when they were involved in oil production, narcotic smuggling, nuclear power, or high military expenditures (Golan & Wanta, 2010).

The overall findings of the study support the claim that international news coverage is not equal and is very much dependent on national connections and attributes related to power (Golan & Wanta, 2010). Thus, core nations are covered the most in international news media. But, the study does not look at news flow from core to non-core nations or the framing of a core nation in non-core media. World systems theory can be used to describe international news flow patterns and newsworthiness. Further research must be done to understand the relationship between world systems theory and international media framing.

**Perception and international relations.** Both domestication theory and world systems theory share a similar conclusion: international news is covered differently in every country. However, the theories do differ slightly on their reasoning as to why news coverage varies. One study points to culture as a determining factor in coverage (Alasuutari, Qadir & Creutz, 2013), and another study points to international relations and hierarchy as a factor (Golan & Wanta, 2010). With these findings, the overarching question becomes, *why does it matter if international news coverage is different?*

Researchers Liu and Yang (2015) used the same question as a driving force for their study. In their rationale for their research, Liu and Yang (2015) explain that international decisions are often influenced by perceptions of foreign nations. Liu and Yang (2015) argue that understanding how a nation is represented in foreign media is important to understanding international relations. In their study, Liu and Yang (2015) analyzed articles in the Chinese press that covered events related to the United States. The researchers found that over the ten year
period of the sample, the coverage of the United States declined, while the image of the United State slowly became more positive overall (Liu & Yang, 2015). However, the study also noted that media coverage of issues related to the U.S. peaked during U.S. presidential election years and in instances of U.S.-Chinese conflict (Liu & Yang, 2015).

Knowing that coverage peaks during election seasons and conflicts tells scholars that the Chinese media views presidential elections and conflict as important to domestic and international issues. The study also found that negative coverage does significantly impact national image (Liu & Yang, 2015). This was found to be the case because in early 2001, the U.S. received negative press due to the EP-3 spy plane incident2 in China. This incident shifted the media image of the United States from positive to negative, and the study found that the positive image of the U.S. did not recovered for four years (Liu & Yang, 2015). Overall, Liu and Yang (2015) believe that image matters. Negative images seem to be perpetuated for longer periods of time than positive images. Additionally, negative images have the potential to create negative international relations (Liu & Yang, 2015).

According this research, other nations view U.S. presidential elections as important. In addition, the images created by the coverage of presidential elections can impact the future relations with foreign nations. Thus, Liu and Yang’s study supports further endeavors to research and understand international election framing because it is important to understand what images of the United States are being created and shared by international media coverage of U.S. presidential candidates.

---

2 The EP-3 spy plane incident refers to the collision of an unpermitted US Navy spy plane and a Chinese plane over Chinese soil. This incident sparked tension with the Chinese government and media.
Celebrity Politics

This last section focuses on literature covering celebrity politics, which is a fairly new concept in the field of political science and political communication. Understanding celebrity politics and the new theories explaining celebrity politics does play an important part in analyzing media coverage of politics. As it will be explained throughout the following section, scholars seem to agree that celebrity status in politics is a growing phenomenon that is impacting the way democratic politics is being covered in the media. However, scholars have yet to come to a consensus on whether celebrity politics aids or hurts democracy.

John Street, one of the leading scholars to research celebrity politicians, created definitions to categorize the types of celebrities involved in politics. The first category emphasizes the politician in the phrase “Celebrity politician” or CP1 (Street, 2004). Street (2004) describes CP1s as being traditionally elected representatives primarily focused on government and policy who also engage in pop culture to advance their political goals. Examples of “celebrity politicians” include President Barack Obama because of his engagement with social media and his use of media tropes. Another example of a “celebrity politician” is former President Ronald Reagan who was an actor before becoming a politician. A few other examples of CP1s are former Alaska Governor Sarah Palin, current Minnesota Senator Al Franken and former California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger.

The second category Street (2004) recognizes is the “celebrity politicians” or CP2s. In this category, the celebrity part of the phrase is emphasized because CP2s are celebrities who make political claims to influence policy without running for or holding office. Examples of “celebrity politicians” include singer and performer, Bruce Springsteen, actress and activist, Angelina Jolie, model and anti-vaccination activist Jenny McCarthy, and actress and HeforShe spokeswomen, Emma Watson. All of these celebrities made their name known in some way
through pop culture, using music, movies, or television, but they have also in some way become involved in the political realm. Often CP2s become activists that promote one cause or policy, but there are other CP2s like Springsteen and Oprah who use their celebrity status to endorse politicians running for office. Either way, Street (2004) claims that CP2s have an influence on political decisions and public political support.

Other political science and political communication scholars use the same or similar categories to aid with analysis of celebrity power in politics. In fact, Nolan and Brookes (2013) use the CP1 and CP2 categories to analyze and compare messages shared by Bruce Springsteen and Clint Eastwood in the 2012 United States Presidential election. In their study, Nolan and Brookes (2013) categorize Springsteen and Eastwood as CP2s. However, Nolan and Brookes (2013) argue that the strict two-party categorization isn’t always black and white. The example provided in their study makes an acknowledgement that Eastwood has held political office, but his primary role in the 2012 election was as a celebrity and not a politician. The researchers determined that Eastwood was primarily a celebrity because he used his celebrity status to endorse and support Republican Party candidate, Mitt Romney (Nolan & Brookes, 2013).

In a separate study, Marsh, t’Hart and Tindall (2010) add that, while the two-party categorizing system works, as long as there is a clear primary purpose in political action, the lines dividing the categories become blurred in some instances like Nolan and Brookes pointed out. More specifically, Marsh, t’Hart and Tindall (2010) argue that to be successful in the current political system, a politician must take on a celebrity persona to appeal to the public. This concept means that to be successful, in terms of public support, all politicians must become celebrity politicians. However, this concept does not work in the reverse because not all celebrities need to become politically active to maintain their status and success. For celebrities
who do choose to engage in politics, this action does frequently come with more power and more attention in society.

While all of these studies did agree that categorization was important to understanding the growing celebrity politician trend, the scholars did not find consensus on the impact celebrity politicians have on democracy and the media. Street (2004) shares very skeptical views on the impact celebrity politicians have on democracy. According to Street (2004), celebrity politicians are expected to neglect political substance and complexity on issues and instead gain political attention from gestures and appearances. Street (2004) argues that making politicians celebrities sensationalizes politics and simplifies issues, which hurts the democratic process. In addition, Street (2004) argues that celebrity politicians only share superficial knowledge and also move their agendas to the front of media attention. Again, this process weakens democratic debate and elections by simplifying and neglecting issues to instead focus on superficial appearances.

Street (2004) does acknowledge that celebrity politics are not all bad and harmful. Street (2004) shares that celebrity politicians do benefit democracy by reinvigorating the general electorate, but this occurs at the price of simplifying and sensationalizing political content. Nolan and Brookes (2013) argue a similar conclusion; that celebrity politicians make political discussion accessible to the general public. Likewise, the presence of celebrities in politics actually aids political issue by making topics more relatable (Nolan & Brookes, 2013).

In their study, Nolan and Brookes (2013) analyzed the role singer and performer Bruce Springsteen and director Clint Eastwood each played in the 2012 Presidential election. Springsteen was an avid endorser of incumbent Barack Obama’s campaign. Throughout the campaign, Springsteen drew crowds to Obama’s rallies. Nolan and Brookes (2013) found that Springsteen’s celebrity persona made him a symbol of blue-collar solidarity that allowed his
message to link to Obama’s message of empowering the middle-class. The same study found that Springsteen’s message, through his music, resonated with undecided voters who were also apart of his fan-network (Nolan & Brookes, 2013).

Similarly, Nolan and Brookes (2013) observed that the Republican candidate, Mitt Romney, used Eastwood as a celebrity figure who embodied the values of the Republican Party. The study found that Eastwood became a symbol for Republican masculinity and self-sufficiency (Nolan & Brookes, 2013). Interestingly, both celebrity figures became symbols of what values each of the political parties represented, which is in line with Street’s (2004) theory that celebrities in politics are used more for appearance and appeal than for actually spreading information on policy and issues. In this sense, celebrity politicians are really a tool or strategy for gaining public support without having to explain in depth what the public is supporting. In the conclusion of their study, Nolan and Brookes (2013) state that the future of the American democratic system is reliant on developing a better understanding of the impact celebrity politicians (CP1 and CP2) have on the public and political issues.

In their study, Marsh, t’Hart, and Tindall (2010) also shared concern that understanding celebrities in politics was important for understanding the election process in the United States. Through their analysis, Marsh, t’Hart and Tindall (2010) found that celebrity endorsers, like Oprah, actually have a significant impact of voter turnout and voter decisions. The same study found that celebrities involved in American politics influence which issues the American media focuses on and covers more frequently (Marsh, t’Hart & Tindall, 2010). Marsh, t’Hart, and Tindall (2010) found that celebrity politicians had the most impact on public mobilization and generating hype for social movements.
This finding supports the notion that celebrities do in fact have influence on politics, policies, and society (Marsh, t’Hart & Tindall, 2010). Thus, it is important to understand the messages celebrities send in regards to political issues. Finally, Marsh, t’Hart, and Tindall (2010) acknowledge that celebrity influence in politics is a growing phenomenon worldwide. Likewise, as globalization connects more of the world through communication channels the reach of celebrities grows. This means that celebrities from one nation can become celebrities in other nations as well. Examples of international celebrities would be Adele, Shakira, Enrique Iglesias, Emma Watson, and even Donald Trump.

Overall, celebrities in politics and politicians in pop culture are becoming an increasingly popular trend in the United States and across the globe. While the consequences of this phenomenon remain inconclusive, it is now more important than ever before to study who are becoming the voices of public policy and government and what the impact of these voices are. In addition, gaps remain in the realm of understanding celebrity influences in foreign nations and how celebrities from one nation may impact the political message that is shared globally with other nations. The link between frames and celebrity politics also has yet to be explored.

**Literature Review Conclusion**

The above sections outlined previous research regarding framing, mass media studies, international media, and celebrity politics. Each section captured an element of political communication or mass communication that requires further research and analysis. In relation to framing theory, scholars have found that framing in news and politics plays a part in influencing public opinion. However, there are still gaps in framing theory. One of the most prominent gaps relates to understanding differing international frames in news and politics. Further research is
needed to better understand the way differing international frames may impact public opinion on foreign nations and international relations.

In regards to media research, there is a growing body of literature on media agenda setting and the impact media agendas have on public perception and political agendas. Scholars have found that the frequency an issue is covered by the media impacts the perceived importance of that issue. Again, the gaps in this research are often international. There seem to be very few studies that compare media agendas to determine the importance of an issue in a certain nation. Agenda setting theory would benefit from comparative studies that look at the perceived importance of “global issues”. These studies could help answer the lingering question, are “global issues” really global? In essence, are some issues not as important to other nation’s media agendas? What impact would varying importance have on international relations and international media coverage?

Finally, political communication has seen a growing interest in the study of celebrity politicians. However, much of this research has been focused solely on American celebrities and politicians within American media. The phenomenon of celebrity politicians is a global issue because of globalization and the impact foreign politics now have on the international community. Thus, it is now of grave importance to understand how far reaching celebrity politicians in the United States may be globally. Likewise, framing research alludes to the fact that the way a celebrity is framed in foreign media can impact perceptions of foreign nations and international relations.

In conclusion, the study of international media coverage of Donald Trump and the immigration/refugee crises is warranted by the gaps in previous research. A comparative framing analysis of several news sources covering Donald Trump and immigration/refugee issues can
provide further context to analyze international framing and celebrity politics. Likewise, a comparative content analysis of several news sources covering Donald Trump and immigration/refugee issues can further knowledge of international media agenda setting. Specific information on the methodology of such research is discussed in the following section.
Methodology

The purpose of the following study is to better understand the frames other nations’ media are using to portray Donald Trump’s campaign on the issues of immigration and refugees. To do so, the study followed the framework of a qualitative framing analysis that analyzed language and themes with the goal of identifying dominant frames. In addition, analyzing the language of news stories was used to determine whether the dominant frames talked about Donald Trump’s rhetoric in a positive, negative, or neutral light in regards to immigration and refugee policy. Another goal of the study was to identify trends of coverage throughout the first year of Trump’s campaign. A quantitative content analysis was chosen to be the method for determining coverage trends. The sample for the content analysis was the same sample of articles used for the framing analysis. A content analysis was chosen to meet this goal because the research questions can be answered by counting the number of articles published each month in each sources. By combining quantitative and qualitative methods of study we were able to apply framing theory and agenda setting theory to understand dominant themes, importance of issues and coverage trends.

Methodology for Qualitative Framing Analysis

The sample of articles found for the framing analysis was taken from three news sites, *El Universal* from Mexico, *El País* from Spain, and *Pakistan Today* from Pakistan. These three news sites were chosen because of their geographical location and relevance to the global immigration and refugee crisis debate. Mexico, in particular, has received heavy political attention from Donald Trump. Mexico has been a significant factor in the heated illegal immigration debate that focuses on Mexicans illegally crossing the Mexican-American border into the United States. *El Universal* has a long history of providing Mexicans with news since
1916. Since moving to an online format, *El Universal* has become one of Mexico’s most popular news sources (Flannery, 2015). All articles sampled from *El Universal* were read in their original Spanish language\(^3\).

Spain’s history with immigration policy is largely reflected by their Canary Islands, which are known for being a destination for African immigrants looking to cross into Europe without documentation. Spain is not known for being a welcoming refuge for those looking for a peaceful place to stay. In fact, Spain rejected the European Commission proposal to take in 20,000 Syrian refugees, just a fraction of the 4 million waiting for asylum in Europe. Thus, Spain is very much involved in the global immigration/refugee debate and will be a good source for analysis. *El País* is the most popular non-sports based news source in Spain with over 1.4 million readers per day and has been providing news to the public since 1976 (Statista, 2016). All articles sampled from *El País* were read in their original Spanish language\(^4\).

Finally, Pakistan currently houses the highest number of Afghan refugees who left their homes due to the conflict between American soldiers and radical groups like the Taliban. In fact, Pakistan houses almost 2 million refugees within their borders but current debate in the country aims to gain assistance from global organizations because Pakistan’s societal structure cannot sustain the number of refugees they are hosting. This situation makes immigration and refugee debates prominent in Pakistani media, while having a unique social understanding of refugees that could impact media frames regarding the issue. *Pakistan Today* is a newer English news source in Pakistan, founded in 2010. *Pakistan Today* had more articles readily available on the

---
\(^3\) The author of this paper is fluent in Spanish and read all articles in their original Spanish form. Notes on the articles were transcribed in English, so non-Spanish speakers would understand the language examples used in the results and analysis section.
\(^4\) See footnote above.
LexisNexis database than the leading paper, *Dawn*, had available, thus it was chosen to be the news sourced analyzed from Pakistan.

**Sample inclusion criteria.** The LexisNexis Academic database was used to draw a sample of articles from *El Universal, El País, and Pakistan Today*. All articles were published between June 16th, 2015 and November 8, 2016, to cover the full campaign after Donald Trump announced his plan to run for President of the United States until Election Day. Because the intention of the research is to specifically look at how foreign news is covering Trump’s position on the issue of immigration and refugees, the exact search terms used for each news source were “Trump AND (immigration OR migration OR refugee OR Muslim)” or in Spanish “Trump AND (inmigración OR migración OR refugiado OR Musulman)”. The search ruled out all duplicate articles. While reading through the articles for analysis, any articles that were found to be irrelevant were not counted in the final total.

The search in *El Universal* initially came up with 182 articles, however after review only 127 of those articles were used. The search in *El País* initially came up with 276 articles, however after review only 177 articles were used. And finally, the search in *Pakistan Today* initially came up with 238 articles, however after review only 135 articles were used. This left a total sample size of 439 articles.

**Questions for analysis.**

**RQ1:** *Is the overall framing trend in each source covering Donald Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric in a predominantly positive, negative or neutral manner?*

The determination of whether a frame was positive, negative or neutral was based on the language used to describe Donald Trump in each article. For example,
phrases that described Trump with a clearly negative connotation were deemed to
be negative frames. Examples of words that were identifiers for negative frames
were “xenophobia”, “racist”, “lies”, or “disaster.” This list is not exhaustive.
Phrases that described Trump with a positive connotation were deemed as a way
to create a positive frame of Trump. Endorsements and support were also
considered to be positive frames of Trump’s rhetoric. Finally, articles that used
both negative and positive words to shed light to both sides or articles that
refrained from using emotionally aligned words were deemed neutral.

RQ2: Did the framing trend of covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration
and refugee issues in a positive, negative, neutral manner change over time?

RQ3: What are the dominant frames found to cover Donald Trump’s rhetoric on
immigration and refugee issues in each source?

This question was answered by analyzing each article for the major frame taken
and then looking to see which frames reoccurred the most frequently. The
rationale for each frame was supported by language from the sample articles.
Example frames include: “Trump is a threat”, “Trump is a joke”, “Trump is
offensive”, or “Trump is right.”

Methodology for Quantitative Content Analysis

A content analysis was used to examine agenda setting trends of the three sources chosen
for analysis. The sample used for the content analysis was the same sample of articles used for
the framing analysis. To answer the broad research questions, nine more specific guiding
questions were used for analysis. These questions are found below.
Questions for analysis.

**RQ4:** Which issue, immigration or refugees, was covered the most frequently by each source?

a) How many stories about immigration did each news source have in the sample?

b) How many stories about refugees did each source have in the sample?

c) How many stories about both refugees and immigration did each source have?

**RQ5:** How do the media agendas in *El País, El Universal*, and *Pakistan Today* compare in regards to issue coverage of immigration and refugees?

a) Which source had the most articles? Which source had the least?

b) Which source had the most articles about immigration? Least?

c) Which source had the most articles about refugees? Least?

**RQ6:** How did the coverage frequency change from June 15, 2015 to November 8, 2016?

a) For each source, how many articles were published each month in the given time frame? Did the coverage of Trump and the issue of immigration/refugees increase or decrease over time?

b) Overall, how did the coverage of Trump fluctuate over time?

c) Overall, which issue was covered more, immigration or refugees?
**Reading Process.** To answer these questions each article was coded based on the primary focus: “I” for primarily immigration, “R” for primarily refugee, or “B” for both. Any articles that were considered “neither” were discounted and were not counted in the final sample. The sample of articles was divided into sections based on the news source and then stratified by the month of publication. The “I”, “R”, and “B” articles for each source were counted and recorded to determine which issue was more prominent and which source had the most articles on each issue and altogether. Table 1 below exemplifies of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th># “R”</th>
<th># “I”</th>
<th># “B”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Universal</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El País</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan Today</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1: Recorded refugee, immigration or both articles for each news source.*

To determine how the coverage of Trump fluctuated over time, all of the articles were separated by sources and then coded by which month they were published. Below is an example table of this process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.U.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.P.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2: News articles per month.*
Finally, when Trump’s coverage was the highest, the articles in that month were reread to determine what issue and event was covered most frequently in that month. This process of identifying stories that received more attention and coverage showed which topic was highest priority on the source’s media agenda and what events received the most coverage in a given month.

**Methodology Conclusion**

During the analysis process, each article was read multiple times and annotated to understand the dominant frame of each article and determine whether that frame was positive, negative, or neutral. Each article was also recorded by month and content of whether the topic related to rhetoric about immigration, refugees, or both, to help determine overall coverage trends. In the following results section, the specifics of the analysis and research questions are discussed. In the results section specific phrases, terms, and words are used as examples to support the conclusion of the dominant frame of each article and whether that dominant frame was positive, negative, or neutral in response to Trump’s rhetoric. The results section also shares the outcome of the data collection of coverage trends.
Results

Results in this section are divided by first, content analysis and then framing analysis, as well as separated by source. Results are based on the categorization of articles based on reading content analysis and categorization criteria.

Quantitative Content Analysis

Articles were categorized as “Immigration” if the topic of the article directly related to or covered Donald Trump’s rhetoric and public policy positions on immigration with no mention of refugees. Similarly, articles were categorized as “Refugee” if the topic of the article directly related to and covered Donald Trump’s rhetoric or public positions on refugees with no mention of immigration. Articles that pertained to both topics were categorized as both, with no distinction as to which topic was “more” prevalent. Additionally, some articles specifically focused on Trump’s proposed Muslim ban, these articles were broadly categorized as “Immigration” unless the article specifically mentioned refugees in relation to the Muslim ban. Following topic categorization, articles were stratified by the month published to determine topic coverage over time.
**El Universal.** One purpose of content analysis was to document the number of articles *El Universal* published distinctly related to the topics of Trump’s immigration or refugee rhetoric. Of the articles published by *El Universal* between June 16, 2016 and November 8, 2016, 111 articles were categorized as covering the topic of Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. In comparison, only one article was categorized as covering the topic of Trump’s rhetoric on refugees. Fifteen articles covered both immigration and refugee rhetoric together. These data can be seen in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El Universal</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>Refugee</th>
<th>Both</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3. El Universal coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric broken down by topic, immigration, refugee, or both.**

The numbers above show that *El Universal* covered Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric more often than his rhetoric on refugees. The topic of immigration accounts for 87.4% of the coverage given to Donald Trump and his rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees. The topic of refugees accounts for 0.8% of the coverage given to Donald Trump and his rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees. However, the topic of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees was more frequently mentioned in conjunction with immigration. The topics of both immigration and refugees account for 11.8% of the coverage by *El Universal.*
A second purpose of content analysis was to document the fluctuation of coverage on each topic over the year and a half campaign period. Of the articles published regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, the most articles, totaling 16, were published in September 2016. Other months with higher volumes of articles published include August 2016 with 13 articles and October 2016 with 10 articles. Months with the lowest volume of articles published include January and March of 2016 each with one article published and October 2016, November 2016, December 2016 and June 2016 each with two articles published. The full breakdown of articles published each month on the topic of immigration can be found in Table 4.

The only article regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric of refugees was published in December 2015. However, 15 articles focusing on rhetoric regarding both refugees and immigration were published throughout the year and a half time span. The highest volume of “both” articles occurred in July 2016 with 6 articles published. Single articles categorized as “both” were also published in August 2015, October 2015, November 2015, December 2015,
January 2016, March 2016, September 2016, October 2016, and November 2016. This monthly breakdown can be seen in Table 4 below.

Table 4. El Universal content coverage or response coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees stratified by month.

According to the counts, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration peaked at the start of his campaign around June through September 2015 and peaked again, more significantly after the Republican convention in July, August and September of 2016. Similarly, coverage of Donald Trump’s both refugee and immigration rhetoric peaked in July of 2016. In contrast, coverage of Donald Trump’s refugee rhetoric peaked in December 2015, the same month he first proposed a ban on Muslims entering the United States.
**Chart 2.** *El Universal* coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the topics of Immigration, Refugees, or both frequency over time.
**El País.** Overall *El País* published more articles covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees than *El Universal* and *Pakistan Today*. The topic coverage of *El País’* reporting varied slightly as well. More specifically, of the relevant articles analyzed from *El País*, 116 were categorized as immigration focused. In comparison, 34 articles were categorized as refugee focused. Twenty-seven articles were categorized as focusing on both immigration and refugee rhetoric in conjunction. These numbers can be seen in Table 5 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El País</th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>116</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Both</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. *El País* coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric broken down by topic, immigration, refugee, or both.

Compared to *El Universal*, the topic coverage breakdown was more spread out. However, immigration still accounted for the majority of coverage, at 65.5%. Refugee rhetoric accounted for 19.2% of the coverage, which is greater than the less than 1% of coverage *El Universal* gave to refugee rhetoric. Articles that combined immigration and refugee rhetoric accounted for slightly less of the coverage than refugees, coming in at 15.3% of coverage.
Chart 3. *El País* breakdown of topic coverage on Donald Trump’s rhetoric in regards to immigration, refugees, or both.

Five months were found to have higher volumes of articles published about Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. The highest volumes occurred in February 2016 and July 2016 with 12 articles published. High volumes of published articles also occurred in August 2015, March 2016, and September 2016 with 11 articles each. The lowest volume of articles occurred in June 2015 with zero articles published, signifying that Donald Trump’s campaign may not have been on Spain’s political radar, so to speak.

The highest volume of 7 articles published on Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees occurred in December 2015, a date that matches with the results from *El Universal*. No articles on the topic of refugee rhetoric were published in the months of June 2015, July 2015, October 2015, November 2015, August 2016, and September 2016. The highest volume of 8 articles covering both immigration and refugee rhetoric were published in September 2016. The second highest volume of 5 articles occurred in August 2016. No articles covering both topics were

Table 6. *El País* content coverage or response coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees stratified by month.

Based on the counts shown in Table 6 and Chart 4, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration peaked shortly after he started his campaign in July 2015 and again during the primary season between February and March 2016. The final peak occurred right around the time of the Republican Convention from July to September 2016. In contrast, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees peaked in December 2015. Combined coverage of refugees and immigration peaked in June 2016 and again in August and September 2016. Overall, coverage of refugees was almost non-existent until December 2015, around the time Trump first proposed a Muslim immigration ban.
Chart 4. El País coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the topics of Immigration, Refugees, or both frequency over time.

Pakistan Today. Overall, Pakistan Today covered Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees less than El Universal and El País. The coverage trends of Pakistan Today mirror the coverage trends of El País more closely than the coverage from El Universal. In total, Pakistan Today published 100 articles focused primarily on Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. Pakistan Today published 17 articles covering refugee rhetoric and 18 articles that covered both refugee and immigration rhetoric.
Table 7. Pakistan Today coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric broken down by topic, immigration, refugee, or both.

Broken down by percentage of coverage, immigration rhetoric account for 74.1% of the coverage. Refugee rhetoric accounted for 12.6% of coverage and both refugees and immigration together account for 13.3% of coverage. El Universal, El Pais, and Pakistan Today all covered Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration more than refugee rhetoric and combined rhetoric. However, El Universal uniquely focused the majority of coverage on immigration. Pakistan Today and El Pais covered refugee rhetoric alone and refugee rhetoric together with immigration rhetoric at a greater rate than El Universal. El Pais showed the greatest rate of refugee coverage between the three sources.

RQ4: Which issue, immigration or refugees, was covered the most frequently by each source?

Chart 5. Pakistan Today breakdown of topic coverage on Donald Trump’s rhetoric in regards to immigration, refugees, or both.

Interestingly, the coverage frequency over time peaks of immigration, refugee and both seemed to correlate more with Pakistan Today’s coverage than with El Universal and El Pais. The
greatest volume of 15 articles published covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration occurred in May 2016, followed by 14 articles published in December 2016 and 11 articles published in July 2016. No articles about Trump’s rhetoric on immigration were published in the months of June 2015, July 2015, August 2015, and November 2015.

While refugee rhetoric was covered less frequently, the greatest volume of 3 articles published on the topic occurred in November 2015 and January 2015. However, no articles were published on the topic during the months of June through September 2015, as well as April 2016, June 2016, July 2016, and October 2016. Similarly, no articles about both refugee and immigration rhetoric were published in June through August of 2015, the beginning of Donald Trump’s campaign. Other months without publication of dual articles include: October 2015, November 2015, January 2016, February 2016, April 2016, May 2016, October 2016, and November 2016. Thus there were 5 months out of 17 in which no articles mentioning Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees was published. Articles about both refugee and immigration rhetoric peaked with 5 articles in December 2015.

Table 8. Pakistan Today content coverage or response coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees stratified by month.

Overtime, the trend of coverage shows that Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was not given much coverage until December of 2015; the same month Donald Trump first proposed a ban on Muslims entering the United States. Coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees both peaked at this time. Immigration related coverage also
peaked in March, May and July of 2017, which correlates with the height of the primaries and the Republican National Convention. Refugee coverage seemed to only peak around December of 2015.

Chart 6. Pakistan Today coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the topics of Immigration, Refugees, or both frequency over time.
Comparison. Together, all articles covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration from *El Universal*, *El País*, and *Pakistan Today* totaled 327 articles. All articles covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees totaled 52 articles, which is less than one-sixth of the total number of articles covering immigration rhetoric. The total number of articles that covered both immigration and refugee rhetoric together was slightly higher, totaling 60 articles. In total, 257 articles were cut and not counted because the topic of the articles did not directly cover Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration or refugees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Immigration</th>
<th>Refugee</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Neither (Cut)</th>
<th>Total-Cut=439</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Combined coverage (number of articles) of Donald Trump’s rhetoric broken down by topic, immigration, refugee, both, or neither.

These counts represented as percentages show that Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration accounts for 74.5% of the coverage of his rhetoric on immigration and refugees. Refugee coverage accounts for 11.8% and coverage that combined the topics of immigration and refugees accounts for 13.7% over the overall coverage. These percentages can also be seen in Chart 7 on the next page. This data shows that *El Universal*, *El País*, and *Pakistan Today* all covered the topic of immigration at a higher rate than the topic of refugee rhetoric. Similarly, the data demonstrates that the topic of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration was higher in the media agenda of all three news sources studied. This result cannot be generalized to more sources, however it is interesting that all three sources prioritized the topic of immigration over the topic of refugees.
Chart 7. Combined (overall) breakdown of topic coverage on Donald Trump’s rhetoric in regards to immigration, refugees, or both.

Another question for content analysis was which source published the most articles covering each topic, as well as which source published the least number of articles. Below are several tables and charts that show these results. For the topic of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, *El País* published the most articles, with a total of 116 articles over the 17-month span. While *Pakistan Today* published the least articles with a total of 100, the total was still within a small 16-article range from the total number of articles published by *El País*. The range between the number of articles published by *El Universal* and *Pakistan Today* is even smaller with only an eleven-article difference. The difference between the number of articles published by *El País* and *El Universal* is the smallest difference of 5 articles.
Table 10. Number of articles categorized as covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on solely the topic of immigration.

![Topic Coverage Comparison: Immigration](chart)

**Chart 8.** Topic coverage comparison on the number of articles each source published regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration.

*El País* again published the greatest number of articles covering the topic of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees, with a total of 34 articles. *Pakistan Today* published 17 articles, half that of *El País*. In drastic contrast was the total from *El Universal*, which published only one article that covered Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees. These ranges are greater than the ranges from the topic of immigration rhetoric. The greatest range from the topic of immigration rhetoric was 16, in contrast to the greatest range on from the topic of refugee rhetoric, which was 33. The smallest range for immigration was 5, however the smallest range for refugees was 17. Thus, the topic of refugee rhetoric was covered at much different rates by the three sources compared to the topic of immigration.
Table 11. Number of articles categorized as covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on solely the topic of refugees.

**Chart 9. Topic coverage comparison on the number of articles each source published regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees.**

*El País* had the greatest number of articles published on the topic of both immigration and refugee rhetoric yet again with a total of 27 articles. On this topic, *El Universal* and *Pakistan Today* were much closer to the total number of articles published. *El Universal* published 15 articles on the both topics and *Pakistan Today* published 18. The greatest range, between the totals from *El País* and *El Universal* was 17 and the smallest range, between *El Universal* and
Pakistan Today was 3. Thus, there was variation between the number of articles published, but the variation was not as great as the variation on the topic of refugee rhetoric.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>El Universal</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El País</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan Today</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12. Number of articles categorized as covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on both the topics of immigration and refugees.

Chart 10. Topic coverage comparison on the number of articles each source published regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on both immigration and refugees.

Overall, El País had the most coverage on the three topics with a total of 177 articles. Pakistan Today followed with 135 articles and El Universal published the smallest amount of articles, with only 127. El Universal and Pakistan Today published close to the same number of
articles with a difference of only 8 between the two totals. However, the difference between the number of articles published by *El País* and *El Universal* was a greater difference of 50 articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All Articles</th>
<th>El Universal</th>
<th>El País</th>
<th>Pakistan Today</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>127</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 13.** *Total number of articles covering Donald Trump’s rhetoric on all topics: immigration, refugees, and both.*

**Chart 11.** *Topic coverage comparison on the total number of articles each source published regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, refugees, and both.*

To view the overall coverage trends over the 18-month period of the study, all of the articles published each source on topics of immigration; refugees and both were added together and stratified by month published. Table 14 below shows the results of this compilation.
According to the table, the topic of immigration overall received the most coverage, with 30 or more articles published, in the months of September 2016, July 2016, and May 2016. The months with the lowest coverage of immigration were November and December 2015, with only 4 and 5 articles published, respectively. The most coverage of refugee rhetoric occurred in December 2015, with a total of 10 articles published. None of the three sources published articles about Donald Trump’s refugee rhetoric in the months of June 2015, July 2015, and December 2016. The most coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on both immigration and refugees occurred in July 2016 with 10 articles published in total between *El País*, *El Universal*, and Pakistan *Today*. No articles covered both topics in the months of June 2015, July 2015, February 2016, and April 2016.

Overall, the greatest coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, refugees and both combined occurred in September 2016, with a total of 46 articles published. Other months with high overall coverage included December 2015, May 2016, July 2016, and August 2016. Donald Trump’s rhetoric of immigration and refugees received the most coverage during the summer preceding the election, which would have coincided with the “Brexit” vote in the United Kingdom and the Republican and Democratic National Conventions, which elected Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton as their party candidates, respectively.

Table 14. Combined (overall) content coverage or response coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, refugees, or both stratified by month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>439</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Throughout the 18-month campaign period, overall coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration increased in intervals, with a large digression in the month prior to Election Day.
In contrast, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric specifically on refugee issues remained fairly flat except for two spikes, one in December 2015 and the other in September 2016. Interestingly, there are similar spikes of coverage for immigration and both immigration and refugee rhetoric in the month of December 2015. December 2015 is only one of two months where all three topics see a similar spike in coverage, the other month being September 2016. Multiple articles from December 2015 focus on Trump’s rhetoric about a Muslim ban and stricter migration vetting as a response to the San Bernardino shooting. Any articles published in September 2016 focus on Donald Trump’s visit with Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto and their discussion of immigration issues pertaining to the United States and Mexico.

Overall coverage of immigration and both immigration and refugee rhetoric surged in the months of July 2015 through September 2015. Interestingly, the articles published from all three sources at this time didn’t connect Trump’s rhetoric to a specific event. Instead, many of the articles focused on critiquing multiple comments Trump has made on immigration and refugees including building a wall on the Mexican border, banning Muslims from the United States, and several other policy proposals. This pattern is also consistent with the overall combined coverage of all three topics from all three sources.

In summary, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees increased overtime and hit its peak in July through September 2016. The majority of coverage from all three sources focused on Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. Coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees alone occurred mainly in December 2015. Outside of December 2015, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees was often combined with Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. Often when refugee rhetoric was discussed in conjunction with immigration rhetoric, the topic of refugees was discussed as part of immigration, and not
mutually exclusive. An explanation for these results will be drawn out further in the discussion section, following the framing analysis results.

**Chart 12.** Combined (overall) coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the topics of Immigration, Refugees, or both frequency over time.

**Table 15.** Combined (overall) content coverage or response coverage from all sources of all articles regarding Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, refugees, and both stratified by month.
Chart 13. Combined (overall) coverage of all articles about Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the all three topics of Immigration, Refugees, and Both over time.
Qualitative Framing Analysis

Before reading the sampling of articles from *El Universal, El País, and Pakistan Today*, three research questions were generated to guide the analysis. The overarching question was, how is each source framing Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees? More specifically, the analysis was meant to determine whether each source was primarily framing Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees in a positive, negative, or neutral way. These frames were determined by taking into account that adjectives, phrases, and context used to describe Donald Trump and his rhetoric on immigration and refugees.

The second specific research question was, did the framing change over time? For example, were there months when Donald Trump was covered more positively or negatively than other months? Did the frames become more or less positive, negative, or neutral over time? If so, why might that be? The final question regarding framing was, what are the most common frames from each source? How do these common frames represent Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees?

While reading and analyzing all of the articles in the sample, each article was marked as positive, negative, or neutral. In addition, common frames were noted next to the article with textual evidence and references for each framing determination. The results of these processes can be found in the following subsections, separated by source.
**El Universal.** Of the articles published by *El Universal* in the 18-month span of Donald Trump’s campaign, 104 articles framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees negatively. Eight of the 127 articles framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric positively, and 14 articles framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric neutrally. Thus, a majority of articles framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric in a negative manner. These results can be seen in Table 16 below.

When broken into percentage form, *El Universal’s* coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was negative 82.5% of the time. Coverage was neutral 11.1% of the time. Donald Trump’s rhetoric was only covered positively 6.3% of the time. Further analysis of common frames for *El Universal* will demonstrate how Donald Trump is framed negatively, positively, and neutrally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El Universal</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 16.** Number of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in *El Universal* from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.
**Chart 14.** Percentage breakdown of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in *El Universal* from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.

Donald Trump received the most negative coverage in *El Universal* during the months of September 2016, July 2016, and October 2016. Most positive coverage occurred during the months of June 2015, when Donald Trump first announced his campaign, as well as August and September 2016, shortly after the Republican National Convention. Most neutral articles were published in August of 2016 as well. *El Universal* published positive articles during 5 of the 18 months Donald Trump was campaigning. In contrast, January 2016 was the only month of the 18-month span in which *El Universal* did not publish a negative article about Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees. Neutral articles were published for half of the months during the 18-month campaign. Exact counts for the framing analysis over time can be found below in Table 17.
Table 17. Number of articles with positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees stratified by month from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El Universal.

Chart 15 below shows the framing frequency over time. According to the chart, Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was framed negatively from the start of his campaign. However, negative frames dropped in frequency from until the primaries began in February 2016. After February 2015, negative coverage rose, reaching its peaks in July 2016 and September 2016. Interestingly, positive coverage peaked in August 2016 when there was a dip in negative coverage. Similarly, peak neutral coverage occurred in August 2016 as well.

In summary, the coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was overwhelming negative and became increasingly negative over time. However, not all coverage was negative. In fact, positive and neutral coverage peaked in August 2016.
El Universal Spin: Frequency Over Time

Chart 15. Frequency of (by number of articles) positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees over time (by month) from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El Universal.

El País. Like El Universal’s coverage, the articles published in El País were framed predominantly negatively. In total, 164 articles of the 167 articles total were framed negatively in regards to Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees. However, 11 articles were framed neutral, while only 2 articles were framed positively. Thus, the coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees in El País was 92.7% negative. Only 6.2% of the articles on the topic were framed neutrally and only 1.1% of coverage was framed positively. And so, coverage overall was overwhelmingly negative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>El País</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18. Number of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in El País from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.

Chart 16. Percentage breakdown of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in El País from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.

Similar to El Universal, the highest frequency of negative articles was published during the month of September 2016, with a total of 20 negative articles. Other peak months for negative articles include February and July of 2016. June 2015, the month Donald Trump announced his campaign, was the only month without negative coverage. In contrast, November of 2016 was the only month of the 18-month campaign with positive coverage that was published in El País. Neutral articles were published in February 2016 through August 2016 with the exception of April.
Table 19. Number of articles with positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees stratified by month from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El País.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>El País</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3/16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5/16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6/16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9/16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/16</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, coverage in El País of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was overwhelmingly negative. While there were 11 neutral frames, Donald Trump’s rhetoric was only covered in a favorable way twice throughout his entire 18-month campaign. In addition, coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric became increasingly negative over time.
Chart 17. Frequency of (by number of articles) positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees over time (by month) from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El País.
Pakistan Today. Of the three sources analyzed, Pakistan Today published the greatest number of positively framed articles about Donald Trump and his rhetoric on immigration and refugees. In total, Pakistan Today published 11 articles that positively framed Donald Trump’s rhetoric on these issues. In contrast, Pakistan Today published 113 articles that framed Donald Trump negatively, and 12 articles that framed his rhetoric in a neutral manner. Yet again, Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was framed predominantly negatively. In fact, 83.1% of the coverage published in Pakistan Today was negative compared to 8.8% that was neutral and 8.1% that was positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pakistan Today</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20. Number of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in Pakistan Today from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.


Chart 18. Percentage breakdown of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in Pakistan Today from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.

For Pakistan Today, negative coverage peaked during December 2015, with a total of 19 negatively framed articles published within the 31 days of December. Other peaks for negative articles occurred during the months of March 2016 and May 2016, which does not correlate with the negative framing peak points from El Universal and El País’ analysis results. Positive framing coverage peaked in July of 2015, the same month as the Republican National Convention when Donald Trump officially became the Republican Party nominee for president. Neutral coverage was spread throughout 8 months of the 18-month campaign. Neutral coverage waved, starting with no coverage, then going up to a few articles, but then falling back down and then moving back up for the final three months of the campaign.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21. Number of articles with positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees stratified by month from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from Pakistan Today.

Interestingly, framing over time in Pakistan Today did not correlate with the same patterns as El Universal and El País. In fact, for the first three months of Donald Trump’s campaign he received no coverage in Pakistan Today regarding his rhetoric on immigration and refugees. However, coverage picked up in December 2015 and peaked again in March 2016 and May 2016 before beginning to lower. As negative frames began to decrease in the months of
June and July 2016, positive and neutral articles began to increase, although not surpassing the volume of negative articles.

In summary, while coverage overall was predominantly negative, *Pakistan Today* had the greatest rate of positive and neutral articles. In addition, the pattern over time is unique in the fact that negative coverage was almost non-existent, peaked and then fell instead of increasing over time like the trends seen in the coverage from *El Universal* and *El País*.

**Chart 19.** *Frequency of (by number of articles) positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees over time (by month) from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from Pakistan Today.*
Comparison. The counts from all three-source frame analyses combined show that the overwhelmingly negative framing of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees still remains. In total, 381 articles framed Donald Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric negatively, while 21 articles framed his rhetoric positively. Thirty-seven articles framed his rhetoric neutrally. The percentage breakdown of the article frames is 86.8% negative, 8.4% neutral, and 4.8% positive. Overall, the overwhelming negative framing results remain consistent between the three sources and combined together.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Combined</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22. Total number of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in El Universal, El País, and Pakistan Today from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.
Chart 20. Percentage breakdown of articles categorized as either a positive, negative, or neutral frame of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on refugees and/or immigration in El Universal, El País, and El Universal from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016.

All three sources combined together show similar trends to those of El Universal and El País. Like El Universal and El País the months with the greatest negative coverage are September 2016 and May and July of 2016. Every month in the 18-month span had a least one negative article that was published. However, there are 7 months of the campaign in which no positive articles were published to discuss Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees. Additionally, there were only three months, the first three-month of the campaign, in which no neutral articles were published. Thus, there were many months in which Donald Trump’s rhetoric was only covered negatively. Positive coverage overall peaked during July and August of 2016. Neutral coverage overall peaked during June and August 2016. Exact counts of all articles published by the three sources combined can be seen below in Table 23.

Table 23. Number of articles with positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees stratified by month from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El Universal, El País, and Pakistan Today.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>381</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>430</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are several interesting features to point about the trends featured in the chart below. First, coverage seemed to increase over time for all three types of spin. Although, negative framing increased most during the 18-month period of Donald Trump’s campaign. Second, while
negative coverage increased throughout the study, the frequency of negative coverage did seem to bounce up and down often. For example, the chart below shows multiple dramatic spikes in coverage followed by dramatic declines. More specifically, there was a spike in coverage during August 2015 followed by a decrease in coverage during September, October, and November 2015. However another spike occurred in December 2016, followed again by a decline. This pattern happened six times in total. Spikes occurred during the months of August 2015, December 2015, February and March 2016, May 2016, July 2016 and September 2016. The trend of the positive and neutral coverage did not oscillate like the negative coverage trend.
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**Chart 21.** Frequency of (by number of articles) positive, negative, and neutral frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and/or refugees over time (by month) from June 16, 2015 to November 8, 2016 from El Universal, El País, and Pakistan Today.
Common Frames

The third guiding question for the framing analysis was, what are the most common frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees from each of the three sources? While reading each article, the overall theme and major arguments were noted as well as textual evidence to support the themes and arguments found. Most articles had several arguments or main points that often supported the same overall frame. Multiple frames from articles were recorded and taken into account when determining which frames were the most common in each source. All common frames did frame Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees negatively. However, a section was included in this paper to discuss the positive and neutral frames that were written as well.
El Universal. There were four prominent frames found in El Universal. The most dominant frame was a conflict frame that pitted Donald Trump against someone else, usually a politician or another celebrity figure. This frame was noted in 50 of the 127 articles published by El Universal. The second most common frame was Trump is racist, hateful, and xenophobic. This frame was noted in 35 of the 127 articles published by El Universal. The third most common frame was that Trump is not a politician, which was evident in 33 of the 127 articles published. Finally, the fourth most common frame was that Donald Trump’s proposed policies on immigration, including refugees under that umbrella term, violate human rights. This frame was found in 32 articles published. Other frames included were strategic frames about how Trump couldn’t win without Latino support or support from the Republican Party and issue frames that depicted Donald Trump’s rhetoric as a major theme focal point of his campaign’s platform. However, these frames were not found as commonly as the first four frames discussed.

Frame one: Donald Trump in conflict. Many articles focused on a conflict that was the result of disagreement on Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugee issues. The reason for the conflict and whom the conflict was between varied. However, broadly the conflicts were the result of opposition to Donald Trump’s rhetoric because his proposed policies violated his opponents’ spiritual, political or personal beliefs. Using this frame, Donald Trump was pitted against United States leaders, Mexican political leaders, the Pope, the entire American-Latino population, journalists, celebrities, other Republican candidates, and business owners.

In an article published on February 18th, 2016 the Pope is quoted saying, “Una persona que piensa solo en construir muros, donde sea, y no construir puentes, no es cristiana” (Hernández, 2016). The translation to this quote is “a person who thinks only of building walls,
wherever and not building bridges, is not a Christian.” This quote from the Pope is calling out Donald Trump’s proposal to build a wall on the Mexican-American border to keep immigrants out of the United States. According Pope Francis, Donald Trump’s proposal violates his spiritual beliefs, which as the primary leader of the Catholic Church are quite influential. However, the conflict does not end with this quote. The article continues by quoting Donald Trump’s response to the Pope, accusing the Pope of being a pawn for the Mexican government. In analysis, Trump’s comment is ad hominem attack, which further reinforces the conflict frame.

The Pope was not the only religious figure who was framed as opposition to Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. Several articles focused on Donald Trump’s conflict with the Archbishop of Mexico. In one such article, an editorial titled “In the defense of migrants” written by the Archbishop is quoted saying that Donald Trump is ignorant to the international human rights of migrants (Rivera, 2015). In addition to critiquing Donald Trump’s knowledge on immigration, the Archbishop was also quoted labeling Trump negatively as an ally to hate and racism as well as being belligerent (Rivera, 2015). This example yet again frames a conflict between Donald Trump’s rhetoric and the beliefs of a spiritual leader. Overall, this article supported three of the common frames, by connecting Trump’s racist policies to violating human rights and highlighting the conflict between Donald Trump and a prominent Catholic leader in Mexico. The Pope and the Archbishop of Mexico were the only two spiritual leaders framed to be in conflict with Donald Trump.

However, there was a multiplicity of political figures that were framed to be conflicting with Donald Trump. Several articles discussed Humberto Roque Villanueva, the deputy secretary of Population, Migration, and Migratory Matters, and his announcement that Mexico will prepare before a “Trump Emergency” occurs (Agencia el Universal, 2016). The article
focuses on Villanueva’s statements that Trump would have a negative impact on the migration policies in Mexico (Agencia el Universal, 2016). In addition, the article highlights that part of Trump’s campaign is dedicated to harsh critique against Mexico and Mexican immigrants (Agencia el Universal, 2016). The article does use the phrase “en contra de” which directly translates to against. This phrasing, along with the focus on Villanueva’s negative prediction of a Trump presidency, supports a conflict frame.

There were also several articles published about the Mexican Secretary of Foreign Relations, José Antonio Meade, and his opposition to Donald Trump’s border wall rhetoric (Agencia el Universal, 2015). Meade was quoted responding to Donald Trump’s rhetoric that Mexican immigrants were criminals and rapists. Meade said that Donald Trump’s rhetoric revealed his “profound ignorance of the reality of Mexicans and their migrant contribution to society” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). Thus, this article uses a conflict frame, this time focusing specifically on the Mexican political opposition to Trump’s Mexican criminal and rapist immigrant rhetoric.

The two most frequent Mexican politicians reported to conflict with Donald Trump’s rhetoric were the current and former Mexican Presidents, Enrique Peña Nieto and Felipe Calderón. Multiple articles covered Calderón and Nieto’s response to Donald Trump’s rhetoric that Mexico would pay for a border wall between the United States and Mexico. Calderón was quoted in one article saying that Mexico would not pay for Trump’s “stupid” wall as well as Trump’s rhetoric is dangerous and comparable to Adolf Hitler (Agencia el Universal, 2016). Similar articles were published about current Mexican President, Enrique Peña Nieto’s response to Trump’s rhetoric about building a border wall and charging Mexico for the construction. Both
stories clearly framed the discourse and heated opposition to Donald Trump’s immigration policies.

Other political conflict was focused on American political leaders, alternating between two conflicts. The first conflict frame with American politicians was that democratic leaders were against Trump’s rhetoric, which was expected. Most articles within this frame were about Hillary Clinton’s critique of Donald Trump’s immigration policy proposals or about Barack Obama’s critique of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. However, there was an additional, unexpected political conflict frame that highlighted disagreement in the Republican Party on the issue of immigration. Most articles focused on conflicting policy views between republican candidates, Jeb Bush, Ted Cruz, Ben Carson and Donald Trump. In addition, these frames often depicted a divide within the Republican Party in relation to immigration rhetoric and policy. Several headlines that demonstrate these frames include “Republicanos cierran filas en contra de inmigrantes”, “Irreal, plan migratorio de Trump, considera Jeb Bush”, and “Chocan republicanos sobre política migratoria” (Hernández, 2016; Hernández, 2015; Agencia el Universal, 2016). The headlines translate to “Republicans close ranks against immigrants”, “Jeb Bush considers Trump’s migratory plan unrealistic”\(^5\), and “Republicans clash on migratory policy”. All of these headlines, and the attached articles, frame a conflict between Donald Trump and other Republican candidates based on opposing political policy views on immigration.

The conflict frame was not exclusive to religious or political beliefs. Conflict was also framed in the way of conflicting personal beliefs as well as business related conflict. One  

\(^5\) This is a great example of the complexity of translation because “irreal” in Spanish does not literally translate to “unrealistic.” However, the headline is translating a quote from a debate in which Jeb Bush critiqued Trump’s immigration plan for being “unrealistic.” Thus the headline is a translation itself, and not an exact translation at that.
example of conflict between personal beliefs related to immigration rhetoric was the coverage of Donald Trump having his security remove journalist Jorge Ramos from a press conference.

According to an interview with Ramos, a Mexican immigrant to the United States, he was expelled from a press conference in August 2015 after asking a question about Donald Trump’s immigration policy that Trump “didn’t like” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). The article, “Seguí las reglas, a Trump no le gustó la pregunta: Ramos” which translates to “I followed the rules, Trump didn’t like the question: Ramos” frames the issue as a personal conflict that Donald Trump is guilty of creating without warrant (Agencia el Universal, 2015). The article quotes Ramos multiple times highlighting that it is Ramos’ job as a journalist to ask tough questions and he is not in the wrong because he followed the correct procedure to ask his question. The conflict is framed as Donald Trump’s fault because he created personal conflict by expelling Ramos instead of answering a question that was difficult. There is also an underlying theme the questions Trump’s credibility as a leader because he refuses to answer questions he doesn’t like.

The article also framed this conflict as a larger conflict between Donald Trump and unfavorable media coverage, including examples of Trump’s conflicts with Fox News anchor Megyn Kelly as another example of personal conflict. The article quotes a response Ramos gave in an interview with Megyn Kelly saying, “No le gustan las preguntas incómodas, pasó contigo, pasó conmigo y ha pasado con otros” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). His quote translates to “He doesn’t like uncomfortable questions, it happened with you, it happened with me and it has happened with others.” This quote creates a larger contextual frame for the conflict. Trump’s action expelling Ramos no longer is the conflict between Ramos and Trump; the conflict is framed as a conflict between Trump and anyone who asks a question Trump doesn’t like.
Trump’s conflict with Jorge Ramos is also mentioned in another article a few days later. In the article, “Los antiTrump” published on September 4, 2015, Ramos’ story is used as a starting point to discuss Donald Trump’s conflict with Latinos (Truax, 2015). The introduction to the article highlights Trump’s interaction with Ramos that led to Ramos being expelled from the press conference. In particular, the article quotes Ramos’ statement that seventy-five percent of Latinos oppose Trump (Truax, 2015). This point then transitions to a larger argument that “la comunidad latina organizada ha empezado a construir una estrategia a largo plazo para responder a Trump con algo más que palabras, y para dejar claro que no lo quieren” (Truax, 2015). This quote translates to “the organized Latino community has begun to construct a long-term strategy to respond to Trump with more than words and to make it clear that they don’t want him.” This transition sentence now frames the Ramos-Trump conflict as a larger conflict between Donald Trump and the Latino community.

The framing of a conflict between Trump and the larger Latino community is strengthened by a paragraph featured later in the article. In this paragraph, several leaders and latino/a icons are highlighted for their efforts that go against Donald Trump. For example, Lupita Jones, an ex beauty queen, announced that the Mexican candidates for the Miss Universe pageant, a pageant owned by Trump, will be boycotting the pageant (Truax, 2015). Colombian singer, J Balvin, along with actress Roselyn Sánchez and actor Christian de la Fuente, announced that they too were cancelling their contracts with the Miss Universe Pageant (Truax, 2015). Finally, popular singer Ricky Martin announced that he would not be singing at Trump’s annual golf tournament fundraiser due to Trump’s rhetoric against immigrants (Truax, 2015). These five examples emphasize the conflict frame by highlighting famous persons who broke contracts with Trump because they couldn’t support his “hateful and racist” actions or words on immigration.
(Truax, 2015). Thus, this coverage highlights the conflict of personal beliefs on Trump’s immigration rhetoric and the manner in which this conflict also becomes a conflict with Trump’s business dealings.

A separate article focuses more on conflict between Trump and his business dealings because of his negative rhetoric on immigrants. The article, “Macy’s rompe relación con Trump” focuses specifically on Macy’s announcing that they are ending Trump’s clothing line because they do not support his comments about Mexican immigrants (Agencia el Universal, 2015). A communication statement quoted in the article declares that the company cannot support Donald Trump because of his “discrimination” that conflicts with the company’s policies of diversity and inclusion (Agencia el Universal). Again, these statements highlight the conflict between Donald Trump and businesses that is a direct result of his commentary immigrants and his policies on immigration. The article also contextualizes the conflict as a larger conflict that is more than a conflict between Donald Trump and Macy’s, it is a conflict between Donald Trump and multiple businesses, including NBC, Univision, and Televisa (Agencia el Universal, 2015).

The articles referenced in this section are only a fraction of the articles that framed Donald Trump in some sort of conflict. Multiple articles covered each of these specific events that were tied to political, religious, personal and business-related conflicts. Overall, Donald Trump was in conflict with multiple individuals, as well as larger groups, populations, organizations, businesses, and even countries. All of the conflicts also related back specifically to conflicting views and beliefs related to Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. The conflict frame effectively creates an expectation that Donald Trump’s policy and commentary on immigration will remain controversial. In addition, the frame highlights the notion that Trump
doesn’t play well with others, especially those who openly question him or oppose his ideas and rhetoric.

**Frame two: Donald Trump is racist, hateful and xenophobic.** This frame was the second most common frame depicted in articles published in *El Universal*. Similarly, this frame was often a secondary focus of an article. For example, the primary theme in an article may have been a conflict between Donald Trump and someone or some group. However, often as a reason for conflict was the notion, or frame, that Donald Trump or his comments were racist, hateful, discriminatory or xenophobic. Interestingly, this frame was often very blatant in comparison to the conflict frame. For example, articles often quoted someone saying that Trump or his comments on immigration were racist, hateful, discriminatory or xenophobic. In comparison, conflict frames were the result of a story that highlighted opposing views often without directly calling the opposition a conflict.

One such article, ““Me gusta México” revira Trump tras dichos xenófobos” is a great example of framing Trump’s rhetoric as xenophobic secondary to a conflict frame. The article referenced opens by connecting Trump’s tweet “I love Mexico” to recent rejection Trump received from politicians, artists, and the Mexican people because of his “commentaries against Mexican migration” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). This opening sentence paints a conflict between Trump and the politicians, artists and Mexican people that came out against him. While the conflict is the primary focus of the article, the reasoning for the conflict is the secondary focus and also is blatantly stated in the headline of the article as well as in the content further into the article.
The title of the article alone, ““I love Mexico” twists Trump after xenophobic comments” calls out Trump’s messaging as xenophobic. The content of the article supports this claim as well. The penultimate paragraph of the article states, “Los comentarios xenófobos de Trump hacían referencia a que México sólo manda, drogas, violencia, violadores a los Estados Unidos desde la frontera sur, por lo que insinuó en la necesidad de construir “una gran-muro” fronterizo que fuera, incluso, pagado por la nación mexicana” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). This translates to “Trump’s xenophobic comments implied that Mexico only sends drugs, violence, and rapists to the United States from the southern border, by which he insinuated the need to build a great border wall, which furthermore, would be paid for by Mexico.” This sentence highlights specific quotes Trump has made in regards to immigration and labels those comments as xenophobic, thus supporting the secondary frame that Trump’s rhetoric on immigration is creating conflict because it is racist, hateful, and xenophobic.

In a similar article, “Trump lanza amenaza al Partido Republicano”, translated to “Trump launches threat to Republican Party”, the major focus is the conflict between Donald Trump and the traditional Republican Party (Hernández, 2015). The secondary focus is reason why Trump is controversial: his “incendiary rhetoric” (Hernández, 2015). The article talks about the Republican Party’s fear that they can’t control Trump’s “insults and attacks” on minority groups like Hispanics, women, Muslims, and African-Americans. But the party also fears speaking up against his “racism and xenophobia” because he could run as an independent and take Republican supporters away from the party (Hernández, 2015). And so, this article ties together two common frames, first that Trump is creating conflict, this time within the Republican party.

---

6 The word “revira” which is a conjugate of “revira” does not translate directly in English. Revirar means to twist or to respond quickly. In this context it is not clear whether the author means one meaning or both. Likewise, revirar could also be used as a form of “tweets.” Thus, the translation could also be written as “‘I love Mexico’ tweets Trump after xenophobic comments.” Either way, the headline still highlights that Trump’s comments are xenophobic.
and that his immigration rhetoric is racist and xenophobic which is a strong contributing factor of the conflict.

However, there were a few articles that focused predominantly on Trump’s hateful, racist, and xenophobic comments. One example of this is the article “Intelectuales condenan discurso de odio de Trump” which translates to “Intellectuals condemn Trump’s hate speech” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). The first sentence of this article states, “Intelectuales, científicos, escritores, cineastas y académicos de Estados Unidos, España y América Latina firmaron ayer martes un acuerdo de rechazo al discurso antiinmigrante del aspirante presidencial republicana Donald Trump que, advirtieron, ‘apela a las más bajas pasiones, como la xenofobia, el machismo, la intolerancia política y el dogmatismo religioso’” (Agencia el Universal, 2015). This sentence translates to “Last Tuesday, intellectuals, scientists, writers, directors, and academics from the United States, Spain, and Latin America signed a statement rejecting Republican presidential candidate Donald Trump’s anti-immigrant discourse, which they warned ‘is full of the most despicable passions, like xenophobia, sexism, political intolerance, and religious dogmatism.’”

This article specifically focuses on Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric and highlights how a very highly educated group of international scholars declared that Trump’s immigration rhetoric is anti-immigrant and xenophobic, both of which are negative words. The article goes on to detail who these scholars are, to increase their credibility. Then the article focuses specifically on Trump’s comments that Mexican immigrants are rapists and criminals, as well as his policy proposals to build a wall on the entire US-Mexican border and to deport millions of undocumented immigrants (Agencia el Universal, 2015). These examples of Trump’s immigration rhetoric are called out as negative and the final paragraph details why such policies
“sería catastrófica” -- would be catastrophic (Agencia el Universal, 2015). Thus, overall, this article paints Trump’s immigration rhetoric as hateful, xenophobic, and ultimately bad policy.

In conclusion, the Donald Trump is racist, hateful, and xenophobic frame takes on two main purposes. The first, most common purpose was to support the conflict frame as a reason for conflict on immigration rhetoric. The second purpose was to highlight specific comments Trump has made about immigration that are inherently racist, hateful, and xenophobic. In both cases these labels were used directly in the articles, sometime through quotes and other times as adjectives used by the journalist to describe Trump’s rhetoric. Not articles directly rebuked the frame that Trump’s rhetoric was racist, hateful, or xenophobic. Thus, readers were only exposed to negative labels of Trump’s immigration rhetoric.
Frame three: Donald Trump is not a politician. The third most common frame used in articles about Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric was that Trump is not a traditional politician. This frame usually emphasized this fact as a negative attribute, implying that Trump didn’t have knowledge of foreign relations or have experience or the qualifications to be the leader of a nation. Often this frame was enforced through the title given to Trump in articles. Typically, Trump was referred to as “el magnate”, “el multimillonario” or “el empresario”, “el ignorante”, “un hombre de negocios”, or “el neoyorquino”. These terms translate to “the magnate or tycoon”, “the multimillionaire”, “the entrepreneur”, “uninformed”, “the businessman”, and “the New Yorker”. All of these names emphasize some aspect of Trump’s background and qualifications, mostly focusing on his business background. Trump was referred using these terms more often than he was referred to as a candidate or nominee. These labels for Trump were used in many articles, even if the main theme of the article was not related to Trump’s qualifications, experience or background.

In an article published in October 2015, an interview between Trump and journalist John Harwood highlights the important question of Trump’s legitimacy as a candidate. After asking Trump a series of questions about his immigration policy, Harwood asked Trump the question whether his campaign was serious or not (Hernández, 2015). This question brought to the forefront of the interview the lingering question as to Trump’s credibility as a political leader in more detail. Trump’s response was that his campaign is not a joke; he insisted that he would make America great again (Hernández, 2015). This article only alluded to the question of Trump’s legitimacy, but other articles called out the question of Trump’s credibility as a political leader in more detail.
For example, there were several articles that focused more extensively on Trump’s lack of a political background and therefore his lack of political credibility. One such article was “Será mejor que tomen en serio a Trump” which translates to “You’d better take Trump seriously” (Krauze, 2016). This article poses a hardline argument that voting American’s need to take to heart what Trump is saying in regards to immigration policy. The article implies that American’s are not taking Trump’s claims and his rhetoric seriously because his campaign is viewed as a joke for entertainment. Several times the journalist writes “no es un reality show”, referencing Trump’s success in reality tv entertainment. This idea is also connected to the notion that if Trump were to be elected, the policies he is talking about would be “increíblemente peligrosas”, incredibly dangerous (Krauze, 2016). The article also includes information that supports the claim that Trump’s policies on immigration are dangerous, violate human rights, and wouldn’t actually improve security (Krauze, 2016). This argument is included because it supports the notion that Trump doesn’t know what he is talking about and that’s part of the reason why he is a dangerous candidate. Overall, the article highlights that Trump only knows reality TV, but not political reality that actually impacts people’s lives, thus Trump’s rhetoric is dangerous and voters should take the threat of his election seriously.

One article focused on Trump’s inexperience as a political leader by quoting other republican candidates. The article, “Migración calienta debate republicano”, “The Republican migration debate heats up”, quotes Jeb Bush accusing Trump of insulting immigrants because he doesn’t understand migration reform (Hernández, 2016). The article also quotes Ted Cruz’s statement that Trump is “un gran entretenedor”, “a great entertainer” (Hernández, 2016). The first quote emphasizes the perspective that due to Trump’s lack of political experience he doesn’t have political knowledge of migration issues or migration reform, therefore he shouldn’t be a
viable candidate. The second quote highlights that Trump’s experience is in show business, not politics. The quote and the context around the quote implies that Trump may sound great by his claims are full of lies because he doesn’t actually know what he’s talking about. In addition, the author of the article referred to Trump as “el magnate” twice, in comparison Jeb Bush was referred to as “ex gobernador por Florida” and Ted Cruz was referred to as “El senador por Texas.” These titles seemed to give experience, credibility and legitimacy to Bush and Cruz’s statements about Trump’s lack of political experience.

**Frame four: Donald Trump’s policies violate human rights.** This frame was unique to *El Universal’s* coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees. Additionally, this frame was one of the only frames that focused on refugees specifically. The frame largely identifies immigration issues as a human rights issue, but also has a special focus on international refugee and asylum seeker rights. Ultimately, there is an underlying warrant that it is a human right to be protected from exploitation, trafficking, violence, and forces that separate families, which are all tied to immigration and refugee issues. According to the framing of multiple articles, Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees does not recognize the rights of immigrants and refugees, which is a violation of international law and also political leadership morality.

In “Debemos eliminar discursos como los de Donald Trump”, “We should do away with speeches like Trump’s”, there is a clear stance taken against Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. Journalist Juan Omar Fierro interviewed the secretary general for the Organization of American States (OEA), Luis Almagro, about immigration rhetoric and the rights of immigrants. In the article, Almagro is quoted saying “No podemos permitir en las Américas en ningún caso que se violen los derechos de los migrantes, además debemos eliminar cualquier
This quote summarized the key point of the article well, that Donald Trump’s attacks of migrants goes against the work of international organizations, like the OEA, that are working towards improving human rights around the world. The article talks in more detail about the risks immigrants face and the harm Trump’s rhetoric does to the American public’s perception of immigration. Trump’s rhetoric is anti-immigrant and is uneducated according to Almagro (Fierro, 2015). Overall, the article focuses on why immigration is a human rights issue and clearly states that Donald Trump’s rhetoric not only contradicts this fact, but also hurts future efforts to protect the rights of immigrants.

Another article took a slightly different approach to covering immigration as a human rights issue. In “Agenda Washington” or “Washington Agenda” the article first focuses on the issue of deportation separating families and hurting undocumented children. Specifically, the article describes how President Barack Obama wrote the Dreamer Act to combat this issue and protect undocumented children in the United States (Hernández, 2016). The article highlights the notion that Obama’s act protects the human rights of migrant children who could be deported to a country they don’t even know or identify with because they immigrated young. Towards the end of the article, the journalist contrasts the proposed immigration policies of Donald Trump

---

7 This quote did not directly translate in English. Some words were modified to better encompass the thematic idea of the original quote in a manner that would have similar meaning in English.
and Ted Cruz that would cancel DACA and DAPA, therefore going against the rights of young immigrants (Hernández, 2016). The article paints this issue as a humanitarian issue and that DACA and DAPA were positive policies to address problems. The article then emphasizes that Donald Trump threatens the progress these policies have made, thus Trump’s rhetoric violates human rights.

An article published in September 2016 combines the conflict, xenophobia, and human rights frame to critique Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. The article titled “Rechaza Macera visita de Trump” translates to “Macera rejects Trump visit” focuses on a diplomatic conflict between Trump and the Chief of the government of Mexico City, Miguel Angel Mancera. Macera is quoted rejecting Trump’s visit to Mexico to meet with President Nieto because Mancera believes in representing his people’s views and protecting immigrants (Aldaz & Villavicencio, 2016). Mancera believes it is his duty to protect his people whom Trump has insulted with his anti-Mexican, anti-immigrant, and xenophobic speech (Aldax & Villavicencio, 2016). In regards to human rights, Mancera said, “En esta ciudad se busca proteger a los inmigrantes, darles derechos a los inmigrantes, y de ninguna manera tendríamos manifestaciones anti-semitistas o de cualquier índole discriminatorio (Andaz & Villavicencio). This quote translates to “In this city we seek to protect immigrants, give rights to immigrants and in no way would we allow expressions of anti-semitism or anything else of a discriminatory nature.” By protesting Trump’s visit to Mexico, Mancera is saying that Trump does not hold up these same values with his rhetoric or actions.

Interestingly, this frame contributes greatly to understanding the reason Mexican officials and Mexican people oppose Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric so strongly. Simply stated, Mexican media frames immigration issues and refugee issues as a human rights issue, meaning
that immigrants have certain rights that protect them from violence and prejudice. However, Donald Trump frames much of his rhetoric on immigration as a security issue, hence the need for a wall to protect against outsiders, or comments about Mexican immigrants as criminals that provoke fear. These two frames are largely incompatible in the way in which they are discussed by the media, and also by world leaders, which in turn leads to conflict. As a result of these opposing world and policy views, conflict frames are created. Thus, the conflict frame and the human rights frame are closely related.

**Positive frames.** It is important to note that while all four common frames found through reading and analysis framed Donald Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric negatively, there were several articles that framed Trump’s rhetoric positively. During the 18-month period of Trump’s campaign, *El Universal* published eight positive articles about Donald Trump and people who have endorsed his rhetoric on immigration and refugees. Two of these articles focused on the endorsement of Trump by Ximena Navarrete, an ex-Miss Universe queen, who claimed that Trump’s characterization of Mexican’s as rapists and criminals did not depict the “real Trump” (Agencia el Universal, 2015; Agencia el Universal, 2015). Other celebrities, including Clint Eastwood, Gene Simmons, Kirstie Alley, and Mike Tyson all endorsed Trump despite his controversial declarations on immigration (Agencia el Universal, 2016).

Another article quoted the sheriff of Maricopa, Arizona, Joe Arpaio, saying that he believed Trump would bring needed law and order to the American-Mexican border and Trump’s wall would prevent illegal immigration (Agencia el Universal, 2016). A similar article supports Trump’s proposal to build a wall on the American-Mexican border because immigration reform is needed to protect the United States (Lastiri, 2016). This article frames Trump’s rhetoric on immigration as a security issue that is America’s highest priority. Interestingly, this frame
conflicts with the human rights issue as a priority frame taken more frequently in articles published in *El Universal*. The article, “Trump mantiene plan de muro fronterizo”, “Trump maintains border wall plan” also frames Trump’s immigration rhetoric regarding the border wall as a necessary of the security of the United States (Agencia el Universal, 2016).

Finally, two articles framed Donald Trump’s visit to Mexico to meet with President Nieto in September 2016 as a diplomatic win. The articles both highlight the agreement that President Nieto and Trump found on needing better border security, a project that the two leaders could collaborate on if Trump is elected (Agencia el Universal, 2016). These articles also frame the meeting in a hopeful way, stating that this meeting signifies Trump’s ability to work well with others and soften his previously harsh immigration rhetoric (Agencia el Universal, 2016).

In conclusion, the eight articles that framed Trump’s immigration rhetoric positively used three major frames to do so. The first frame was an endorsement frame that supported Trump’s policies as well as his character. The second frame as a hope frame that spread a message that good would come from Trump’s proposals. The third frame was a necessary security frame, which was used to support Trump’s policies as necessary action to protect the United States and Mexico. Interestingly, these three frames each seemingly oppose and contradict one of the common negative frames found: endorsement and conflict, hope and hate, human rights and national security.
There were three common frames found in the articles analyzed from *El País*. Again, the most dominant frame was the conflict frame that pitted Donald Trump against another politician, celebrity, group of people or other world leader. The conflict frame was found in 71 of the 1 articles read for analysis. The second most common frame found focused on the idea that Trump is not alone in his nationalist and populist politics. The fifty articles that used this frame often compared Trump to other world leaders who use similar rhetoric to that expressed by Donald Trump. The third most common frame was that Trump’s rhetoric is racist. Thirty-two articles used this frame to discuss Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric. Other common frames included strategic frames, that often claimed Trump couldn’t win, and an outsider frame that painted Trump as not a politician in a way that challenged his credibility as a candidate. The three most common frames were all used to frame Donald Trump’s rhetoric negatively, however there were two articles out of one-hundred and seventy-seven that framed Trump’s rhetoric positively. These positive frames will also be discussed.

**Frame one: Donald Trump in conflict.** Similar to the conflict frame used by *El Universal*, the conflict frame created in many *El País* articles was often rooted in the coverage of a disagreement between Donald Trump and another politician, activist, celebrity or world leader that was spurred by Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration. Similarly, Trump was pitted against other people and other groups in this frame usually because of a political, spiritual, or personal disagreement on the topic of immigration.

One such article that relied heavily on the conflict frame was “Francisco dice que Trump no es cristiano” which translates to “Pope Francis says that Trump is not a Christian” (Monge, 2016). The article refers to Pope Francis’ comment that Trump is not a Christian because Trump would rather build walls than bridges, which is referencing Trump’s rhetoric to build a wall to
stop illegal immigration across the United States and Mexico border (Monge, 2016). This event was also covered in *El Universal*. The author of the article writes, “Trump reaccionó veloz y declaró la guerra al jefe de la Iglesia de Roma,” which frames Donald Trump’s response to Pope Francis’ comment as a declaration of war between the two leaders. The author of the article also describes Donald Trump’s words back at Pope Francis as “bravatas y ataques” which translates to “threats and attacks” (Monge, 2016). The language used in this article to describe the interaction between Donald Trump and the Pope frames a war-like or battle-like conflict between the two powerful men.

Other articles also cover Pope Francis’ response to Donald Trump’s immigration plan, again framing the event as a conflict between the two men. However, in the article “El Papa reta a la derecha de EEUU con un mensaje progresista en el Congreso”, the reason for conflict is different than that framed in the previously discussed article. The article focuses on Pope Francis’ message to United States leaders, mostly referring to Congress members, to have compassion for refugees and immigrants who need better opportunity (Ordaz & Bassets, 2015). The conflict frame arises when the authors of the article connect the Pope’s message back to Republican Party’s rhetoric that promotes the resentment of immigrants, and specifically highlighting Donald Trump’s rhetoric on the topic (Ordaz & Bassets, 2015). Instead of framing the conflict as a war between the two leaders, like in the previous article, this article frames the conflict as an ideological conflict. The ideological conflict is spurred by the contention between Pope Francis’ humanitarian perspective on immigration and the republican security perspective on immigration issues.

Other articles in *El País* use the conflict frame to discuss Donald Trump’s interactions with business partners that have been affected by Trump’s anti-immigration rhetoric. One article
in particular highlights the conflict between Donald Trump and Chef José Andrés, who was signed to be a chef at a restaurant in one of Trump’s properties. The article headline reads “Donald Trump reclama nueve millones al cocinero José Andrés” which translates to “Donald Trump sues chef José Andrés for $US 10 million” (Agencias, 2015). The article focuses on a business conflict between Trump and Andrés because of Trump’s anti-immigration comments that “personally offended” Andrés (Agencia, 2015). Andrés claims that Trump’s comments about Mexican immigrants being drug dealers, criminals, and rapists could offend customers as well and hurt his business and brand (Agencia, 2015). Trump claims that Andrés cannot cancel a contract because he was offended by Trump’s words and politics (Agencia, 2015). Not only does the focus of the article support the conflict frame, wording does as well. Words like “demand” “against”, and “argument” to signify the conflict interactions between Trump and Andrés. And so, yet again Trump’s rhetoric on immigration is framed with conflict.

The conflict frame highlighted a variety of ideological, political, business and personal conflict, however the conflict frame was also used to discuss Trump’s conflict with an entire community, supposedly. The article, “Donald Trump clashes with the Hispanic Community power” starts by discussing Donald Trump’s conflicts with other people, groups and businesses. Specifically, the article mentions Macy’s breaking their commercial partnership with Trump due to his anti-immigrant rhetoric (Pereda, 2015). The article then goes on to discuss that Mexican leaders are breaking ties with Trump’s Miss USA and Miss Universe pageants because of his anti-immigration and racist comments (Pereda, 2015). Finally, the article briefly highlights a petition circulated on Change.org that was signed by 200,000 people who wanted NBC to not broadcast the Miss Universe pageant like Univision (Pereda, 2015). Petitions, boycotts, and
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8 “Nueve” translates directly to nine; however, the headline is referring to 9 million euros, which would be around 10 million US dollars.
broken relationships are all symbols of conflict, and are also all featured in this article. Overall, the article’s main theme is that there are many Hispanic leaders and community members who vocally challenge Trump’s immigration rhetoric. And so, this conflict frames expands the conflict beyond one person and pits Trump against a larger population, as well as specific groups and businesses.

A similar article, “Silicon Valley doesn’t like Trump” also frames Trump as being in conflict with larger populations and communities. The first article about Silicon Valley starts with “Donald Trump doesn’t like the world of technology” and then expands on this idea to demonstrate that many technology leaders don’t like Donald Trump because of his anti-immigrant policies (Cano, 2016). More specifically the article talks about how Donald Trump has called out Apple for not doing enough with cyber security to prevent immigration and terrorism, related to the San Bernardino shooting in December 2015 (Cano, 2016). Interestingly, the author doesn’t name any other specific conflicts, but the title of the article still frames the situation as an “ALL against Trump” battle, yet Apple is the only company mentioned to be in direct conflict with Donald Trump’s words and actions. Still, the take-away of the article is that Donald Trump and Silicon Valley do not get along because of ideology and business-related conflicts.

Readers of these articles may potentially be impacted by these conflict frames and view Trump as a person that doesn’t get along with others. Additionally, the conflict frame, specifically related to immigration issues, supports a view that Trump’s immigration rhetoric is not supported by the masses. However, today Donald Trump holds the office of President of the United States, so there is evidence to support the notion that there are supporters of his immigration rhetoric. But supportive frames were not used in articles published in El País. The
conflict frame also creates controversy in showing the Donald Trump is arguing with other politicians, world leaders, business leaders and large populations on the topic of immigration. Similarly, this controversy perspective supports negative coverage of Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. Thus, it would not be surprising if readers of *El País* were more likely to view Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric as negative and controversial. Whether this is actually the case would depend on individual perspective.

**Frame two: Donald Trump is not alone.** This frame was used most commonly to compare Donald Trump’s immigration policy to that of populist and nationalist leaders in European countries, like Marine Le Pen of France, Viktor Orbán of Hungary, Jaroslaw Kaczynski of Poland, Nigel Farage of Great Britain, Milos Zemen of the Czech Republic, and Geert Wilders of the Netherlands. Many of the articles compare the immigration policies of these political figures, usually using a thematic frame that ties together an overarching political trend instead of focusing specifically on one event or comment Trump has made regarding immigration. This is different from the conflict frame, which was almost exclusively episodic framing based on one specific event, sometimes with a brief connection to another event.

One article that used the not alone frame was “Trump, Orban, Albiol…” which compared Donald Trump to Viktor Orban of Hungary and Alexis Tsipras of Greece, Marine Le Pen of France, Matteo Salvini of Italy, and Xavier García Arbiol of Spain (Mantilla, 2015). The article lumps these leaders together as radical politicians who promote fascist ideologies, like building walls and discrediting media (Mantilla, 2015). The article specifically discusses Viktor Orban’s comment that he would like to build a wall between Hungary and Serbia, like Trump’s wall between Mexico and the United States (Mantilla, 2015). The author suggests that these remarks
have “levantaba tan pancho” or “rose a ruckus”, implying that these political claims were controversial (Mantilla, 2015).

The author also specifically talks about Donald Trump kicking journalist Jorge Ramos out of a press conference for asking Trump questions about his immigration policy that Trump didn’t want to answer. However, the author uses a thematic frame for this and connects this specific incident to a larger issue, other international politicians who are spreading “la bacteria cutánea de los fascismos”, the plague of fascism (Mantilla, 2015). Overall, this article uses powerful language to lump all of these politicians together as fascists and “ogres” without providing details and evidence to back the claim that all of these leaders are alike in their “fascist” ideologies (Mantilla, 2015).

Another article that framed Trump as being part of a global political movement was “Todos somos Bruselas” which translates to “We are all Brussels” (Bassets, 2016). This article also uses a thematic frame to talk about Donald Trump’s immigration policies, connecting Trump’s ideology to that of a growing international movement. In particular, the article connects Trump’s anti-immigration rhetoric to recent terror attacks including the [then] recent terror attack in Brussels. The author writes that fear of terrorism has caused us to close our borders, destroyed free internal circulation in many European countries, hardened immigration policies and isolation and has caused a rise in xenophobia, Islamophobia and created a war against Islam (Bassets, 2016). While Trump has promoted anti-immigration policies out of fear and for protection, he is not alone. Other politicians with similar ideologies and motives include Viktor Orban and Jaroslaw Kaczynski (Bassets, 2016).
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9 “La bacteria cutánea” literally translates to “the skin bacteria.” However, this doesn’t have significant idiomatic meaning in English, this the translation is more equivalent to “the plague” because of the medical tone and negative, infectious connotation.
The article doesn’t focus on critiquing Trump’s specific immigration comments or policies. Instead the article broadly focuses on the reasons why Trump and other international leaders are spreading divisive anti-immigration policies. The main reason is the fear of “outsiders” who pose a threat because of the growth of terrorist groups. The author does acknowledge that the policies created out of fear are negatively affecting the world because they are xenophobic, Islamophobic and anti-immigrant. But the overarching message is that Trump is not the only politician affected by fear of terrorism: it’s really a global phenomenon.

The Trump is not alone frame by nature is a thematic frame that ties Trump to larger international political discourse and trends. However, many authors of such articles use the frame differently. The first article discussed as an example in this section demonstrated that the thematic “not alone” frame could be used to tie Trump’s immigration rhetoric to other international leaders using very specific rhetorical instances. The second example article demonstrated that the thematic “not alone” frame could be used to connect international trends, events, and issues together, while using specific leaders as evidence. In conclusion, the “not alone” frame could potentially broaden reader’s knowledge of Trump’s rhetoric related to international politics. The frame also has the ability to make Trump’s rhetoric more relevant to an international audience by connecting Trump to politicians in their own, or neighboring countries, which is an important concept of Domestication Theory (Alasuutari, Qadir & Creutz, 2013).
Frame three: Donald Trump is racist. Like the “Donald Trump is racist” frame that was shared in *El Universal*, the “racist” frame in *El País* seemed secondary to other frames. Most articles used a primary frame that was either the conflict frame or the not alone frame. However, within both of these frames was a focus on Trump’s words and policies being racist, xenophobic or Islamophobic. The racist frame is worth discussing as a secondary frame because it was frequently used as the means of framing Donald Trump’s rhetoric as negative. For example, the Trump is not alone frame is not inherently negative unless paired with the notion that the share ideologies of these leaders are populist, xenophobic, racist, etc. In fact, knowing that other politicians share Trump’s immigration ideologies may increase his political credibility with some readers. However, this frame often became negative when it was paired with the “Trump is racist” frame because then together the frames became “Trump has friends, who are also racist”. Additionally, the Trump is racist frame seems to amplify the negativity of conflict frame because Trump’s racism is a cause of contention. This amplification also emphasizes that the cause of conflict is Trump’s fault, not the other party.

The article, “Trump promote deportar a los sin papeles de EEUU” which translates to “Trump promises to deport the undocumented from US” is an example of this amplification effect. The article primarily focuses on conflict between Donald Trump and Latinos due to Donald Trump’s promise to deport 11 million undocumented people (Pereda, 2015). This focus follows the conflict frame, however, there is an additional layer that amplifies the conflict. The article says that Trump’s declarations are racist to immigrants, and are ignorant and threatening (Pereda, 2015). This framing of Trump’s rhetoric on immigration changes the conflict from being a political conflict between sides to an ethical conflict, in which Trump is in the wrong for his racist remarks. And so, the racist framing puts Trump at fault for the conflict and amplifies
the negative framing of Trump’s rhetoric. This amplification of negativity may make this article more agreeable to readers who already agree that Trump’s immigration rhetoric is offensive or unethical.

The Trump is racist frame also influences the spin of the Trump is not alone frame. The Trump is not alone frame creates a broad thematic outlook of international immigration rhetoric and ties together the immigration rhetoric of many world leaders. However, this frame is not inherently negative until a racist frame is added to discuss the specifics of the immigration rhetoric shared by this pack of world leaders. The article, “Miedo en democracia” which translates to “Fear in Democracy” is a good example of the combination of these two frames (Galindo, 2016). The article focuses on politicians like Trump, including Geert Wilders, Nigel Farage, and Marine Le Pen, who all promote similar immigration policies out of the fear of allowing terrorists into their own nation (Galindo, 2016). This frame is not inherently negative, unless you read the opening line to the article which states, “El martes se confirmaba la nominación de Trump como candidato republican, envuelto en discursos con tintes racistas” (Galindo, 2016). This sentence translates to “On Tuesday, Donald Trump’s nomination as the republican candidate was confirmed, surrounded by discourse with hints of racism.”

This opening sentence sets the stage for a negative interpretation of Donald Trump’s rhetoric. The rest of the story then goes on to talk about “radical” political anti-Muslim rhetoric that is being shared by world leaders to spread the of fear of terrorism associated with Islam (Galindo, 2016). And so, the stage is set at the beginning of the article that Trump’s rhetoric is racist, just like other radical right wing politicians. Now the rhetoric of Donald Trump and the other international politicians mentioned in the article is spun in a negative way for readers. Additionally, Trump’s rhetoric now becomes more relevant to Spanish readers because it is
linked to the rhetoric of leaders “close to home.” Thus, the negative frame potentially becomes more potent as it is now more relevant than just stating, “Trump is racist and a threat to democracy”. Now the message becomes “The democracy that you participate in is threatened by the racist politics of Le Pen, Wilders, Farage and Trump.” The second message if more relevant and immediate, which also potentially makes it more powerful.

**Positive frames.** The three most common frames found in articles published in *El País* all supported an overall negative framing of Trump’s immigration rhetoric. This is not surprising since most articles were determined to frame Trump’s rhetoric negatively. However, there were two articles that framed Donald Trump’s position on immigration in a positive way.

The first article titled, “Melania, una primera dama inmigrante” which translates to “Melania an immigrant first lady” highlights that Melania Trump is seemingly the antithesis of Donald Trump (Mars, 2016). The article discusses coverage of Trump often focusing on how he is anti-immigration, yet his own wife is an immigrant. Which has not been a common trait of first ladies throughout U.S. history. In fact, the first lady of the United States has not been born outside of the country since Louisa Adams (Mars, 2016). And so, the article implies the question, is Donald Trump really anti-immigration if he is married to an immigrant?

The second positive article was titled, “En Mexico saben que van a pagar ese muro” which translates to “In Mexico they know that they are going to pay for that wall” (El País, 2016). The brief article features Fredie, who identifies as a Latin American and Trump supporter. Fredie is quoted saying that he supports Donald Trump because his family came to the United States legally and he believe all immigrants should enter legally (El País, 2016). According to Fredie, Donald Trump is not anti-immigration, he is anti-illegal immigration and that’s not a bad thing (El País, 2016). This frame directly counters the conflict frame because it promotes and
endorsement for Trump. Likewise, the frame counter’s the racist/anti-immigration frame that many of the articles published in El País shared. The article spins the “anti-immigration” argument as oversimplified and incorrect. Instead Trump is “anti-illegal immigration” and so he isn’t a racist, he is upholding the law.

While these two positive frames countered negative frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration, they were not used often. The frequency of negative frames of Donald Trump’s rhetoric published in El País implies that the target audience of the paper is most likely a left-leaning or anti-Trump audience that already interprets Trump’s rhetoric on immigration as negative. We know from previous communication studies that news sources often tailor their articles to target audiences because media consumers are most likely to read sources that reinforce their beliefs and world-views (Imison & Schweinsberg, 2013). Additionally, according to Entman (1993), Scheufele (1999), Wolfsfeld (2011), and Iyengar (1996) dominant frames have more power to influence perception and beliefs. Based on this knowledge, reader’s of El País are more likely to encounter negative frames of Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric and therefore more likely to perceive Trump’s rhetoric as negative.
Pakistan Today. There were four prominent frames found in Pakistan Today. The most dominant frame was yet again the conflict frame that pitted Donald Trump against someone else, usually a politician or celebrity figure. This frame was noted in 53 of the 136 articles published by Pakistan Today. The second most common frame was Trump’s immigration rhetoric inflames hate and Islamophobia. This frame was noted in 39 of the 136 articles published by Pakistan Today. Three other less common frames were “Trump is not a politician”, “Trump is racist” and “Trump isn’t alone.”

Frame one: Donald Trump in conflict. Like the conflict frames used in El País and El Universal, the conflict frame in Pakistan Today discusses the issue of immigration as a point of contention between Donald Trump and another person. However, the use of this frame does vary from the use of the same frame in the other two sources analyzed. El País and El Universal covered a range of conflicts between Trump and world leaders, celebrities, business partners, and groups, however most leaders, celebrities, business partners and groups had some tie to Hispanic culture. In contrast, the conflicts covered in Pakistan Today most frequently featured world leaders, celebrities, and groups with ties to Islam or the Middle East. This is most likely because the articles were written to be relevant to a domestic audience within Pakistan, while the articles published in the other sources were written to be relevant to a Hispanic audience.

One example multiple articles covered a conflict between Donald Trump and the newly elected London mayor, Sadiq Khan, who is London’s first Muslim mayor. One such article was “London’s new mayor, already tilting the world’s political chessboard” which focuses on Khan’s critique of Donald Trump’s promise to ban Muslims from the United States if he were to become president (Agencies, 2016). Part of the article reads, “In forcing a public spat with the presumptive Republican presidential nominee, Khan demonstrated that having someone like him
in high office can subtly tilt the political chessboard (Agencies, 2016).” The wording of this sentence phrases the interaction between Khan and Trump as a spat, or a small argument. Further on in the article the author continues with the conflict metaphor by saying, “In taking on Trump, the former human-rights lawyer has made clear he ahs no intention of dodging such battles (Agencies, 2016).

And so, a conflict between Trump and Khan, based on Trump’s proposed Muslim ban, is framed as a spat and an international political battle. Likewise, the author frames Khan as an effective peacemaker and positive Muslim role model. In contrast, Trump’s Muslim ban is framed as an empty promise that is unclear, poorly thought out and will never stand. Thus, Trump is at fault for the conflict and his Muslim ban and immigration policy is framed negatively in this article.

A different article, “Muhammed Ali hits out at Trump over Muslim ban remarks” covers a conflict between Muhammed Ali and Trump, again due to Trump’s Muslim ban rhetoric (Agencies, 2015). The title alone – “hits out” – implies that there is a conflict between Ali and Trump. The author of the article supports this frame with language like “Muhammad Ali has rebuked Donald Trump” and “the boxing icon became just the latest high-profile name to strongly criticize the presidential hopeful (Agencies, 2015).” The wording of the article frames the interaction between Trump and Ali as a conflict based on an argument of fact. Ali claims that “there is nothing Islamic about killing innocent people” and so Trump’s Muslim ban is “using Islam to advance [his] own personal agenda (Agencies, 2015).” However, Trump’s argument is that the Muslim ban would protect the United States from radical Islamic terrorists. And so, Ali argues that the Islam is a peaceful religion and Trump argues that Islam is a violent religion that poses a threat to security.
At the end of the article, Ali is framed favorably as a peaceful Muslim by an added note that he was banned from boxing after refusing to service in the Vietnam War on religious grounds. The article also mentions a conflict between Trump and Barack Obama, to give context to the conflict between Trump and Ali. The added context reaffirms that message that Trump is in conflict with many people because he is arguing not only with Ali but also Obama.

Another example of an article that frames conflict between Trump and Muslims is “Muslim woman kicked out of Trump rally in South Carolina” (News Desk, 2016). The article covers a silent Muslim woman protester would was booed at and evicted from a Trump rally for standing in peaceful protest. The article talks about the protester, a woman named Hamid, as a “peaceful, silent protester” (News Desk, 2016). According to the report Hamid didn’t have a negative message against Trump, her only message was “Salam, I come in peace”, highlighting her peaceful protest even more (News Desk, 2016). The article does quote Hamid directly, blaming Trump for the conflict (News Desk, 2016).

The use of the conflict frame to specifically call out conflicts with Muslim people emphasizes the message that Trump doesn’t get along with Muslim people. Interestingly, the conflict frame is also an episodic frame used to cover one specific interaction or conflict between Trump and a Muslim person. Additionally, all of these articles blame Trump’s proposed Muslim ban as a cause for these conflicts. Thus, Trump is found at fault for the conflict and his immigration rhetoric is framed negatively. It is likely that readers of these conflict frames are more likely to perceive Donald Trump’s Muslim ban as negative because it is framed negatively in the majority of article and the ban is a major reason for conflict between Trump and Muslim people.
Frame two: Donald Trump’s rhetoric inflames hate and Islamophobia. This frame focuses on a rise in anti-Muslim rhetoric and hate crimes in relation to Donald Trump’s rhetoric. By nature this frame is an episodic frame that covers one specific instance of anti-Muslim rhetoric or a hate crime. All of the articles connect these events to Donald Trump’s anti-Muslim rhetoric with the warrant that Trump is spreading and inspiring hateful words and actions against Muslims.

The article, “UN officials sickened by public hatred against Muslims” provides a good example of this frame. The article covers statements made by two UN officials who both spoke on the “blatant manifestations of hatred and intolerance” against Muslims by public figures (Agencies, 2015). The statement references Trump’s Muslim ban as an example of unacceptable government actions (Agencias, 2015). The article also states that “Experts say that Trump’s call on Dec 7 to keep all Muslims from entering the US, a plan he said would only temporarily apply to non-citizens, had only fanned the flames” of anti-Muslim sentiment (Agencies, 2015). And so, the focus of this article discredits Trump’s proposal and also states that his policies spread fear and Islamophobia in the United States.

Another example of an article sharing this frame was “7-year-old Muslim boy beaten up in school bus because Trump’s Islamophobic comments: Father” (Web Desk, 2016). This article covers a Facebook post of a 7-year-old boy in South Carolina that went viral. The boy’s father, an immigrant for Pakistan, created the post that blamed Donald Trump’s “incendiary rhetoric” for the attack of his son because he is Muslim and an immigrant (Web Desk, 2016). The article quotes the father multiple times claiming that he and his family have been victim to a rise in hate crimes and discrimination since Trump started targeting Muslims. The focus of the article is very much a personal story of discrimination, however that claim that this discrimination is the result
of Trump’s rhetoric is technically unsubstantiated. Still, the article creates a strong emotional appeal that Trump’s Muslim ban is influencing a rise in anti-Muslim sentiment in the United States.

This frame is mostly likely a dominant frame in *Pakistan Today* because it emphasizes an aspect of Donald Trump’s Muslim immigration ban that is relevant to Pakistani people, who are mostly Muslim. In addition, this frame highlights a specific reason to be concerned about Donald Trump becoming the United States president. The specific reason is that Donald Trump greatly influences his base, and his rhetoric has not been kind to Muslims. And so, there is a growing fear that his supporters will be influenced by his rhetoric to discriminate and hurt Muslims. Overall, the dominant frames from *Pakistan Today* focus on Donald Trump’s Muslim immigration ban and frame this ban negatively. Likewise, the frames demonstrate domestication theory by covering events that are most relevant to the Pakistani people who are mostly Muslim and would potentially be targets of the Muslim ban.
Positive frames. Pakistan Today published the greatest number of articles that framed Donald Trump’s immigration negatively compared to coverage in El País and El Universal. Even though Pakistan Today published the most positive coverage, negative coverage still far surpassed the positive. The positive frames found are important to discuss. One article, “Trump, after Republican pledge, breaks from pack on Iran, gay marriage” framed Trump’s discourse on the refugee crisis as positive because early on in Trump’s campaign he acknowledged the refugee crisis when his opponents wouldn’t (Agencies, 2015). Likewise, Trump stated that the crisis was “horrible” and he would possible accept more Syrian refugees into the US if elected (Agencies, 2015). This article framed Trump as a caring leader who wanted to help refugees, which is a drastic shift from coverage of his Muslim ban.

Another article, “I am a Muslim and I love you, Egypt-born man tells Trump” takes on an endorsement frame and also challenges the notion that Trump inflames Islamophobia (Agencies, 2016). Elhamy Ibrahim is quoted saying that he thinks Trump’s Muslim ban will protect America from terrorists and that the proposal is not Islamophobic or hateful (Agencies, 2016). And so, this article challenges both the conflict and the Islamophobia frames that were established by many other articles.

Three other articles all frame Trump’s Muslim ban as a necessary security measure to protect America from terrorists as well. These articles include, “Suspend immigration from nations affected by terrorism: Trump”, “Trump pitches softer line on immigration: ‘fair and humane’”, and “Dozens of Afghan troops missing from military training in US” (Agencies, 2016). This articles all critique Obama’s immigration policy for not being strict enough with vetting and surveillance, and focus on how Trump would enforce stricter and safer vetting and surveillance of immigrants to protect America. This frame challenges the negative frame that
calls out Trump’s Muslim ban as inflaming hate, violence and Islamophobia. However, this frame is still a minority in all of *Pakistan Today*’s coverage.

Multiple articles cover Trump’s popularity in India. The overall frame of these articles is that Indians are hopeful that Trump will protect their country from violent terrorists and Afghan refugees that they don’t want in their country. The headlines of these articles are: “Indian Hindus pray for Trump’s win”, “Hindu Sena celebrates birthday of ‘saviour of humanity’ Trump”, “Bollywood stars to meet Donald Trump in September” and “India’s Hindu Sena celebrates Trump victory” (Agencies, 2016). These three articles all demonstrate an endorsement frame from important groups in India, this frame challenges the conflict frame and it also supports Trump’s claims that Islam and immigrants are threats to nationalism and security.

Overall, these two frames directly challenge the two dominant negative frames found in *Pakistan Today*’s coverage of Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. This finding supports Entman (1993), Scheufele (1999), Wolfsfeld (2011), and Iyengar (1996) conclusion that common frames are often a seemingly conflicting duality, but depending on the source and their target audience one frame will be more dominant. Again, based on Imison and Schweinsberg’s work that states news sources tailor their content to appeal to target audiences, it is likely that *Pakistan Today* is writing for a predominantly Muslim audience (2013). Additionally, this Muslim audience is mostly likely already predisposed to believe that Donald Trump’s immigration policy are negative and anti-Muslim and the articles in *Pakistan Today* reinforce these beliefs.
Conclusion

In conclusion, the quantitative content analysis and qualitative framing analysis conducted in this study came up with four major conclusions. The content analysis supported Agenda Setting Theory, and also showed that the coverage of Trump increased over time, as Trump became more dominant leader in the election. Additionally, Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees was mostly framed negatively by the three sources analyzed, which would support the claim that these sources are written to appeal to a left-leaning audience and that the frames were potentially written based on the concerns of each source’s audience. Finally, the framing analysis discovered that certain negative frames were more dominant in media coverage and the positive frames that were published challenged the dominant negative frames, thus creating a framing binary of two contrasting frames.

First, the content analysis of all three sources supported Agenda Setting Theory that certain topics will be covered more frequently by news media. This was supported by the content analysis of *El País*, *El Universal*, and *Pakistan Today* because all three sources covered the topic Trump’s rhetoric on immigration more frequently than his rhetoric on refugees. It is also important to note that refugee status is a specific form of immigration, however this fact was not acknowledged in the coverage of refugees or immigration. Not a single article in any of the three sources discussed refugee status explicitly as a form of immigration. The coverage of refugees was commonly differentiated from coverage of immigration issues. Finally, the data from the content analysis supports the claim that *El País*, *El Universal*, and *Pakistan Today* are prioritizing stories that cover and relate to Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration over his rhetoric on refugees. Further research would be needed to test whether this prioritization impacts the reader’s perceptions of the importance of these two topics.
Second, the content analysis of all three sources showed that the overall coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration increased throughout the 18-months of his campaign. Additionally, the coverage trends over time showed that coverage of Trump’s rhetoric peaked in certain months, usually when a specific event tied to Trump’s policies or rhetoric was heavily covered. This trend reflects the episodic framing tendency of the sources analyzed, because coverage was based on specific events tied to an issue or topic. The episodic frames used to cover Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric did not cover the topic of immigration or refugees as a complex issue, but instead focused on specific quotes, policies or incidents from Trump’s campaign that related to immigration or refugees.

Third, the framing analysis found that the vast majority of articles published by any of the three sources framed Trump’s rhetoric negatively. This finding does not mean that Trump’s speech or rhetoric is inherently negative or that the majority of the population perceives Trump’s immigration rhetoric negatively. Instead, this finding supports the claim that certain news sources tailor their framing of events, people, and issues to appeal to an audience that likely already believes that frame. In other words, the frequent use of negative frames to cover Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees most likely reinforces negative feelings towards Donald Trump’s rhetoric. In the future, it would be interesting to research other news sources in Spain, Mexico and Pakistan with a right-leaning reputation to see if the framing of Donald Trump’s rhetoric would differ and if so, in what ways.

Finally, the framing analysis of El País, El Universal, and Pakistan Today found that there were several dominant negative frames that were commonly used to discuss Trump’s rhetoric. All three sources commonly used a conflict frame to highlight a disagreement between Trump and other person or group related to his immigration policies. However, there was also a
common positive endorsement frame that highlighted support of Donald Trump’s immigration policies. These two frames create a seemingly binary of for or against Donald Trump’s immigration rhetoric. Likewise, another common negative frame in *El Universal* was that Trump’s policies violate human rights. In opposition to this frame was the frame that Trump’s policies would protect the United States from terror and threats. Again, these two frames reflect two opposing views of Trump’s rhetoric. These dueling frames reflect an “either/or” fallacy because the reality is that the issues of immigration and refugees are far more complex than a two sided coin.

These findings are not generalizable to all media coverage of Donald Trump because of several limitations. Similarly, these findings do not prove any theories or findings. One limitation on this study was that only three sources were analyzed, due to time and capacity restrictions. And based on the results of the study, all three sources were left leaning, thus the study did not cover a diverse sampling of sources. This skews the data to be in favor of anti-Trump (negative) frames, which were discussed as negative frames in this study. Also, the sources used for analysis were not randomly selected, which may have impacted the results. The sources chosen were based on which countries are connected to current immigration and refugee issues and which sources can be found on LexisNexus. Thus, it is already more likely that these countries would cover international immigration and refugee issues. Thus, the data gained from these sources is not reflective of coverage of the topics of immigration and refugee rhetoric in other nations.

Other limitations include potential data collection errors and the inherent subjectivity of framing analysis. One potential error is that the manner in which the articles were pulled from LexisNexus was not as sophisticated as it could have been. This is in part due to a lack of
understanding of LexisNexus’ features and also a response to time constraints. The consequence is that some articles covering Donald Trump and immigration and/or refugees may have been left out of analysis simply because the search terms left out variations of wording for “immigration”, “refugees”, and “Muslims”. However, the number of articles identified and read was still substantial. Another potential error is due to translation errors. Spanish doesn’t always translate word for word or with the same connotation as English, thus it is possible that the researcher could have interpreted phrases differently a native speaker. Finally, framing analysis is ultimately subjective, so framing themes; as well a positive and negative framing, may be interpreted differently by someone with a different background.

In conclusion, this study contributed to the body of research on Agenda Setting Theory and Framing Theory. This study found that El Universal, El País and Pakistan Today prioritized immigration rhetoric on their media agenda. Also, analysis found that framing of Donald Trump’s immigration and refugee rhetoric was mostly negative, but there were some positive frames that challenged the dominant negative frames in a way that reflected a binary framing system. Finally, this study found that coverage of Donald Trump’s rhetoric was mainly episodic and neglected the complexity of the issues of immigration and refugees.

While all of these findings are important, further research is still needed to address whether these factors of media coverage actually impact reader’s perceptions of Donald Trump and his immigration/refugee rhetoric. If possible, future surveying of readers of El País, El Universal, and Pakistan Today could determine whether dominant agendas and frames change or reinforce perceptions of Donald Trump’s rhetoric on immigration and refugees. However, further research like this is for another date and another time.
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