

Mediated Citizenship: Immigration and Poverty Reporting from the US and Canadian Press

Contemporary journalism is confronted daily with a growing list of citizenship issues concerned with urban poverty, undocumented migrants, and “reasonable accommodation” of cultural diversity. To bring this complex set of issues into a focused study of how citizenship is represented in the mainstream press, our research applies critical framing, dialogic, and field analysis in order to study the relation between newspaper articles and the civic audience most directly implied by their address in daily reportage on immigration and poverty in specific cities from United States and Canada. The purpose of the research is to identify and compare ways in which journalism expands or reduces gaps between the citizens and non-citizens they report on and the ideal audiences implied by their address.

Explanation of terms used in analysis

AUTHORITY: Who or what is the source of the information in the article? Whose voice is heard in the article? What personas is the author using to give authority to what he/she is writing? Who is quoted in the article?

The authority can be internal or external. For example, in the case of reasonable accommodation, an *external authority* is someone that doesn't need to be accommodated, is part of the majority, or is in the position to accommodate others. The *internal authority* is someone that represents/is/can be the beneficiary of reasonable accommodation. In the case of immigration, internal authority is an immigrant, a community of immigrants, etc.

JUDGEMENT: what is the authority's stance concerning the issue?

Positive Opening: is in favor of

Conditional: is in favor of as long as some conditions are imposed, respected etc, agrees with some things but disagrees with others, imposes certain limits

Rejection: rejects

VALUES: what considerations is the judgment based on?

Emotional: the authority's judgment is based on emotional considerations (personal feelings and experiences); the authority is presenting his/her feelings regarding the issue

Moral: the authority's judgment is based on moral considerations and is giving arguments similar to “because this is how things should be”, “because this is the right thing to do”.

Rational: the authority's judgment is based on rational considerations; the authority is discussing the issue rationally, or/and is maintaining a certain distance or objectivity when discussing the issue