**Introduction**

“A new format for a type of news program never seen before: ‘The Flip Side Newscast’ is a news show where each news item is broadcast twice. After all, behind every worrisome headline that one out every ten Israelis does not trust the National Insurance Institute, for example, hides a dramatic headline that more than 90% of Israeli citizens consider the National Insurance Institute a reliable organization. If it is announced that ‘the Immigration Police intend to expel Israeli children’--the Flip Side Newscast will immediately also broadcast that ‘the Interior Ministry is acting to implement the law regarding foreign infiltrators, and return them with dignity to their countries of origin.’ This is a wonderful game that will allow viewers to see the situation from all sides, and also practice the fine art of being doubtful: not everything that is worded in a certain way by the group holding the microphone is the honest truth.” (*Israel Hayom*, Hashavua Weekly Supplement, 11 May 2012, page 17).

The media is a key source of information for human society. Knowledge transmitted to the audience framed by certain narratives greatly influences the shaping of the audience’s thoughts, perceptions, and behavior (Frenkel-Faran & Lehman-Wilzig, 2007). That is to say, the fact that narrative framing is used to create media reports means that these reports are stories deliberately told in a certain way which, by the same token, could have been told completely differently. Thus it turns out that different reports could present the same content in different forms that have completely different meanings.

In this study, I would like to investigate whether major news outlets in the Israeli media framed differently or identically two populations of asylum seekers that have one major difference--one sought to reach Israel, and the other Europe. My main question is: Did the Israeli audience that watched television reports or read newspaper articles see a picture that framed political statements, ideals, and connotations in the same way for each group of asylum seekers? Did the media coverage of each group focus on the same aspects? Did these aspects reflect to the audience a broad and comprehensive picture of the issue, or alternatively, did they see a narrow one-dimensional picture?

Examining the issue in the Israeli media will bring to light an important message for Israeli society. A comparison of the Israeli framing of people seeking asylum in other countries and as such being perceived as “someone else’s problem,” against those seeking asylum in Israel, and as such affecting the lives of its residents, can reveal our entrenched attitudes as a society toward asylum seekers. These attitudes face us as a mirror reflecting society’s outlook, values, and tolerance toward strangers.

Since we are fed information by the media, it is appropriate that we take a look at the content it provides. The content broadcast to us by the media greatly influences our thoughts and perceptions. From this content we draw our information and at the same time, nurture our lack of knowledge. Recognition and understanding of both sides of the media coin will foster the possibility that the audience might view or read reports critically, and instill a desire to see a multi-dimensional picture of reality, even when it is not presented in its entirety by the media.

Literature Review

“The news industry is more an act of structuring reality than of presenting the reality” (Avraham, 2001, p. 15).

Media framing is like a frame that delineates a story. By focusing on a specific segment of reality and limiting exposure to other parts, framing sets the limits of the perception of reality (Tuchman, 1978). Gamson and Modigliani define media framing as organizing an idea or story in a way that creates meaning for the sequence of events. The framing generates the substance of the controversy and the substance of the issue. (Gamson & Modigliani, 1987). In other words, the media framing structures the perception of the event it covers.

Myers and Rosen (2013, p. 102) argue that “newsworthiness is a characteristic of the event, while framing is a characteristic of the event coverage.” This highlights media framing as a narrative act, intentional and not incidental, in which the journalist has the ability to act, choose, and take responsibility (Schlesky and Appel, 2010). Media professionals influence the way issues are perceived by the audience (Entman, 2007), affecting the formulation of opinions, social discussions, policy-making, and more. Therefore, many scholars claim that the study of media representations is critical because knowledge of many topics is inevitably mediated by the media (Bleiker, Campbell, Hutchison & Nicholson, 2013). Nevertheless, there is a tendency to relate to the content of news broadcasts as verifiable truth. It should be kept in mind that the news is cultural structuring, a narrative telling a story about new and important events (Bird, 1996).

Content and coverage patterns are affected by various strict constraints on media activity (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015): technical constraints, like news cycles and logistical restrictions; ethical constraints related to definitions, ideals, and conduct; and business constraints like budgets and influencers with great financial resources. In other words, circumstances also play a part in media framing. However, it must be kept in mind that ultimately, the choices in creating media text are determined by the media professionals themselves (Oring, 1990). Therefore, the coverage itself “is not free of emotional content and values” (Klein, 2010) and does not depend solely on circumstances.

The Fair & Parks study (Fair & Parks, 2001), which dealt with American media coverage of the movement of refugees from Rwanda in 1996, demonstrates this point. The researchers analyzed television broadcasts and satellite photos used by major news companies in the US: ABC, NBC, CBS, and CNN. According to the researchers, media coverage focused on the displacement of the refugees, and not on the genocide itself, because covering the refugees was easier for the media professionals; both physically and because it did not require knowledge of the internal conflicts and politics. According to the authors, this coverage further separated and distanced the West from Africa. The American media coverage did not present the refugees as individuals, but rather as a human category on which the reporters constructed their stories. The refugees were portrayed as invisible in terms of political actors parameters: since they were stateless, they were classified as a “problem” and a threat to the national and global order. The researchers write that “refugees are made visible in Western media only as crowded masses of ‘dirty’, ‘unhealthy’, ‘fatigued’, ‘diseased’ bodies; and therefore are understood as the vulgar antithesis of white Eurocentric norms.” (Fair & Parks, 2001, p. 49).

Cohen (2007) discusses two phenomena of journalistic writing that can influence the content of the coverage and its message. One is the political context – that is, the writer’s moral position and his or her expression of a political stance in the public arena. The second is the style of writing: use of literary writing in texts describing suffering might frame the discussion “as a fictional genre with a separating and distancing character” (Cohen, 2007, p. 3). Cohen (2007) analyzed articles dealing with visits by Israeli journalists to Palestinian refugee camps. She states that the writers had provided space for diverse voices, but framed them in a way that weakened the impressions of the accounts. An example of such framing is the journalist’s decision to articulate her story with ever-increasing emotion, and emphasis of the political framework. Another example is the journalist’s intervention in the account, which make it clear that it is the journalist who controls the discourse. Thus, Cohen argues, the writers built the text in a way that “appealed to the audience at the expense of the people they were reporting on,” and the accounts becomes an accompaniment in the journalist’s journey (Cohen, 2007, p. 20). In addition, the journalists’ choice of a literary writing style was a problem in the creation of the minimal conditions for the readers to be able to engage with the reality presented, which brought them in contact with the distant suffering of foreign personalities.

**Representations of Refugees and Asylum Seekers in the International Media**

Scholarly literature on framing refugees and asylum seekers in the media provides a clear and unflattering picture of the media coverage in various countries around the world. Philo, Briant, & Donald (2013) point out that the depiction of refugees and asylum seekers in the media is negative and serves as a source of moral panic, conflict, and crises, instilling a sense that society is under threat.

Framing is usually accomplished through the use of phrases, connotations, and metaphors that are familiar to the audience and convey meanings and associations with the subject (Entman, 2003). Philo and others (Philo, Briant & Donald) demonstrate the use of language as a key element in the framing process. The researchers show, for example, that starting from 2002, the British media made widespread use of the phrase “illegal immigrants” to describe asylum seekers. This terminology implies that asylum seekers are not honest and their motives are economic. The use of this term for asylum seekers puts them in the same category as immigrants and criminal elements. In this way, regardless of their legal status and before it is even known, associations evoked by the label “illegal immigrants” are attributed to them, which greatly influences society’s perception of them.

Another study that attests to the power of language in framing refugees found that the British media often used negative labels to describe asylum seekers (Buchanan, Grillo, Threadgold, & Mosdell, 2003). Examples of such terms are ‘surge’, ‘flood’, ‘parasites’, ‘scroungers’, and ‘fraudulent asylum seekers’. Military metaphors were used, which foster a sense of invasion or attack. It was also found that media coverage relied primarily on official sources such as the government and police. Very little space was left for the voices of the asylum seekers themselves, and when they were included, they were mediated through NGOs (Buchanan et al., 2003).

O’Doherty & Lecouteur (2007) studied the role of social categorization in the representation of asylum seekers who arrived in Australia by analyzing texts from the Australian media. They also examined the flexibility of the content, and the boundaries of the categorization and the effects of its use. They found that the frequent switching between categories used to describe the population of asylum seekers moved associations from one category to another. Thus, the use of ever-changing categories to describe asylum seekers blurred the definitions of each category. The public’s ability to understand and perceive broadly the covered population was also blurred. Blurring the definitions of the categories made it easier to legitimize actions such as returning asylum seekers to their countries of origin and implementing mandatory detention policies.

In many scholars’ opinion, the media is a mediator of narratives and not a neutral means of conveying information. It assists in promoting ideologies, values, and reflecting powerful relationships (Avraham, 2001). An example of this is presented in the study by Zagar (2011), which investigated the framing of refugees in the Slovenian media. The researcher compared the framing of Bosnian refugees who arrived in Slovenia in 1992-1993 with the framing of refugees from other countries (the former USSR, Asia, the Middle East, and Africa) who arrived in Slovenia in 1999-2001. It was found that the refugees who arrived in 1992-1993 were framed as a “problem” in every aspect of life, both in terms of their quantity and as a threat to public order. When the “new” refugees began arriving in 1999, the description of the “old” refugees in the media was completely reversed. Suddenly the media coverage described them as “our people” and as an inherent part of society. The “new” refugees, on the other hand, were described as “illegal immigrants” which is consistent with the findings of the textual analysis that indicates the Slovenians’ unwillingness to recognize or have any kind of contact with foreigners.

Another study attesting to narrativity in media framing dealt with refugees and asylum seekers who arrived in the UK in 2000 (Speers, 2001). The textual analysis indicated that the media coverage in Welsh TV, radio, and the press framed the arrival of the asylum seekers as an “official” matter. Most of the media coverage focused on the way the government officials “managed” the issue, and the police’s preparedness. The researcher found that there was widespread use of terms of “costs” and “quantities,” which neutralized the coverage of humane aspects, and facilitated “creating the separation between ‘us’ (British citizens), and ‘them’ (asylum seekers who ‘waste’ the government’s precious resources)” (Speers, 2001, p. 41). The coverage presented asylum seekers and refugees as a threat and a burden. It was also found that there was minimal reference to the lives the asylum seekers had lived in their countries of origin, or their current situation. The refugees and asylum seekers were not a source of information--they were given a very limited opportunity to make their voice heard regarding their views, personal story, or the contribution they could make to British society.

The study of Bleiker, Campbell, Hutchison & Nicholson (2013) is an example of a study of the framing of asylum seekers in the media using the methodology of visual analysis. It was found that visual patterns displayed in the Australian press framed the refugee and asylum seeker “problem” in Australia as a potential threat requiring the intervention of border police and security mechanisms. The analysis indicated that media outlets delegitimized the asylum seekers in their political depiction of them. Not only did the prevalent forms in which they were presented (such as in pictures of medium-to-large groups of asylum seekers which are viewed as anonymous rather than pictures of individuals) generate a response in the audience that was the direct opposite of showing empathy and identifying with them, they also laid the groundwork for a narrative political debate on the issue, and framed the refugees and asylum seekers as a threat to the state.

**The Present Study**

At this stage, it can be said simply that all media coverage frames its covered population in one way or another. The method of coverage and presentation of the topic, word choice, writing style, colors and placement of pictures, all of these structuring a certain perception--is all framing with its various ramifications. The Israeli media has also covered the movement of populations of immigrants, refugees, and asylum seekers. Some of these populations reached the borders of the Israel, and some the borders of other countries. The question that underlies this study is: Was there a difference between the way the Israeli media framed the people who came to the state of Israel and the way it framed those who reached different destinations? In order to answer this question, I will focus on two populations composed of people who for the most part claimed to be refugees and asylum seekers, people who had escaped from a situation they perceived as difficult and terrible, and that from their point of view, they had nowhere to return to. I will therefore refer to these populations as “asylum seekers,” as they themselves wanted to be perceived.

Note that this study does not purport to determine whether these people were indeed entitled to such a legal status, nor to legitimize any thinking that suggests any opinion regarding their status. There is no statement in this work that advocates a particular political line of thinking or proposal of a policy to handle these populations. The objective of this work is to examine whether the Israeli media, and particularly the news outlets, presented to the viewing audience two populations with similar characteristics, similarly or differently. What framing did each of these populations receive, and what effect did the framing have on public perception?

For this purpose, I will compare the way the Israeli media framed a population of asylum seekers moving to Israel with a population of asylum seekers moving toward countries in Europe. Specifically, I will compare the media coverage from 2009-2016 of the Sudanese and Eritreans who arrived in Israel to the media coverage from 2011-2016 of the Africans and Middle Easterners who reached Europe. The objective is to examine the different and similar ways in which the two populations were framed by the media, and to understand the implications this had for the perception of these populations in Israeli society.

**Methodology**

Foucault (1972) argued that nothing has meaning outside of discourse, and that it structures reality for us. As is evident from the research literature, framing structures our perception of the covered topic. Therefore, it is possible to say that framing is the creation of media discourse. In this work, I wish to try and understand the discourse created in the major Israeli news outlets regarding framing of the population of asylum seekers. Toward this end, I will perform a textual analysis comparing the content dealing with asylum seekers who arrived in Israel with the content dealing with asylum seekers who reached Europe. The objective of the comparative analysis is to examine the framing carried out by the Israeli media and note the differences in their coverage and framing of the two different populations.

For the purposes of the study, texts were gathered from two different mainstream Israeli news outlets: the newspaper *Israel Hayom*, and the main edition of Channel 2 News. Material was collected from the digital archives on the internet sites of each of the media outlets. I began the initial search for texts with the Hebrew word for “Sudanese” in the Channel 2 News digital archives, in order to locate texts dealing with the population of asylum seekers who arrived in Israel that was composed partly of people from Sudan. The search uncovered many relevant articles, but upon perusal, it was found that even when searching under such a specific term, there were many different words used to refer to this population (I will expand on this point in the Findings section). Common headlines and phrases such as “the infiltrator problem”, “the infiltrator law”, and “deportation of infiltrators”, like explicit statements by public figures such as the prime minister at that time, show that the most commonly used epithet to describe these people was “infiltrators.” Further to this, I carried out several searches in the digital archives of both media outlets examined in this study, using the Hebrew words for “infiltrators”, “asylum seekers”, “refugees”, and “immigrants.” I also searched for texts dealing with the population of asylum seekers in Europe, using the same search terms. In this case, the prominence of headlines and phrases such as: “refugee crisis”, “stream of refugees to Europe”, “immigrant tsunami” and others reflected that the most common words used to refer to this population were “refugees” and “immigrants.” This extensive search, which included four search words that turned out to be most representative of the coverage of the populations, was conducted once for each population. The search found many articles on a variety of topics. Irrelevant articles were filtered out, leaving those that covered the two populations.

The purpose of the analysis in this study is to reflect the framing found in major news reports on each of the news outlets mentioned above. That is, the focus of this study is the main news flow offered by each media channel. In order to focus on the mainstream of the newspaper and television coverage, I chose to concentrate on the main editions and sections of each news outlet. Therefore, analyses such as opinion columns and letters to the editor from *Israel Hayom* were not included. In the case of Channel 2 News, only news items broadcast in the Main Edition, Friday Studio (Ulpan Shishi--the channel’s main Friday edition during the sampling period), and the weekend news were collected.

The search in *Israel Hayom*’s digital archive produced 280 articles published from 2010-2015; 168 of them dealt with the population of asylum seekers that arrived in Israel; 112 additional articles dealt with the population that reached Europe.

The search in the Channel 2 News digital archive produced 113 articles from 2006-2016; 64 of them covered the population of asylum seekers that reached Israel, and 49 additional articles those who reached Europe.

Note that it is certainly possible that there were additional articles regarding the two populations published during that time frame that did not come up in the searches. This could happen because the digital archives may not be fully updated, or because different terms from those used as search words were used to refer to the populations. There was extensive use of various epithets to cover the asylum seekers, especially for those who arrived in Israel, but the search included those found to be most common in describing both populations. Therefore, it can be assumed that the study is based on most of the articles dealing with the subject, and I believe that they broadly represent the coverage of the two news outlets.

At the next stage, four central themes were extracted from the texts that express different aspects of the discourse created in the news outlets.

The first theme deals with framing the asylum seekers who reached Europe as stable, well-defined figures, as opposed to the framing of asylum seekers who arrived in Israel as lacking identity or definition. This theme focuses on the use of language and the power of epithets pinned to a population by the media. The second theme examines the structuring of the attitude toward foreigners by examining the nature and diversity of the political and public voices reported in the coverage of both populations. The third theme deals with the policy represented in each of the coverages to deal with the different asylum seeker populations. Finally, the fourth theme examines the presence or lack thereof of an explanation for the displacement of the two populations and coverage of the situation of the countries of origin.

Conducting a comparative analysis of this type in central texts from the Israeli news media will enable understanding of the components that created the discourse on the topic. As a result, the effect of such coverage on public perception of the population of asylum seekers that arrived in Israel in comparison with those that reached Europe will be disclosed.

**Findings**

I. **Refugees as stable figures in comparison with infiltrators lacking identity or definition.**

“Words can lead to deeds” said a Channel 2 writer (Channel 2 News, 1 June 2012, Minute 4:52). Words also have the power to shape our thoughts and perceptions (Whorf, Carroll, Levinson & Lee, 2012). The names and epithets conferred by the media are descriptions that structure meaningת and are the basis for actions. It can be learned from this that names and epithets have a very strong influence on the nature of thoughts, conclusions and perceptions to be formulated by the audience, in relation to the object of the names. The media coverage of the movement of the asylum seekers to Israel in comparison with the movement of the asylum seekers to Europe, has two important differences with regard to the power of epithets used for reference by the media:

1. The most commonly used names in the media coverage from 2011-2016 to describe asylum seekers that reached Europe were “refugees” or “immigrants.” In contrast, in media coverage from 2009-2016 of asylum seekers who reached Israel, the main term used to describe this population was “infiltrators.” There is no doubt that the two designations are significantly different from each other, and in order to demonstrate their power, I will refer from now on to the two groups by the names given them by the media.

The literal meanings of the terms “refugees” and “infiltrators” are completely different. An infiltrator is “someone who secretly penetrates a certain place without permission,” (Milog, the free internet dictionary). Therefore, the mere attachment of the epithet ties the population of infiltrators with negative connotations that affect the audience’s perception of the situation. A very prominent element in the coverage of the infiltrators emphasizes just how undesirable their presence in Israel was, and that it was seen as an act of invasion. When the headline of the article in *Israel Hayom* is, “Interior Minister..: ‘The goal is the State of Israel without infiltrators’“ (*Israel Hayom*, 6 June 2012, p. 12), and on Channel 2 News the following words are heard: “Resident of South Tel Aviv: ‘Are you Jewish?’ Infiltrator from Sudan: ‘I’m not Jewish.’ The resident: ‘So go back where you came from, what did you come here for?!’“ (Channel 2 News, 22 December 2010, Minute 1:07). This well-demonstrates the perception of the infiltrator as an invader, who fraudulently enters a place where he was not invited and is not welcome. The term “infiltrator” has been linked in the media coverage to features such as fraud and trespassing, intrusion into private space and disregard for laws and boundaries. The infiltrators are framed as undesirable in Israeli society, which plants the idea in the mind of the public to want to deport them from it: “Anyone who does not have a visa and is an infiltrator, the government should remove them” (Channel 2 News, 21 December 2010, Minute 00:45).

A refugee, on the other hand, is “an individual who has escaped or been evicted from his home and now is left destitute.” (Milog, the free internet dictionary), and thus he is also framed in the media coverage, with emphasis of his suffering along the way. Many examples in the media coverage demonstrate this point, for example, “...there is a legal and moral obligation to assist refugees. Europe should not shut its gates on these desperate people” (Channel 2 News, 18 September 2015, Minute 00:44). The refugee portrayed in the media should be accepted and adopted straight into society, and helped to become rehabilitated. This is demonstrated in the media coverage in statements like that of the German Chancellor, “We cannot ignore the distress of the stream of refugees... This is translated into removing barriers and opening borders to thousands of refugees” (Channel 2 News, 5 September 2015, Minute 00:07). In addition, there is recognition of the injustice caused to the refugees and even during a protest against them. “Angela Merkel: ‘...We must solve the refugee crisis. This means... ending the civil war in Syria” (Channel 2 News, 23 September 2015, Minute 00:01). In addition, the term “immigrant” refers to “a person living in a country other than his homeland” (Milog, the free internet dictionary), with no indication of the reasons for such. Thus, these epithets enable a perception with no hint of hidden or criminal motives.

It should be noted that the terms ‘infiltrators” and “refugees” were used in the past by the media. Therefore, they are charged with social connotations and associations. These associations and connotations are now borne through re-use of the terms for the “new” infiltrator and refugee populations.

In the past, the word “infiltrators” was used to describe enemies of the state looking to cause harm, “Palestinians were detained for agricultural theft and sabotage of the fence... Palestinians...infiltrate to the fence unhampered” (*Israel Hayom*, 3 May 2013, p. 13). Another example can be found in the article entitled “Infiltrating to Nablus--Palpable Danger” (*Israel Hayom*, 31 May 2011, p. 7). The article discusses a group of Jewish worshippers who infiltrated the city of Nablus in contravention of the military prohibition, and conducted riots there. The infiltrating worshippers were portrayed as radicals seeking to challenge the law and the accepted situation, and were therefore a risk to society. Such examples demonstrate how the term “infiltrators” was charged in the past with negative associations. Now just the use of this designation alone associates the African infiltrators with elements like serious crime and danger to the public, threat to social order, and legitimacy to deport them from the country.

The designation “refugee” has also been used in the past, for example in the report: “Research reveals how ministry employees (the Nazi foreign ministry; author’s note) participated in persecution of Jews, from refugee tracking to real contributions in massacring Jews” (*Israel Hayom*, 26 October 2019, p. 23). Another example can be found in an article dealing with the giant Mount Carmel forest fire in 2010. In the article, a resident of Kibbutz Beit Oren explains, “Sixty years ago, I came on a boat to the kibbutz, a refugee... with nothing. I came and built the kibbutz, and now I’m a refugee again... with nothing” (*Israel Hayom*, 3 December 2010, pp. 2, 3). A third example of using the term refugees in the past, is found in an article covering the situation of the people in Haiti, about a year after the earthquake there, “About 55,000 refugees are cramped into one of the most difficult areas of the city... Many cases of violence and rape... There’s not much hope” (*Israel Hayom* Shishabbat weekend edition, 3 December 2010, p. 25). These examples demonstrate how the term “refugees” has the inherent meaning of someone who has experienced difficult life circumstances against his will. A refugee in the media can be anyone; a Jew in the holocaust, an elderly Israeli pioneer whose luck went bad, or a victim of a natural disaster on the other side of the world. The coverage frames boundary-crossing dimensions of mercy and empathy towards refugees, as well as a desire for their situation to improve.

2. Another difference in the media coverage is manifest in the large number of ever-changing epithets used to describe the infiltrators to Israel, while only two designations were used to describe the refugees to Europe.

The term infiltrator is the one most used in the media coverage from 2009-2016 to describe the Africans who arrived in Israel. But there are many other terms used in the various news items: “There is no reason not to send back the few migrant workers” (*Israel Hayom*, Hashavua weekly supplement 30 March 2012, p. 11). “Even before the sun comes up, the modern slaves are already there--refugees who escaped to Israel...” (Channel 2 News, 17 April 2009, Minute 00:16). “After Molotov cocktails were thrown at the houses of the foreigners in the neighborhood...” (Channel 2 News, 30 April 2012, Minute 00:28). “These blacks that people are so afraid of are now the majority of the residents in the Shapira neighborhood” (Channel 2 News, 4 May 2012, Minute 13:24).

The very use of such a large number of ever-changing designations to describe that population creates a sense of lack of uniformity and confusion regarding all the characteristics of the group. There is no clarity regarding the motives of the population, its social composition, ambitions, or hopes. A perception is created that the only thing connecting the infiltrators is their illegal penetration into Israel, which is also against the wishes and interests of Israeli society, and even puts it at risk.

On the other hand, to describe the population of refugees, only two terms were used, “refugees”, and “immigrants.” The lack of variation between a large number of epithets creates a clearer and firmer perception regarding the identity and definition of the refugees. The coverage depicts the refugees as a population with clear motives, “to find a better and safer place to live on a new continent... and to start a new life.” (Channel 2 News, 24 August 2015, Minute 4:59 and Minute 10:00).

These uses of language by the Israeli media create completely different framing of the two populations in question and thus a different public perception. Such is the power of an epithet.

II. **Attitude towards foreigners: Unvarying voices that instill a perception of threatening foreignness vs. a discourse of opinions on acceptance or sending back, and reflecting a pluralistic perception**

As part of creating the picture reflected in the media coverage, a stage is provided to the statements of public figures and politicians whose opinions are considered authoritative knowledge for the public, that is to say, knowledge that is legitimized and seen as official (Jordan, 1987). As a result, it is possible to say that the statements of politicians and public figures have considerable impact on public perception of many issues. But the media stage is not an open stage where anyone who wants to be heard can get up and speak, rather it is a narrative stage which is a significant part of the media framing process.

The vast majority of public figures and politicians who were heard in the media coverage of the infiltrators to Israel presented an attitude characterized by refusal to accept them into society or see the difficult circumstances of their life as a legitimate factor related to their staying in the country. The political and public attitude reflected by the coverage implanted the sense of threat from the infiltrators, and as a result, a clear desire to deport them from the country, without enabling them to find employment during their stay in the country. Missing from the discourse were the voices of people with different views, like for example, giving refugee status to those people, or finding social and occupational solutions for integrating infiltrators into society, if only temporarily. In this way, the public received a one-sided picture of authoritative knowledge composed of views and opinions that advocate a /very particular approach to the infiltrators.

There are many examples that demonstrate this; for example, the words of the then prime minister, who made it clear that the infiltrators are a serious problem that affected every aspect of life, “The phenomenon of infiltration is a national plague that affects the economy, society, infrastructures, welfare, and domestic security... And if we do not take action to stop this illegal flood, we will simply be washed away...” (Israel Today, 12 December 2011, p. 2) In addition, the police chief at that time framed the infiltrators as criminals, “The infiltrators... have very very unique crime characteristics of violence, property and drugs, but mainly involvement in serious crime: murder, rape...” (Channel 2 News, 25 December 2010, Minute 00:33). To this a battalion commander of the Eilat Regional Brigade added a parallel that leaves no room for doubt regarding the threat posed by the infiltrators, “We handle infiltrators exactly like terrorists” (*Israel Hayom*, 23 December 2011, p. 13). The Interior Minister at that time clearly explained that the presence of infiltrators could well lead to the destruction of the state, “If they stay here, we’ll need to shelve the declaration of independence... we need to send them a firm message with a fence, army, enforcement of employment laws, and deportation. If we do not take those steps, it will be the end of the Zionist dream... It is either us or them” (*Israel Hayom*, 11 June, 2012, p. 5). And finally, a Knesset member at the time drew a parallel between the infiltrators and a dangerous parasitic illness, “The Sudanese are a cancer in our body. We’ll do everything to send them back to where they came from” (Channel 2 News, 24 May 2012, Minute 02:11).

This handful of examples illustrates the specific unanimous political opinion seen in the coverage of the infiltrators. This stance reflected a clear narrative depicting the presence of infiltrators as a threat to the state and its residents. Statements by politicians and public figures created a strong connection between the infiltrators and dangerous negative elements such as serious crime, an existential threat to the state, parasitic behavior and illnesses. Presenting the government’s attitude toward the infiltrators in this way shapes the public’s perception of this population of foreigners.

Reporting of the words of public servants and politicians who represented a different approach from the main narrative was meager. Out of all the articles examined for this work, there was one subject that led to reactions from politicians and a public figure against the main narrative. But the issue did not touch on the entirety of the infiltrators issue, rather on a specific issue, “The government’s decision to return 400 children of foreign workers and their families to their countries of origin... (In) a letter sent by the prime minister’s wife... to the Interior Minister... she asked to prevent this from happening” (Channel 2 News, 14 August 2010, Minute 00:00). In addition, “the Education Minister... and the Defense Minister... turned to the prime minister... and asked him to promptly organize a renewed discussion in the government on regulating the status of children of foreign workers” (*Israel Hayom*, 4 October 2010, p. 4).

Different voices from the central narrative of the coverage of the infiltrators were presented mainly via the words of the representatives of organizations or non-profits engaged in providing assistance or protecting human rights. For example, a public activity coordinator at a hotline providing assistance for foreign workers said the following about the status of the infiltrators, “These people are refugees, the fact that they come and say they want to work doesn’t make them less than refugees (Channel 2 News, 26 November 2011, Minute 12:38).” In another article are the words of the director of Mesila (center for assistance and information for the foreign community), calling to formulate a different policy regarding infiltrators who were already in Israel, “Action must be taken... Ignoring them will hurt us. The greatest miracle would be a government policy to handle the people who are already here. Besides a fence, besides stopping the flow. And there should be Mesila throughout the country and not just in Tel Aviv” (Channel 2 News, 28 April 2013, Minutes 7:52, 10:25). While these examples show very different things from the central narrative of the coverage, their presence in the coverage was very limited.

In contrast, the media coverage of the refugees that reached Europe included many varied political voices. There were voices of people on the left and the right, creating a diverse political and public discourse. This discourse included statements against integrating refugees into society, and even fear of it, like for example the British Foreign Secretary… did not hesitate to declare that “the African immigrants are endangering our way of life” (*Israel Hayom*, Hashavua weekly supplement 14 August 2015, p. 4). Lack of recognition of the legitimacy of the refugees to be in Europe was also expressed, “They are here illegally. They have no documents or permission to be here (Channel 2 News, 4 September 2016, Minute 6:19),” said a senior official of the National Front party in France. In addition, there were voices calling to block and even deport the refugees to their countries of origin, “After the conditions of entry to the country were toughened, the Interior Minister (of Sweden; author’s comment) announced this week that tens of thousands of immigrants that had entered Sweden that year would be deported from it (Channel 2 News, 6 February 2016, Minute 7:30).

Nevertheless, heard also were opinions of politicians that reflected an approach of social absorption and acceptance of those refugees. For example, the Prime Minister of Sweden said that, “All those who are forced to leave behind everything they love, the most important thing is that they be received properly in the place they arrive” (Channel 2 News, 6 February 2016, Minute 2:08). Also, “Angela Merkel... announced that she would accept unlimited asylum seekers” (Channel 2 News, 5 September 2015, Minute 00:54). The coverage also included statements by the Justice Minister of Germany in the context of attacks that took place on New Year’s Eve in Cologne, “To deal with this issue with extreme simplicity and tie it to the refugee problem is to lead the debate to unworthy places” (Channel 2 News, 5 January 2016, Minute 1:34), Such a statement not only softens the high level of pre-existing tensions around the events, it also seeks to put things in the right context and not to make unnecessary generalizations that could lead to escalation and extremism towards the already weak refugee population.

In addition to the variety in the coverage of the politicians, there was also very broad media coverage of social involvement of citizens and volunteers in organizations and non-profits on behalf of the refugees; a volunteer in Munich told how there were many donations and that “the people of Munich were wonderful... and that we also have enough volunteers” (Channel 2 News, 7 September 2015, Minute 2:59). Another volunteer said, “We want to continue to help, until the politicians say ‘We will act on this issue... Until we see that they (the refugees; author’s comment) are again receiving proper humane conditions” (Channel 2 News, 1 September 2015, Minute 1:42). An Austrian volunteer exhorted, “People come here from so far away. If they left such a nightmare behind, we need to stand here and say, ‘Welcome!... Welcome to Austria!” (Channel 2 News, 6 September 2015, Minute 4:16). The broad media exposure of those volunteers weaves an image of compassion and acceptance for the refugees, as well as a sense of pride in the citizens working on behalf of those who lost everything.

Such a media discourse fully reflects the complexity of the situation. Such coverage frames for its audience the refugees as people, who have many complex sides to them and their situation which must be taken into account when formulating an opinion of them. The coverage frames the perception of the refugees in a pluralistic way that gives legitimacy to a variety of opinions on the subject.

III. **Policy for Dealing with the Situation**

An additional aspect of the media coverage of infiltrators to Israel and the refugees to Europe concerns the policy of dealing with them. Ultimately, large groups of people arrived in new countries, which were faced with the question: How do we cope with the new situation? This question too, or rather, the answer to it, was presented by the news outlets in various forms for each population. And here too, the different nature of the coverage provided an additional layer to the difference in framing the populations.

The answer regarding the nature of the policy reflected by the media coverage of the infiltrators to Israel indicated a clear and unequivocal position: a fence should be built to prevent the entry of infiltrators to Israel, to jail and isolate whoever manages to enter and deport the infiltrators already living in the country. These things were described by the prime minister at that time, who allocated extensive resources “to fund a program for the handling of work infiltrators... The program was built of several parallel stages, including completing the border fence, expanding the Ketziot detention facility and... formulating a plan to deport them from the country,” (Channel 2 News, 7 December 2011, Minute 00:00).

Coverage of the plan for handling the infiltrators to Israel included widespread use of the word “deportation.” The restraining, detaining, and deportation were framed as the necessary and best solutions, and presented as the only solutions for dealing with the issue. These solutions were demonstrated as necessary through statements such as that of then chief of staff that “the fence on the border with Egypt will provide security and prevent penetration by infiltrators,” (*Israel Hayom*, 1 June 2011, p. 7). Another article included the element of detention in the policy, “The government approved: infiltrators will be detained for a year” (*Israel Hayom*, 18 November 2013, p. 13). Another example presents a call that is shown many times in the coverage, “Deport those who do not belong here,” (Channel 2 News, 21 December 2010, Minute 00:22). This call is very common in the coverage of the infiltrators to Israel, and it frames the deportation policy as justified and desirable in the public perception.

The coverage also included a few voices speaking out against the central narrative of the nature of dealing with things, such as for example, “The youth and community coordinator in Assaf (an organization to assist refugees and asylum seekers in Israel; author’s comment), is convinced that the results (of the deportation; author’s comment) will be deadly. ‘The move is a mistake--they are being sent to their deaths!’“ (*Israel Hayom*, 15 December 2010, p. 13). The then Tel Aviv precinct commander did not act in opposition to the entire narrative, but presented a different approach for the staged solution, “...we believe that their employment (of the infiltrators; author’s note) for a fixed time, until some solution is found, will ease the situation” (*Israel Hayom*, 22 May 2012, p. 9). In another proposal, Israeli dairy farmers suggested to the then prime minister, “Train the infiltrators in the cowsheds, animal pens, and various agricultural sectors. Then at the end of the allotted period, the immigrant will be returned to his home country with a profession...” (*Israel Hayom*, 21 May 2012, p. 7). But there was little presence of such voices in the coverage.

On the other hand, the coverage of the answer of European countries on how to deal with it was diverse, and presented various positions and approaches for coping with the issue. The answer to the question of coping was composed of the diverse positions of the leaders of the countries as presented in the previous theme. As a result, the solutions proposed were also diverse: from “the Hungarian foreign minister who announced... that in light of the unending stream of immigrants into the country, his government had decided to build a fence along the border..” (*Israel Hayom*, Hashavua Weekly supplement 14 August 2015, p. 5); to Chancellor Angela Merkel’s deputy and coalition partner who declared... that Germany could absorb half a million asylum seekers a year for several years” (*Israel Hayom*, 9 September 2015, p. 35). The policy was not unambiguous, and its coverage too showed framing of coping with the refugees in a variety of ways. In this way, another dimension of complex and varied perception was added to the framing of the refugees in Europe.

It could have been possible to claim that this parameter was not to be used for comparison between the two sets of coverage, as one dealt with coverage of one country with one government, while the second dealt with the conduct of an entire continent with many leaders, and what they say should be heard. But my argument is that it is the same thing; every government has many opinions, just as the composition of the EU is heterogeneous and diverse. The media could have sounded additional voices in major news outlets, identified with different and varied political and social positions. Such diverse coverage could have exposed the audience to various coping options, and thus also enable a broad perception of the issue. But coverage of the infiltrators contained voices reflecting a certain narrative, and thus framing the coping issue as having a single solution. This was while coverage of the refugees to Europe included diverse voices and reflected different policy options.

IV. **Coverage of the Reasons for Displacement**

Displacement does not come out of nowhere, rather there is always a factor that motivates it which must be understood in order to understand the essence of the movement. This is also true for movement of people over geographical locations. A comprehensive understanding of the movement of the infiltrators to Israel and the refugees to Europe depends on the question of whether the coverage included the background to the displacement. The background to the displacement is in fact the story of the countries of origin, the domestic struggles and conflicts, and the socioeconomic-political situation there. Exposure to these elements provides the audience additional important information that is relevant for understanding the motives behind the behind the infiltrators’ and refugees’ setting out on their dangerous journey to distant countries. Such knowledge can contribute to and greatly affect the public’s perception of the foreigners. Learning about the circumstances of their lives enables public awareness and understanding. Such content evokes a personal aspect that generates empathy in the coverage and also in the public perception. Also at this point, the modes of media coverage differed from one another.

Presenting the reasons for the movement of the infiltrators to Israel was not a significant portion of the media coverage. There was mention in the various news items of possibilities to recognize motives such as, “Some (of the infiltrators; authors note) were escaping from wars and persecution. Others from poverty and famine” (Channel 2 News, 17 April 2009, Minute 4:16). But if severe life circumstances were mentioned in regard to the infiltrators, for the most part it was in reference to the dangerous journey they had taken upon themselves to reach Israel. For example, an article revealed their imprisonment in torture camps by “Bedouin gangs that kill African refugees in Sinai to trade their organs...” (Channel 2 News, 7 November 2011, Minute 00:07). But of course this provides no explanation of what brought them to set out on the journey in the first place.

The sparse coverage of the reasons for the movement of the infiltrators to Israel in the first place included several articles that reported on South Sudan’s gaining independence as “an historic day in Sudan” (*Israel Hayom* 10 January 2011, p. 23). There were also a few articles covering the state of the country after it gained independence, as being in a situation “of poverty surrounding you almost everywhere... Terrible problems with running water... food... infrastructures... Here and there there are also conflicts with North Sudan... even among tribes. But on the whole it’s safe here” (Channel 2 News, 17 June 2012, Minute 00:36). A few other articles included an explanation of what led to South Sudan’s split from the north, “Once there was one Sudan. An Arab Muslim country under Sharia law... But in the south there are African tribes with an affinity for Christianity. And so since the 1950’s there have been murderous clashes here. A bloodbath of about two million dead, millions of refugees. Until three years ago... South Sudan gained independence” (Channel 2 News, 25 April 2014, Minute 1:44).

Such coverage is problematic for two reasons. One is that South Sudan was granted independence in 2011, but the displacement of the Sudanese began long before that (there are articles from 2009), meaning the coverage long ignored the movement of the South Sudanese. The second is that the infiltrator population is not made up only of South Sudanese but also North Sudanese and Eritreans. Eritrea’s situation was mentioned in one news item: “There is no (in Eritrea; author’s note) war there but there is a collapsing economy and dictatorship, and decades-long conscription” (Channel 2 News, 26 November 2011, Minute 7:00). The items investigated for this study did not provide informative coverage of Eritrea, and did not clearly reflect the situation in the rest of Sudan.

In contrast, media coverage of the displacement of refugees to Europe was opened with extensive coverage of the war in Syria. “The situation in Syria is deteriorating, thousands of refugees are flocking to Turkey for fear of being slaughtered. The military is advancing... and at the same time there are increasing reports of soldiers deserting...” (Channel 2 News, 9 June 2011, Minute 0:02). The comprehensive coverage included all stages, sides, and influences of the war in Syria (Channel 2 News, 8 December 2015). Thus a full picture was received, providing a solid explanation of the displacement of the Syrian refugees, “The massacre in Syria... continues and with it grows the wave of refugees escaping from the country” (Channel 2 News, 11 June 2011, Minute 0:00).

The Syrians did account for a significant percentage of the refugee population, but not its entirety. The background for the displacement of people who came from elsewhere was not covered in the same way as that of the Syrians, but in many news items that described the difficult journey of the refugees to Europe we saw people who had arrived from other countries, and thus we learned about the situation of those countries. For example, “Most (of the refugees) come from Syria and Iraq. Years of bloody war have caused many millions of citizens to flee” (Channel 2 News, 24 August 2015, Minute 4:51). Another example from the same item was in the voice of a girl refugee from Afghanistan, “Our lives are not safe in Afghanistan. Especially the girls. Every day people are killed” (Channel 2 News, 24 August 2015, Minute 7:09).

**Discussion**

Underlying this study was the question of whether there was a difference in the way the Israeli media framed the population of asylum seekers who reached Israel in comparison with the way it framed the population of asylum seekers who arrived somewhere other than Israel. To examine this issue, a comparison was made between the way the population of asylum seekers moving to Israel was framed, referred to by the media as “the infiltrators”, in comparison with the framing of the population of “the refugees” (as they were referred to by the media) who were moving towards European countries. A comparative textual analysis of the media coverage for each population was conducted, coverage of the “infiltrators” to Israel from 2009-2016, in comparison with the coverage of “the refugees” who reached Europe from 2011-2016. The two news outlets examined for this study were the newspaper *Israel Hayom*, and the main edition of Channel 2 News. The objective was to examine and compare the ways the different populations were framed, in order to expose and understand the implications of the framing on public perception of these populations in Israel.

As we have seen, in the research literature it is accepted that the media framing reflected in the coverage by the news outlets has a crucial influence in forming the public’s perception. This is expressed even more emphatically when it comes to foreign populations for which the public has no prior knowledge or understanding. In this case, the vast majority of the knowledge on these populations was obtained from the media coverage and therefore it was the main factor shaping the public’s perception.

Many elements influence the product obtained in the media framing. In this study, the following four elements were discussed.

I. Use of language and attaching epithets with different connotations and associative baggage from past uses.

II. Presentation of a diverse discourse of political views or presentation of a one-dimensional view that frames narrative political reference.

III. Presentation of various types of handling the populations or adherence to a single and specific coping pattern.

IV. Coverage of the background behind the movement of the populations and presentation of the situation of the countries of origin, or completely ignoring this important information.

Examining these elements brings about two very different pictures, as framed by the Israeli media:

One is the picture of “the infiltrators”. African asylum seekers, mainly from Sudan and Eritrea, who were called in the Israeli media by many different names, which caused their identity and definition of their status to be perceived as fluid and unclear. In addition, past use in the media of the term “infiltrators” has implied negative connotations of malice, sabotage, crime, and undermining of the laws of the state and the social reality. These connotations were also associated with the African asylum seekers, to which was attached the epithet “infiltrators”. The essence of the “infiltrating” asylum seekers in the coverage was shrouded in darkness and positioned in the shadow of the only thing that is framed as clear about them--the very infiltration, invasion of the country.

The vast majority of statements by politicians and public figures that were included in the coverage of the asylum seekers who arrived in Israel reflected a specific non-varying political stance. The predominance of this stance in the coverage contributed to framing the asylum seekers who reached Israel as a threat to the state as the state of the Jewish people, and as a national problem, reminiscent of statements in the context of wars and enemies. The coverage of the news outlets examined for this study did not sound diverse political voices and approaches, rather most of the voices sounded were in favor of unequivocal restraint of the asylum seekers, with their urgent incarceration and deportation from the country. Very little room was left for the voices of organizations or non-profits working on behalf of asylum seekers calling to provide assistance or even recognize them as refugees.

The media coverage included a very sparse presentation of the reasons for the displacement of asylum seekers who reached Israel. It can be said that the public was not provided with knowledge of the circumstances of the asylum seekers before they decided to set out on the grueling and dangerous journey to the state of Israel. The situation of the countries of origin was not revealed, nor were their internal wars and struggles. Information regarding South Sudan was indeed provided in several news items, but only after it was granted independence and could reinforce the perception that the asylum seekers should be deported to where they came from, because at that point they had a home to go to. But as mentioned, the population of asylum seekers that arrived in Israel was not composed solely of South Sudanese, and so the coverage is still missing the background for their movement.

The second picture is that of “the refugees” or “the immigrants”, African and Middle Eastern asylum seekers whose journeys to Europe were extensively covered by the Israeli media, which called them by two main epithets, “refugees” and “immigrants.” The lack of variation between a large number of such terms creates a clearer and firmer perception regarding the identity and definition of these asylum seekers. These terms enabled a pure perception with no allusion to hidden or criminal motives. The extensive use of the term “refugees” evoked connotations of pity, empathy, identification and recognition of the difficult circumstances of this population.

The media coverage of the asylum seekers who reached Europe presented a diverse discourse of opinions that included statements by politicians and public figures across the political spectrum. In addition, a substantial portion of the coverage was devoted to the activity of non-profits and volunteers working on behalf of the asylum seekers, which greatly enriched the opinion discourse and conveyed feelings of compassion and acceptance for asylum seekers, as well as a sense of pride in the citizens working on behalf of those who had lost everything. Such coverage structured for the public the possibility of pluralistic and comprehensive thinking, reflecting and weighing all the complex sides of the asylum seekers’ issue. Various ways of dealing with their arrival were presented, from calls to prevent their arrival and deport them from Europe, to cries to accept them into society and enable them to build new lives in Europe. Presentation of a variety of political opinions and accordingly a variety of ways to deal with the situation framed the asylum seekers as a complex population, which in order to deal with it required taking into account many factors. The presence of a discourse of opinions reflects a picture with many sides, a picture that the public can decide in its regard on the basis of diversity and not one-dimensionality.

Israeli media coverage of the population of asylum seekers who arrived in Europe included extensive coverage of the war in Syria which played a significant role in the movement of many of the asylum seekers. The situation of other countries was not covered in the same way, but was mentioned in interviews with asylum seekers from many countries, as part of the research items that covered extensively their difficult journeys to Europe.

There is no doubt that these two pictures are very different from each other and lead to different perceptions for each population. The coverage of the population of asylum seekers that reached Israel did not leave the public room to develop diverse opinions, rather it directed the public to a specific perception. This perception was built from elements of fear, aversion, distaste, and defensiveness in the face of the threat posed by the asylum seekers themselves. The coverage of the asylum seekers that reached Europe on the other hand provided the possibility to formulate a pluralistic position. This position could be identical to the one that stems from the coverage of the infiltrators, but the big difference is that it could also be completely different and arise from elements such as acceptance, understanding, and desire to provide assistance. The intention is not that the coverage of the asylum seekers that reached Europe presents them in a positive light and the coverage of the asylum seekers that reached Israel presents them in a negative light; rather the important difference that emerges from this work is that the coverage of “the refugees”, in contrast to the coverage of “the infiltrators,” presents framing that reflects a multiplicity of legitimate opinions regarding the issue. Such framing plants in the audience a complex multi-dimensional perception, and an element of freedom of imagination to formulate their own opinion regarding the population.

The only similarity that could be found between the two coverages was the sparsity of information regarding the situation of the asylum seekers’ countries of origin, unless there was an Israel interest in providing such information. This was the case in the coverage of South Sudan, a kind of presentation of the legitimacy of the deportation policy. The same was the case with the very extensive coverage of the war in Syria, which must have been of great interest, due to the border with Israel. The coverage among other things did not include the situation of Eritrea or Iraq in the context of the refugees to Israel or Europe, and also not many other countries. As a result, the refugees and infiltrators remain anonymous figures with no roots or historical identity, causing them to be seen as rejected in Israeli society, a place where national belonging is very important.

I would like to emphasize the point that neither of the asylum seeker populations discussed in this study was framed by the media as a population of asylum seekers. Long before the legal status of the asylum seekers was ascertained, the media coverage created many images of them, affixed various names to them, and as such framed them in a way that determined public perception of them one way or the other; refugees/immigrants or infiltrators. When the media framed a certain population as “infiltrators” or “refugees”, it in essence put a legal status on it, including connotations and associations that have a decisive influence on society’s perception. The effects of the media framing process often precede legal discussions and policies decisions as well as the formulation of the public’s attitude toward the population. This is in fact the biggest influence of the framing process, structuring reality.

As mentioned, in this study, two major Israeli news outlets were investigated, but of course there were many other outlets. I would like to propose further studies in the field of framing refugees and asylum seekers by the Israeli media, to extend this investigation to the rest of the Israeli news outlets. Thus in my opinion, additional aspects of the difference and similarity between ways of framing foreign populations arriving in Israel in comparison with populations arriving at other destinations will be exposed.

In addition, I would like to propose, that an additional investigation in the field will also further explore the differences between the different coverages of the many news outlets. Thus for example in this study was highlighted a difference between the two news outlets, in the exposure of the voices of politicians and public figures in the coverage of asylum seekers that reached Europe: in articles in the newspaper *Israel Hayom*, more space was given to voices of the right and the extreme right, over those of the left in comparison with the articles of the main edition of Channel 2 News. But still the coverage in the newspaper was not one-dimensional politically as was indeed found in the coverage of asylum seekers who reached Israel. Nevertheless, it is still a difference that can have implications for public perception, as if for example it is found that this news outlet is more common since it is a free newspaper. It is reasonable to assume that a wider distribution would cause the content of the paper to be viewed more, and thus its influence on public perception would be greater. Another difference between the news outlets touched on the broader exposure given in the main edition of Channel 2 News to the presence of human rights organizations, the volunteers and donations in a way that highlights their importance, in comparison with *Israel Hayom*. Such a difference could have implications for public perception, among the populations more exposed to television content such as children and people with disabilities for whom it is more convenient to watch television than read a newspaper.

The variability between the coverage of each news outlet indicates that it is indeed possible to structure the reality in different ways using textual means. Further to the differences that I have outlined, I suggest that follow-up studies can check whether the various “realities” reflected in both coverages had an effect on the shaping of the public perception and government policy.

In conclusion, as an audience fed on the knowledge the media provides us, it is very important to notice which content is presented in the media coverage and which voices are heard. But it is equally important to pay attention to the voices that are not heard and to the content that is excluded from the discourse (Ardèvol-Abreu, 2015). Yes, we will probably continue to draw most of our knowledge on the world and what is foreign to us from media reports. News editions and newspaper articles continue to be a key provider of information and shaper of our perceptions regarding many subjects, along with the development of the internet media and social networks. Investigation of media framing and developing an awareness of it are like holding a mirror against the way society blindly perceives what the media presents to it. We must critically examine media and news content so as not to blindly take it as the “honest truth”, as the facts, and remember that media coverage is not an objective means presenting what is happening in reality, but a means that structures reality.