

produce similar results. No school system is intrinsically better performing than the others, admit the editors in their conclusion. Their line of argument therefore shifts to the clever formulation of the third law of inequality, paraphrasing Newton: for every initiative to reduce inequality there is an opposing (but not necessarily equal) reaction to preserve it (258).

By emphasising the reactivity of the systems and thus the theory of effectively maintained inequality (258), the authors come close to Bourdieu's idea that the struggle within social fields ensures social reproduction, that is, the persistence of educational stratification. As a consequence, the authors show that attempts to improve school systems meet the obstacle of renewed awareness and acknowledgement of power relations in society.


The authors do a convincing job in their well-articulated analysis of different aspects of school policies and practices, connecting data with theoretical scaffolding and providing inspiring examples of methodologies which are useful in carrying out comparative projects. Because of its innovative traits, the book is an extremely valuable contribution to ongoing theoretical and political debates on the management of incorporation processes; furthermore, it underlines the importance of careful exchanges of experiences across societies.

References

- Alba, Richard. 2005. "Bright vs Blurred Boundaries: Second-generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 20–49.
- Alba, Richard D., Johan Handl, and Walter Müller. 1994. "Ethnische Ungleichheit im Deutschen Bildungssystem." *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie* 46 (2): 209–237.
- Alba, Richard, Jeffrey G. Reitz, and Patrick Simon. 2012. "Contrasting National Conception of Integration and Assimilation." In *The Changing Face of World Cities. Young adult children of immigrants in Europe and the United States*, edited by Maurice Crul and John Mollenkopf, 44–61. New York: Russell Sage.
- Alba, Richard, and Roxane Sielberman (2002). "Decolonization Immigrations and the Social Origin of the Second Generation: the Case of North-Africans in France." *International Migration Review* 36: 1169–1193.
- Crul, Maurice, and Jens Schneider. 2012. "Comparative Integration Context Theory." In *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?* edited by Maurice Crul, Jens Schneider, and Frans Lelie, 19–37. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Crul, Maurice, Jens Schneider, and Frans Lelie, eds. 2012. *The European Second Generation Compared. Does the Integration Context Matter?* Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Rosita Fibbi

University of Neuchâtel

 rosita.fibbi@unine.ch

© 2016 Rosita Fibbi

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123859>

Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison, by Rodney Benson, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 293 pp., £60.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-0-521-88767-0

While always a source of contention and debate, some insightful new contributions offering analyses of contemporary representations of immigration, conducted by scholars on both sides of the Atlantic, have particularly sparked my attention recently in my role as a journalist, a cultural geographer, a critical race scholar and journalism professor. The *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* recently published a special issue entitled 'Migrants, Minorities and the Media' and *American Behavioral Scientist* also delved into this territory. However, despite these contributions, I still felt that something was missing.

Rodney Benson's book *Shaping Immigration News: A French-American Comparison* represents an important new departure in critical journalism and immigration studies. Benson challenges some of the methodological approaches that tend to dominate this domain. He provocatively invites us to consider the potential, not just the pitfalls, of comparative approaches to studying immigration news, and sets out a broad and invigorating framework that will serve as a useful template to those wishing to revitalise these debates, which, as some scholars staunchly believe, have long remained stagnant (Mahtani 2001, 2005).

Benson's project is undoubtedly enterprising. He provides a comprehensive study of news coverage of immigration in both France and the USA, spanning a time period of more than 30 years. Embarking upon a comparative study of more than 2000 US and French news stories on immigration, ranging as far back as the early 1970s through to the mid-2000s, Benson also offers us glimpses into interviews he gathered from activists, scholars and journalists (approximately 80 in total) in both countries. He refuses to limit his analysis to national newspapers: he also includes TV items from TF 1, France 2 and Arte in France and, in the USA, from ABC, CBS, NBC and PBS. He rightly suggests that this sample provides a coarse cross-section of the ways that the leading media organisations in both countries cover immigration stories.

What is most potent about this book is its simultaneous depth *and* breadth. The point that I kept returning to as I read the book was Benson's surprising success in overcoming the immense challenge of gathering, and then analysing, this massive pool of data from not one, but two countries, over such a long time period. If that was not enough, Benson draws from two very different media—TV and print journalism—and this led to my piqued curiosity. It would have been ambitious enough to simply focus on TV stories, or print stories on their own, over the course of a decade, for example. But clearly this was not enough for Benson. Instead, the New York University sociology of media scholar offers us an example of how one can conduct strong comparative national journalistic analysis—a field which, unfortunately, has remained immature and nascent. In other words, he offers us a way to think through *both* history and geography through his meticulous and detailed methodological scaffolding.

Benson uncovers some important lessons for those of us interested in the epistemology of news discourse and our contemporary approaches to analysing data in critical journalism studies. Drawing from the language of framing—not a new lens through which to think about difference, to be sure—Benson provides us with a way to *extend* this language to illuminate journalism's insatiable desire to ensure that some aspects of storylines are emphasised, while others are often neglected. Benson reminds us that this tendency guarantees that a complex reality is often glossed over. He provides us with approximately 10 distinctive immigration 'frames' which are culturally available in both the USA and in France. The frames include, but are not limited to, the victim frame portrayal, the global economy frame (which sheds light on the larger context by underlining issues of global inequality), the jobs frame (which accuses immigrants of stealing jobs) and the national cohesion frame, which portrays immigrants as a threat to national unity, a frame I have found particularly pernicious in Canadian media accounts (see Roberts and Mahtani 2010).

Benson smartly does not fall into a particular seductive arena, where scholars tend to focus only on what we might call 'bad' immigrant stories: a tendency that so often distinguishes simplistic and cursory understandings of media representations of immigration. He rightly points out that there are also stories that portray immigrants as heroes, as well as an integration frame that puts a positive spin on immigrants fitting into their host society. He deepens this analysis by asking, what kind of problem, as well as positive phenomenon, is attached to immigrants? And what might be the political precursors that led to these stories?

Benson has some important revelations for us. He tells us that we cannot assume that what he calls the public order frame is solely employed for commercialisation purposes. This is interesting, not least because it can be erroneously assumed that being hard on immigrants in the news will lead to profitability. Benson shows that journalism in both countries tends to follow political attention, whereby government officials, more than any other source, frame immigration as a problem of public order. He also tells us that the humanitarian frame is popular because of its potential to sell media. Explaining how this works in the USA example, he provides us with a rich and focused analysis of American-style narrative reporting, asking about the implications of attempts to humanise the immigrant experience. Deftly dotted through the analysis of these frames are surprisingly candid and fascinating interviews with some of the world's best immigration reporters, including this clip from Nina Bernstein, the New York Times' chief metropolitan immigration reporter, who admits,

I know that some people criticize immigration coverage as too episodic ... and distorted by individual narratives that exaggerate the migrant's agency ... I want to argue for the centrality of human narratives and human voices ... individual stories are a powerful way to convey larger forces. (89).

These interview segments are a gold mine for journalism professors who so rarely have an opportunity to share with students the personal insights from international journalists who cover the immigration beat.

I could not help but wonder what Benson would have made of the European and North American journalistic response to the photo of Syrian refugee Alan Kurdi's lifeless body washed up on the shores of Turkey. We have seen a spate of stories on refugee and immigration issues splayed across the pages of international newspapers since this tragic picture appeared in the press. This is precisely where Benson's meticulous analysis offers scholars an opportunity to reflect more cogently on the potential of progressive comparative media analysis.

I am frankly hard-pressed to come up with what I would deem to be a fair weakness of the book. I often think it is patently unrealistic to expect scholars to critique a book for what the author chose not to explore, as it is, of course, impossible to cover all areas that will please everyone in a two-hundred or so page tome. However, I must admit I was hoping to hear more about diversity. I was left wondering why diversity as an ideology, theme and as a movement in journalism got short-shrift in the book. Those familiar with Benson's *oeuvre* of scholarship will be aware that thinking about diversity in journalism is one of his areas of speciality. I am reminded of his valuable piece in the 2005 issue of *Media, Culture and Society*, where Benson carefully dissects the relationship between American journalism and diversity. In it, he asks if the ideal of diversity can serve as the basis for true media reform, or if it will only serve to offer what he calls 'progressive political cover' (Benson 2005, 6) for a profit-based media that has steadfastly refused to truly engage in serious, democratically infused coverage of growing economic inequality. I was hoping to see Benson delve into this discussion in greater detail in the book. What impact has the diversity discourse in journalism (see Glasser, Awad, and Kim 2009 for an example) had on immigration representations? Benson does explain that a 'limited rise' of a 'diversity orientation' towards immigration reporting (70) contributed to the decline of the jobs frame and the rise of the racism frame, and he gestures in a preliminary way to the neo-liberal reconfiguration of the economic and political fields and its impact on the journalistic field, suggesting that 'an organized diversity journalistic movement partially shifted coverage to emphasizing problems of racism and discrimination' (75). However, he is quick to say a few pages later that '[one] should not overstate ... the ultimate 'success' of diversity journalism inside American newsrooms and its capacity to frame

immigration solely as a problem of racism' (77). I was hoping to hear more about that. As David Roberts and I point out (Roberts and Mahtani 2010), neo-liberalism works to modify the very way race functions in journalistic representations of immigration. We explain that race and racism are inextricably embedded in the neo-liberal project. Analysing immigration representations in Canada's national newspaper, *The Globe and Mail*, we found that immigrants were constructed as neo-liberal subjects through 'common-sense' discourses that work to erase histories of injustice facing immigrants in Canada. The relationship between neo-liberalism—as policy, practice and ideology—and immigration representations offers potentially rich fodder for analysis here. But this is but a minor quibble, and admittedly reflects more of my professional scholarly interests in dissecting the relationship between critical race theory, immigration and journalism, as well as my belief in tracking how structural change can effectively occur in media organisations through ongoing and systemic agitation and activism in newsrooms, particularly among journalists of colour. It may not be fair to take Benson to task for my own professional proclivities, particularly given the impressive range of this book.

At the end of the day, we cannot forget that Benson has offered us a ground-breaking study that covers an astonishing amount of data. Benson not only asks, but answers, some crucial questions that matter to all of us interested in immigration representation and the sociology of media, including the zinger: 'what happens when story-telling journalism, that is, 'narrative' journalism, encounters a structurally complex issue like immigration? Can immigration's relationship to the global economy be captured in a story?' (96). He pushes us to think about the true value of personal narratives in journalistic output, asserting that, '[o]ver and above policy solutions, personal dramas are paramount. But whose personal dramas?' (92). And then the kicker: 'But how often do ... narratives fully 'convey larger forces' including the 'push and pull of economic forces' ... or the conflicts between powerful organizations shaping immigration policy, or the social and economic impacts of immigration on the host society?' (90). Benson concludes by saying that it is nowhere near enough to change individual practices in journalism. Rather, we need to change the rules of the game by considering how to make way for greater reflexivity, ideological diversity as well as critique. This book helps us move towards that space with great creativity, insight and care.

References

- Benson, Rodney. 2005. "American Journalism and the Politics of Diversity." *Media, Culture and Society* 27 (1): 5–20.
- Glasser, Theodore, L. Isabel Awad, and John Kim. 2009. "The Claims of Multiculturalism and Journalism's Promise of Diversity." *Journal of Communication* 59: 57–78.
- Mahtani, Minelle. 2001. "Representing Minorities: Canadian Media and Minority Identities." *Canadian Ethnic Studies* 33 (3): 99–134.
- Mahtani, Minelle. 2005. "Gendered News Practices: The Experiences of Women Journalists in Different National Contexts." In *Journalism: Critical Issues*, edited by Stuart Allan, 299–310. London: Open University Press/McGraw-Hill publishers.
- Roberts, David, and Minelle Mahtani. 2010. "Neoliberalizing Race, Racing Neoliberalism: Representations of Immigration in the *Globe and Mail*." *Antipode* 42 (2): 248–257.

Minelle Mahtani
 Roundhouse Radio/University of Toronto, Scarborough
 ✉ mahtani@utsc.utoronto.ca

© 2016 Minelle Mahtani
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123861>

Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison, by Rodney Benson, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2013, 293 pp., £60.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-0-521-88767-0

Shaping Immigration News is a rich new volume that connects comparative media studies, cultural sociology, and immigration studies. Benson's empirical target is media coverage of immigration in France and the United States, but he uses those data to touch on issues of much broader significance, such as cross-national variation in how the field of journalism operates, and the role of the media in contemporary democracy. Given the broad applications of *Shaping Immigration News*, there are many ways in which one could engage with the text. However, my own research background lies in the study of immigration, so I will address Benson's contribution to those issues.

Benson justifies his comparison of French and American media by noting that the two systems have basic similarities which make them comparable, but that they also have key differences in field position, logic, and structure which can explain some of the media outcomes he observes. In addition, Benson argues (on pages 2 and 3 and in Appendix C) that 'the structural characteristics and politics of immigration in the two countries are similar in many ways ...' This point is intended to strengthen Benson's use of immigration as a case study for analyzing differences in the French and American media and being able to isolate the importance of the unique media field characteristics in each country. Yet while I agree with the basic thrust of Benson's analysis, I think he overstates the immigration similarities between the countries, and it would only strengthen his argument if he placed more emphasis on the differences.

On page 237, Benson writes: 'Although France's assimilationist "republican" tradition is often contrasted with American "multiculturalism", especially in France, immigrants tend to be highly integrated in both countries.' One implication of this observation is that the supposed 'national models' of immigrant integration are inaccurate and create false distinctions between countries. I am sympathetic to this view and fully on board with the notion that 'national models' often obscure important internal diversity and lead to inaccurate caricatures of developments in a given country. Nonetheless, I am not sure Benson is making this critique from the most useful angle.

From my perspective, for Benson's project the most relevant difference between France and the United States when it comes to immigrant integration is not whether immigrants are more or less integrated in one of the two countries, but rather how the two countries approach the issue of immigrant integration. In particular, the French insistence on assimilation means that there is a sharper and brighter divide between those who can be considered authentically French and those who are considered immigrants. In comparison, the American openness to multiculturalism leads to blurrier boundaries in which the difference between being an American and being an immigrant is likely to vary more according to the specific situation (Alba 2005). This distinction has two main implications for Benson's analysis of media coverage of immigration in France and the United States.

The first implication is that the different conceptions of immigration in the two countries may affect what stories get chosen, how the stories are written, and what stories get included in Benson's search terms. Broadly speaking, the concept of immigration in the United States refers to people who were born in another country and immigrated to the United States. In France, the concept is applied much more broadly to also include people who were born in France but are still not considered authentically French for various reasons relating to their families' origins. Curiously, this tendency towards framing the concept of immigration in different ways is probably exaggerated by the stricter search terms Benson employed for the

United States as opposed to France.¹ This is important for Benson because a key assumption in his analysis is that journalists in the two countries are dealing with similar substantive 'facts' that they could choose to cover, but that the field-specific aspects of the two media cultures explain the observed differences in coverage. However, if France has a much broader conception of what counts as 'immigration', this could also contribute to the greater focus on cultural diversity frames. In comparison, the narrower conception of immigration in America could lead to a stricter focus on the act of entering the country and an emphasis on public order frames.

The second implication of the distinction between bright and blurred boundaries in the two countries actually strengthens Benson's analysis. If France and the United States have fundamentally different ways of framing the concept of immigration, yet still look to similar sources and have similar amounts of diversity, criticism, and multi-perspectival coverage, it further strengthens Benson's argument that the field-specific characteristics are most important for understanding the media. This point may have been less relevant for Benson and his primary audience of comparative media systems scholars. Yet as a scholar of immigration I find the point very persuasive and worth making, as it contributes to debates about how to conceptualize 'national models' of immigrant integration. Recent research (see, for example, the July 2012 special issue of *Comparative European Politics* entitled 'The Problems with National Models of Integration: A Franco-Dutch Comparison') questions the use of 'national models' as independent variables that can predict the nature of immigrant integration. This work acknowledges that there may be broad conceptual differences in how people in different countries understand the immigrant integration process (e.g. there is more value placed on assimilation in France as opposed to the United States). Yet, it is not clear that those broad conceptual differences necessarily shape all the numerous societal mechanisms that comprise immigrant integration, such as public policy, labor market priorities, or—in this case—media coverage.² Benson's book builds on these critiques of national models of immigrant integration by showing that whatever differences may exist between the French and American broad conceptualization of immigrant integration, they do not appear to matter much for how the two media systems cover immigration.

In short, *Shaping Immigration News* is an exciting new book with rich and detailed data on how the French and American media have covered immigration over the past 40 years. The book may speak most directly to media studies and cultural sociology, but from my perspective there is plenty of insight for immigration scholars and it is fitting that the book is profiled in *JEMS*.

Notes

1. On page 230, Benson discusses his use of a wider range of search terms in France to capture 'immigrant populations' who were not being referred to as immigrants. The term 'immigrant populations' implies a multi-generational definition, but Benson does not make this point explicitly.
2. In fact, a recent working paper of mine ('Race and the media in France and the United States: Which national approach to racial diversity leads to more biased media coverage of professional tennis players?') makes a similar point about media coverage of black and white professional tennis players.

Reference

- Alba, Richard. 2005. "Bright vs. Blurred Boundaries: Second-Generation Assimilation and Exclusion in France, Germany and the United States." *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 28 (1): 20–49.

Rahsaan Maxwell
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
✉ rahsaan@email.unc.edu

© 2016 Rahsaan Maxwell
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123862>

Response to reviews of *Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison*

Before I respond to their insightful comments and critiques, I want to thank Minelle Mahtani and Rahsaan Maxwell for taking the time and care to engage with my work. I appreciate this opportunity to enter into dialogue with such thoughtful interlocutors and to clarify some of the most important arguments and findings of *Shaping Immigration News*.

I will begin with Rahsaan Maxwell's comments because they raise fundamental issues of comparative research design and methodology. He is absolutely right that in order to make the explanatory argument that differences in journalistic fields shape divergent immigration discourse outcomes, I had to hold constant as much as possible other factors, including the actual immigration experiences and processes in the two countries. I agree with Maxwell that the historical experiences and 'social mechanisms' of immigration are not precisely the same. Yet as Maxwell also notes, French-American differences are often exaggerated. Both France and the USA have long historical traditions of immigration and similarly diverse and increased flows since the 1960s. As I wrote on p. 3, and elaborated in the book's Appendix C:

Research shows similar economic costs and benefits for the host society and similar struggles for immigrants. In both countries, a plethora of well-established immigrant rights associations and restrictionist groups vie for influence over immigration policy, and periodically the immigration issue has become an important stake in political party struggles for power.

In sum, I would argue that the situations in the two countries are close enough that one can reasonably say that French and US journalists covering immigration are able to choose and shape their coverage from comparable ranges of experientially available facts on the ground and culturally available discourses.

Throughout the research process, I was aware of the challenge of constructing comparable national samples, and to the extent possible attempted to control for any possible distortions. For instance, in both countries, my samples included articles about would-be, recent, and second- and third-generation immigrants. News content patterns within and across national media samples were relatively constant regardless of which search terms I used. Maxwell astutely suggests that differences in how the very term 'immigrant' is conceptualised could also shape news coverage, independent of the facts on the ground. He argues that a broader definition of who counts as an immigrant in France could account for some of the news coverage differences I find. I appreciate this nuancing, yet the patterns he cites (higher focus on cultural diversity in France, greater highlighting of public order in the USA) are a bit overstated or ultimately not crucial for the larger arguments that I make.¹ Frame diversity – a measure of ideological pluralism – was actually highest in France during the early 1970s, before the emergence of the 'second generation' arguably broadened the French conception of immigrant. In any case, my intention throughout is to try to isolate the specifically journalistic processes at work. For example, a post-1983 decline in frame diversity in French coverage may be due in part to French reporters' increasing tendency to suppress negative coverage of immigration in order to avoid 'playing Le Pen's game'. In cross-national studies with an *N* of 2, all differences are relative and no single explanatory argument is likely to be complete. I appreciate Maxwell's suggestions of additional factors to take into account.

Even if models of immigration integration are operative somehow in shaping media discourse (a claim towards which both Maxwell and I are sceptical), one thing to consider is that these models actually refer only to a limited range of frames: for instance, they do not help us understand why the French media focus relatively greater attention on the 'global economy frame' that highlights the structural forces prompting massive *emigration*. In both countries, the frames most centrally linked to integration models – integration, cultural diversity, racism, and national cohesion – have periodically but not consistently been major frames, and even then, never the top frames. This finding also connects quite well to Maxwell's second major point, to which I will now turn.

I am intrigued by Maxwell's suggestion to stress more the media similarities in my findings, as a means to call into question the social efficacy of national immigration models. One could indeed stress the fact that in both countries, the public order and humanitarian frames dominate, responding to broadly similar political and economic constraints. Likewise, in both countries, unaffiliated individuals – especially on television news – have become increasingly visible speakers. While I ultimately stress French-American journalistic differences in order to explain divergent and internally diverse patterns of ideological diversity and criticism in immigration coverage, I agree that the important project that Maxwell outlines could fruitfully highlight the similarities. I also concur that the appropriate emphasis may well depend, as Maxwell notes, on the primary scholarly audience and purpose of the research. In relation to immigration scholarship, my chief aim was to draw attention to the news media as an active contributor to and shaper of national immigration debates rather than simply a passive mirror. If nothing else, I hope this book will serve as a reminder to immigration scholars that no serious examination of this highly mediated issue can legitimately afford to leave media out of the equation.²

Minelle Mahtani raises a different set of issues directly related to media representations of immigration and the factors specific to journalistic organisations and professional practices that help account for such representations. Before I respond to her comments, I would like to thank her for calling attention to the many in-depth interviews I conducted with leading immigration journalists. In writing the book I certainly thought of the insider insights offered by these interviews as a major part of my contribution to the literature, so I am delighted that she found these useful and enlightening.

I very much endorse Mahtani's proposal to explore the linkages between neoliberalism and immigration representations, a complex question that she herself has explored with great insight and that deserves to be analysed from multiple angles and perspectives. To some extent this is what I tried to do, examining both cross-national differences in the degree of integration into the global neoliberal system (with France maintaining slightly greater autonomy than the USA) and changes over time (as neoliberal pressures intensified globally). But in regard to how 'race and racism are inextricably embedded in the neoliberal project' (and I have no doubt that they are in diverse and complex ways), what I actually found interesting in my research were the seeming contradictions and unexpected outcomes. In the *Media, Culture, and Society* article mentioned by Mahtani (Benson 2005), I found a surprisingly close alliance between the *anti-racist* 'diversity journalism' movement and major corporate media companies and advertisers. In other words, the people fighting racism appeared to be the most closely linked to the neoliberal project. Moreover, to the extent that reporters were actually influenced by this anti-racist, pro-diversity rhetoric, increased reporting on diversity and racism seemed to displace critical attention to the low-wage economy that attracted so many undocumented immigrants in the first place. For these reasons, I raised a sceptical eye towards the capacity of (this version of highly compromised) diversity journalism to truly broaden the ideological debate or openly challenge capitalist power relations.

How much has changed since the 1990s? Not much. Despite the fact that the vast majority of recent immigrants to the USA are of Latin American origin, Latino/a journalists still make up less than 10% of reporters covering immigration at the leading national newspapers; what is more, after the initial bump in attention, news focused on racism or cultural diversity makes up only a small proportion of immigration coverage. At the same time, the decline of labour reporting on immigration has continued unabated even as the diversity journalism movement has stalled: it no longer seems reasonable to me to posit such a close inverse relationship between the two, which is part of the reason why I did not delve deeper into diversity in *Shaping Immigration News*.

Comparison with France also places the US diversity journalism movement in a different light. What is the difference between a highly compromised diversity movement and no movement at all? The French case suggests: not much, or rather, that such a movement may be largely beside the point. If presence of journalists of colour in the newsroom is the goal and a powerful professional diversity movement is key, then French journalism is definitely less committed to diversity than its US counterpart. And yet the only time over the past three decades that cultural diversity arose to become a major immigration news frame in either country was during the early 1980s in France. This short-lived media celebration of the 'right to be different' was caught up in the politics of the early years of the first post-war socialist administration in France. But the very fact that it could happen in such an explicit way has something to do with the more overt politicisation of the French press. The lack of any pretense of 'objectivity' made it possible for some French journalists to inject cultural diversity into the public debate in a way that has not been possible for American journalists, regardless of their politics or their ethnic/racial background.

My research suggests that France, seemingly less progressive on the politics of difference than the USA, is actually better equipped in the long run to fight for a kind of diversity that is *not* 'embedded in the neoliberal project'. Certainly, greater diversity of backgrounds and experiences could potentially shift the kinds of stories that get covered, the kinds of sources that are asked questions, and the kinds of questions that are asked. Without a doubt *who* is in the newsroom matters, but organisational and professional practices seem to matter even more. To put it another way, a pro-diversity social class habitus has to be supported by a pro-diversity professional habitus. In both countries, news coverage is most pluralistic and critical at news organisations with the greatest autonomy from commercial pressures. Unique features of French journalistic practice also contribute to more ideologically diverse coverage. Inside French newsrooms, immigration reporters are part of a larger 'société' (social problems) department emphasising context and diversity of voices. Page one coverage (the focus of my study) tends to be organised in France as a multi-genre 'debate ensemble' of news, background features, guest commentaries, interview transcripts, and official editorial. Independent of word length, I found that use of this multi-genre approach increased frame and speaker diversity in news coverage. In contrast, as Mahtani quite accurately summarises my conclusions, the personalised narrative approach dominant in the USA – while often providing empathetic in-depth portraits of immigrant lived experiences – tends to suppress context, complexity and diversity in immigration news.

Much of the American coverage of two recent migration waves – of women and children fleeing violence in Central America and of the refugee exodus to Europe from the Middle East and Africa – has been largely true to form: heavy on truly heart-rending images and narratives, but light on history and structural context (Benson 2014, 2015). Emotionally powerful images and articles may temporarily spur the public to action, but for how long? And to do what, exactly? And will they help change the views of those already disposed to anti-immigration attitudes? These questions seem to fall by the wayside. The public wants and needs

information that will help them connect the dots, that is, answers to questions about what is driving emigration and what can be done to help, not just immediately but over the long term. Understanding how and when the media are able to rise to this difficult challenge will be crucial for our democracies at this tumultuous moment in history. *Shaping Immigration News* is my attempt to provide some initial answers and to inspire other scholars, whether from migration or media studies, to put this question at the top of their future research agendas.

Notes

1. As to the former, except for the early 1980s, US–French differences on cultural diversity are trivial, and in both national cases, it is a minor frame; as to the latter, while US media do focus on public order slightly more often than French media, I stress throughout cross-national similarity in this regard given that it is by far one of the dominant frames in both countries.
2. See, as noted in passing by Minelle Mahtani, the recent special issues on media and migration in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, Vol. 41, No. 6, 2015 ('Migrants, Minorities, and Media: Information, Representations and Participation in the Public Sphere' edited by Erik Bleich, Irene Bloemraad, and Els de Graauw) and *American Behavioral Scientist*, Vol. 59, No. 7, 2015 ('Framing Irregular Immigration in Western Media: Voices, Stories and Audience Impact,' edited by Kjersti Thorbjørnsrud).

References

- Benson, Rodney. 2005. "American Journalism and the Politics of Diversity." *Media, Culture & Society* 27 (1): 5–20.
- Benson, Rodney. 2014. "An Immigration Crisis Long in the Making." *Miami Herald*, Issues & Ideas Sunday Section, July 13, Print. <http://www.miamiherald.com/opinion/issues-ideas/article1975324.html>.
- Benson, Rodney. 2015. "Migrants at Sea: The Missing Context." *The Conversation*, May 22. <https://theconversation.com/migrants-at-sea-the-missing-context-42028>.

Rodney Benson
 New York University, New York, NY, USA
 ✉ rodney.benson@nyu.edu

© 2016 Rodney Benson
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123866>

Frontiers of fear: immigration and insecurity in the United States and Europe, by Ariane Chebel d'Appollonia, Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 2012, 336 pp., \$75.00 (hardback), ISBN 978-0-8014-5068-6, \$27.95 pb. ISBN 978-0-8014-7774-4

Debates about border controls, migration status, mobility of persons and the eruption of political violence have evolved dramatically over the past decades. They have been colonised by a language of unease and suspicion transforming the way they are framed as problems, and the nature of public policies applied to them. Border controls are seen through the lens of an (in) securitisation process whereby mobility becomes a danger; they become less a matter of legal distinctions between citizens and foreigners and more the locus of 'frontiers of fear'. This process is led by a political imagination of suspicion surrounding the potential dangers posed by people wishing to enter a country, even before their departure.

Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison

Minelle Mahtani

To cite this article: Minelle Mahtani (2016) Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42:4, 680-683, DOI: [10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123861](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123861)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123861>



Published online: 18 Feb 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 82



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjms20>

Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison

Rahsaan Maxwell

To cite this article: Rahsaan Maxwell (2016) Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42:4, 684-686, DOI: [10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123862](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123862)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123862>



Published online: 25 Jan 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 83



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjms20>

Response to reviews of Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison

Rodney Benson

To cite this article: Rodney Benson (2016) Response to reviews of Shaping immigration news: a French-American comparison, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42:4, 686-689, DOI: [10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123866](https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123866)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2015.1123866>



Published online: 22 Jan 2016.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 115



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
<http://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=cjms20>