Introduction

Immigration is a controversial political issue in many parts of the world, since migratory movements are a global phenomenon and the number of displaced people is at the highest ever recorded in human history. Scandinavia has had the issue on the public agenda for decades. The SCANPUB research project at the University of Bergen (with Prof. Jostein Gripsrud as the principal investigator) starts from the general impression that the three Scandinavian countries – in spite of all of their similarities and close ties – have had strikingly different public discourses on the issue of immigration and have developed quite different political regimes in relevant policy areas (Brochman and Hagelund 2012).

The SCANPUB projects charts, describes, analyzes, evaluates, and compares public discourse on immigration in the three Scandinavian countries from 1970 to 2016 and attempts to explain observed differences, also with respect to the relations between public discourse and, on the one hand, immigration policies, and, on the other, the public’s attitudes and opinions. As part of this work, a wide variety of sources for discourses are being investigated, including (but not being limited to) studies of the press, social media, literature, tv entertainment, and movies.

The largest empirical undertaking in this project, which has involved dozens of research assistants and thousands of hours of work is undoubtedly the press project, with the aim to make a representative sample of Scandinavian press coverage in the almost fifty years covered by the project.

The aim of the press project was, first, to provide a large material of the leading Scandinavian newspaper articles on immigration from the 1970 to 2016, which could be analysed with both qualitative and quantitative methods for a wide variety of research questions by the SCANPUB group of researchers. Second, we wanted to make a smaller, representative sample of articles for a quantitative content analysis, which could be used to suggest (1) statistically reliable broader trends over time, (2) be compared with relevant timeseries of other kinds of data (e.g. opinion polls, unemployment rates, immigration numbers, electoral results for populist radical right parties) to probe causality between media coverage and other factors, and, more generally, (3) be used to study systematic - and changing - differences between the newspaper coverage in the three countries, suggesting deeper national differences in the immigration discourses.
The report has three parts. Part 2 is the codebook, and Part 3 provides tables for most of the variables in the codebook, by country and year. Note that these tables exclude letters to the editor. Part 1 gives an account of the methodological considerations that have gone into the production of the data resulting from the quantitative content analysis. It must be noted, however, that it is impossible within the scope of such a report to give more than a general picture of the many minute methodological decisions and the meticulous work underlying the data, given the immense scope of this project and the many people involved. The work was completed over a period of one and a half year and spanned more than forty-five years of newspaper material in three countries. It involved thirty research assistants working thousands of hours reading and coding newspaper articles, and a massive work also by the main researchers responsible - hundreds of hours revising and testing the questionnaire, teaching and supervising the research assistants, checking and correcting the data for errors - which is an endless task which cannot be completed, only discontinued.
PART 1: METHODOLOGY

What we talk about when we talk about immigration

It is hard to think of a more difficult subject for a quantitative content analysis than immigration. If Berelson’s (1952) ideal of making a “objective, systematic, quantitative description of manifest content of communication” is no longer in the vogue, but has mostly been replaced by an ideal of a systematic and reproducible classification of texts, as in Krippendorffs (2004a) definition of content analysis as a “systematic reading” for making “replicable and valid inferences from text ... to the contexts of their use”, and where such inferences “are merely more systematic, explicitly informed and (ideally) verifiable than what ordinary readers do with texts”, the task of making a systematic comparison of newspaper coverage of immigration in three countries over almost fifty years has more than once given the authors time to appreciate the truth of the words of Haruki Murakami (1997) that hell has no true bottom. One major problem is the shifting nature and vagueness of the phenomenon itself.

The notion of "immigrants" and associated concepts like “guest workers”, “asylum seekers” varies from context to context, from country to country, and over time. Not only do definitions from the national census bureaus and official institutions vary, they are also no doubt very different from what most people have in their minds when thinking about and debating immigration. For example, insisting that East European construction workers on short-term contracts, children born in Scandinavia of recently arrived African asylum seekers and the Romani beggars people meet daily in their cities are “not really immigrants” and should be kept outside the immigration debate, would by many no doubt be seen as strange, even absurd. Immigration debate is fundamentally an impure discourse that engages a long range of neighboring discourses and themes: racism, foreign aid, individual rights, national culture, nation and nationalism, changing neighborhoods, changing social and cultural patterns, moral values, crime, poverty, religion, populism, the future of the welfare state, and so forth. Many of these were also part of major public debates long before the “new” (non-Nordic) immigration hit Scandinavia in the sixties and seventies. For example, debates in Norway in the early seventies on the cultural rights and possible assimilation of new immigrants were clearly influenced by earlier debates on very similar subjects in regard to the indigenous Sami and Rom populations (Eide and Simonsen 2007; Gripsrud 2018). The shifting focus of the debates also means that themes and social groups move into and out of the spotlight. For example, the integration of Finnish immigrants was continually debated in Sweden in the sixties and early seventies. Nordic immigrants appear to have been left out of the immigration discourse after the larger waves of refugees and asylum seekers in the eighties and nineties, when "exotic" immigrants appeared (in newspaper debates) in much larger numbers than before - from faraway locations in the Middle East, Africa, and Asia - places few migrants had previously arrived from. They came to a country that conceived of itself as monocultural, homogeneous, and had little experience in dealing with other cultures. Even status and celebrity status matter: Foreign royals marrying into the Scandinavian dynasties (e.g. Queen Silvia of Sweden) appear more or less exempt from the debate even if fulfilling all formal requirements; at the other end, descendants of third-world families are no doubt often perceived as immigrants even after two and three generations on Scandinavian soil.
Such problems bear on the task of identifying immigration debate in the media. Discourses on immigrants can appear in any newspaper genre, in the headline or buried in the text, and be discussed with designators clearly implying immigrants (e.g. "asylum seekers", "work immigrants") or without, for instance when discussing how national culture or a neighborhood has changed in recent decades. For many reasons – which we have here merely scratched the surface of - immigration debate is an immensely difficult subject for any social researcher who is concerned with making systematic and reproducible inferences from the texts.

**Sampling of newspapers and issues**

The enormous amount of available press coverage of immigration in Scandinavia in the period - dozens of newspapers over almost fifty years - meant that a full study of the phenomenon was clearly out of the question. Two main approaches to sampling were considered. The first was to select a smaller number of periods of particular importance and intensity in the immigration debate, ideally roughly similar to one another in the countries under study. Examples of this approach is the analysis of "peak years" in Benson’s (2013) study of immigration coverage in USA and France, and the three two-week periods (which we might call "peak moments") in the study of the European coverage of the refugee crisis in 2015 (Chouliaraki and Zaborowski 2017). A second possibility was to do a full representative sampling of representative weeks in the years under study (every year or a systematic interval, e.g. every second or fifth year). The main advantage of "peak sampling" is that a) it ensures that the immigration issue is on the public agenda and debated in the newspapers studied, b) it makes it more feasible to study every day in the period and not just a sample, and c) by reducing the number of days studied it makes it possible to include more newspapers, and in sum provide a more complete picture of the debate in the press than "representative" sampling can do. One major disadvantage of "peak sampling", however, is that it requires a prior judgement about important periods in the debate and limits the study to these. A "representative" sample of constructed weeks makes no such a priori judgements, which is an advantage in explorative studies. It also makes it feasible to compare time series of coverage with other time series, e.g. with real immigration numbers, economic conjunctures, public opinion, which parties were in power etc., which makes it possible to statistically test possibly important factors in the formation of the debate in the press (and vice versa). On the other hand, including every year, even when studying only a few weeks of coverage, meant that only a limited number of newspapers could be included in the study. While both "peak" and "representative" sampling have their merits, the SCANPUB project decided on the latter approach. A particularly compelling reason was the lack of satisfactory reviews of the press debate for the period, which meant that we were uncertain about which periods that were the best candidates for such «peaks» in the immigration debate.

Six leading Scandinavian newspapers were selected for the study, two for each country: the broadsheets Aftenposten (NO), Dagens Nyheter (SE), and Jyllandsposten (DK), and the tabloids VG (NO), Aftonbladet (SE), and Ekstrabladet (DK).¹

A sample of two newspapers per country can of course not capture the full breadth of the debate in the press on such a complex theme. Combining the largest broadsheet and the largest tabloid in each country, however, enabled us to capture some of the variation due to the newspapers’ varying journalistic profiles and readership, and can suggest common topoi in the debate that reached a large proportion of readers, not only directly, but also indirectly via such newspapers being important in defining the national news agenda.
While leaving out TV news from the analysis at this point is a clear weakness, it should be noted that this is likely less of a problem for the analysis of Scandinavian media systems compared to others. First, whereas TV news is the most important news source for most people in many places in the world, this is not the case in Scandinavia, where newspaper readership is among the highest in the world (Reuters Digital News Report, 2017). Second, the small populations, the late-coming and limited number of commercial national television channels (the first national commercial channels appeared first in the mid-1980s), and the continuing strength of the public broadcasters very likely contribute to a largely common news agenda for national TV news and the major national newspapers.

The newspapers gradually lost their party affiliations in the 70s and 80s (Weibull 2014), and the selected newspapers have had different political affiliations. While Aftonbladet and Ekstra Bladet arguably can be said to come from a social-democratic tradition, the Norwegian tabloid, VG, was founded after the war by the Resistance, without any political affiliation. In regard to the broadsheets, Aftenposten and Jyllandsposten both have roots in the conservative press, while Dagens Nyheter is arguably a newspaper in the liberal tradition. Although one might expect this to influence the stances of the newspapers on the issue, the fact that immigration was a much less politicized issue in the 70s (Hovden and Mjelde 2018) and the complex relations between the newspapers and the parties, which, as in the case of Denmark, were often internally divided on the question of immigration policies (Brochman and Hagelund 2012), means that the real effect of this relationship on their coverage is far from clear. As political leanings appeared to be most evident in the Danish press, a limited sample of Politiken (only every 5th year) was added to the sample.

To create a representative sample of articles from each year, we used constructed week sampling, starting with the first Monday of the year and selecting every subsequent 15th day, excluding Sundays: in total four constructed weeks/24 days per year. This way, the articles were systematically spread over weekdays and months. In total, 6768 issues were selected (1128 pr. newspaper) for study.

The state of the archives

At the time of the collection of the articles, the archives of the selected newspapers were digitised to varying degrees for the years under study. Some were available in digital form for the whole period (VG and Aftenposten), but most were digitally available only for the last decades (meaning several decades had to be collected via microfilm or via physical newspapers). This was further complicated by the many different archiving and retrieval systems. Some newspapers were available via secondary services (Atekst, Medistream), others via national libraries, others only via their own services. These systems offered very different possibilities for searching and the downloading of materials (some only allowed viewing, some offered only single-article viewing, not the full issue, some did not offer the newspaper pages in their original form, but only as texts etc.).

Working with the digital archives also showed that for some newspaper issues - usually older newspapers - automatic translation from image to text (via OCR) had produced garbled text, meaning that they would often not appear in searches. Given the blurriness of the phenomenon under study, using a handful of search terms to identify relevant articles were in any case deemed a deeply problematic strategy, as it would likely lead to both under-sampling and a very skewed sample of themes, genres, and framings.
For a consistent methodology, then, given the state of the archives, we had to resort to an old and very time-consuming (and therefore also costly) method: the research assistants had to read the 6768 newspapers - in whatever available form (physical, digital, microfilm) - from start to finish when selecting articles. On the plus side, this made it possible to select articles on their own merit as relevant for the debate on immigration, potentially giving a much more complete overview of the genres and themes in the discourse.

The sampling of articles - first stage (inclusive sampling)

As noted, the first aim of the project was to collect an extensive material of relevant newspaper texts, also relevant for qualitative analyses by researchers in SCANPUB with very varying research questions. We also had to be open to the possibility that immigration debate could turn up at unexpected times, in unexpected places and in unexpected ways, and not necessarily be the main theme of the article or a particularly frontpage-worthy subject. The relevance of a text to the immigration issue had to be determined on an article-by-article basis, rather than because it belonged to a genre, theme or important period of immigration debate believed to be particularly relevant.

For example, it was very tempting to drop all sports articles, as there were many foreign football players playing in Scandinavian clubs. Against this formal approach, albeit very common in content analysis, one can argue that while most sports articles where immigrants are involved were largely irrelevant to immigration debate, some of these articles were actually very important, not only because issues like racism and integration were important themes, but also because the sports section was a place where (usually) male immigrants from Non-European countries were early on presented as individuals with biographies and positive characteristics, and to readers who probably often had little interest in regular «news on immigrants». A similar argument could be made for reviews of (work by) immigrant artists and writers (and more generally, for the importance of fiction for understanding the immigration debate) in modifying and expanding the debate on immigrants in the early years.

The need for a very broad sampling strategy for this first selection of articles meant, as noted earlier, that we rejected sampling strategies of the kind used by Benson (2013), who chose only articles that had a front page presence, and Chouliaraki and Zaborowski (2017), who selected only the two largest ´news` articles on immigration in each issue. We also tried to avoid exclusion criteria based on single criteria, like genre and theme, instead focusing on more heuristic and holistic criteria.

In the first phase, research assistants were asked to initially identify and store all newspaper articles that clearly or arguably had an immigration-related focus. Specifically, articles were selected that addressed/discussed/thematized all forms of immigration to and migration within Scandinavia and Europe in general (including Turkey) (e.g. refugees, asylum seekers, labor migrants); integration and representation of immigrants in Scandinavia, both at an individual and a macro level; discussions of racism (e.g. accusations of racism); individuals whose name and appearance Scandinavians might reasonably be expected to associate with immigration/immigrants; and feature journalism about immigration-related topics (e.g. stories on refugee camp conditions). These criteria applied to both first-generation immigrants and their descendants. General stories about war, conflict, human suffering etc., where immigration was not thematized; domestic migration (e.g. Palestinians in Israel); and stories about pre-modern immigration were excluded.
While there are many obvious problems with many of the criteria in terms of reliability, we believe that the sum of them did successfully capture most of the articles that could be relevant to both the general aims of SCANPUB and more specific and explicit immigration debates in the press. The sample, by year and newspaper, is presented in table 1.

Table 1. Collected articles (first sample), by year and newspaper.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>AFTENPOST</th>
<th>AFTONBLAD</th>
<th>DAGENSNYH</th>
<th>EKSTRABLA</th>
<th>JYLLANDSP</th>
<th>POLITIKEN</th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1977</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1978</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>638</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3455</td>
<td>7017</td>
<td>6789</td>
<td>3864</td>
<td>3505</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>3981</td>
<td>28769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sampling of articles - second stage (exclusive)

This initial corpus of close to 29,000 newspaper texts on immigration was then the basis for a secondary sampling, using much stricter selection criteria, for the purpose of a quantitative content analysis.

According to these criteria (shown in the form presented to the coders below), immigration discourse had to be tangibly present in the articles (rather than immigrants merely being represented) and articles below 200 words (in the case of debate items, below 50 words) were excluded. Weekend editions were also left out. When choosing relevant articles, coding assistants were asked to look for:

- Immigrants (e.g. asylum seekers, work immigrants) entering or returning to European states

- integration of immigrants and their descendants (whether in work, housing market, organizations, politics, sports, welfare state, friendships, language acquisition, marriage, education and so forth. Stories about immigrants in relation to crime were also to be included)

- immigrants who are explicitly identified in the text as immigrants

- coexistence in multicultural/diverse societies, including discussion of cultural values among ethnic Scandinavians or immigrants

- policies and regulations in the fields of immigration control, integration and anti-discrimination (based on ethnicity, race, nationality)

- citizenship rules and naturalization - the impacts of immigration on national identities and communities

- discrimination, racism, anti-racism/discrimination, anti-/pro-immigration movements

- “stand-in” debates for the immigration debate, e.g. discussion of the use of religious/cultural symbols in schools or working life (e.g. hijab), general debates about racism in the Scandinavian countries.

In addition, we emphasized to coders that the presence of people in a news story or debate article who are clearly, or likely to be perceived as, immigrants or of immigrant descent is not in itself a sufficient criterion for inclusion (unlike in the initial sampling). The prime goal of the content analysis is not to show how immigrants are represented in the media, but the debate on the immigration issue. For example, a sports news story that mentions an athlete with a “foreign” name was not be included, unless his/her immigrant background is thematized or otherwise connected to the debate on immigration. Furthermore, the immigration dimension would normally not include tourism, short-term stays, foreign students; indigenous and national minorities; religious minorities (unless they are identified as immigrants) and inter-faith cooperation; adoption/adopted people; diplomats and people associated with them; general coverage of non-Scandinavian affairs, which does not explicitly concern migration to Europe/Scandinavia. However, the categories above will sometimes be thematized with reference to immigration, and then such items were to be included. For example, stories of racism against adopted persons and discussions of the use of the Hijab in Scandinavian schools are highly relevant.
Using the new criteria, 32% of the collected immigrant articles were deemed relevant by the coders. This sampling rate was relatively constant over time, but varied noticeably between the countries (not so much between the newspapers). Where close to half of the Danish newspaper articles were selected, this was true for a little over a third of the Norwegian articles and only one in four Swedish articles (Table 2).

Table 2. Sampling rate for the second sample (for the content analysis) from the first collected articles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>VG</th>
<th>Aftenposten</th>
<th>Aftonbladet</th>
<th>Dagens Nyheter</th>
<th>Ekstra Bladet</th>
<th>Jyllands-posten</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most reasonable explanation, we think, is to see this as largely a reflection of the different national character of immigration coverage, with articles in Denmark, and to some degree Norway, generally being more skewed towards explicit immigration debate than in Sweden. Whatever the reasons, however, we believe that the much stricter guidelines for the second sample go a long way in addressing this problem, as the sample rates are inverted (fewer Swedish articles), and this should make the samples much more homogenous across the countries. The final dataset used for the content analysis included 4406 articles from the 47 years under study.

Reliability of sampling

All 10 main assistants involved in the sampling and coding of articles were assigned to a list of years and newspapers to sample and/or code and were also required to enter their unique ID when coding. Based on comparisons with other coders for adjacent years (for the same newspaper) and for other newspapers in the same years, two assistants were later suspected of over-sampling (selecting too many relevant articles) and under-sampling (selecting too few), respectively. Their work was checked and corrected by independent assistants.

The codebook

A unique codebook was created which included thirty themes, each having an average of ten variables. In the process (which involved the majority of the members of the SCANPUB project), several variables were excluded after reliability testing showed that the coders were unable to agree on their applicability. This goes for example for questions about whether articles were conflict or consensus-oriented, whether they had a positive or negative tonality overall, or whether the immigration issue was presented in a polarized way. In the final version, the codebook contained the following main themes.

- **URL/link, Publication, Year, Date, Title**
- **Editorial priority** (front page, size/length)
- **Format** (news item, editorial, column, letter to the editor, etc.)
- **Images**
- **Themes** (e.g. sports, crime, religion, integration, arrival and departure, etc.)
- **Voices** (quoted sources, including a special focus on political parties)
- **Depictions of immigrants** (e.g. social categories, wording)
- **Groups of immigrants** talked about (ethnicity, country of origin and current location, references to their religion)
- **Arguments about immigrants and immigration**, including
• **Dominant frames** (hero/victim/threat and subframes, inspired by Benson 2013))
• **Specific arguments** (e.g. that their religion causes problems)
  • **Presence of populism** (speaking on behalf of people, criticizing elites generally, negative evaluation of immigrant groups)
  • **Measures of civility in the debate** (inspired e.g. by Coe, Kenski, and Rains, 2014)
• **Metadebate**

Almost all codes were dummies (noting the presence or absence of a characteristic), and not exclusive. For example, there was no limit to the number of themes or frames that could be checked. For example, an article covering the 2002 "honorary murder" of Fadime Sahindal in Sweden by her father and brother, would simultaneously be coded as having a threat frame (immigrants as murderers and oppressors of their daughters and wives), a victim frame (the murdered Fadime) and a hero frame (Fadime again, as a courageous feminist of immigrant origin).

Codes were, as a rule, not evaluative. While they require judgements - e.g. about the applicability of a "story" (the frames) or a theme, coders were not asked to make judgements about coverage presenting immigrants in a positive or negative light, or being a "good" or "bad" debate in a Habermasian definition of characteristics of deliberation (for an example of an application of such an approach in content analysis, see e.g. Wessler and Rinke 2014). The full codebook is attached in Appendix 2. Note the inclusion of help texts which specify for the coders how categories are to be interpreted (e.g. themes and frames).

**Coding**

Research assistants were recruited from master and advanced bachelor students at the media departments of the Universities of Bergen, Copenhagen and Stockholm. Each research assistant took a training course (one course was held in each country, with several Skype follow-ups with smaller groups or single coders when necessary) by the authors, which included an introduction to the project, detailed reading and discussions of the sampling criteria and the codebook. This was followed by practical training in the coding of a selection of articles, where the assistants’ codings were tested for reliability, and inconsistent codings were adressed. Those who coded articles were also later tested in their ability to identify relevant articles from a selection of 20 articles\(^5\).

While approximately thirty assistants were trained, approximately half of these did the bulk of the sampling and coding, selected on the basis of both their work capacity and their apparent strengths after the training course. As we found that research assistants used very unequal time in going through a newspaper issue - varying from 15 minutes to more than an hour, 30 minutes were set as the upper norm.

**Reliability of coding**

120 previously coded articles were randomly chosen for reliability testing of the coding, using a quota securing the equal representation of newspapers and decades. Three experienced coders - one from each country - coded the articles, avoiding articles they themselves had previously coded. For various reasons, the final reliability test had to be done on a smaller sample - 77 articles\(^6\).
The articles were checked for agreement by the two coders on all numerical variables calculating intrarater agreement both in terms of percentage of agreement and by Krippendorf's Alpha, which adjusts for expected agreement by chance. While not measuring reliability directly, agreement between coders is an important indicator of and a requisite for reliability. The results are given in Table 3. Note that due to a low number of registrations on many of the smaller variables, we were unable to test them for reliability.

Table 3. Reliability test for coding. Coder agreement for selected variables. Agreement (%) and Krippendorf's Alpha.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Agreement</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>v02 Year</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>0,97</td>
<td>v12 Themes</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>91 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v03 Publication</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>79 %</td>
<td>0,51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v05 Terms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Integration</td>
<td>77 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Foreign worker</td>
<td>99 %</td>
<td>0,96</td>
<td>Racism</td>
<td>92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>0,69</td>
<td>National security</td>
<td>83 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>99 %</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>92 %</td>
<td>0,78</td>
<td>Legal immigration</td>
<td>62 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>100 %</td>
<td>1,00</td>
<td>Civil rights</td>
<td>75 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v06 Social category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v13 Sources</td>
<td>National politicians</td>
<td>92 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>0,82</td>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>94 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>94 %</td>
<td>0,84</td>
<td>Immigrant</td>
<td>88 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child</td>
<td>91 %</td>
<td>0,72</td>
<td>v15 Photo of immigrants</td>
<td>87 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>83 %</td>
<td>0,50</td>
<td>v17 Ethnicity mentioned</td>
<td>96 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v08 Front page</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>0,87</td>
<td>v19 Islam mentioned</td>
<td>97 %</td>
<td>0,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v09 Length (original)</td>
<td>62 %</td>
<td>0,47</td>
<td>v20 Frames</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>0,54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v09 Length (recoded)</td>
<td>90 %</td>
<td>0,76</td>
<td>v21 None of arguments</td>
<td>84 %</td>
<td>0,53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v10 Format (original)</td>
<td>73 %</td>
<td>0,54</td>
<td>v22 None of arguments</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>0,50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v10 Format (recoded)</td>
<td>82 %</td>
<td>0,65</td>
<td>v23 Emotionality</td>
<td>45 %</td>
<td>0,14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v11 Location of immigrant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v25 Populism</td>
<td>83 %</td>
<td>0,07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>96 %</td>
<td>0,92</td>
<td>v26 Civility: Respect</td>
<td>78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>95 %</td>
<td>0,85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>96 %</td>
<td>0,91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reliability test suggested that some variables needed to be simplified for the analyses. In the case of length (v09), the problem was mainly choosing between two adjacent levels of a variable (e.g. if an article was <25% or between 25-50% of a page). A similar problem presented itself in the case of newspaper genres (v10), where there was some confusion between e.g. ‘news’ and ‘feature/reportage’, and between columns of (a) internal and (b) external columnists, and in the case of the latter, also with (c) Op-Ed articles. Some of these were merged with their most similar genres.

While most themes (v12) have relatively good agreement (e.g. Social issues, Crime, Racism), some themes, which have in common that they often require more interpretation, appear to have low reliability, including the themes of Integration, National security, Legal immigration and Civil Rights. Checks for the possible coding bias of single coders vis-a-vis these variables (controlling for newspaper and year via multiple regression, with Coder ID as an independent variable) show considerable individual variation in their tendency to code a theme as present or not. This supports our impression from coder training that coders disagreed not so much on whether a theme was present or not, but rather on whether or not the theme was present enough to merit inclusion — a question of different thresholds. A similar problem seems to be the case...
with the measurement of populism (v25) and emotionality (v23). While the results here show real cause for concern about the reliability of these variables, we suspect this problem to be somewhat less grave than it appears, given that each country has several coders with demonstrably different thresholds, which probably contributes to a diminishing “averaging effect” of the threshold problem, which does not appear in pairwise checks for reliability.

Concluding remarks

We would like to thank all the members of the SCANPUB project, the research assistants, and affiliated researchers on the steering committees and advisory board, and other colleagues who otherwise have contributed with comments and encouragement in this work.

Literature


Notes

1. To control for the representativeness of the Danish newspapers, a smaller sample of Politiken (DK) was later drawn.

2. Another reason was the fear of bias in the themes and framing of the articles chosen for the front page. A pre-analysis of 705 articles (the 3 broadsheets, 5 random articles from each year) showed that articles on immigration with hero frames were less likely to appear on the front page (such frames were present in 19% of all articles when looking at the title, ingress and first paragraph, but only in 13% of the immigration articles on the front page), but threat frames were more common (34% of articles, 40% of those on the front page). In contrast, there was no difference in regard to articles that framed immigrants as victims.

3. Their sampling strategy was a little more complicated. See their article for details.

4. These 10 coders coded 99.8% of the articles.

5. Note that some of this training happened much later than the initial training course, depending on when the assistants attended and which subsequent changes had been made to the sampling criteria and the codebook.

6. The majority of the 12 re-coded articles did not have a corresponding coded article. In some instances, this was due to error by the second coder (choosing a previously uncoded article), in other instances this was due to the first coder entering an incorrect ID number for the article. In addition, some reliability coders had by mistake control-coded their own articles, which had to be excluded from the testing.

7. Krippendorff’s Alpha will in most cases give very similar results to the more commonly used Cohen’s Kappa, but has according to some provided a better measure of reliability. The issue is more technical than we can go into here, see Krippendorff’s critique of Cohen’s Kappa (Krippendorf 2004b).

8. Only variables with at least 10 registrations were tested.

9. Recoded variables: v09 Length: (1) <50% of page, (2) 50%-100% of page, (3) more than one page. v10 Format: (1) News/telegram/interview/feature, (2) Op-ed, (3) Editorial, (4) Letter to editor, (5) Column.
Main timeline for the work

- December 2016-January 2017: First sampling of relevant articles
- November 2016-May 2017: Code book development, test codings (by selected research assistants) and subsequent revisions
- April-May 2017: Main training of research assistants
- May-June 2017: Major test coding (1/5 of the articles of the three broadsheets, in total * articles).
- June-July 2017: Final codebook and coding instructions
- July 2017: Additional training of coders
- July 2017-February 2018: Coding (most of it in the fall of 2017)
- January-March 2018: Control and correction of the dataset, including: revision of incorrect coding categories used; removal of articles wrongly selected as relevant, removal of duplicates; check for sample reliability of coders where some coders work was controlled and corrected (including coding of new articles).
PART 2: THE SCANPUB CODEBOOK

00 Coder-ID (three digits)

01 Article ID (number)

02 Year
Write full year, e.g. 1972

03 Publication
Identify the publication/broadcast network the item is printed/published in.
- NRK
- TV2
- VG
- Dagbladet
- Aftenposten
- Bergens Tidende
- SVT
- TV4
- Expressen
- Aftonbladet
- Dagens Nyheter
- Göteborgsposten
- DR1
- TV2
- Extrabladet
- BT
- Politiken
- Jyllandsposten

04 Title
Write the title of the item. For print items: Main title of story ad verbatim (only first "main" sentence in title). For broadcast items: Title of news item ad verbatim if available, if not simple description of content in a few words - e.g. Homicide in Oslo.

05 Are any of these terms/categories (or very similar) explicitly mentioned in the text in relation to immigration (either in relation to concrete persons or general issues)? If used, note if they are used in the title/introduction of the story or elsewhere in the text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term/Category</th>
<th>In title or ingress</th>
<th>Elsewhere in the text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign worker(s) (e.g. &quot;gjestarbeider&quot;, &quot;utenlandske arbeider&quot;, &quot;fremmedarbeider&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant(s) (e.g. &quot;immigrant&quot;, &quot;innvandrere&quot;, &quot;innvandrerjøngetra&quot;, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asylum seeker(s) (e.g. &quot;asylsøker&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refugee (&quot;flyktninger&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority population (e.g. &quot;minoriteter i Danmark&quot;, &quot;minoritetskvinne&quot;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second- or third-generation immigrant(s)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorist(s)/Jihadists (e.g. ISIS fighters)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific ethnicities/national identities clearly indicating parts of immigrant population (&quot;Poles&quot;, &quot;Pakistani&quot;, &quot;Muslims&quot; or similar)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other human-based categories clearly indicating immigrants (e.g. "sorte", "utlendinger", "fremmede" etc.)

NONE of the above

All types of content should be coded for the presence of these terms, not just news articles.

06 What social categories of immigrants are present in the text or are otherwise clearly discernible (e.g. via image). Mark all that apply.

- Male(s)
- Female(s)
- Child(ren)
- Adolescent(s)
- Elderly/old people
- Family/families
- NONE OF THE ABOVE

All social categories should be coded, e.g. a family with two children should be coded as "male", "female", "children" and "family".

08 Placement in newspaper
Was the item mentioned on the front page? If yes, was it the main story (marked by the largest title, the main image etc.)?

- Not mentioned on the MAIN front page
- MAIN Front page, main story
- MAIN Front page, but not main story (or unclear if it is the main story)
- NOT APPLICABLE

Note: If the front page is not included in the PDF, this means that the news item was not represented on the front page. The category "NOT APPLICABLE" is only relevant in the case that the front page of this issue is missing from the archives. In that case, the coder will be given explicit information about this problem before coding.

09 Length (newspaper article)
Please indicate the approximate page length of the item (including images).

- Less than 25% of the page
- 25-50% of the page
- 50-75% of the page
- 75-100% of the page
- More than one page, but less than two pages
- Two pages
- More than two pages, but less than three pages
- Three pages
- More than three pages
- NOT APPLICABLE -> how many words incl. title/ingress (approx.)?

The category NOT APPLICABLE should only be used when the PDF is missing and one only has the story as a pure text file.

08 Placement in news broadcast
Identify where in the broadcast the item was first presented.

- Not mentioned in intro of news broadcast
- Introduced by presenter, top story
- Introduced by presenter, not top story
- Breaking news (added during broadcast)
- UNKNOWN

09 Length (broadcast item)
Please indicate the approximate length of the item in seconds (e.g. 2 min 30 sek = 150)
10 Format/genre (newspaper)
Please identify which type of format the item has.
- News article
- Telegram (notis)
- Letters from reader/letter to editor
- Editorial article/column (ledarartikel)
- Feature/reportage
- Regular column (by journalist working in the newspaper)
- Regular column (by someone hired from "the outside" to write regular column)
- Op-ed (longer opinion article written by someone not affiliated by the newspaper) ["kronikk", "essay"]
- Portrait/interview
- Review/critique (e.g. theatre, literature)
- OTHER

10 Format/genre (broadcast)
Please identify which type of format the item has.
- Anchor only: stand-alone news item presented by anchor in studio
- Studio interview/analysis/debate (in studio or with direct link)
- News reportage (outside studio, stand-alone)
- Press conference/speech etc.
- Other
- Unknown

11 In what COUNTRY/COUNTRIES are the immigrants (speaking or being spoken about) LOCATED?
Code the explicit and else obvious (from the context) geographical countries or regions the immigrants relevant to the story are located in.
- NORWAY
- SWEDEN
- DENMARK
- FINLAND
- ICELAND
- In SPECIFIED OTHER EUROPEAN COUNTRY/COUNTRIES
- In SPECIFIED OTHER NON-EUROPEAN COUNTRY/COUNTRIES
- (General regional reference) SCANDINAVIA
- (General regional reference) NORDIC COUNTRIES
- (General regional reference) EUROPE
- (General regional reference) NORTHERN EUROPE
- (General regional reference) WESTERN EUROPE
- (General regional reference) CENTRAL EUROPE
- (General regional reference) SOUTHERN EUROPE
- (General regional reference) EASTERN EUROPE
- (General regional reference) BALTICS
- (General regional reference) YUGOSLAVIA/BALKANS
- (General regional reference) SOVIET UNION
- (General regional reference) MIDDLE EAST
- (General regional reference) AFRICA
- (General regional reference) NORTH AFRICA
- (General regional reference) SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA
- (General regional reference) CENTRAL AFRICA
11b In what specific NON-NORDIC country/countries are the immigrants located?

- Afghanistan
- Albania
- Algeria
- Andorra
- Angola
- Antigua and Barbuda
- Argentina
- Armenia
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh
- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bhutan
- Bolivia
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Brazil
- Brunei Darussalam
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cabo Verde
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Central African Republic
- Chad
Jordan
Kazakhstan
Kenya
Kiribati
Kurdistan
Kuwait
Kyrgyzstan
Lao People's Democratic Republic (Laos)
Latvia
Lebanon
Lesotho
Liberia
Libya
Liechtenstein
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Madagascar
Malawi
Malaysia
Maldives
Mali
Malta
Marshall Islands
Mauritania
Mauritius
Mexico
Micronesia (Federated States of)
Monaco
Mongolia
Montenegro
Morocco
Mozambique
Myanmar
Namibia
Nauru
Nepal
Netherlands
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niger
Nigeria
Oman
Pakistan
Palau
Palestine
Panama
Papua New Guinea
Paraguay
Peru
Philippines
12 Subjects present in the text (in relation to immigration)
Are any of the following subjects clearly present in the text? Several can be selected. You should code based on how you read the text, not how you think average newspaper readers would read it. Note also that both categories 6 and 7 concern attitudes to immigration. You should only use these categories if attitudes/racism are thematized; you are not to determine whether or not some attitude is being expressed or is racist.

- 01 Social care/Health care/Welfare state
- 02 Education
- 03 Work
- 04 Integration policy
- 05 Family and social customs
- 06 Majority population´s attitudes towards immigrants/immigration
- 07 Racism
- 08 Religion
- 09 National security
- 10 Crime
- 11 Accidents
- 12 National and social economy
- 13 Immigration as a partisan-political issue
- 14 Arrival and return of legal immigrants
- 15 Illegal migration and human trafficking
- 16 Civil society organizations
- 17 Multiculturalism
- 18 National identity (of Norwegians, Swedes or Danes)
- 19 Culture, arts and entertainment
- 20 Sports
- 21 Immigration debate
- 22 The role of media in the debate
- 23 Suppression of women immigrants
- 24 Immigrants’ political and civil rights
- 25 Parallel societies
- 26 Adoption

NONE OF THESE SUBJECTS ARE PRESENT -> What is the subject?

1 Social/Health care/Welfare state (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to welfare/social programs and policies, illness, elderly care, hospital policy, access to health care, welfare state expenses, welfare state sustainability, poverty, homelessness and begging etc.)

2 Education (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to kindergarten, elementary, secondary, and higher education, including language training for children e.g. learning their native language)

3 Work (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to workforce participation, workplace conditions, wages, the need for labor, the right to work, unions, discrimination of immigrant workers, exploitation of immigrant workers, unregistered/illegal labor, stories about [professionally] successful immigrants, etc.)

4 Integration policy (Mentions or discussions of policies intended to facilitate the integration of immigrants, language training for adult immigrants, workforce training, introductory programs, naturalization policies/citizenship/citizenship ceremonies, policies to combat
discrimination and racism, etc.)

5 Family and social customs (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to family life and practices, way of living/cultural practices, the family as a socializing institution, gender equality, gender roles, sexuality, forced marriages, dressing/attire, gender mutilation.

6 Majority population’s attitudes towards immigrants/immigration (Mentions or discussions of the majority population’s (national or local) attitudes to immigration/immigrants/asylum seekers/refugees.

7 Racism/discrimination (Mentions or discussions of racism, xenophobia, extremist attitudes, “everyday”/soft racism, structural discrimination, extreme and far right parties and rallies/demonstrations by such groups or against them by for example leftist groups, discussions about what constitutes racism and acceptable language when speaking about immigrants, etc.

8 Religion (Mentions or discussions of immigrants’ religion and religious practices, religious leaders, religious laws and norms.

9 National security (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to national security, terrorism, radicalization and violent extremism [e.g. violent religious extremism], military threats and countermeasures, etc.

10 Crime (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to crime [as victims, suspects, or perpetrators], criminal investigations, crime statistics, criminal court cases, etc.

11 Accidents (Fires, traffic accidents, drownings, etc. in which victims are identified as immigrants)

12 National and social economy (Mentions or discussions of how immigration affects the economy, dependence upon labor migration, the economic contribution of immigrants, immigrants’ over- or underrepresentation within specific professional groups)

13 Immigration as a partisan-political issue (Mentions or discussions of immigration in relation to party politics, parties’ programs/policies on immigration, electoral campaigns, the importance of immigration to voters, parties’ strategic use of the immigration issue, etc.)

14 Arrival and return of legal immigrants (Mentions or discussions of public policy for the arrival/legal residence/return of immigrants [e.g. refugees, asylum seekers, labor immigrants, family migration and reunion] and enforcement thereof; statistics about arrival and return of immigrants, size of immigrant population in the country)

15 Illegal migration and human trafficking (Mentions or discussions of illegal migration and human trafficking [e.g. the extent of it and how it takes place], legal measures to combat it, undocumented immigrants and their rights, the criminal organizations behind illegal migration and human trafficking)

16 Civil society organizations (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to civil society organizations and events, immigrant participation in civil society/grassroots organizations and the local community and mentions of local events and action to integrate immigrants into such foras, interest groups for immigrants and their descendants [e.g. “Norwegian-Pakistani Association”, mentions of advocacy groups for asylum seekers, discussions of how little immigrants participate in traditional civil society organizations])

17 Multiculturalism (Mentions or discussions of the ethnic/cultural/religious diversity that exists in society as a result of immigration, how different groups live side by side, e.g. stories about culturally heterogeneous neighborhoods

18 Norwegian/Swedish/Danish national identity (Mentions or discussions of what it means to be Norwegian/Swedish/Danish, the role of ethnicity in national identity, the effects of immigration on the traditional Norwegian/Swedish/Danish cultures and values)

19 Culture, arts and entertainment (Mentions or discussions of arts and entertainment within all genres, immigrant artists and their art, premieres, culture news, etc. that address immigration and integration)

20 Sports (Sports, sports events, and athletes where immigration/nationality/immigrant backgrounds are discussed)

21 Immigration debate (Mentions or discussions about the metadebate, i.e. the debate about the immigration debate; e.g. “Danish immigration debate is harsh”, “Immigration opponents are being excluded from the debate”)

22 The role of media (Mentions or discussions - criticism and praise - about the role of media in relation to immigration, e.g. in how media [general, or in the form of specific publications [including online], social media, journalists etc.] contribute to the shaping of the debate on immigration or how immigrants or discussants are portrayed in the media, discussions about “echo chambers”, “mainstream media” etc.)

23 Suppression of women (Mentions or discussions of immigrant women as oppressed by their own culture: Immigrant women are victims of forced and arranged marriages, genital mutilation; immigrants bring with them patriarchal cultures and religions which threatens women’s rights; immigrant women are confined to the private sphere and prevented from integrating into the host society)

24 Immigrants’ political and civil rights (Mentions or discussions of violation/neglect of immigrants’ political and civil rights; e.g. immigrants are not allowed to vote, immigrants are not sufficiently protected by the legal system, etc.)

25. Parallel societies (Mentions or discussions of immigrant communities existing next to the majority population as parallel societies/immigrants grouping together in certain geographic areas, immigrant groups not interacting with the majority population, immigrant “ghettos”, e.g. Rinkeby in Stockholm, Groruddalen in Oslo, Romani people)

26. Adoption (Mentions or discussions of immigrants in relation to adoption; e.g. interviews with adopted persons, adoption policy, adoption cases)

13 Who are QUOTED in the text (in relation to immigration)? And what country are they representing? Also note the names of any organizations (except parties).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality / country represented</th>
<th>Name of institution / organization (separate by comma) as it appears in the text (e.g. WHO, Stockholms universitet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NORWAY SWEDEN DENMARK OTHER COUNTRY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians: National government/parties (such as the cabinet, party-affiliated spokespeople for the government, members of parliament)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politicians: Local/regional government/parties (e.g. municipal board, local mayor, county council)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service: State administration at the national level (e.g. Justice Department, Immigration authorities etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil service: Public administration at regional/local level (e.g. local bureaucrats and adm. leaders, schools, hospital, police etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign or international governmental organizations (e.g. the EU, UN, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-governmental organization (e.g. Red Cross, Amnesty, organizations for refugees/asylum-seekers/other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
immigrants, trade unions)
Expert/intellectual THINK TANK
External media outlet, journalists or media-affiliated commentator
Cultural practitioner (actor, director, musician etc.)
Religious leader/representative
Athlete
Private (commercial) business
Ordinary people: immigrants and immigrant descendant
Ordinary people: non-immigrant
OTHER -> please specify
NONE OF THE ABOVE

We are here interested in who are directly quoted by the journalist (e.g. as a source in this particular text, interviewed by the journalist). In the case of debate articles, columns, we are interested in who the writer is.

14 Political party (QUOTED in the text). You have noted that a political representative / party was quoted in the text. Which party was quoted/mentioned?
☐ DAN: Danmarks Kommunistiske Parti
☐ DAN: De Grønne
☐ DAN: Alternativet
☐ DAN: Venstresocialisterne/Danmarks Kommunistiske Parti/Socialistisk Arbejderparti/Enhedslisten
☐ DAN: Sosialistisk Folkeparti
☐ DAN: Sosialdemokratene
☐ DAN: Venstre
☐ DAN: Radikale Venstre
☐ DAN: Kristeligt Folkeparti/Kristendemokraterne
☐ DAN: Det Konservative Folkeparti
☐ DAN: Dansk Folkeparti
☐ DAN: Fremskridstspartiet
☐ DAN: OTHER DANISH PARTY
☐ SVE: Sveriges Kommunistiska Parti
☐ SVE: De Gröna
☐ SVE: Socialdemokraterna
☐ SVE: Vänsterpartiet/Vänsterpartiet Kommunisterna
☐ SVE: Centern
☐ SVE: Folkpartiet Liberalerna
☐ SVE: Kristdemokraterna
☐ SVE: Moderaterna
☐ SVE: Sverigedemokraterna
☐ SVE: Ny demokrati
☐ SVE: OTHER SWEDISH PARTY
☐ NOR: Norges Kommunistiske Parti
☐ NOR: Arbeidernes Kommunistiske Parti/Rød Valgallianse/Rød
☐ NOR: Miljøpartiet
☐ NOR: Sosialistisk Folkeparti/Sosialistisk Venstreparti
☐ NOR: Det norske arbeiderparti
☐ NOR: Senterpartiet
☐ NOR: Venstre
15 Is a photo, drawing or illustration present?
- No photo, drawing or illustration in story
- Photo(s) or drawing depicting immigrants
- Photo(s) or drawing not depicting immigrants
- Illustration (e.g. maps, statistical visualizations, flags etc.)
- NOT APPLICABLE (e.g. only text version of article available)

Do NOT include by-line image used by the journalist/writer.

16 Does the text mention any of the online medias listed below in connection to coverage about immigrants? Are the any references to the Internet (e.g. net newspapers, social media, blogs etc.)? Check all that apply.
- a. Online newspaper (e.g. vg.no, aftenposten.no, dagbladet.no, minervanett.no, expressen.se, aftenbladet.se, jyllands-posten.dk, politiken.dk. In general: all online newspapers that complies with the ethical rules of the press, for instance the Norwegian “Redaktørplakaten” and “Vær Varsom-plakaten”, the Swedish ”Yrkesregler” and ”Publicitetsregler”, and the Danish ”Vejledende regler for god presseskik”
- b. Online newspaper comment section (e.g. comment section on vg.no, aftenbladet.no. If the text refers to comments published on the Facebook-sites of the online newspapers, such findings shall be coded as category (c): Facebook).
- c. Facebook
- d. Twitter
- e. Other Social media (e.g. Instagram, MySpace, Nettby and Blink. In general: web-based services that allow individuals to construct a public or semi-public profile within a bounded system.
- f. Other online communities (e.g. IRC [Internet Relay Chat], discussion forums [e.g. diskusjon.no, Kvinneguiden, freak.no, flashback.org, Den-Debat.dk], BBS [Bulletin board system].
- g. Document.no
- h. Human Rights Service [HRS/Rights.no]
- i. Avpixlat [Avpixlat.info]
- j. Fria Tider [friatider.se]
- k. Nya Tider [nyatider.nu]
- l. Nyheter Idag [nyheteridag.se]
- m. Motgift [motgift.nu]
- n. Den Korte Avis [denkorteavis.dk]
- o. Trykkefrihedsselskapet [trykkefrihed.dk]
- p. Other blogs, alternative media and online magazines (e.g. Folkebevegelsen mot innvandring, Gates of Vienna, Breitbart, Swedenwatch, Tobbes Medieblogg, Tino Sanandají’s blog; tino.us. In general: online sites that do not comply with the ethical rules of the press.
- q. Online video media (e.g.Youtube, Vimeo, Flickr and DailyMotion).
- r. Wikipedia
- s. Other online media
- NO REFERENCE TO ONLINE MEDIA

17 Are ethnicities, national identities, inter-national identities or religion of immigrants explicitly mentioned?
- Yes, explicit mention of ethnicities, national or continental identities (e.g. "Asians", "Swedes", "Somalis", "Swedish-Pakistanis") [note: reference to majority population - e.g. "Norwegians" in a Norwegian newspaper - is not relevant here)
- Yes, reference to ethnicity of majority population IN CONTRAST to immigrants (e.g. "Etniske svensker/danske/nordmenn", "Danske barn", "Nordmenn flest")
- Yes, colour-based references to immigrants (e.g. "De sorte", "fargede")
Yes, religion (e.g. mentions of Islam, Christianity, specific religious groups, use of religious adjectives [e.g. "Muslim men"] etc.)

NONE OF THE ABOVE

18 Which ethnicities/nationalities/continental identities are explicitly mentioned in the text? (In relation to immigrants.)

- Afghans
- Americans (i.e. U.S. citizens)
- Bosnians and Herzegovinians
- Czechoslovakians
- Chileans
- Chinese
- Croatians
- Danes
- Dutch
- East Germans
- Eritreans
- Estonians
- Ethiopians
- Filipinos
- Finns
- French
- Germans (not East Germans)
- Hungarians
- Icelandic
- Indians
- Iranians (incl. Persians, Iranian Kurds and Azeri)
- Iraqis/Iraqi Kurds
- Kosovars/Albanians
- Latvians
- Lithuanians
- Moroccans
- Norwegians
- Pakistanis
- Palestinians
- Poles
- Rom/Romani
- Romanians
- Russians
- Somalis
- Soviets
- Sri Lankan/Tamil
- Swedes
- Syrians
- Thai
- Tsjetsjenia/Chechya
- Turks/Turkish Kurds
- Vietnamese
- Yugoslavian
- General term: Africans
- General term: North Africans
General term: East Africans
General term: West Africans
General term: Central Africans
General term: Asians
General term: South Asians
General term: East Asians
General term: South-East Asians
General term: West/South-West Asians
General term: Kurds (unspec. nationality)
General term: West Europeans
General term: South Europeans
General term: Eastern Europeans
General term: Baltics
General term: Soviets
General term: North Americans
General term: Latin Americans
General term: South Americans
OTHER -> please specify
NOT APPLICABLE (e.g. unspecified discussions about "immigrants", "other groups")

19 Which religions are explicitly referred to in the text? (In relation to immigrants.)
This can be the religion of individuals or groups, reference to specific religious organizations or the explicit linking of regions and religion (e.g. "The Muslim world"), etc.

1) Christian/Christianity
2) Muslim/Islam
3) Jew/Judaism
4) Buddhist/Buddhism
5) Hindu/Hinduism
6) Other
NONE

20 Immigration frame
Indicate how the stories are framed. A frame is a certain perspective which is clearly evident in the text. Several frames can be selected. The frames may refer to circumstances in both the host country and the country of origin. You should code based on how you interpret the text, not how you think average newspaper readers would interpret it.

a Victim/Global economy
b Victim/Humanitarian
c Victim/War
d Victim/Racism-Discrimination
Victim/OTHER
e Hero/Cultural Diversity
f Hero/Integration
g Hero/Good worker
Hero/OTHER
h Threat/Jobs
i Threat/Public order
j Threat/Fiscal
k Threat/Social cohesion
Threat/OTHER
NONE of the above frames are present in the text

Victim Frames
a Global economy (Immigration is a subset of the larger problem of laissez-faire economic globalization and unjust North-South relations; immigrants are people who are hit hard by economic insecurity, global economic injustices and economic crises/turmoil)
b Humanitarian (Immigrants are victims of unjust government policies [violations of human rights, fair legal process] or business practices; they are persecuted; they suffer from poverty, poor living conditions, lack of access to health care and adequate welfare and health services, etc; climate refugees)
c War (Immigrants are refugees who are escaping from specifically war; recipient countries have obligations to help them as a matter of international solidarity, recipient countries have also contributed to generating the situations they are escaping from [bombing Libya, Iraq etc, failing to negotiate peace in the Balkans, Syria and so forth])
d Racism/ Discrimination (Immigrants are victims of racist or xenophobic slurs or hate crimes, or discrimination [intended/unintended] based on national origin, race/ethnicity, religion, sexuality or culture)
e Cultural Diversity (Immigrants bring positive differences to society, from new cuisines to the unique contributions of immigrant artists, musicians, and writers. It is positive that society becomes more diverse also in terms of values, culture and religion, and that national norms and conventions are being challenged)
f Integration (Immigrants enthusiastically adopt mainstream cultural mores or civic obligations. Immigrants successfully take part in work, education and civil society)
g Good worker (Immigrants work hard, are particularly skilled in certain professions, take jobs that citizens or legal residents and natives will not or cannot do, or contribute to economic prosperity and growth)
h Jobs (Immigrants take non-immigrants' jobs or depress wages/work and wage conditions)
i Public order (Illegal immigrants break the law in coming into this country; once here, immigrants – legal or illegal – are more likely than others to commit crimes, use drugs, and carry diseases; immigrants are coming in such numbers that it leads to overcrowding and environmental degradation; immigrants cluster together in ghetto-like areas with high levels of social unrest)
j Fiscal (Welfare Immigration threatens the normative foundations and/or future fiscal sustainability of the welfare state. Immigrants [especially] abuse government social services programs [health, education, social security etc], imposing an unfair burden on taxpayers. Immigrants receive preferential treatment compared to natives, or are unjustly prioritized compared to other groups in need)
k Social cohesion (Immigration bring foreign customs and values that threaten to undermine the host country's culture or national identity/the cohesion of the national or local communities; immigrants are unassimilable)

21 Do any of these views and arguments NEGATIVE to immigration explicitly appear in the text?

- Crime: It leads to (more) crime in our own country
- Terrorism: It leads/can lead to terrorist attacks in our country
- Disease: They bring with them infectious diseases
- Neighbourhood: Their presence leads to the deterioration of the neighbourhood
- Religion: Their religion causes problems
- Culture: Their culture causes problems (e.g. patriarchal views of women or children)
- Help them where they are: We should help immigrants/refugees in their own country/neighboring areas instead
- Care for our own weak first: The nation (and the welfare state) already has weak groups (e.g. the sick and the elderly) that we must take care of first
- Fortune hunters: They are fortune hunters (NO: "Lykkejeger", DK: "Bekvemmelighedsflytgning"), who do not really need help.
- Labor market: Immigration threatens the labor market by dumping cheap labor into our country
- Special treatment: Immigrants and/or refugees get special treatment and benefits that are not offered to ordinary citizens
- Welfare abuse: Immigrants abuse government social service programs and burden national tax payers

22 Do any of these views and arguments POSITIVE to immigration explicitly appear in the text?

- Work: Immigrants are needed in the workforce
- Affordability: We have the economic means to help people in need
- Moral: We have a moral obligation to help
- Humanitarians: We as a country have a humanitarian tradition of helping people in need
- Formal obligations: We have an obligation according to international treaties
- Free movement: People should be allowed to move freely across borders
- Diversity: Immigrants bring positive cultural diversity and enrichen our communities

23 Emotional vs. unemotional reporting

Does the article contain verbal, visual or auditive language/means that potentially arouse or amplify emotions among readers/viewers? Or does it present their information in a matter–of–fact style not using such language/means (unemotional)?

- Predominantly emotional
- Mix of emotional and unemotional elements
Emotional vs. unemotional: Coding of the writer's/journalist's use of emotional language/effects. This category does not relate to the emotion- arousing potential of the topic, event etc. itself that is covered in a news report. Some means to arouse or amplify emotions can be, for example:
(a) dramatizing events, i.e. presenting them as exceptional, exciting, or thrilling;
(b) affective wording and speech, e.g. superlatives, multiple use of strong adjectives, present tense in the description of past events, pronounced accentuation;
(c) by film cutting techniques (e.g. fast cuts, point-of-view shots) or the use of emotional music;
(d) by reporting on or visually presenting explicit expressions of emotions (e.g. hurt, anger, fear, distress, joy)

25 Presence of populism
Populism is the belief that elites are immoral/corrupt/incompetent/self-serving, while regular people are decent/hard-working/wise, but neglected by elites. Are the following elements of populism present in the text, either by the author or others? (see details below)
a Reference to “the people” (in a populist sense)
b Anti-elitism/anti-establishment
c Exclusionism (immigrants as "the other")
d State of emergency: Crisis, breakdown, threat against the society or nation
e The need for a strong leader
f Conspiracy (benefitting immigrants)
g Call for referendum ("folkeavstemming")
NONE OF THE ABOVE

26 General civility
Are any of the following elements related to civility of the debate present in the text?

CIVILITY AND RESPECT: Explicit statements of respect for fellow debater or his/hers arguments (not immediately followed by disrespectful comments).
INCIVILITY AND DISRESPECT: Crass, mean-spirited or disparaging words directed at a person, group of people, or their arguments/policies. Includes references to their looks or personal qualities; using profanity or strong language; accusations of lying (e.g. "What an idiotic argument!"; "You're a fool/naive!")
NONE OF THE ABOVE

27 Meta-debate: Explicit concerns about the tone of the debate
a Express general disappointment with the tone of the debate or general encouragement to use a more decent tone
b Criticize specific persons for being indecent or disrespectful towards opponents in the debate
c Criticize specific persons for being indecent or disrespectful towards immigrants/refugees
d Claiming that the debate or specific persons are racist or arguing in a racist way
e Claiming that the debate or specific persons are "political correct" or similar (e.g. "naive", "blue-eyed" towards immigrants)
NONE OF THE ABOVE

28 Meta-debate: Explicit concerns about the lack of openness of the debate
a Explicit concern that the debate is not open and free
b Explicit concern that specific persons or institutions are limiting the possibility for an open and free debate
c Explicit concern that specific viewpoints are suppressed or freedom of speech is being limited.
d Explicit concern that expressing oneself will lead to accusations of being "racist", "xenophobic", or similar

NONE OF THE ABOVE

29 Debate frame
Are any of the following debate frames present in the text? Both can be selected.

CONTAINMENT: Public debate on immigration is dangerous. It contributes to xenophobic or "muddy" sentiments in the population. New divides open up. Anti-immigration parties benefit from playing the "immigrant card".

OPENNESS: Public debate on immigration is positive. It brings out into the open xenophobic and "muddy" arguments and voices, and make them open to criticism and ridicule. New, alternative and multiple voices must be heard. Dangerous to "put lid" on debate.

NONE OF THE ABOVE