Alexandru CÂRLAN*
Mălina CIOCEA*

Media deliberation on intra-EU migration. A qualitative approach to framing based on rhetorical analysis¹

Abstract

In this paper we investigate how the model of deliberation proposed by Isabela and Norman Fairclough can be used for a better clarification and understanding of the framing processes in media – especially in opinion articles. We thus aim at integrating theoretical contributions from critical discourse analysis and argumentation theory with standard approaches to framing, originating in media studies. We emphasize how a rhetorical approach to framing can provide analytical insights into framing processes and complement the typical quantitative approaches with qualitative analysis based on textual reconstruction. Starting from an issue-specific approach to framing, we discuss a particular case of framing of intra-EU migration, analyzing four opinion articles selected from a larger corpus of Romanian, British and French media. We highlight, along our analysis, various methodological options and analytical difficulties inherent to such an approach.

Keywords: framing, intra-EU migration, rhetorical approach to framing, deliberation

Background

Migration of Romanian and Bulgarian professionals/unskilled workers/“gens de voyage” has long been a staple item on media in both the sending and receiving countries. For the purpose of this article, we have selected ‘the incident’ of president Traian Băsescu’s declaration regarding the migration of doctors on August, 4, 2010: “Let us not make a drama out of the fact that we are going abroad. Romania’s grand objective was the liberalization of work force market. Our right to leave where we are better off. Where our work is correctly paid. At this moment, the Romanian state cannot pay its doctors, teachers, their worth, it cannot, that is reality.” In Romanian media, editorialists and bloggers tended to use the problem of professional migration as a sub-theme in a broader debate about the challenges and missed opportunities in Romanian society development. The media debates in France were intensified by other events in the same month: the decision to expel Roma migrants from Romania and Bulgaria and pay them to return home; in Great Britain, articles focused on the impact of migration on the welfare system. Throughout our study, we have looked at over 400 articles in several dailies in Romanian, French and British media (129 articles in Romanian press: *Evenimentul Zilei*, *Adevărul*, *Jurnalul Național*, *Gândul*, *România Liberă*; 207 articles in French press: *Le Figaro*, *Le Monde*, *Libération*; 70 articles in British press: *The Independent*, *Daily Mail*, *The Telegraph*, *The Express*, *The Sun*). The corpus has been deliberately select-

* College of Communication and Public Relations, National University of Political Studies and Public Administration, Romania, alex.carlan@comunicare.ro, malina.ciocea@comunicare.ro

ed to include various journalistic practices and genres and thus to allow an insight into the complexity of the problem articulation in the public arena (Hilgartner & Bosk, 1988).

For this article, we have selected four texts which pose various methodology problems: Lucian Avramescu, *Trăim într-o țară second hand?* *Jurnalul Național*, 10 august 2010; Andrei Crăciun, *Generația care pleacă*, *Adevărul*, 24 august 2010; Immigration is more than an economic issue, *Telegraph View*, *The Telegraph*, 26 august 2010; Jean-Marc Leclerc, *Roms: un fichier pour éviter la fraude de l'aide au retour*, *Le Figaro*, 17.08.2010.

Deliberation as media practice vs. deliberation as argumentative genre

The deliberative function of the media has been the object of significant research tradition, much of it stemming from the discussions initiated by Habermas' work on the public sphere (Habermas, 1991). The public exchange of arguments through various media genres (news, commentaries, televised debates, talk-shows) has been treated as a form of deliberation (see for instance Dahlgren, 2009; Beciu, 2011; Coleman 2012). Such analyses employ a broad and descriptive concept of deliberation, whose scope covers the journalists' stance through various media genres, ideological positioning, manners of representing participants in debate, inclusion and exclusion and the potential for the emergence of new points of view and new social actors in the public debate. One of the main foci of such analyses and a starting point for critical inquiry is the epistemic outcome of deliberation – what type of public knowledge do such deliberations produce? What kind of citizenship do they foster? Can an informed consensus over public issues emerge from media debates? A second, stricter concept of deliberation comes from contemporary argumentation theories, but has its roots in Aristotle's typology of rhetorical genres and in his ethical theory. Conceived either as a specific type of dialogue (Walton, 2010), or as an "argumentative *genre* in which practical argumentation is the dominant mode of argumentation" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p.13), deliberation is an argumentative exchange that advances as standpoint a normative proposition: a call for action – something that needs to be done – or, in Aristotle's description of the deliberative genre, an expedient choice (Kennedy, 1991). For instance, in relation with migrants, policies dealing with controlling migration can be object of political but also media deliberation: should migration be restricted? Should the social security system be adjusted to accommodate migrants? In the framework proposed by Isabela Fairclough and Norman Fairclough (the analysis of deliberation as debate which employs practical arguments), deliberation is analyzed as an argumentative genre instantiated by activity types such as parliamentary debates, which are farther articulated through specific speech events. In our case, individual media texts (belonging to various media genres: editorials, opinion articles, pieces of news) are the speech events that draw upon activity types (media debates), which can further implement the argumentative genre of deliberation: "[f]or a debate to instantiate the genre of deliberation (...) a minimum requirement is that it should focus on a normative proposition that can (but does not have to) ground a collective decision for action and (...) that it should weigh reasons in favour of an action against reasons that may count against it, such as the consequences of doing the action" (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 201). The two concepts of deliberation share a close relation with political models of deliberative democracy, the rational exchange of arguments in the public sphere and the epistemic value of deliberation, but differ in significant ways, of which relevant for us are their domain (the former describing any type of debate, while the latter focusing on specific

standpoints and argumentation patterns), analytical categories (media genres such as editorials can be conceived rather as activity types, not as genres as such) and focus (descriptive-oriented rather than normative-oriented, but both being able to accommodate a critical dimension).

We will adopt as an analytical instrument the model of deliberation proposed by Isabela Fairclough and Norman Fairclough. As we have seen, in this model deliberation consists mainly of practical reasoning supporting a *claim for action*. On the one hand, the claim for action is justified by certain *goals*, and the goal is itself justified by certain *values* or *concerns* of the agents advancing argumentation. On the other hand, the action claimed is assumed to be instrumental – *a means* – for the achievement of the goal, and this constitutes a factual premise in the structure of the argument. A second factual premise in this model deals with the agent’s *circumstances*, consisting of natural, social and institutional facts that define the initial state or situation – the problem which requires the call for action. So, two dimensions are involved in this type of practical reasoning: a moral dimension, comprising goals and values, and a cognitive dimension comprising circumstances and the means-goal relation. In the context of the debate, the call for action might be contested by participants, either by refuting the claim – usually through pointing negative consequences of the action requested, or by proposing alternative courses of actions. Moreover, participants can dispute the acceptability of premises used in various manners: for instance they can propose different values or value hierarchies, supporting different goals; they can challenge the instrumentality of the action (means–goal relation) or propose alternative description of the circumstances. See a visual representation of the model in *Figure 1*.

The structure presented so far describes the elements involved in practical reasoning. The step from practical reasoning to deliberation relies exactly in “the balancing in favour of one proposal for action against considerations that supports various alternatives. Deliberation involves therefore considering *alternative practical arguments*, supporting different *claims*, and examining and weighing considerations that support these alternative claims.” (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 50). Such consideration of alternative claims and the possibility to challenge the goals invoked lead to the idea that *goals, not only means, can become object of deliberation* (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 50).

Figure 1. Deliberation: argument & counter-argument (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012, p. 51).

The merit of such a model consists in serving as a heuristic tool for systematic reconstruction, analysis and evaluation of deliberation. While evaluation of deliberation features an important role in Fairclough & Fairclough's approach – hence their emphasis on the normativity of the model and on critical questions as instruments for critical appraisal of deliberation – we are interested in this paper rather in the explanatory virtues of this model, in relation to framing. This means that agents are expected to adopt the most convenient lines of argumentation in order to be effective. Their choices in describing the circumstances, the goals and the values in argument depend not only on their knowledge of the facts, but also “on their evaluative (including ideological) orientation towards this context and their particular interest in changing it” (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 93). The concept of *framing* is particularly relevant in this context, since “People's claims for action follow from their own description of the context and may not follow from the ways in which their opponents define the situation. Re-describing or re-framing reality in a rhetorically convenient way is part of a strategy of action” (Fairclough & Fairclough, 2012, p. 93). Consequently, we will show, in the following section, how framing operates in a rhetorical perspective, by selective representation of circumstances, strategic usage of evaluative terms and persuasive definitions of goals and values.

Framing – from media studies to rhetorical approaches

The literature on frames and framing has boomed in the last twenty years, mainly in relation with discussions on media effects and, more specifically, on agenda setting, although the concept of *frame*, as employed initially by Goffman (1974), refers to the definitions of a social situation that are built up in accordance with principles of organization which govern social events and the agents' subjective involvement in them. Frame analysis then refers to the examination of frames in terms of the organization of experience. In relation with media studies, a standard approach is that of Entman (1993), who defines framing as a process involving the choice of certain components of a perceived reality and then their salience, in the message communication, with the goal of advancing a specific interpretation of the particular situation under discussion (p. 52). For Entman, frames are not limited specifically to the domain of the text producer; he starts from the assumption that frames operate along four nodes of the communication process: the communicator, the text, the receiver, and the culture. According to Wiesman (2011), Entman's approach can be better grasped within the integrated process model of framing proposed by de Vreese (2005), stipulating three stages of framing: frame building, frame setting, and consequences of framing at individual and societal level. “The model suggests the overlapping of the four locations posed by Entman (...) in the process of framing. Frame-building is the determination of the frame by the communication source and its subsequent creation in the text. *Frame-setting* refers to the interaction between media frames and individuals' prior knowledge and predispositions, both of which are determined by cultural norms as well as personal experience (...). Consequences, the final stage in the model, are the effects of these frames on individual attitudes and broader social processes” (Wiesman, 2011, p. 133). The relation between Entman's and de Vreese approaches is illustrated in *Figure 2*, and is useful in delineating the methodological site of rhetorical approaches to framing: they would focus on frame building, without denying its constitutive link with the node of culture, since “rhetorically, a frame promotes its preferred

perception by linking information to corresponding “culturally familiar symbols” present in the audience’s knowledge structure that guide individuals’ processing of information.” (Wiesman, 2011, p. 133) Consequently, rhetoric can provide an analytic framework to account for the discursive construction of framing in relation to situational exigencies such as genre, audience, and symbolic resources available for producing meaning in a certain context. Epistemologically, such approaches tend to adopt various constructivist paradigms (Carter, 2013, Van Gorp, 2010; Van Gorp & Vercruysse, 2012) while disciplinarily, several tracks can be identified for their development: rhetorical criticism (Kuypers, 2010), cognitive semantics (Lakoff & Johnson, 1997; Lakoff, 2004), hermeneutics (Carter, 2013), cultural studies (Van Gorp 2007; Van Gorp & Vercruysse, 2012), discourse analysis (Pan & Kosicki, 1993), argumentation theory (Van Eemeren, 2010; Greco Morasso, 2012).

Figure 2. Situating rhetorical approaches to framing in the broader context of theoretical perspectives on frames and framing.

Two important theoretical questions with relevant methodological consequences need to be addressed prior to undertaking an analysis of the frames: where to look for analytical categories in the analysis of framing and how to justify them in relation with both the aims of the research and the categories analyzed. Usually, in framing theories, two main types of analytic categories are invoked: generic frames and issue-specific frames (de Vreese, 2005). The first type comprises categories which are defined and operationalised prior to the investigation, involving consequently a rather *deductive* approach, and an *etic* position of the researcher. Common examples of such categories are *episodic vs. thematic frame*, or the ubiquitous *conflict frame*; quantitative content analysis is usually used in research. The second type comprises categories that are specific to a particular problem under discussion and are defined and operationalised by analyzing the discursive material investigated. It involves usually an *inductive* approach and an *emic* position of the researcher. For instance, a specific issue – migration – can be framed as a barbarian invasion, an economic benefit for the receiving community, or a moral obligation toward migrants who do not have the same standard of living in their sending countries. The analyst should look at *framing devices*, i.e. textual occurrences that constitute the symbolic resources of the frame, such as metaphors, exemplars, catch-phrases, depictions, and visual images (Gamson & Modigliani, quoted in de Vreese 2005, p. 54). Method-

ologically, analyses of this type require qualitative content analyses (without excluding ulterior quantification), but they can also appeal to discourse analysis or rhetorical analysis, depending on corpus and unit of analysis (Cooper, Kuypers & Althous, 2008).

Mixed types are possible, as is the case for the category proposed by Baldwin van Gorp: *culturally embedded frames* (Van Gorp, 2010; Van Gorp & Vercruysse, 2012). These types share a certain *genericity* with the first category, in the sense that frames are considered issue-specific (for instance the archetype of the villain can be used in electoral campaigns as well as in discussions about migration or social movements), yet they are inductively generated from a large corpus and are part of a cultural repertoire. Accounting for them requires a qualitative methodology, designed to reconstruct frame packages along the following analytical categories: cultural theme involved, definition of the problem, causation of problem, consequences, moral values involved, possible solutions/actions, metaphors, and choice of vocabulary (Van Gorp & Vercruysse, 2012, 1277-1278). It is easily noticeable that these analytical categories have significant similarities with the model of deliberation proposed by Isabela Fairclough & Norman Fairclough: some of them (metaphor, choice of vocabulary) are instrumental in framing the circumstances, while others are constitutive for the moral dimension of the deliberation (values, cultural theme), for the cognitive dimension (causation, consequences) and even overlapping with the claim for action. A theoretical consequence stemming from this observation would be that framing does not operate, as Fairclough & Fairclough assume, only at the level of circumstances, but across all types of premises and all procedural steps of deliberation. Nevertheless, one is expected to find a rhetorically convenient consistency between the framing of circumstances, the moral dimension of the deliberation and the claim for action proposed by a certain agent.

Another possible mixed type, which is particularly relevant for our research, combines a deductive approach (i.e. categories of analysis defined independently, previous to the analysis of the corpus) with an issue-specific conception of frames. Ecaterina Balabanova and Alex Balch, in their study on the ethical framing of intra EU migration, argue that “attention needs to be paid to the deeper, ontological, framing which operates to inform or legitimize the ways in which ‘the other’ is subsequently portrayed” (Balabanova & Balch, p. 383). According to them, “media treatment of immigrants/immigration is contingent upon and symptomatic of deeper (and often submerged) values and ideational structures related to the ethical basis for immigration controls themselves” (Balabanova & Balch, p. 384). Consequently, linking media framing in a more systematic way with normative political theory, Balabanova & Balch identify their categories in political philosophy (what type of arguments can be advanced to for or against controlling migration) and then analyze which of them are present in media debates, which are most prominent and to what effects (see discussion below).

To conclude, what is specific to rhetorical approaches to framing? According to Jim Kuypers, one the most representative scholars for this approach, “framing is the process whereby communicators act – consciously or not – to construct a particular point of view that encourages the facts of a given situation to be viewed in a particular manner, with some facts made more or less noticeable (even ignored) than others. When highlighting some aspect of reality over other aspects, frames act to define problems, diagnose causes, make moral judgments, and suggest remedies.” (Kuypers, 2009, p. 182) If this is the case, then a rhetorical approach to framing amounts to an analytical endeavour aiming at: a. identifying the frames, be them generic or issue-specific; b. identifying the shared cultural premises which particular frames mobilize and which the audience allegedly shares (*endoxon*); c. revealing how par-

ticular frames guide the debate in particular directions, create social facts and foster particular types of citizenship, in relation to the type of engagement required from the audience; d. suggesting alternative framing and ways of counteracting pervasive frames. Consequently, a rhetorical approach to framing serves both a comprehension-oriented and a critical agenda. Methodologically, such an approach relies on qualitative methodologies that focus on textual analysis requiring a reconstruction of the discourse along analytical categories which are defined either in an etic or in an emic manner. The basic assumptions of such an approach are that a.) framing is possible whenever rhetorical choice is present, and b.) agents design their speeches in a “communicatively and internationally functional way” (Eemeren, 2010, p. 119) through expedient choices. Consequently, viewed rhetorically, framing “amounts to creating a context by verbal means in which what is put forward makes sense to the audience in a way that is in agreement with the speaker’s or writer’s intention.” (Eemeren, 2010, p. 126)

Framework of analysis: combining the typology of framing intra EU migration with the model of deliberation

The typology of arguments that we follow in the articles we analyze draws on the work of Balabanova and Balch (2010), who propose a normative approach to media debates on migration. The analysts argue that a discussion of frames employed by the media must reveal the underlying ethical arguments that can justify various positions. These ethical arguments are reconstructed deductively, two main positions being identified in debate in the first stage: communitarian and cosmopolitan. For each position specific arguments for the topic of migration are identified and are formulated in relation to recognized positioning in political theory and philosophy. Communitarian arguments will describe the problem of general and professional migration as catastrophic for the community, because it lessens community strength and its development potential. A frequently occurring subtype of the communitarian argument is the “domestic social justice” argument, employing considerations on “the best social and welfare conditions for citizens” (Balabanova & Balch, 2010, p. 384). The cultural protectionist argument draws on the imperative of preserving national culture, the public security argument reflects fear for social insecurity potential, the liberal constitutionalist argument reflects the ideal of democratic society, the ‘priority for compatriots’, a particular (historic) understanding of good governance. Cosmopolitan arguments will invoke the right of migrants to be treated fairly from the perspective of the rights and privileges derived from the European citizenship. Within this category, universalist arguments will appeal to human rights imagery to discuss the individuals’ right to free movement; the instrumental cosmopolitan arguments regard migration as “a means to maximize total welfare” (Balabanova & Balch, 2010, p. 384). Banal cosmopolitanism reflects “personal cultural programming” (cf. Lull, 2000), which allows multiple cultural allegiances and identities. A complete overview of the types of arguments and framing produced through them is presented in *Table 1*.

Table 1. Ethical frames for understanding immigration controls. Adapted from Balabanova & Balch 2010, Balch & Balabanova 2013.

Position in the debate	Type of frame	Argument structuring the frame	Examples
Communitarian (arguing for restrictions on migration)	Domestic social justice	Immigration should be controlled to deliver the best possible economic, social and welfare conditions for citizens	<i>Immigration has increased unemployment ... Schools, hospitals and GPs also come under pressure' (Daily Mail, 2 May 2006)</i>
	Cultural protectionist	Ethno-national arguments for controls to maintain a 'national culture'	<i>Immigration threatened 'the very essence of our society' (Dnevnik, 15 August 2006)</i>
	Public security	Uncontrolled immigration poses a threat to public order and social stability	<i>'immigrants who can't get jobs will survive on the streets by begging and stealing' (Sun, 31 July 2006)</i>
	Liberal constitutionalist	Restrictions needed to maintain democratic functioning of the state	<i>'migrant workers are exploited in a number of sectors. Unions need to step up their recruitment and government must do more to enforce legal standards' (The Independent, 1 May 2006)</i>
	Priority for compatriots	Special ties or obligations related to the nation-state, e.g. civic practices or historical (national) conflicts/struggles	<i>Uncontrolled immigration 'is putting Britons out of work' (Daily Telegraph, 18 August 2006)</i>
Cosmopolitan (arguing for migration)	Universalist cosmopolitanism (ecstatic)	Freedom of movement as part of universalist conceptions of human rights	<i>'If you want to achieve a united Europe, to build social conditions and standards, you cannot impose restrictions...' (Dnevnik 13 September 2006)</i>
	Consequentialism (instrumental)	Immigration as a means to maximize total welfare	Positive: <i>'mutual interest dictates our welcome' (the Independent (21 August 2006); Negative:</i> <i>'the consequences are not only negative for the British people but also for the immigrants themselves who leave themselves open to exploitation' (Daily Mail 14 November 2006)</i>
	Quotidian cosmopolitanism (banal)	Linkages between immigration and post-national forms of identity formation	<i>'Polish delis are sprouting up across the country' (The Independent 11 June 2006)</i>

The terms “communitarian” and “cosmopolitan”, as used in this typology, might seem to reflect an implicit ideological polarization, while in fact some categories overlap. For instance, instrumental cosmopolitanism (consequentialism) can be analyzed as the reverse of the domestic social justice subtype of communitarian argument: if migration is instrumental or the welfare of a community, then it should be accepted; if, in fact, it is detrimental, then

restrictions on migration should be enforced. This would suggest that arguments supporting migration can be advanced in a communitarian framework. Yet, such a debate on migration amounts to a cost-benefit analysis and is divorced from any underlying ethical considerations. A further commentary needs to be made regarding the possibility to distinguish clearly between various frames, as is the case with the frames “priority for compatriots”, and “public security”, which can work as particular instances of the “domestic social justice” frame. A clearer definition of these frames can be based on the model of deliberation presented above, which considers the values and commitments characterizing each position (communitarian / cosmopolitan) as distinct analytical categories. Our article is an attempt to integrate the two approaches.

The interplay among these arguments is quite complex. For instance, a cosmopolitan framing of Roma migration will appeal to human rights imagery to feed a discourse whose claim will be the non-exclusion of Roma. The goal reflecting these cosmopolitan values will be to build a post-national EU citizenship, and the debate will likely select circumstances such as: EU citizenship, democracy, EU regulations. On the other hand, a communitarian framing of professional migration will refer to citizens’ welfare, public order and social stability to justify the goal, which will be the maintenance of social/economic stability. Circumstances are expected to detail the workings of the health/welfare system, and the action claimed will be the tackling of professional migration.

Integrating the ethical framing of migration in the deliberation model: four case studies

Integrating the ethical framing of migration in the deliberation model proposed by Fairclough and Fairclough poses several methodological and analytical problems. The first question is how a particular article contributes to the general debate on migration: it could be new ideas, it could be new claims for action or counterclaims, or a different means-goal representation. When looking at a text, the analyst will focus on: who is speaking (Which are the voices in the text? Who do they represent? What position does the journalist assume?), which are the arguments (How are they built/distributed/reconstructed? Are counterarguments addressed?). However, when trying to understand how a particular text echoes the general debate on the topic, the analyst reconstructs the context of the debate in accordance with theoretically motivated guidelines. For instance, one relevant problem is: What is present in / missing from a particular text in relation to other texts that constitute the debate? Which texts should be taken into account and how should they be selected? A selective representation of circumstances means that the analyst needs to highlight what other circumstances are present in the debate, but are ignored in the text. Again, if we take circumstances to include both elements in the general debate on migration (interdiscursive context) and situational context elements (meso-context), what is the relationship between them? One answer would be to take previous elements expressed in the text as the arguer’s commitments and thus treat them as institutional facts. Another important problem is to establish the object of the persuasive definitions and track down evaluative terms. A heuristic principle in the reconstruction and the analysis of the text is that of the *rhetorical convergence* of the various elements (circumstances, values, goals) in the overall argument. Framing, in an argumentative text, is tantamount to strategic maneuvering seen from the perspective of presentational devices (Eemeren,

2010). Through topical selection, adaptation to audience demands and presentational devices, the arguer aims not only at dialectical reasonableness, but also at rhetorical efficacy. The three aspects of strategic maneuvering can be only analytically distinguished, since at textual level a rhetorical choice would at the same time constitute a form of adaptation to the audience's demand and a selection of a particular argument through particular presentational possibilities. Consequently, "putting a certain event into one or the other contextual box (frame) significantly changes its interpretation, even when the reconstruction of the events is seemingly neutral" (Greco Morasso, 2012, p. 198). Accounting for strategic maneuvering amounts to revealing the convergences of particular strategies and resources used in various stages of the deliberation. Consequently, the rhetorical convergence of the symbolic resources used in each element of the deliberative model can work both as a heuristic principle in the reconstruction and the analysis of the text and as an indicator of framing.

The first text selected (Lucian Avramescu, *Trăim într-o țară second hand? Jurnalul Național*, 10 august 2010) takes arguments from Băsescu's speech, which it oversimplifies in order to challenge the President's claim that people are leaving Romania because they can do better abroad: "Through the voice of the father of the nation, the first and foremost thinker ... we find that we are a second-hand country. A country very much like a pawn shop, a second hand shop around the corner. We are used, dirt-cheap clothes on the market. It is good we are leaving the country, we salute doctors who are treating other patients (ours will soon die, anyway), it is a good thing teachers become dishwashers in Germany's restaurants ... Congratulations to those who are leaving and no longer ask anything from parents back home, the last guardians of poverty. Before dying, the last will turn off the light". The claim of the text seems to be that Băsescu is right in thinking that those who choose to stay behind in this second hand country are stupid. The text builds reasons around this claim by emphasizing the fact that as long as people do not punish politicians, they are indeed stupid. People's choice not to take a stand against politicians is a confirmation of the president's claim. However, this argument is restructured at the end of the article ("Băsescu's policy is based on the conviction that we are stupid. What if, as I once wrote, the president is right? Might he not be right now, when he says that we are a second hand country? Isn't the very detail that we are bearing with him as President more than enough confirmation?"). The relationship between the rhetorical question in the heading and the argument in the last paragraph changes the meaning of the whole text.

How does the text contribute to the general debate on migration? The underlying claim is that (professional) migration should be stopped. The circumstances which have been selected by the journalist to build his frame are: massive migration, political non-elites, people's tolerance of corruption. The goal (good governance) is reached by negative description (this is a country that is not well governed). The values which feed the goal are: general welfare, justice, elites' recognition, justice, democracy and order.

How does the text solve the problems we have mentioned above? The journalist echoes both documented facts (such as the phenomenon of doctors' migration) and themes on the permanent agenda of the press (politicians' corruption and incompetence). Relevant absences are: free movement as a fundamental right, the burden on the social security system in case professionals choose not to leave (arguments invoked by the President). Evaluative terms (*anarchy, foolishness*) converge with values and goals, but also with a certain audience. The underlying values and goals build a communitarian (public security) frame, in answer to the President's framing, which employs both cosmopolitan elements (ecstatic: freedom of move-

ment is a right we have gained), and communitarian (domestic social justice: leavers alleviate the burden on social welfare system).

The second text (Andrei Crăciun, *Generația care pleacă*, *Adevărul*, 24 august 2010) poses a different methodological problem. There is no textual indicator for an argumentative text. There are few evaluative assertions in this text, which seeks to define a ‘we’ (the 70s-80s generations, too young to have experienced communism as adults: “We, the dictatorship’s last children, were never sentenced ... We never had to choose between Hitler and Stalin, we had to choose between Pepsi and Coca-Cola”). Rather than being argumentative, the text tacitly advances a point of view, that migration has a negative impact (“All the sadder and more normal is our fleeing from the world and into the world. The best of us have left and are yet to leave. This generation was supposed to succeed here and will succeed there”). Redefinition of a sense of belonging through presentational devices (antithesis “A new generation is tearing apart from an old country”) is more pervasive in the text than arguments (the only instance we could find was: “Romania is losing its most important resource – its educated youth” as an implicit call for policies).

The problem that the text raises is how to discuss a text which contributes to the general debate without clearly fitting the deliberative model adopted. The arguments highlight the claim that migration should not be encouraged (a counter-claim to the president’s declaration). The goals of the text are implicit, not stated (a certain continuity with previous generations, a feeling of community, personal integrity in relation with belonging), and values are used to describe the generation, rather than advancing an argument. The circumstances which were selected (migration and post-communism; the migration is the choice of a whole generation, not of individuals) add something significant in the general debate: how you define a generation is essential for the problem of migration. It is difficult to decide on the convergence between circumstances, values and goals in the absence of a claim.

With articles in receiving countries, circumstances, values and goals converge to create arguments for migration control which fall into the category of communitarian framing. Generally, we have found that Romanian media discuss general migration, skilled (professional) migration and Roma migration as separate categories, evolving into different genres, positionings and types of arguments (see Ciocea & Cârlan, 2012). In French media, references to general migration are scarce, with prominent interest in ‘gens de voyage’. This focus on a minority leads to frequent use of communitarian (cultural protectionist) arguments (for instance: “Or le problème n’est pas de savoir si les «*Roms et Gens du Voyage*» sont avant tout victimes de l’appareil d’État et du racisme populaire ou, s’«*ils*» sont, au contraire, coupables de leur «*marginalité*»” – *Le Monde*, 10.08). The reverse is, unsurprisingly, the use of cosmopolitan (ecstatic) arguments: “la France, pays symbole de la démocratie (...) contribue à la stigmatisation” des Roms. (*Le Monde*, 18.08); “Les discours sécuritaires qui peuvent laisser entendre qu’il y a des populations inférieures sont inacceptables” (*Le Figaro*, 22.08).

In British media, on the other hand, the focus falls on general and skilled migration; the Roma migration is hinted at only when the expulsion measures against the Roma in France are discussed. Communitarian arguments tend to refer to the sphere of domestic social justice (“It is possible, although not yet proven, that immigration adversely affects the employment opportunities of young people who are competing with young immigrants from the A8 countries (lower-income Eastern European countries in the European Union” – *Daily Mail*, 19.08.) Sometimes communitarian arguments make use of cosmopolitan imagery, like in this example, where liberal constitutionalist arguments fall back on banal (clichéd) cosmopol-

tanism: “The Left’s theory of patriotism is that it’s all false consciousness invented by the powers-that-be to get gormless proles to work and die for the system. But actually, it’s a two-way system that also demands a sense of responsibility by the ruling class towards their working-class compatriots. That’s all gone now and the English class system has basically ended in divorce, with the new elite running off with the equivalent of a Thai bride, who cooks, cleans and doesn’t complain, largely because she can’t even speak English.” (The Telegraph, 12.08).

Consequently a methodological problem in dealing with French and British texts is to see how the selective representation of circumstances and the persuasive definitions of goals and values through evaluative terms converge to create arguments not only in the local (national) debate on migration, but also in the international debate. British media discuss the events in France from a cosmopolitan perspective; when the topic is migration to the UK, however, communitarian arguments pervade, and cosmopolitan stances are built as rather ideal (ecstatic) circumstances. For instance, in our Telegraph article (*Immigration is more than an economic issue*, Telegraph View, 26 august 2010), the claim is that migration must be debated not only in economic terms, but socially and culturally (“To a great extent, however, the focus on economic migration misses the real target, which is the number settling here through family reunion and marriage ... This raises difficult social and cultural questions that politicians are reluctant to engage with – hence their concentration on economic migration. But the political classes are lagging far behind the general public: it took the intervention of Gillian Duffy, ‘that bigoted woman’, to shoe-horn immigration into the last general election campaign. Such political timidity does the country a disservice. Immigration raises serious and potentially divisive problems that must be addressed. We ignore them at our peril.”). The goal is a free debate on migration (which implies that both communitarian and cosmopolitan arguments will be used). See, for example: “The public pressure for more rigorous immigration controls is far less to do with xenophobia or racism (we remain one of the most tolerant countries in Europe) and far more to do with the intolerable pressures imposed on our public services and infrastructure, and therefore on our quality of life.”. The values invoked are: the quality of life, multiculturalism, freedom of expression; the circumstances that triggered the response in the article: the political discourse does not reflect the public’s interests, opinions and knowledge (“These figures simply confirm what people see with their own eyes – that after more than a decade of virtually unfettered immigration under a Labour government that saw electoral benefit in such a policy, our country is desperately overcrowded.”).

The same negotiation of communitarian and cosmopolitan stances is characteristic of French media, as well. Ecstatic cosmopolitanism is not missing from the texts, but, rather than being built through arguments, it is a distant/ideal ethical framing, which does not coincide with the text as such, but is somehow expectant in the broader debate on migration. For instance, in our French article (Jean-Marc Leclerc, *Roms: un fichier pour éviter la fraude de l’aide au retour*, Le Figaro, 17.08.2010), cosmopolitan arguments belong to one of the voices in the article, not to the journalist himself: “Mardi, le ministère de l’Intérieur pointait plus de cinquante campements illicites de Roms déjà démantelés en France depuis le début du mois. Au moins 700 personnes en situation irrégulière seront reconduites à Bucarest «par des vols réguliers», a tenu à préciser Éric Besson. Le ministre l’a reconnu également, s’agissant des Roumains, membres de l’Union européenne: «Ils pourront revenir en France, puisque c’est la loi, mais ils ne pourront pas y stationner en situation irrégulière et a fortiori recevoir une aide au retour volontaire.»” The claim (migration needs to be controlled), the goal (to render migration control instruments efficient), the values (good governance, institutional effi-

ciency) converge to build a communitarian (social security) argument: “à compter du 1^{er} septembre prochain, tout change. L'étranger membre de la communauté des gens du voyage contrôlé par la police, lors de l'occupation illicite d'un camp par exemple, verra ses empreintes digitales insérées dans le fichier, à côté du nom.” (see the implicit politically incorrect assumption that the police will apply this measure against a minority they will be able to identify with the naked eye).

Conclusions

The exploratory analysis of the selected texts shows how accounting for a rhetorical construction of framing in deliberative media texts has to take into account the convergence of the values, goals and circumstances as they are discursively constructed. For articulating the frames, one has to take into account values and goals, which amounts to using the model of deliberation as an instrument of textual reconstruction capable of revealing how frames are constructed. Yet, while values and goals can be conceived as categories to identify and label the frames, as is the case with the typology articulated by Balabanova and Balch, it is most frequently through rhetorical presentation of circumstances (by means of evaluative terms, persuasive definitions and presentational devices) that a particular understanding of the problem and the possible solutions is produced. A frequently employed strategy involves negative presentation of circumstances, in opposition with convergent goals and values that are allegedly shared with the audience, in order to justify a change in the status quo. The convergence of values, goals and circumstances can be understood as a particular case of strategic maneuvering, involving topical choice, adaptation to audience demands and presentational devices. Thus, although framing cannot be reduced to circumstances, as Fairclough and Fairclough seem to assume, but operates across all elements and stages of deliberation, it is by rhetorical construction of circumstances that framing is produced. This confirms the Greco-Morasso's position that the presence of contextual frames can turn apparently non-argumentative texts into significant input in the deliberative process.

Such an approach can prove insightful for the analysis of media deliberation on migration because it can reveal not only how various ethical framings structure the media debate, but also allow for a clearer articulation of the role of values in the definition of the frames, an identification of media engagement with the audiences, and a broadening of the scope of framing theories. The next step in our research is to advance a fully articulated model of rhetorical framing in media debates, able to cope with a large corpus of articles in order to identify how various frames (communitarian, cosmopolitan) are constructed, and what are the rhetorical peculiarities of such framing in sending and receiving countries.

Note

¹ This work was supported by a grant of the Romanian National Authority for Scientific Research, CNCS – UEFISCDI, project number PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0968, *Diaspora in the Romanian Media and Political Sphere*. From Event to the Social Construction of Public Issues (project coordinator: Professor Camelia Beciu).

References

- Avramescu L. (2010). Trăim într-o țară second hand? [Do we live in a second hand country?] *Jurnalul Național*, 10 august 2010.
- Balabanova, E., Balch, A. (2010). Sending and Receiving: The Ethical Framing of Intra-EU Migration in the European Press. *European Journal of Communication*, 25 (4), Sage, pp. 382-397.
- Balch, A., Balabanova, E. (2013). Transition to what? Framing of Bulgarian and Romanian Migration in the UK press 2006-2013. Paper presented at the workshop *Diasporic Identities and Transnational Experiences: From Social Actors to Public Discourses*. Bucharest, 13-14 May, 2013.
- Beciu, C. (2011). *Sociologia comunicării și a spațiului public* [Sociology of communication and public space]. Iași: Polirom.
- Carter, M. J. (2013). The Hermeneutics of Frames and Framing. An Examination of the Media's Construction of Reality. *SAGE Open*, 3(2).
- Ciocea, M., & Cărlan, A. (2012). Debating migration as a public problem: diasporic stances in media discourse. *Romanian Journal of Communication and Public Relations*. Vol 14, no. 3 (27), 193-214.
- Coleman, S. (2012). Debate on Television. The Spectacle of Deliberation. *Television & New Media*, 14(1), 20-30.
- Cooper, S., Kuypers, J., & Althous, M. (2008). The President and the press: The framing of George W. Bush's speech to the United Nations on November 10, 2001. *American Communication Journal*, 10(3).
- Crăciun, A. (2010). Generația care pleacă [Leavers' Generation], *Adevărul*, 24 august 2010.
- Dahlgren, P. (2009). *Media and Political Engagement. Citizens, Communication and democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Daily Mail Reporter (2010). High levels of immigrants 'linked to high youth unemployment'. *Daily Mail*, 19.08.2010.
- De Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information design journal+ document design*, 13(1), 51-62.
- Ed West Society (2010). Why foreigners are the new working class. *The Telegraph*, 12.10.2010.
- Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of communication*, 43(4), 51-58.
- Fairclough, I. & Fairclough, N. (2012). *Political Discourse Analysis. A Method for Advanced Students*, London: Routledge.
- Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. London: Harper and Row.
- Greco Morasso, S. (2012). Contextual frames and their argumentative implications: A case study in media argumentation. *Discourse Studies*, 14(2), 197-216.
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: MIT press.
- Hilgartner, S., & Bosk, C. L. (1988). The rise and fall of social problems: A public arenas model. *American Journal of Sociology*, 53-78.
- Kuypers, J. A. (2009). Framing analysis. In Kuypers, J. A. (Ed.). *Rhetorical criticism: Perspectives in action*. 181-204. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.
- Kuypers, J. A. (2010). Framing analysis from a rhetorical perspective. In D'Angelo, P., & Kuypers, J. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Doing news framing analysis: empirical and theoretical perspectives*. 286-311. London: Routledge.
- Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't think of an elephant: Know your values and frame the debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
- Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1997). *Metaphors we live by*. 2nd Edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Leclerc, J.M. (2010). Roms: un fichier pour éviter la fraude de l'aide au retour [The Roma: a file for avoiding return aid fraud]. *Le Figaro*, 17.08.2010.
- Lull, J. (2000). *Media, communication, culture: A global approach*. New York: Columbia University Press.

- Kennedy, G. A. (Ed.). (1991). *Aristotle on rhetoric: a theory of civic discourses*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Le Figaro. (2010). Roms : deux hommes d'Église dénoncent les expulsions. [The Roma: two people of the Church denounce the expulsions]. *Le Figaro*, 22.08.2010.
- Le Monde, AFP. (2010). Expulsion des Roms : la Roumanie et la Bulgarie haussent le ton. [Expulsion of Roma: Romania and Bulgaria raise their voices]. *Le Monde*, 18.08.2010.
- Olivera, M. (2010) Dénoncer l'anti-tsiganisme sans s'attaquer à ses racines? [Denouncing anti-racism without attacking its roots?]. *Le Monde*, 10.08.2010.
- Pan, Z., & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political communication*, 10(1), 55-75.
- Telegraph View. (2010). Immigration is more than an economic issue. *The Telegraph*, 26 august 2010.
- Van Eemeren, F. H. (2010). *Strategic maneuvering in argumentative discourse: Extending the pragma-dialectical theory of argumentation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Van Gorp, B. (2007). The constructionist approach to framing: Bringing culture back in. *Journal of communication*, 57(1), 60-78.
- Van Gorp, B. (2010). Strategies to take subjectivity out of framing analysis. In D'Angelo, P., & Kuypers, J. A. (Eds.). (2010). *Doing news framing analysis: empirical and theoretical perspectives*. 84-109. London: Routledge.
- Van Gorp, B., & Vercruysse, T. (2012). Frames and counter-frames giving meaning to dementia: A framing analysis of media content. *Social Science & Medicine*, 74(8), 1274-1281.
- Walton, D. (2010). Types of Dialogue and Burdens of Proof. In *Proceedings of the 2010 conference on Computational Models of Argument: Proceedings of COMMA 2010* (pp. 13-24). IOS Press.
- Wiesman, P. (2011). We Frame to Please: A Preliminary Examination of The Daily Show's Use of Frames. In Goodnow, T., & Knapp, T. G. (Eds.). (2011). *The Daily Show and rhetoric: Arguments, issues and strategies*. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books.