Framing Terrorism in Nordic News Media

A study regarding acts of terror, involved actors, and political messages during 2014-2018

Health and Lifestyle, 15 credits

Halmstad 2019-06-12
Mick Bolland
Framing Terrorism in Nordic News Media

A study on trends within Nordic news media in regards to the presented acts of terror, actors involved with said acts, and political messages during 2014-2018

Mick Bolland
Thesis - Health and Lifestyle 15.00HP, HL8022
Spring Semester 2019, Halmstad University
Supervisor: Linus Andersson
Examiner: Sara Helmersson
Date: June 12th, 2019
The overall aim of this study was to investigate what common trends are within the communication of acts of terror towards the public within the Nordic countries. This was done by positioning the portrayal of terrorism within the theory of framing by Entman (1993) and the model of framing terrorism by Norris, Kern and Just (2003), which provided the following sub-topics to analyze during the research in regards to terrorism: (1) problem definitions, (2) diagnoses, (3) moral evaluations, (4) treatment recommendations, and (5) political messages.

The method was based on quantitative content analysis, which made use of physical, categorical, and thematic distinctions surrounding the framing of terrorism. The sample size consisted out of 138 articles which were analyzed based on these distinctions. The included articles originated from the following online editorials of publisher The Local: The Local Denmark, The Local Sweden, and The Local Norway.

Results indicated an overall more objective approach from the tabloid in regards to terrorism, meaning that mostly only facts were provided but no political messages. Biases within the articles were not directly found, though a focus on male and Muslim perpetrators in regards to acts of terror was apparent.

Conclusions surrounding the analysis include that the editorials generally appear to be protecting the public by not mentioning too many details surrounding acts of terror. The editorials also seemingly contribute to the avoidance of radicalizing potential actors in regards to acts of terror by leaving out details such as diagnoses and moral evaluations. The editorials were furthermore found to hold an objective tone and did not subject to sensationalism.
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1 INTRODUCTION

‘Act of War’, ‘None of us will ever forget’, and ‘Our nation saw evil’ (Abadi, 2018) were news headlines of which the words resonate within the mind for a long time after reading them. These words were the immediate outcome following the acts of terror which occurred on September 11th, 2001, in the United States of America, narrating uncertainty, violence, and encompasses the existence of perhaps true evil within this world. These are the stories that changed the world its perception on both terrorism and Muslim culture.

It has been found, within the media, that a news agency may change their portrayal of a terrorist event depending on the location of the act of terror, but also depending on who the perpetrators or victims are (Arva, Idris & Perez, 2017; Crenshaw, 2014; Powell, 2018). This has been brought in relation with keeping the community reading the news outlet interested, perhaps to be translated to the credibility of the outlet, but also has been brought in relation with shaping the opinions of those following the media outlet. Coverage on Western-based attacks may create islamophobia (Patrick, 2014), and in some countries, such as New Zealand, this has brought on issues such as racism and discrimination towards minority groups such as muslims, as a result of the frequency and type of narrative, perhaps indicating some sort of inequality or too much of a coverage regarding certain individuals, creating stereotypical images when looking at terrorism (Patrick, 2014; Nister Kabir & Hamid, 2015).

The Nordic countries have been found to be among some of the most egalitarian in the world (Social Progress Imperative, 2018), though also within these countries racism and discrimination occasionally flares up within the news. An argued high trust with the news media and potential mirroring of the political landscape (Syvertsen et al., 2014) may have detrimental effects on the Nordic countries and its residents. Radical right-wing political parties opposing immigration are gaining momentum (Payne, 2016), with rankings showing that four out of five Nordic countries—Iceland, Sweden, Finland, and Norway—are among some of the most economically well fairing countries opposing immigration the most (Widfeldt, 2018), and even though racism is condemned by the governments it still exists within the public debate (Gudrun Jensen, Weibel & Vitus, 2017). It becomes apparent that in order to be able to combat these issues, one will have to assess how terrorism within these countries, specifically the Nordics—in regards to the characteristics of the events, victims, perpetrators and motive—, is portrayed.

The aim of this study is to define key elements within the reporting of terrorism in written, online Nordic news media, such as the narrative regarding the characteristics of the perpetrators,
the intent of an event if applicable, how the victims or the effects of a terrorist attack are described, and whether the reporting appears to be subject to sensationalism rather than objective statements. Noted has to be however that even though the study aims to find general trends within the framing of terrorism in the Nordic countries, that the study does account for potential differences between the included countries. Syvertsen and colleagues (2014) argue that the Nordic countries are likely to follow a common, similar news media structure, though may hold minor individual differences.

Consequently, the goal is to create more understanding in regards to the Nordic framing on terrorism, and to lay the pathway towards future national, international and global research on inequality concerning the reporting of acts of terror in regards to ethnicity, religion, and gender, while potentially creating means to abandon stereotypes in global media in regards to what constitutes as a terrorist.

The study was positioned within the theory of framing by Entman (1993), which explains how a narrative, or frame, is generated and what its functions are. This was combined with a model of how terrorism is framed within news media, which is a model described by Norris, Kern and Just (2003). The definition of terrorism, which was also provided by Norris, Kern and Just (2003), was placed within both the theory of framing and the model of framing terrorism, after which several Nordic news media editorials—The Local Norway, The Local Denmark, and The Local Sweden—were compared to these concepts and how these media editorials created, or framed, their articles. An argument can be made that Finland and Iceland are excluded from the equation, however as earlier mentioned it is likely that both will follow a similar approach in regards to media and communication.

In the following sections a more detailed background of the subject will be provided, as well as the research questions and the theoretical framework in which the study was conducted. A literature review of previous conducted research fitting with the narrative and framework will be given after, followed by the used methodology—quantitative content analysis—, closing off with the results and discussion.

1.1 Background

The background section is made up of two subsections. The first subsection contains information regarding previous reporting on acts of terror and the availability of previously done research concerning the topic of framing terrorism, both globally speaking but also specifically in regards to the Nordic countries. The second subsection explains more in detail what online news
agency. The Local constitutes in regards to which countries they serve and how their user base is made up.

1.1.1 A national and global perspective on the framing of terrorism

*Behind the Backlash: Muslim Americans after 9/11* is a book by professor Lori Peek (2010) which holds the stories of 120 Muslim Americans after the 9/11 terror attacks, and gives an insight in what life meant for Muslims after the attacks. It is a story portraying racism, abuse, and oppression, towards people that were wrongly brought into relation with terrorism as a concept, signifying a long road of negative attitudes and prejudice towards individuals and large population groups having no bonds with the extremist views of those responsible for the acts of terror.

Several newspapers until this day, such as The New York Times and The Guardian, still are more likely to be calling events involving extremist religious views as terrorist events, contrary to those involving non-religious motives often being described as lone-wolfs and sole-operators. The Washington Post—another newspaper which conducted their own research regarding the framing of terrorism—concluded that events such as the killings of civilians in Charlottesville, in which an individual named James Alex Fields ran a vehicle into a group of protestors in 2017, killing one and wounding 19 more (Farivar, 2017), and Charleston, where an individual called Dylan roof opened fire on a church, killing nine people in 2012 (Sanchez & Payne, 2016), were quickly condemned by news media and politicians as ‘hate crimes’ contrary to acts of terror, but rather explored the mental instability of the perpetrators than reviewing their extremist views (Arva, Idris & Pervez, 2017). Both events occurred in the United States of America. This is in contrast with the acts of terror in Orlando, United States of America, where a gunman opened fire on a nightclub and killed 49 (Visser & Couwels, 2016), and Barcelona, Spain, where a driving vehicle was used to kill at least 13 and injure 80 people in 2017 (Bolon, Karasz & McKinley Jr., 2017), which were more easily branded as acts of terror. The largest common difference between the events occurring in Charleston and Charlottesville and those in Orlando and Barcelona is that of supposed religion. The former does not involve a Muslim religious component, whereas the latter does (Arva, Idris & Pervez, 2017).

The Nordic news media are no exception, and have also been found to show prejudice towards condemning the Muslim society when looking at terrorist motives and attacks (Hervik, 2018; Nord & Strömbäck, 2006). Norwegian news media have been found to give coverage to terrorist events, though appear to do so in a depoliticizing manner, by not giving the terrorist
motives a platform to speak out but rather present the terrorist as a sole-operator instead of a politically motivated individual (Falkheimer & Olsson, 2015; Goodman & Falkheimer, 2014).

Current scientific research has determined that news media, globally speaking, distinguish on whether to attribute threats or attacks to terrorism depending on: the origin of the perpetrator (Crenshaw, 2014), the belief of the perpetrator (Powell, 2018), whether the perpetrator is male or female (Yarchi, 2014), whether or not the perpetrator is a fellow countryman (Saumel-Azran, Lavie-Dinur & Karniel, 2015), and whether the news outlet is a Western or Eastern-based one (Gerhards & Schäfer, 2014; El-nawawy & Elmasry, 2017).

Initial searches in academic journals and databases makes apparent that a lot of research has been done regarding the framing of terrorism in global news outlets, such as The New York Times, The Guardian, and Al Jazeera. Research appears to however often be limited to either one newspaper with one article, one newspaper with several articles, or coverage on one or two events only in approximately two different news outlets. It appears also, that research done within this field is very limited within the Nordic countries, especially in regards to readers of English versions of the Nordic news media. The Nordic countries are known as some of the most egalitarian countries on the globe according to the Social Progress Index (Social Progress Imperative, 2018), with all Nordic countries appearing in the top 15 out of 146 entries, and it may be that these Western-based countries contain a different image of what to refer to as terrorism than other Western-based news outlets. Initial searches within academic databases showed little research on the framing of terrorism in Nordic news media in general, meaning that in a search specifically directed towards the narrative of terrorism only five articles within 150 journal articles showed somewhat usable data. More research into these specific topics is needed.

1.1.2 The Local

The Local is an online-only news agency, meaning they do not produce any physical papers which is spread to the public, their news items can only be read online. The Local is a single main publisher which holds several editorials based on which country they publish in. The Local has editorials in the following countries: Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Italy, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland. Each editorial has their own editors and writers, mostly two per country. The Local is furthermore owned by both private and institutional investors, of which roughly 20 percent is owned by staff. The Local serves over five million readers combined in all countries of publication, and the funding of the publisher is mostly facilitated by their investors and readers, of
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which the readers pay five euros a month for membership (The Local, n.d.; The Local, n.d.). The Local supposedly, according to an article from 2014, serves mostly readers which identify as either foreign visitors—businessmen, journalists, and tourists—or expats (Langley, 2014). The largest group of readers resides within Sweden with approximately 1.75 million readers, or about one in every six people when comparing to Sweden its total population. In 2009, The Local was nominated as Swedish Digital Newspaper of the Year, however did not win the award. In 2018 The Local won two awards, the first of which was Digital Publisher of the Year in regards to popularity (Sveriges Tidskrifter, 2018), and the second in regards to the Best Use of Online Media (Native Advertising Institute, 2018).

1.2 Theoretical framework

In order to investigate what key elements are within the reporting of terrorism in online Nordic news media and its possible connotations in regards to the public and the political landscape, one must define the following four elements: (1) what the effects of the news media may be on public opinions and public health, (2) what framing is, (3) what terrorism is, and (4) how framing in regards to terrorism works. These four elements are defined within the following sections: 1.2.1, Health and lifestyle, 1.2.2, Framing terrorism, and 1.2.3, The political media environment.

1.2.1 Health and lifestyle

Syvertsen and colleagues (2014) argue in their book ‘The Media Welfare State: Nordic Media in the Digital Era’ that the Nordic countries maintain a high consumption in regards to not only traditional news media in general, but also the more recently developing online news media. It is mentioned that, as cited by Syvertsen et al. (2014, pp. 33) that in 2010 one in three Europeans (34 percent) consulted online newspapers, whereas 78 percent in Norway, 63 percent in Finland, and 54 percent in Sweden made usage of online newspapers. Only major tech giants such as Google and Facebook outperform the presence of the larger online traditional newspapers, and argued is that this showcases the high trust of the Nordic population in regards to traditional but also online reporting. As mentioned by Syvertsen et al. (2014, pp. 33): consumption of online news is a new activity but also represents a form of continuity in relation to the strong tradition of the Nordic countries as typical newspaper countries. High trust with the media may bring opportunities for effectively communicating pressing issues with the public, but may also hold detrimental effects as.
Western-based news media have for example been brought in relation with creating anti-Muslim prejudices, caused in combination with the portrayal of Muslims in Hollywood movies. People having been in contact more regularly with Muslim people showed less negative prejudice towards Muslim populations, though it is argued that the substantial exposure leading to negative prejudice towards Muslims may influence people their opinions in regards to the immigration of Muslims towards Western countries (Saifuddin, 2017). Gorham (2006) also noted that news media using stereotypical depictions within the reporting of crime statistics may subtly influence an individual his/her perception in regards to other social groups.

Yeonjin and colleagues (2015) showed that prejudice regarding other social groups within communities may have a negative impact on the social capital of the neighbourhood. A decreasing social capital—a decrease in interpersonal relations between local neighbours—has been brought in relation with an increased mortality rate among white and black people, thus signalling that negative prejudice within communities may have a negative effect on the general public health.

Negative media attention may also be a cause for depression or negative affection towards the self. A study from 2019 (Misiak et al., 2019) showed that people experiencing depressive symptoms may be more prone towards radicalization, as well as that isolated lone-wolfs may be more subjected to extreme beliefs, ultimately perhaps presenting themselves with psychotic behaviours and/or mood disorders which may be key factors for engaging with extremist actions.

Above stated arguments regard mostly the individual, though news coverage may affect not only individuals but also groups as a whole. Allen and Bruce (2017) for example mention that when minority groups in New Zealand received a negative rhetoric and negative labelling from the media that the majority group tended to marginalize the minority group. They are, in other words, viewing the minority groups as less significant people, and contribute to the exclusion of the minority group from society.

Additionally, attention towards terrorism within media may be a catalyst in people experiencing negative prejudice towards refugees or immigrants, or even dehumanization of those groups. Essess, Medianu and Lawson (2013) found that when news media gave attention to terrorist events that the people their opinion in regards to refugees changed, perceiving them more as animals as opposed to actuals humans. This dehumanization may come paired with feelings of contempt towards the dehumanized, and, as another study pointed out, may result in hostility towards immigrants and refugees (Louis, Esses & Lalonde, 2013). Similarly, the dehumanized group themselves may also show feelings of contempt to those engaging within dehumanizing
ideologies, and may show less admiration towards the majority groups of a country and the country itself.

1.2.2 Framing terrorism

Framing is a theory first developed by Entman (1993), which entails how news items are built up and what effects these deem to have. The model of framing terrorism by Norris, Kern and Just (2003) however adds an extra dimension concerning the public debate and the push of political agendas and policy changes. Both theories rely on the presentation of information and the production of salience among the public. The theory of framing itself however holds some connotations, mostly in relation to its application nowadays when looking at what makes an in-text element salient. The following three subsections will therefore elaborate more on: (1) The theory of framing, (2) Framing terrorism, and (3) Critiques in regards to the usage of framing theory.

The theory of framing

When looking at how terrorism is narrated within Nordic news media it appears suitable to approach this from perhaps the theory of framing, as this is a theory that addresses mostly items communicated by text. Framing is a theory that was first introduced by Robert Entman, who described framing as:

“to select some aspects of a perceived reality, and make them more salient in a communicating text, in such a way as to promote a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation for the item described.” — (Entman, 1993).

Framing consists of four functions, which are deemed to be (Entman, 1993; Jørndrup, 2016):

(1) A particular problem definition. One is to determine what a problem is, and which costs/benefits this problem brings with itself;
(2) A causal interpretation. One is to identify what causes the specific problem. In other words, as Entman describes it, provide a diagnosis;
(3) A moral evaluation, in which motivators by agents are described, and/or;
(4) A treatment recommendation, in which solutions for the problem are provided, including potential costs/benefits of said solution.
Framing can make elements of an article more important by repeating key words more often in-text, thus connecting these words to certain themes, or by connecting elements to symbols which are familiar with the receiver. Framing determines if and how one interprets a problem, but also what one finds an appropriate way as of to solve the problem. This has been confirmed by a study performed in 1984, which showed that framing can direct a large mass of people towards a specific problem and/or solution, though does not guarantee a 100 percent acceptance. The same study also showed that the use of framing may attract attention to one matter, but subsequently also divert attention from other matters by omitting information, which is deemed just as important as the presence and highlighting of other elements within a text (Kahneman & Tversky in Entman, 1993). In this sense it may be appropriate to acknowledge that framing can be used to guide the public, and perhaps even manipulate them. As Kahneman describes: The character, causes, and consequences of any phenomenon become radically different as changes are made in what is prominently displayed, what is repressed and especially how observations are classified.

Entman (1993) makes another notion towards frames in political news, which may be of application in regards to the communication of terrorism within Nordic news media. Entman states that within political news the narrative becomes a competition of registering the identity of actors or interests, and as such can provide a basis for political expression as to how to address acts of terror or on how to provide solutions, where the presence or absence of information may colour the political position of the actors involved. Within this discussion one may have to make use of specific terminology, meaning that the usage of certain keywords may add to credibility of the article, which also means that changing terminology may result in the receiver experiencing lack in credibility. The language used within the frame can, as put by Entman (1993), be as powerful as the frame itself:

**Framing terrorism**

In order to understand how terrorism is narrated within Nordic news media one must first understand what the definition of terrorism is. In their book *Framing Terrorism: The News Media, the Government, and the Public* Norris, Kern and Just (2003, pp. 6) describe terrorism as the systematic use of coercive intimidation against civilians for political goals. Within this definition one can find three elements, which are all determined as necessary in order for an event to be portrayed as terrorism, which are: (1) techniques, (2) targets, and (3) goals.
Techniques involved with a terrorist event can be, as cited by Norris, Kern and Just (2003, pp. 6-7): sabotage, destructive riots, hijackings, assassinations, kidnappings, arson, mass poisonings, torture, rape, bombings, and unlawful imprisonment designed to instill fear, insecurity, and anxiety among its target population. This definition already narrows down that terrorist events are not subject to only personal gain for a perpetrator, but rather serve a broader goal, which could be defined as sending a message to a larger public. Mentioned is that within a democratic society terrorist techniques are usually used as a last resort to send a message to the regime, as within non-democratic environments a terrorist technique may be employed as a primary mean of expression.

The targets within terrorist events are confined to those of the public, making them different from acts of war in which attacks against military personnel are described. A wider definition employed by the United States may be that of non-combatants, which also includes military personnel that is not engaged with military actions or carrying weapons at the time of the event. Targets may be chosen at random or be confined to specific groups such as Muslims, Israelis or Christians. The unpredictable choice of target adds to the character of terrorist events to instill fear among the public. Often there is a connotation attached to terrorism that perpetrators are usually found within extremist groups sending a message to the government, though the state or government itself may also engage in terror-like actions infringing on human rights as a means to send a message to their civilians. Terrorism is usually defined as domestic when both the victims and perpetrators originate from within the same national borders (Norris, Kern & Just, 2003, pp. 7).

Terrorist events often pursue multiple political goals. The first goal is connected to the event itself, and involves generating fear with those affected by the event and those related to the affected, such as victims and families. The secondary goal often relates to the wider public, in which the aim is to for example eliminate political opponents and destroy symbolic targets, effectively weakening the opposition and to make it easier to create a political discourse (Norris, Kern & Just, pp. 7-9). Terrorist events are therefore often used to publicly announce the for the perpetrator pressing issues, display complaints in regards to the political environment, and communicate demands to be accepted by the receivers. This is where perhaps some difficulty for the media may arise: what should one report on terrorism? The media may transform into a ‘mouthpiece’ for the terrorist organization, putting journalists in a tough spot on how and what to communicate in regards to terrorist events. One excludes here that goals again are private and serve
to pursue a more public ‘good’, as well as that events are usually happening within a chain contrary to only single events. Norris, Kern and Just (2003, pp. 7-9) also include that a terrorist event can only be deemed an act of terrorism when goals of the event have been made clear. As such, random acts of violence are excluded from being categorized as acts of terror. Acts following a general idea, such as to combat the usage of animals in testing products by destroying testing facilities, may also be described as terrorist events as these have a political goal and are following a chain of events: the acts spread a message. The mass media becomes an important part of terrorism, where one can communicate demands, motives, but also reactions. The mass media becomes the ground for what is ‘good’ and what is ‘bad’, and may portray the conflict with the regime or between the government and terrorist groups. As such, news agencies become facilitators for the discourse of political messages as involved with such events.

The definition of terrorism and the theory of framing can be combined in a model which can be found in the book of Norris, Kern and Just (2003, pp. 12). The model includes factors that make up how a terrorist event will be portrayed in the news media, based on three factors: (1) the act of terror itself, (2) the definitions and opinions of the target group which the news item is directed towards, differently coined as the group frame, and (3) the definitions and opinions of the government regarding the event, including briefings by, as cited by Norris, Kern and Just (2003, pp. 12): political leaders, spokespersons for relevant government agencies, the military, law enforcement, intelligence services, and expert commentators, in the model referred to as the government frame.

Figure 1: Model of the framing process for terrorist events (Norris, Kern & Just, 2003, pp. 12)
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Norris, Kern and Just (2003) mention that the social culture at any point, on at least ‘one-sided’ coverage—coverage which is often found in which the government its position is a dominating one, leaving out minority opinions—is a determinant for how the event will be communicated towards the public. It may be that when the articles are aimed towards internationals residing within a country that one may receive a differently phrased narrative than their native peers. It is also argued that a source may be deemed credible when exploring more reasons as if to why an event occured. The language itself may be telling, such as that different words for the same event can be used, as for example: lynching, murder, assassination, or killing (Norris, Kern & Just, 2003, pp. 13). The choice of words and use of imagery within a news frame may influence the so called load or feeling a message brings along. In some sense one could consider, according to Norris, Kern and Just (2003), that journalism or narratives within the news media happen in a similar style as scientific reporting, as depending on the group one reports to there may be a hidden set of rules which a news outlet conforms to in order to stay relevant. In some cases this may cause controversion between news outlets, as their interpretation of what the correct way of reporting acts of terror entails may differ from one another, highlighting events from different perspectives or connecting different motives as if to why said event took place. This may be especially apparent within ‘two-sided’ coverage, in which the interpretation of two different communities may form an opposition towards one another.

Critiques in regards to the usage of framing theory

However, Carragee and Roefs (2004) argue against framing, or rather, the utilization of the concept of framing. Modern discourse has argued that framing nowadays mostly constitutes the production of text based on either story topics, attributes, or issue positions. In this sense an article may be limited in its scope, and Carragee and Roefs (2004) explain the potential troubling effect that this may have, as the news articles themselves may be placed out of the context themselves, potentially creating a power imbalance between the actual event which was reported on and the reporting itself. Another issue that rises as a result of only approaching articles from a ‘topic, attribute, or issue position’ perspective is that these materials are more categorized as being themes, rather than frames (Carragee & Roefs, 2004). Frames do not only contain categorized news, but rather also investigate where the emphasis within reporting lies, the interpretation of said reporting, and excluded materials within reporting. In that sense, framing goes beyond just what is presented, but aims to investigate how information is presented (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2015). This
argues however that based on solely text that it may be hard to determine a frame as one does not investigate how the information is interpreted.

Another issue raised by Carragee and Roefs (2004) is that frames by definition interact with the public, meaning that from a more psychological perspective one has to be aware that frames interact with and contribute to the social and political environment of the public. This means that the discourse regarding the frames often neglect the mirroring or opposing relation of the news media with the political landscape. Argued is therefore that when discussing framing one should also integrate a political discourse, meaning that the effects of public and national ideologies should not be left out of the picture in regards to news articles.

Additional ‘problems’ regarding framing were mentioned by Cacciatore, Scheufele and Iyengar (2004), mainly in regards to defining framing but also its relation to other models. According to them, framing is a theory which bases itself on salience, or whether how important certain elements in-text are made out to be. Arguably this means that, whenever a text more prominently or at all displays certain elements in contrast to another text, in regards to the same topic, that this text has a different frame. They argue that this means that framing itself would not have any practical value based on differences in information, but should rather be approached from a more categorical perspective in which the persuasive power and quality of the text take a more central position during analysis (Cacciatore, Scheufele & Iyengar, 2004).

The discussion by Cacciatore, Scheufele and Iyengar (2004) also surrounds other theories such as ‘priming’ and ‘agenda-setting’. A clear distinction has to be made between these three models, in which both priming and agenda-setting are also based on salience of text elements, however these theories are significantly different. Priming works more in relation to how the public perceives the information, whereas agenda-setting relates more to how the text determines what the public and political debates are about. Entman (2006) argues that the theory of framing may use both priming and agenda-setting in that it uses priming to direct the public focus towards in-text elements, and defines agenda-setting as the first function of framing in which it provides the ‘problem’ which seems most valuable to communicate towards the public. This makes for a new argument, which states that in some sense the message is always political, as the topic of what the public should be thinking about is arguably always decided by the news media. As put by Cohen (1963, pp. 13): *the media may not be successful much of the time in telling people what to think, but is stunningly successful in telling its readers what to think about.* This does counter the idea that states that a political message may be present when looking at potentially present treatment
recommendations, but adds to it that by deciding what the public discourse is about that a political direction is always present, even though the political message itself may not be prominently visible.

1.2.3 The political media environment

In addition to that the framing of terrorism may to some extent involve a politically loaded message, it may be of importance to highlight different models as if to how the media and politics operate when communicating political decisions and opinions towards the general public. Hallin and Mancini (2004) described in ‘Comparing Media Systems: Three models of Media and Politics’ three different models on the interaction between media and political streams, further known as: (1) The mediterranean or Polarized Pluralist Model, (2) The North/Central European or Democratic Corporatist Model, and (3) The North Atlantic or Liberal Model. An explanation regarding all three models will be provided below.

The Polarized Pluralist Model

The Polarized Pluralist Model is a model which has a strong focus on narrating the political environment, in which the media tends to familiarize with key political figures, the government, and figures with strong ties to political parties. The media can be used as an instrument to push political agendas, and public broadcasting occurs frequently. This specific style has received criticism as journalism itself appears to have less autonomy. It is also apparent that media outlets are funded and regulated by the government, though the latter only with limitations. Countries that were previously shown to show similar traits as compared to the Polarized Pluralized model include: France, Greece, Italy, and Portugal (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, pp. 73).

The Democratic Corporatist Model

Historically speaking this model was subject to a high degree of mirroring the political landscape, though in recent years this has somewhat degraded. This means that nowadays this model is more subject to neutral news coverage, making it more of an information-oriented news provider rather than maintaining an opinion-influenced approach. The media landscape does usually provide high state support, but in addition to this also operates individually, meaning that the media is not so much regulated by politics but rather voices being in agreement with the government. Countries that were known to be following a Democratic Corporatist approach at
the time of publication included countries such as Austria, Belgium, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Finland (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, pp. 74).

The Liberal Model

Hallin and Mancini (2004, pp. 75) mention that the Liberal Model is known to not narrate in unison with the political environment, but is rather driven by consumer needs and therefore does subject more to sensationalism rather than objective views, though does still favour informative journalism. The government has a relatively low influence on the news coverage as compared to the Democratic Corporatist Model and the Polarized Pluralist Model. Examples of countries involved with a more liberal style in regards to interaction between the news and politics include: Canada, the United States of America, and Ireland.

Additionally, in regards to the different media models as described above, Syvertsen and colleagues (2014) argue that the Nordic countries all follow a similar pattern when using several kinds of media, such as printed and online newspapers, but are different enough from other parts of the world to obtain attention from researchers everywhere. It is mentioned that, within the Nordic media landscape, that the newspapers function as a mirror for the current socioeconomic and political environment within the Nordic countries. If this is the case it may be possible that, even though the Nordics are regarded to as egalitarian, one may find that the news media mirrors the rise of radical right-wing parties within parliament, thus maybe showing a tendency to display negative prejudice towards immigrants when reporting on immigration and terrorism. The media is to some extent responsible for the public debate and functions as sort of a social glue, meaning that an individual’s image of the social environment is not only depending on face-to-face interaction with one another, but rather can be influenced by the media also. This means that feelings such as identity and inclusion can be formed by the media, but also feelings of alienation, division among social groups, and social exclusion (Syvertsen et al., 2014, pp. 13).

1.3 Problem definition and aims

In regards to trying to find out whether the framing of terrorism happens in a fair, equal manner within the Nordic countries, as a way to find out whether or not steps have to be taken to not stereotype offenders—and with that, whole populations having no connections to terrorist events possibly resulting in the oppression of specific populations—, it seems of importance to find
out what the narrative within the Nordic news media is in regards to terrorism. The main research question was therefore phrased as:

“How was terrorism framed within Nordic news media in the years 2014-2018?”

The main research question is a broad one, and thus it was proposed to make use of several sub-questions to properly answer the main research question. As the question regards the framing of terrorism it appeared appropriate to make use of the four functions of framing and the addition of the presence of a political message when framing terrorism when constructing sub-questions. Five sub-questions were therefore proposed, of which the first was formulated as:

1) To what extent were problem definitions provided within the reporting of acts of terror?

This question regards to what happened, which includes variables such as: the presence of a terror attack or terror threat, characteristics of those involved with executing the attack or threat, characteristics of victims of attacks or threats, and whether an act of terror—including both terror attacks and terror threats—was depicted as domestic or international.

The second and third function of framing constitute the presence of a diagnosis, or goal, and the presence of a moral evaluation, or motive. As such, the second and third sub-questions were phrased as:

2) To what extent were diagnoses provided within the reporting of acts of terror?
3) To what extent were moral evaluations provided within the reporting of acts of terror?

The last function of framing provides the presence of a possible treatment for the problem. Therefore the following sub-question was constructed in order to find what solution or response the authorities gave in regards to terror activities:

4) To what extent were treatment recommendations provided within the reporting of acts of terror?

Norris, Kern and Just (2003) argued for the presence of a political message when communicating terrorism towards the public. Consequently the last sub-question was therefore deemed to be:
5) To what extent were political messages provided within the reporting of acts of terror?

It has to be noted, though, that the questions above do not represent frames, but rather give the opportunity to find out as if to what constitutes within the functions of frames surrounding the reporting of terrorism. The sub-questions do not form frames by themselves, but rather provide bricks to build frameworks both in regards to Entman (1993) his theory and Norris, Kern and Just (2003) their model on framing terrorism.

The study aimed to gain a broader understanding regarding the trends when reporting on terrorism within the Nordic countries, to investigate whether the narrative in regards to acts of terror are perhaps subject to stereotyping, sensationalism, or spreading political ideologies within the Nordic news media. This may colour the image which the public has regarding what constitutes as a terrorist event and/or a terrorist, possibly subjecting people of minority groups to racism and discrimination as a result of news framing. The news media play a large role within communicating that it is not an entire population, such as Muslims, that is connected to acts of terror, rather than a few outliers or extremists. That said, it is important to become aware what the narrative is like in current day and age in order to be able to make steps towards a more fair and objective portrayal of terrorism, if deemed necessary.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

For the literature review it seemed of importance to find more material on the victims and perpetrators involved with terrorist events, as well as the involvement of the government, the frequency of coverage regarding the characteristics of terrorist events, and how a threat or attack was viewed when depicted as either domestic or international. All elements were searched for in regards of their portrayal within the news media. Articles were included based on the following criteria:

(1) Described effect(s) of terrorism on media;
(2) Described effect(s) of media on terrorism;
(3) A narrative in regards to terrorism in the news media;
(4) A narrative involving a description of perpetrators, victims, and/or authorities.

In total 29 articles were included in the literature review, of which the results were divided into the following categories:
For a more comprehensive explanation on how the literature review was conducted, see appendix I.

2.1 The characteristics of perpetrators, victims and the government/authorities

Yarchi (2014) found in a study on 625 newspaper articles appearing in British, American and Indian tabloids, that when females were the perpetrators of a terrorist attack more attention was given to the personal issues surrounding the perpetrator. The narrative changed to analyzing the psychological state of the female perpetrator, as opposed to male perpetrators.

In regards to domestic terrorism, a 2015 study by Saumel-Azran and colleagues found that American newspapers reasoned in favour of mental instability when reporting on domestic terrorism, whereas Norwegian and Israeli newspapers, regardless of ethnicity or religion, maintained to label domestic terrorist attacks fueled by political motivators, excluding mental instability. Additionally it appears, according to Crenshaw (2014), that if terrorists appear to be fellow countrymen that one is to describe these people more as lone-wolfs and cast away from society, whereas terrorists with a foreign nationality easier obtain a ‘terrorist label’. Domestic attacks may also be, additionally to being subject to being described as lone-wolf operators, be depoliticized, meaning that socio-political motivators may be excluded from the news report as Falkheimer and Olsson (2015) reported after analyzing over 900 articles from two major Norwegian newspapers.

Also, identities of perpetrators may sometimes be wrongly represented within the news media. Chang and Chin Roemer (2014) found that within several American newspapers the identities of the perpetrators after an attack, Muhammed and Malvo, were described as with varying degrees of ‘blackness’, from Muslim origin, veterans of war, or maintained an immigrant status. Argued was that this may be due to confusion with reporting, or deliberate misinformation.

Ethnicity is arguably involved within the framing of terrorism as well, as even ten years after the incidents following the Muhammed Cartoons in Denmark Danish news outlets still refer to Muslims as potential threats being in a phase of transitioning towards exercising extremist methodologies. The dominant information flow still covers Muslims using a spacial-racial logic, potentially generating negative prejudice towards the Muslim population (Hervik, 2018). This is
confirmed by Kanji (2018), who showed that terrorist events involving Muslim perpetrators generally received 1.5 times more coverage than events with non-Muslim perpetrators, as well as that Muslims were more often brought in relation with violence than non-Muslims. Another study supported the idea that Islam was connected to terrorism by the news media (Powell, 2018). Schmuck et al. (2018) also showed that the news media may harbour islamophobic tendencies, as unidentified perpetrators, whether true or not, were more easily referred to as from Muslim descent. The same paper also mentioned that right-wing extremism was more often called as a motivator for a terrorist event if Muslim victims were present, but attacks on non-Muslim populations were more easily labelled as terrorist events, grouped together with Islamic features.

Additionally it was pointed out by El-nawawy and Elmasry (2017) that location together with ethnicity and/or religion may influence terrorist framing also, as they found that victims were humanized when attacks occurred within Western-Europe, as opposed to terrorist events in Muslim-majority countries such as Turkey and Nigeria, where attacks were more commonly referred to as a result of internal conflict within the country and not as a result of terrorist activities.

Speculation remains part of framing terrorism within the news. Nord and Strömbäck (2016) demonstrated after analyzing several Swedish news agencies that Swedish tabloids often speculate on what motivates terrorist attacks, more so than their British counterparts. British newspapers appeared less anti-Muslim and showed more favourable intent towards the Muslim community. The idea of Muslim oppression by Western society was often left out of the Swedish narrative on terrorism, maintaining a status of ‘good versus evil’ between the West and East.

Lastly, counterterrorist actors such as governments and police officers may be identified as ‘heroes’ in wake of a potential terrorist attack. A threat deemed real may cause a shift of attention from victim and perpetrator to the effectiveness of safety and security forces involved with countering terrorist strikes (Sela-Shayovitz, 2015). Alternatively, according to a case study from Kenya, it was found that when a domestic attack took place that the government was generally criticized, questioning its effectiveness and potential to prevent such attacks (Schaefer, 2006).

2.2 News coverage, focus, and differences

Findings from a 2015 paper conclude that, contrary to Western-based news outlets, Middle-Eastern networks such as Al Jazeera and Al Arabiya TV do recognize the majority of Muslim victims. Focus however remained with mentioning that most terror-related strikes
involved Muslim perpetrators. The tabloids were also found to give little information in regards to the societal effects of the strikes (Abdullah & Elareshi, 2015; Zeng & Tahat, 2015).

Patrick (2015) has shown that coverage on Western-based attacks may support islamophobia, as is confirmed by Nister Kabir and Hamid (2015) who showed that continued focus on Muslim elements within attacks sparked racist feelings among inhabitants of New Zealand.

A study on British news channels also found that news agencies may focus more on death and injury revolving around terrorist events, playing into factors such as chaos and confusion. Elements such as affected survivors or the attack its effect on society were less highlighted within the news media. Newspapers were deemed the largest culprit in regards to spreading chaos and confusion (Iqbal, 2015). Yarchi and colleagues (2013) add to this idea, having found that journalists generally engage more with creating dramatic stories, as opposed to generating accurate, political portrayals of terrorist events.

A study analyzing 19 years of media coverage mentioned that, specifically within Danish news media, it was found that terrorist were depicted as identifiable and controllable people, perhaps suggesting that terrorist events to some measure are preventable (Mortensen, 2019).

Finally, it may be difficult to find which narrative is more true, as the lens through which a news outlet views a terrorist event may differ based on the outlet. Differences have been found to be the largest between the news outlets themselves, and not between countries. CNN and Al Jazeera for example were found to document terrorist events in light of “the global war on terror”, whereas the BBC and ARD depicted the same events as more individualized attacks on humanity, much less painting the image of war (Gerhards & Schäfer, 2014).

2.3 News coverage effects

Michael (2017) found that terrorist events may occur more often after news coverage on terrorist strikes, as much as a rate of 1.4, or three casualties, within four weeks after initial news reporting originating from the The New York Times. However, news coverage may reduce cross-border terrorism, as Asal and Hoffman (2016) reported that terrorist events transcending country borders were reduced after national news coverage by the press. Freedom of press however appeared to not be of influence on the frequency of terrorist events.

Research from 2016 showed that, besides frequency of attacks being influenced by news media coverage, it appears that overall attitudes towards Muslims gained a more positive twist
following news reports on terrorist attacks. The duration of this effect was however short, reverting back to its usual narrative within a few months (Bleich, Nisar & Abdelhamid, 2016).

Earlier it was described that following news coverage in regards to terrorist events that people may experience racist feelings towards Muslims. Similarly it was found that in American news coverage after the 9/11 attacks in 2001 that the discourse regarding Muslims changed, connecting them to radicalization and extremist views (Umamaheswar, 2015). Another study confirms this theory, signalling once again the ongoing conflict between the ‘good’ West and ‘evil’ East (Silvia, 2017). Ali and Khattab (2017) expand on this, having found that in Australia, next to racism and discrimination, people may from a nationalistic perspective feel the need to ‘regain the country’. The paper suggests that the media plays an important role within of the stigmatization of ethnicity and religion based on extremist groups.

And, next to nationalistic feelings and racism, it has been found that the mass media may be of influence on the copycat effect (Helfgott, 2015), meaning that media coverage of terrorist events may ‘invite’ potentially dangerous individuals to engage with acts of terror themselves.

2.4 Summary

In short, it seems that the news media on a global scale seemingly favours the involvement of Muslim perpetrators within the narrative of terrorism, possibly contributing to stereotyping those of Muslim descent as potential perpetrators for future terrorist events. The explanation of what constitutes as a terrorist is not a strong given, but veterans of war, immigrants, people with various degrees of blackness, and Muslims have all been brought into relation by the news media as perpetrators. Additionally one is more easily described as being a terrorist when part of the male population, as sources found that when the perpetrator was deemed to be a woman that the need to explain complications happening within their personal life seemed to favour the explanation of extremist views and motives.

The description of victims of terrorist events also seem to be affected by perhaps their ethnicity and location, as Western-based terrorist events generally receive more media coverage, and are more often labeled as a terrorist event, whereas Eastern-based terrorist events are subjected to less or no media coverage, with an explanation of said event boiling down to that of internal conflict within the country.

Location matters, not only for where a strike takes place, but also from the perspective of whether an event is either domestic or international. Domestic terrorism suffers the same error as
that of the male and female debate, namely that domestic perpetrators are more often described as lone-wolfs and individuals with perhaps mental issues, as opposed to those within an international environment where the line of communication has the tendency to call a perpetrator more often a terrorist.

The government may also be of influence on the narrative, such as that terrorist events or perpetrators will often be described as identifiable and controllable people, making them potentially subject to more control by the government. One can also see that when international threats are about to happen that the news media focuses more on effectiveness of the government, possible hailing those involved as ‘heroes’. Contrary to international threats, in case of domestic threats, the opposite seems to happen, causing criticism in regards to the government instead of praise. Little information was found regarding the involvement of authoritarian regimes engaging in suppressing actions themselves.

3 METHOD

In this chapter the chosen methodology for the analysis of the Nordic news media on the reporting of terrorism will be discussed. In the first section the overall methodology will be discussed, which is content analysis. Afterwards the more specific method of the study will be further explained, including elements such as the design of the study, the sampling method, the data gathering method, the processing and analysis of data, and the ethical decisions taken into consideration when conducting the study.

3.1 Methodology

Science is a tool, a tool to provide oneself but also others with knowledge (Johansson, 2016). Scientific knowledge therefore must be right, and must be approached from a scientific perspective or methodology. The natural sciences often aim to find laws, however, in regards to the social sciences, there are merely only trends or perhaps common behaviours to be found. The social aspects as is the matter with communication are subject to social interaction and human behaviour, and therefore cannot be expressed in determined laws, as well as that consciousness and interpretation are by default unique properties of every individual (Johansson, 2015, pp. 173; Znaniecki, 1925). Framing trends can still considered to be knowledge, but only if these are deemed to be the truth, can be fully justified, and are not subject to accidental generalizations (Johansson, 2015, pp. 21-38). As communication and framing therefore can be considered unique
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and subject to human behaviour, the study merely functioned as if to find trends within the reporting of acts of terror, rather than find absolute truths. Therefore, a methodology fitting with the systematic analysis of textual trends—and consequently also method—was employed: quantitative content analysis.

Content analysis is a methodology leaning itself especially well for the analysis of texts such as, as cited by Krippendorff (2004, pp. 21): *printed matters, recorded speech, visual communications, works of art, and artifacts*. The methodology works from the perspective that all texts are to be read, and thus have a receiver and carry meaning for said receiver. The texts do not just have meaning for the content analyst, but contains meaning for both reader and writer. This does also mean, that when conducting content analysis, that one has to be aware of the following parameters as involved with written text, as cited by Krippendorff (2004, pp. 22-25):

1. Texts have no objective qualities;
2. Texts do not have single meanings;
3. The meanings invoked by texts need not be shared;
4. Meanings (content) speak to something other than the given texts;
5. Texts have meanings relative to particular contexts, discourses, or purposes;
6. The nature of texts demands that content analysis draw specific inferences from a body of text to their chosen content.

The points above illustrate that texts to some extent can never be objective, as a text always has a writer and a receiver. Everyone, including writer, receiver, and analyst, reads from a different perspective and may interpret text differently. Consequently, a different interpretation can also mean that the text has a different meaning depending on whoever looks at the text. As is with the social sciences, individuals may hold different reasons, interpretations, and motives in order to take certain actions, and in line with social sciences this also means that the meaning in regards to a text may be different depending on the individual. Actions may well be executed in a similar fashion, but the why may be different. This also signals that texts may call for different ideologies or actions from the reader, as is illustrated with parameter 4 above, as conceptions and actions in regards to texts may differ based on the individual. The text speaks to a certain concept or preconception, or may generate both. Similarly, it would be important to be aware of the contextual setting in which the text appears, even though this may require additional literature. The meaning of text may change depending on why it is examined, but also depending on who examines it. Consequently
this does make content analysis perhaps more manageable, as the context of the text itself may narrow the amount of possible interpretations. A content analyst is however bound to draw conclusions only from the characteristics of the text, meaning that factors such as unobserved facts, intentions, mental states, prejudices, planned actions, and antecedent or consequent conditions should be left out of the equation, and as such content analysis should only answer questions specifically drawn from texts itself (Krippendorff, 2004). Content analysis as a technique is by Krippendorff ultimately defined as a research technique for making inferences by systematically and objectively identifying specified characters within a text (Stone, Dunphy, Smith & Ogilvie in Krippendorff, 2004, pp. 25).

Content analysis can be divided in two streams, which are qualitative and quantitative content analysis. Both forms of content analysis have their negative limitations, and both approaches have received criticism of equal volume. Quantitative content analysis has been deemed merely a study of numbers and according to many scientists leaves out the impression of what a text could be or the more complex thought processes that surround texts. The quantitative approach searches more for general trends instead of a deeper understanding of what a text does (Krippendorff, 2004). Remarks around a qualitative approach regarding content analysis conclude that, even though it lends itself more to analyse reasoning behind the construction of an article, and to go more in-depth regarding phrasing and such, it fails to generate generalizable data, and to some extent perhaps lacks structure, reliability, and can feel impressionistic. Krippendorff (2004) mentions though, that within this methodology both qualitative and quantitative approaches overlap and should both not be excluded from research, as one will try to generalize data which has a quantifying nature, but also categorize data, in which giving the weight to certain factors in some sense is always a subjective process, making a quantitative approach by default also qualitative.

However, given that the objective of this study is to find out how textual framing of terrorism is performed within the Nordic news media, indicating that the objective is to find key characteristics within the terrorism communication based on multiple data entries, one can assume that the most fitting approach would be to use quantitative content analysis as opposed to qualitative content analysis.

3.2 Method

Within this section the characteristics of the study will be described, such as the design, the sampling, the data gathering, and data processing and analysis. The method will be described in
light of its application in regards to the content analysis of several Nordic news media editorials, online newspapers, their reporting on terrorism.

3.2.1 Design

Within the methodology of content analysis the type of method used to collect and analyse data was a content review. A review is based only on already available content, and as such the study itself was of a non-experimental nature, meaning that the samples and collected data were not subjected to any form of manipulation by the researcher. The study did also not include participants of any kind. The study was furthermore both correlative and comparative of kind, meaning that relations within the data were tried to be found, but also differences between different news editorials based on the relations found. Texts, or units, were gathered from multiple Nordic news editorials as described in section 3.2.2. Units were then individually coded based on the codebook, which can be found in appendix II. The data was afterwards analysed with the use of SPSS, as further described in section 3.2.4.

3.2.2 Sampling

Systematic relevance sampling was used in order to collect all samples for the study. Three Nordic news editorials were determined to be used for analysis, which were The Local Denmark, The Local Sweden, and The Local Norway, as these news editorials provide texts written in English and are all part of a larger publishing agency. On each news editorial its website—either The Local Denmark, The Local Sweden, or The Local Norway—the phrase “terror month year” was used as search query, in which the word ‘terror’ was consistently present, and the month was changed to the month of publication one was looking for, as well as the year of publication. The search was limited to articles published between January 1st 2014 and December 31st 2018. Units were then systematically chosen from each year and month of publication, meaning that the most early publication within the month meeting all the inclusion criteria was included within the sample. Units included for the gathering of data were selected based on the following criteria:

(1) The text must be written in English;
(2) The text must be placed within the context of, but not limited to, acts of terror. The text may address other issues as well, such as immigration and/or political agendas, but must at the very least contain a reference towards terrorism;
(3) The text must originate from one of the following online news outlets: The Local Denmark, The Local Sweden, or The Local Norway.

In total N=138 articles were included based on the inclusion criteria, of which N=45 from The Local Denmark, N=50 from The Local Sweden, and N=43 from The Local Norway. 42 data entries were left out of the sampling as these entries did not meet the inclusion criteria, meaning that the data set was 77 percent complete. The missing 23 percent was not deemed to be of major influence on the results.

3.2.3 Data gathering

Data was gathered by means of recording units (Krippendorff, 2004) placed within the included text. In that sense, units were then recorded from the viewpoint of the model regarding framing of terrorism. Krippendorff (2004, pp. 103-107) describes five ways of recording and analyzing bodies of text, which are: (1) physical distinctions, (2) syntactical distinctions, (3) categorical distinctions, (4) propositional distinctions, and (5) thematic distinctions. During this study use was made of three of these distinctions, which are: (1) physical distinctions, (2) categorical distinctions, and (3) thematic distinctions.

Physical distinctions

(1) General elements within the text (date of publication, origin of text, length of text in words, etc.);
(2) Recurrence of the words ‘terrorist’, ‘terror’, and ‘terrorism’;
(3) The usage of identifiable sources;

Categorical distinctions

(4) The presence and/or absence of a perpetrator and/or victim profile, including factors such as: identification of the perpetrator/victim, religion, nationality, and gender;
(5) The presence and/or absence of a location as if to where the act of terror, domestic or international, took place;
(6) The presence and/or absence of governmental organizations and/or authorities within the framing of terrorism;
Thematic distinctions

(7) The presence and/or absence of a political message within the framing of terrorism;
(8) The presence and/or absence of goals and motives for exercising an act of terror.

A codebook was used during the recording of the units. The codebook was drafted and afterwards tested in three stages in order to create inter-rater reliability. After the first draft the codebook was tested—on three randomly from the sample chosen articles—by the researcher and an external individual. After this stage the codebook was revised, and tested by two other external individuals, after which the codebook was altered again in order to account for inconsistencies and errors. Following the final revision, the codebook was tested by externals once more and found to be consistent. The codebook provided for all physical, categorical and thematic distinctions, which were divided over six different sections: (A) Physical properties, (B) General characteristics, (C) Characteristics of perpetrators, (D) Characteristics of victims, (E) Characteristics of governmental bodies and/or authorities, and (F) Writing properties. See appendix II for the codebook and all 46 variables.

3.2.4 Data processing and analysis

The retrieved data of the articles was registered in SPSS. The results of the data were divided within two sections: (1) Frequencies and (2) Relations. The frequencies section reports the counts found, or amounts, as discovered when checking each variable for all units. Followed are the relations found between these variables, provided in the relations section. Within the first section the data was divided within the following categories, in accordance with the four functions of framing (Entman, 1993) and the presence of a political message within the unit (Norris, Kern & Just, 2003):

(1) Trends as found within reporting the problem, meaning the description of what happened, provided characteristics of the perpetrators, and provided characteristics of the victims;
(2) Trends as found within reporting the diagnosis, meaning the description of what goal was attended to achieve with the acts of terror;
(3) Trends as found within the moral evaluation, meaning the description of what motivated one to engage with acts of terror;
(4) Trends as found within the treatment treatment recommendation, meaning the description as if to what constitutes a treatment and/or response in regards to acts of terror;
(5) Trends as found within the presence of a political message following an act of terror.

The results were then used to examine whether the news editorials from the three countries followed a similar style in communicating terrorism, thus perhaps indicating a communal style in regards to the framing of terrorist acts, or whether there are differences between their styles of reporting.

3.2.5 Ethics

The study has taken several ethical considerations into account, which will be discussed briefly below. Ethical considerations taken into account are those found on the website of ‘Stakeholders Acting Together On the ethical impact assessment of Research and Innovation’, as these guidelines were advised by the Swedish Research Council (Swedish Research Council, 2018; SATORI, 2019), as well as guidelines provided by the Association of Internet Researchers (Ess, 2002; Markham & Buchanan, 2012).

Research integrity was provided, as research was only conducted within the borders of quantitative content analysis. Results and conclusions were only derived as a result of said content analysis, taking earlier research from the literature review into account. Results based on the researcher his/her baseless assumptions were not taken into account. Issues surrounding the research have been stated before, meaning that bias within the news media could be found, if in any case this proves to be right, action is not needed for the researcher to be taken, but rather by the news outlets. Conflict of interest was not found during the research, as financial ties to any ideological, institutional or political organizations were not present. Protection for human participants was not needed, as human participants were not present during the study, meaning that also informed consent was not necessary. The protection of data was also deemed to be a non-issue, as the data used for analysis is data that is considered to be public and can be assessed by anyone, at any time, and does not contain secret, personal or sensitive data. The researcher was protected, meaning that the study did not pose any psychological or physiological risk in any way, and as no experiments or field work were conducted, the local community and/or local environment was also deemed to not be at risk. The paper was afterwards published on Digitala Vetenskapliga Arkivet, an online research publishing portal located within Sweden, to guarantee transparency, openness and accessibility to and for everyone.
4 RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The results were divided in two separate sections after the data collection: (1) Frequencies and (2) Relations. Within the frequencies section the counts reported on each variable were transformed into percentages in order to properly display to what extent certain aspects in regards to the reporting of terrorism showed within each news editorial. The relations section then elaborates on all the relations found between the measured variables and displays only counts as opposed to percentages.

4.1 Frequencies

The frequencies section holds five sub-sections: (1) The problem definition, (2) The diagnosis, (3) The moral evaluation, (4) The treatment recommendation, and (5) The political messages found within the texts.

4.1.1 The problem definition

The problem definition consists of several parts: the general properties, the perpetrator profile, and the victim profile. The general properties discuss what happened, in which country an act of terror—either a terror attack or a terror threat—occurred, whether an event was deemed domestic or international, whether deaths or wounded were mentioned, and whether or not secondary terror events were mentioned in the articles. The perpetrator profile will elaborate more on how the perpetrators involved with acts of terror were generally described, meaning variables such as how they were identified, if they were seen as a sole-operator, and what characteristics such as nationality, religion and gender they harboured. The victim profile provides findings on properties that were reported in regards to victims, such as age, religion, nationality, and gender, but also whether multiple, or single citizens were targeted.

General properties

Table 1 illustrates the general properties surrounding the writings in regards to acts of terror. At first sight it becomes apparent that each editorial posted more news articles in regards to when their own country was considered a target. More than half of the coverage analyzed in regards to terror threats were found to be written towards each news editorial their own country. Contrary, the reporting on terror attacks was found to be lower, ranging from one fifth of coverage for The local Denmark to nearly over half for The Local Sweden. Fourth country of interest was
found to be Syria, which on average received almost fifteen percent of coverage in regards to terror attacks and twenty percent when looking at terror threats. Other countries which were a target of an act of terror were not heavily reported on, with no country aside from Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Syria receiving more than five percent coverage. Exact details for the coverage on other countries can be found in appendix III, table 13, variable B2.1.

Table 1: General properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>TLD* (N=45)</th>
<th>TLS (N=50)</th>
<th>TLN (N=43)</th>
<th>Average (N=138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target country (B2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
<td>TA (N=23)</td>
<td>TT (N=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic or international (B4)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International</td>
<td></td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method of attack (B5)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearms</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stabbing</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombing</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recruitment</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidnapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving vehicle</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary activity (B6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casualties, death (D6)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Casualties, wounded (D7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-mentioned</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td></td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.
About half of the coverage found was in regards to international acts of terror. In regards to domestic coverage it was found that there was barely any material in which the perpetrator was identified as domestic native or domestic non-native. A third of the entries did not describe whether the act of terror was domestic native, domestic non-native, or international.

Methods involved with acts of terror were generally speaking not widely described. One can see that on average, with terror threats, over three quarters of the articles did not describe what method was deemed involved with the event. When looking at terror attacks one can see that The Local Sweden appeared to cover more what methods were involved with terror attacks. Both The Local Denmark and The Local Norway described what methods were involved with terror attacks about half of the times. The method that was reported on most was the usage of firearms, as followed by bombing. In case of The Local Sweden, the usage of a running vehicle driving into the public during a terror attack appeared in over a quarter of the articles. For the complete table on which methods were mentioned, see appendix III, table 13, variable B5.

Deaths involved with terror attacks were mentioned more than half of the time, with The Local Sweden reporting deaths most of the time, with nearly three quarters of the articles involving the death number as a result of a terror attack. Wounded however were rarely mentioned. The Local Denmark was found to be the most prone to non-implication of casualties, meaning that when terror events were reported that they were the most likely to not in the slightest mention any casualty.

Generally, secondary acts of terror were not mentioned in the articles, meaning that all three news editorials did usually not refer to any other acts of terror occurring at different times.

*The perpetrator profile*

All variables in regards to the perpetrators are displayed in table 2 and are discussed accordingly. Perpetrators were mostly identified as single civilians or groups of civilians, leaving out the state as being the aggressor. The state as aggressor was mentioned in two cases, once in relation to terror attacks and once in relation to terror threats. Both cases spoke of disagreement with a foreign government which stood to be accused of promoting acts of terror.

As can be seen in table 2, most perpetrators were also found to be part of a larger movement. In about a quarter of the cases a description on whether the perpetrator was a sole-operator or part of a larger organization was missing.
It also appears that, overall, the term terrorist is favoured as a term for perpetrators involved with acts of terror. This is however in regards to if a description is present, as a non-description was present in a third of the cases. The Local Denmark was found to be the editorial referring to perpetrators mostly as terrorist in case of a terror attack. The Local Sweden

---

**Table 2: Perpetrator identification, type, description, and characteristics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>TLG (N=45)</th>
<th>TLS (N=50)</th>
<th>TLN (N=43)</th>
<th>Average (N=138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
<td>TA (N=23)</td>
<td>TT (N=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification (C1)</td>
<td>State aggression</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Single civilian</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Group of civilians</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type (C2)</td>
<td>Sole-operator</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Larger movement</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description (C3.1)</td>
<td>Jihadist</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extremist Islamist</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Islamist</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Terrorist</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neo-nazi</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin (C4.1)</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (C5)</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male and female</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (C6)</td>
<td>Islam</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note**: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.

---
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was most non-descriptive, with nearly 70 percent in case of terror attacks and almost 30 in case of terror threats.

Country of origin was mostly found to be reported on when it regarded fellow countrymen, meaning that most articles that did mention the origin of the perpetrator described these as either from Sweden, Denmark, or Norway. Several more countries were mentioned, such as Turkey, Somalia, and Kenya, however none of these appeared for more than five percent, Appendix III, table 14, variable C4.1 holds more information in regards to all countries mentioned as country of origin. In a quarter of the cases, country of origin was not mentioned.

Gender was mostly found to be described as male, or non-described. Meaning that it is unknown if in the other cases males and females were present, or just females, or both. It does appear though that in case of just men being involved that this is more likely to be mentioned.

Religion was also mostly non-described, meaning that in over half of the articles, both in regards to terror attacks and terror threats, religion was not described when looking at the perpetrator. However, when religion was described, it was shown that this was consistently Islam. Other religions were never discussed, meaning that notions such as one following Christianity or no religion at all were always absent. Islam was mentioned in nearly a third of the articles as being attached to the perpetrators.

**The victim profile**

All variables included within the victim profile can be found within table 3. Victims were generally speaking, in case of terror attacks, defined as multiple citizens, meaning that most articles in regards to terror attacks reported more than one victim. In case of terror threats one can see that potential victims were usually not indicated, as these were not discussed at all and therefore found to be non-implicated within the narrative. Businesses and the authorities were also mentioned as targets, however appeared less than five percent of the time. A full disclosure in regards to the victim identification can be found in appendix III, table 15, variable D1.

However, besides the victim identification, as can be seen in table 3, it became apparent that generally speaking one did not refer to characteristics of victims involved with either terror attacks or terror threats. The majority of the articles did not describe or even implicate victims, meaning that a more general profile including factors such as religion, gender, country of origin, and age could not be shaped.
4.1.2 The diagnosis

A diagnosis in regards to an act of terror was rarely given in the articles, as can be seen in table 4. All three news editorials followed a similar trend, meaning that all generally did describe an act of terror but left out goals, with Denmark in case of terror attacks never reporting any goals. The findings show that the goals, and therefore the wanted results when engaging within terror crimes, were often absent, indicating an overall lack of diagnoses within the news writings on terrorism. The favoured explanation for an act of terror taking place was that of recruiting new foreign fighters for terror movements, though these were also only mentioned in relation to
individuals being prosecuted in regards to recruiting offences only, as opposed to them having any relation to any other terror events. Other offences such as shootings and bombings did usually not provide any information on the goals of the perpetrator which was attached to executing the terror attack. Defending religious beliefs was a close second when reporting on acts of terror, but did not receive much coverage either, with a maximum of only 6.4 percent in regards to terror attacks and barely one percent in regards to terror threats. Interestingly, it was found that in a particular case, a terror attack referred to several times, that the reason of executing a strike was to fight multiculturalism. The articles here specifically refer to the terror actions of Anders Behring Breivik, killing 77 people, of which eight were killed by a bomb and 69 by gunfire.

Table 4: Perpetrator goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>TLD (N=45)*</th>
<th>TLS (N=60)</th>
<th>TLN (N=38)</th>
<th>Average (N=138)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recruit new fighters</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defend religious beliefs</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Demand financial aid</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fight multiculturalism</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal (C7)</td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>85.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.

4.1.3 The moral evaluation

Similarly to goals, motives, which were deemed to be the basis for a moral evaluation, were also found to generally be absent. On average 90 percent of the articles lacked a motive when reporting on terror attacks, and almost 90 percent lacked that explanation when reporting on terror threats. The most favoured motive for engaging with terror crimes, as can be seen in table 5, was that of defending religious beliefs, however this was only found to be reported in five articles, of which one was in regards to a terror attack and four were in regards to (potential) threats. Defending nationalism was also found to be a viable explanation, but was only deemed to be present in one article only, similarly to being at conflict with the state, which was also found in only one article.
4.1.4 The treatment recommendation

Table 6 displays to what extent terror strikes were apprehended, but also what the governmental response was in regards to acts of terror. Overall the articles did describe either that a terror attack or threat was unapprehended, whether a terror threat had gone unexecuted or whether the terror attack was apprehended. In case of the reportings on terror attacks, it was mostly indicated that these were not apprehended, and terror threats remained mostly within the future, though no expectation on whether or not the threat was still to be executed was given. As a result, it appears that the most prominent government response was that of arrest and prosecution of those involved with acts of terror, where The Local Denmark showed to be most active
regarding the reporting on prosecution. Increased border control was found to be a more common trend in the reportings of The Local Denmark. Earlier mentioned target countries of attacks and threats also mentioned Syria as a country of interest, and as such it was visible that all three Nordic countries in relation to terror threats displayed actions of sending troops abroad to aid the United States of America to combat terrorism in the Middle-East. Other actions, which are to be found in a more elaborate table in appendix III, table 15, were also implicated, though not give broad coverage, such as: tougher reprimands for potential or accused foreign fighters, increased traveller surveillance, terror response training for emergency forces, and more heavily armed and vigilant police forces. Multiple new installed measures were not often mentioned, accounting for roughly three percent when reporting on terror attacks and roughly seven percent when reporting on terror threats. A general trend in regards to measures to combat terrorist events was not found, besides the prosecution of those whom had already engaged in actively acting out plans.

4.1.5 The political message

As table 7 displays there was no clear evidence found of the editorials displaying perpetrators as being villains, meaning that the editorials did not generally implicate the idea of being at war with a lesser, ‘evil’ opponent. The same can be found in table 8 when looking at how the actions of the government were narrated and whether they were described as ‘heroes’ or ‘villains’. It was found that the authorities in general did not receive approving commentary, nor critical commentary, as the editorials appeared to function more as platform to communicate the government their decisions to the public, rather than provide an emotional or interpreting charge with those decisions. Overall speaking, it was displayed that the government was generally neither seen as a ‘hero’ or a ‘villain’. Only once was the government displayed as a villain, as in this particular case one expressed displease with a foreign government in regards to the promotion of acts of terror. The opposing government was here made out to be ‘evil’, and was questioned for their morals as if to why they were attending peace conferences while simultaneously funding war. Table 9 shows that also barely any evidence was found of speculation, as only on average seven percent in regards to terror attacks and eight percent in regards to terror threats displayed assumptions and lacked credible, verifiable sources for those assumptions. In over two thirds of the articles use was made of at least two or more verifiable sources, such as spokespeople for governmental organizations, and the use of official documents and/or reports as source material. None of the analyzed articles displayed any sign of public activation. Thus, no clear evidence was
found of forwarding political messages, and no clear indicators were found that portray a ‘good-versus-evil’ mentality.

Table 7: Perpetrator described as a villain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (G9)</th>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLD (N=45)*</td>
<td>TLS (N=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is a villain</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not a villain</td>
<td></td>
<td>93,3</td>
<td>93,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td></td>
<td>16,7</td>
<td>8,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.

Table 8: Tone towards government and government description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (E2)</th>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLD (N=45)*</td>
<td>TLS (N=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tone</td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>86,7</td>
<td>86,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approving</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>13,3</td>
<td>13,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9: Writing properties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable (F1)</th>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLD (N=45)*</td>
<td>TLS (N=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signs of</td>
<td>Non-speculative</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>96,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>speculation</td>
<td>Speculative</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>17,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>100,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Signs of      | A documented source    | 6,7             | 10,0            | 4,3         | 3,7           | 18,5        | 25,0        | 9,8        | 12,9       |
| accuracy      | A quoted professional  | 13,3            | 20,0            | 26,1        | 7,4           | 14,8        | 31,3        | 18,1       | 19,6 |
|               | Two sources            | 53,3            | 36,7            | 21,7        | 44,4          | 44,4        | 37,5        | 39,8       | 39,5    |
|               | Three or more sources  | 26,7            | 33,3            | 47,8        | 37,0          | 22,2        | 6,3         | 32,2       | 25,5       |
| Total         |                        | 100,0           | 100,0           | 100,0       | 100,0        | 100,0       | 100,0       | 100,0       | 100,0 |

| Signs of      | Non-activating         | 100,0           | 100,0           | 100,0       | 100,0        | 100,0       | 100,0       | 100,0 |
| public        |                         | 100,0           | 100,0           | 100,0       | 100,0        | 100,0       | 100,0       | 100,0 |
| activation    |                         | 100,0           | 100,0           | 100,0       | 100,0        | 100,0       | 100,0       | 100,0 |

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.
4.2 Relations

In order to find relations between variables first a selection was made of variables deemed of importance. Table 10 shows the variables that have been tested for potential relations using chi-square. Variables that in the frequencies section showed an average percentage in regards to non-descriptions and non-implications of over 50 percent were by default not included in the crosstabulation. Only the variables domestic and/or international acts of terror versus the amount of terror markers in-text and domestic and/or international acts of terror versus perpetrator descriptions showed a relation. Tables 11 and 12 illustrate these relations in more detail.

Table 10: Variables tested for relations using chi-square

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable 1</th>
<th>Variable 2</th>
<th>Chi-square (p-value*)</th>
<th>Relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B4, Domestic/international</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B4, Domestic/international</td>
<td>C3, Perpetrator description</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C3, Perpetrator description</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>0.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4, Year of publication</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.645</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4, Year of publication</td>
<td>C3, Perpetrator description</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2, Target area</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.886</td>
<td>0.495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7, Length of article</td>
<td>C3, Perpetrator description</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7, Length of article</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>0.338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C4, Perpetrator area origin</td>
<td>B3, Terror markers</td>
<td>0.801</td>
<td>0.794</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: P-values < 0.05 are considered as statistically significant.
Note**: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.

Table 11 makes visible that no relation was found between domestic and/or international acts of terror and the description of the perpetrators in the reporting of The Local Denmark. The Local Sweden and The Local Norway however do have a significant relationship. In regards to the former, the crosstabulation makes clear that if a description of the perpetrator is present, that international terrorism is more referred to as Islamic influenced acts of terror, such as Islamism, jihadism, and Islamic militancy, contrary to using plain terminology such as extremism or terrorism. Domestic native actors were also not usually named as plain terrorists, but rather right-wing fanatics.

Table 12 adds to this perspective by showcasing how often terror markers—words such as ‘terrorist’, ‘terror’, and ‘terrorism’—were mentioned within the text in relation to whether an act of terror was domestic or international. The Local Denmark was linked to having a relation here, indicating that texts in regards to domestic natives usually received less terror markers within text than their international and domestic non-native counterparts. The same can be found for The
Local Norway, which also showed more in-text terror markers in regards to international acts of terror as opposed to domestic native acts of terror.

Table 11: The relation between terrorist descriptions and domestic and international terror events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>P-value***</th>
<th>Domestic/international</th>
<th>Perpetrator terrorist description group</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>I-o*</td>
<td>R-wt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD**</td>
<td>0.257</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLN</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: I-o = Islamic oriented terrorism, R-wt = Right-wing terrorism, N-D = Non-described, N-I is Non-implicated
Note**: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note***: P-values < 0.05 are considered as statistically significant.

Table 12: The relation between domestic and international terrorism and the frequency of terror markers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publisher</th>
<th>P-value**</th>
<th>Domestic/international</th>
<th>Frequency terrorist markers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>1-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD*</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=45)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLS</td>
<td>0.589</td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLN</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>Domestic non-native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(N=43)</td>
<td></td>
<td>International</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Domestic native</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: P-values < 0.05 are considered as statistically significant.
5 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The discussion chapter is made up of three sections: (1) the results and analysis section, (2) the method discussion, and (3) a conclusion.

In the first section the results have been described and interpreted in light of the previously formulated research questions. The second section consists of a discussion in regards to the method, in which items topics such as validity and reliability are addressed, and the conclusion summarizes the results of the study as well as provides recommendations for future studies.

5.1 Results and analysis

In order to discuss the main research question in regards to the framing of terrorism in Nordic news media, it seems appropriate to first discuss all the sub-questions as these form the building bricks within the framing process. After discussing the sub- and main research questions a discussion on the relation in regards to the Nordic perspective on health and lifestyle will be provided.

5.1.1 The problem definition

The first sub-question that was proposed was deemed to be:

“To what extent were problem definitions provided within the reporting of acts of terror?”

Firstly, problem definitions were present in all articles analyzed, however the depth of description varied. All articles involved the presence of either an attack or a threat, a potential remaining threat at that. That said, aside from the distinction that terror attacks and threats were presented, the characteristics surrounding those threats in regards to their general properties vary. It became obvious that in around one third of the articles no distinction was made in regards to whether an attack or threat was deemed international or domestic, and whether or not executed by a native in case of domestic strikes. A potential reason for not providing this information could be that one tends to not let acts of terror get too close, or make them too recognizable for the public in order to ensure public safety and security. This explanation however remains an assumption at best, and was not a hypothesis that was tested during this thesis, and may encourage future research. The non-descriptory behaviour maintains through to the methods used when engaging in terror attacks, as on average over half of the cases when combining the reportation on terror attacks and threats did not include as if to what method was used. Mentioned methods described mostly were
those of shooting, however no other method received significant coverage in any news editorial. Only in The Local Sweden it was found that coverage was given to one other method: driving a vehicle into the public. This was related to one event only, though, as this was an event happening in Sweden itself, killing and injuring many while leaving uncertainty regarding whether this constituted as an act of terror. Secondary acts of terror were also rarely discussed, suggesting that attention was usually only pointed towards the discussion of the event at hand, leaving out possible connections to larger terror movements engaging in chains of terror events, contrary to involving other methods as if to drive a public narrative on a potential outside ‘war’ against the country. Casualties were only of mention in case of attacks, however the potential casualties did not appear to be of discussion when looking at terror threats, potentially also in order to maintain the public safety in order to not unnecessarily induce public ‘fear’. At most, at least when looking at the general properties surrounding the ‘problem’ description of a terror attack or threat, all three editorials provided a basic description as if to what happened or is about to happen, but does not appear very likely on elaborating more on descriptive facts concerning the event. Agenda-setting does seem to take some space here, as Entman (2006) explains that merely presenting the news item, in this case a basic problem definition, does contribute to potentially guiding the public debate.

In regards to who was responsible for the act of terror the three editorials on the surface seemingly follow a similar structure, meaning that they show roughly the same statistics on the victim identification, meaning whether they were depicted as either the state, a single aggressor, or multiple aggressors. Non-description occurred, but did not exceed more than twenty percent averagely speaking. However, aside from describing whether one was operating as a group or solo, other characteristics defining perpetrators, such as a description—portraying one as for example a terrorist, an extremist, Islamist, or else—, country of origin, and gender, remained mostly undescribed, with generally a lacking description in over a third of the cases. Especially in the case of religion, in all three editorials, a description on what belief one followed or if one followed a belief at all remained unspoken, with over half of the cases both in regards to terror attacks and threats not mentioning a form of faith. The only spoken of faith was in nearly a third of the articles that of Islam. This is a surprising fact in some sense, as no other beliefs were ever mentioned. This perhaps incites the idea that Islam may be connected to acts of terror in general, by leaving out the mention of other potentially involved religions. Non-existence of faith with a perpetrator was also never discussed, meaning that a potential focus on Islam, whether or not intentionally, linked
positively with earlier findings of Hervik (2018) and Powell (2018) on the media generated connection between Muslims and acts of terror. Another factor leaning in here may be that of the terrorist description. Earlier it was pointed out that the largest ‘name-calling’ referred mostly to ‘terrorist’, however, the second, third, and fourth largest groups all are in regards to descriptions connected with faith, where jihadist, Islamist, and extremist Islamist all partially provide a connection of the perpetrators with religious intent, giving a potential negative tone towards Muslims, which may be linked to the negative effect that the media has on how the West experiences the East as Umamaheswar (2015) described. Additionally it was found that international acts of terror were referred to with more in-text terror markers, in line with how international acts of terror were more brought in relation with being called Islamic influenced terrorism. However, even though a link has been found between mentioning Islam together with acts of terror, it may not be experienced as such by the readers of the editorials. More research into the experience of tabloid-users in regards to the connection of Islam to acts of terror may be of interest to find a relation, or non-relation, between writer and reader. One has to be aware though, that as Krippendorff (2004) mentioned, that texts are meant to be read and thus do not solely contain meaning for just the writer. Another research may be conducted in order to find out whether there is intent to distribute bias among the public. This includes perhaps research into bias among whether a ‘terrorist’ is considered to be a male, as it was found that primary focus on explaining terror strikes remained with mentioning that perpetrators were men. Rarely ever was an image given which explained the presence of females, or both males and females. It may be that within these strikes of course females were never present, or that there never was a mixed set of sexes, but as in the remaining cases one usually referred to a non-description besides the male characteristic, the public may not know about the potential involvement of the other sex, perhaps unknowingly elaborating on a bias on what constitutes a ‘terrorist’. The absence of facts is just as important as the presence of facts (Entman, 1993). One does have to make a notion here, as according to Cacciatore, Scheufele and Iyengar (2004) a more prominent display of certain elements, in this case the Islamic and male aspect, does not necessarily mean that a frame has changed. Here it is however argued that as these elements are not only more prominently present but also present at all as compared to other religions and the other sex that these elements do hold some significance in regards to framing.

As far as victims goes, findings portray that besides the general information is if to who or what was the target of a terror strike, the consensus is that a description was overall speaking not
present in terms of religion, gender, country of origin, and age group. Only The Local Denmark seemed to favour descriptive information slightly as compared to The Local Sweden and The Local Norway, though not by a landslide. The impression that this provides is that this may be due to guarding the safety of the public, again to perhaps not unnecessarily cause a disruption and saw fear when not needed. A description of potential victims may encourage to catastrophic thinking on behalf of the public, meaning that strikes may appear closer and one may fear more for their own well-being. Keeping descriptives out of the narrative may be a reason for the public to not take events too close to heart. This would provide a suggestion for future research, where one can try to find out whether or not descriptives make it possible for the public to more familiarize with terror events.

5.1.2 The diagnosis

The second research question was aimed towards finding out what diagnosis was given to a terror-related event, and as such was phrased as:

“To what extent were diagnoses provided within the reporting of acts of terror?”

The diagnosis was interpreted as articles providing the goals that were seemingly attached to acts of terror. However, goals were surprisingly rarely mentioned within the writings, where the most frequent explanation was that of recruiting new fighters, which always paired together with the prosecution of those engaging in such acts. Defending religious beliefs came up occasionally, however in only six out of 138 articles. Demanding financial aid only occurred twice within the total sample. The results by themselves only signal a lack of a diagnoses, but are perhaps in line with the discussion in the previous section in regards to protecting the public, by not giving terrorism and terrorists a platform as if to not cause unnecessary fear, nor engage in potentially recruiting new fighters by displaying goals. This yet provides grounds for more research with the editorialists, perhaps with management of those editorialists or the writers, as if to why goals of acts of terror are suppressed when reporting on them.

5.1.3 The moral evaluation

The following sub-question referred mostly to moral evaluations, differently coined as the deeper reason provided to engage in acts of terror. The term is closely related to goals, though there
is a slight nuance: it is not so much the desired effect, but the reason as if to pursue said effect. The sub-question itself was therefore phrased as:

“To what extent were moral evaluations provided within the reporting of acts of terror?”

As it was mentioned earlier in the results section, the moral evaluation appeared to be grounded in the same way as the diagnosis, meaning that also motives were generally not discussed when narrating acts of terror. Non-description was overall present in over 90 percent when reporting on terror attacks and nearly 90 percent when reporting on terror threats. In a similar fashion as the diagnosis, this may be to not show the reasoning behind terror attacks, as if to not present motivators for creating new terrorists in the process. Helfgott (2015) reported that news media may trigger the copycat effect, and suppressing the goals and motives, the reasoning behind terror attacks such as ideals and beliefs which perpetrators hold, may help as if to not shape copycats. But to answer the question in regards to what extent moral evaluations were provided: not much, overall a maximum of ten percent, mostly focussed on religious motivators, with five out of 138 cases.

5.1.4 The treatment recommendation

The last function of framing is that of a treatment recommendation, which was within the theoretical framework pointed out as a function that may be present, but not necessarily. Still it appeared valuable to find out whether proposed treatments were generally present within the narrative, and what these treatments specifically entailed. The fourth sub-question was then phrased as:

“To what extent were treatment recommendations provided within the reporting of acts of terror?”

Table 6 in the results suggested that treatment recommendations were offered in a multiple of varieties, and none of the treatments in that sense were really consistent throughout the articles. Only the arrest and the prosecution of perpetrators and suspects came to light in slightly over a third of the cases, however no other treatments gained ground in a multitude of articles. The only two other options being mentioned a little over five percent of the time in case of threats were increased border control and troops sent abroad to assist the United States of America in their fights against ISIS. Another finding from this table however suggests that when the authorities were mentioned in text, is that they always except for around ten percent did give a response,
whether it be the notion of a travel warning to dangerous areas or the earlier mentioned prosecution, suggesting that at all times one is working on the issues surrounding threats, and making these more approachable and portrayed as something that can be fixed. Though, aside from prosecution, no favoured treatments were identified, only that treatments are present.

5.1.5 The political message

Besides the four functions of framing, another function in regards to framing terrorism was highlighted within the theoretical framework. This function was found to be that of the presence of political messages attached to the acts of terror. The last sub-question therefore was:

“To what extent were political messages provided within the reporting of acts of terror?”

Political messages can be approached from two perspectives, those of the perpetrators and those of the government.

In case of the perpetrators it is argued that political messages from them were out of the question. Explanations towards motives and goals were not provided, and thus a reason as if to why one would engage with these activities will not present itself. No demands were mentioned, nor the expressing of highly important personal ideologies to which one can relate or distant themselves. A driver as if to why one was at conflict with the state also did not appear, further confirming that from a perpetrator perspective the message that they perhaps held was never really communicated towards the public.

Political messages may be hidden when looking at the authorities however, mostly that of providing solutions, and that they always provide a solution to a situation or potential situation in case it presents itself, suggesting that perhaps the government is doing a good job of at least working on the problems, perhaps signaling in line with an earlier study by Mortenson (2019) that the perpetrators of acts of terror are controllable and identifiable. The tone towards the perpetrators was generally not portrayed in a negative sense, meaning that generally they were not described as villains. The government was also generally not described as heroic, countering the findings of Sela-Shayovitz (2015), or villainous, indicating that overall speaking a ‘good-versus-evil’ mentality was not present within the narrative. Additionally, building on the ‘good-versus-evil’ topic, governments usually did not receive criticism nor approving commentary, further confirming a more neutral kind of communication. Political messages may be present, but not towards either the government or the perpetrators their behalf.
A confirmation of this attitude can be found within the styles of writing, as over 90 percent in both cases did not show signs of speculation in regards to both the reporting on terror attacks and threats, as well as not asking for specific opinions, statements, and/or actions of the public. This finding goes directly against earlier research suggesting that news media may be subject to speculation in favour of sensationalism and viewer-ratings as found by Nord and Strömbäck (2016) in relation to Swedish tabloids. In this sense, no guidance as to what one as an individual should think in regards to perpetrator and government was present. Most articles also provided identifiable sources, of which around two thirds presented either two or more credible sources, indicating a sort of more informative style rather than a speculative one. The possibility of deeper hidden political messages may be present, however that was not the aim of this study. It is suggested to specifically study the political load of the articles in a separate research, including more parameters of what constitutes as a political message by itself. In regards to the question however, political messages do not appear apparent in the articles, only in the sense that the authorities are working on issues surrounding acts of terror, whereas the message surrounding the perpetrators is overall speaking left out. This indicates that the framing surrounding terrorism is perhaps more in line with the Democratic Corporatist Model, as the editorials do not appear driven by political ideologies nor seem to favour political exclamations, while maintaining an informative and neutral structure (Hallin & Mancini, 2004). Added to this is the perspective of funding, as the earlier look into The Local made clear that funding is partially provided by private investors and institutions, and partially by paying members (The Local, n.d.). This leaves out that the The Local is government funded, adding to the Democratic Corporatist style of media communication towards in regards to the interaction between the media and the political landscape.

Then again, as mentioned by Carragee and Roefs (2004) and Entman (2006), frames always to some extent carry a political load, as the editorials do to some extent decide what the public thinks about, whether or not they contribute to how the public thinks about these issues, as is also mentioned by Cohen (1963).

5.1.6 The framing of terrorism

The initial main research question heading this study was:

“How was terrorism framed within Nordic news media in the years 2014-2018?”
In light of the above answered sub-questions, a short conclusion can be formed as followed: The articles displayed the acts of terror in a mostly objective, substantially sourced way. Meaning, sources were most of the time present in at least a two-fold fashion or more, signs of speculation remained mostly unfound, and the public was not asked for specific questions.

Perpetrators and victims were mostly described in a ‘fair’ fashion, meaning that people were not specifically divided based on factors such as religion, gender, and nationality. Only the necessary pieces of information were provided, meaning that the articles, for all editorials, generally appeared to follow the following steps:

1. **Problem definition**: a report on an act of terror shall be provided. Domestic or international properties will be mentioned but only if known whether an event is domestic or international. No comments on other acts of terror will be provided. The perpetrators shall be described only in light of connections to larger organizations such as ISIS, but no more than that except for perhaps the distinction of a sole-operator. Victims shall be mentioned, but only in light of who/what constituted as target, and whether or not casualties fell. All other elements such as gender, age, religion, and nationality shall not be discussed;

2. **Diagnosis**: a diagnosis in regards to the perpetrators shall not be discussed, meaning goals as to why engage with acts of terror shall not be discussed;

3. **Moral evaluation**: a moral evaluation in regards to the perpetrators shall not be discussed, meaning that motivators as to why engage with acts of terror shall not be discussed;

4. **Treatment recommendation**: a response from the government shall be recorded, but there are no specific preferences as to what constitutes as a treatment, nor shall an opinion be given on whether this treatment is considered proper or improper;

5. **Political message**: Political message(s) shall not be given in regards to the perpetrators, hence coming back to steps (2) and (3) that perpetrators shall not be given a platform, nor shall they be described as evil. No war with certain people or areas from a global perspective shall be implicated, meaning that stances of the government shall not be described in a heroic, overly approving method. Only the presence of treatments may be provided, to imply that the problems surrounding acts of terror are being dealt with, to ensure control and public safety.
The articles tended to come across as fairly objective, stating mostly verifiable facts only. The only biases that were found were perhaps towards men and Islam as being seemingly connected with acts of terror, as these appeared more highlighted than other sexes and religions within the narrative, meaning that communication in regards to females and other religions or absence of religion were mostly not involved within the articles. All three editorials, in accordance with the writings of Syvertsen and colleagues (2014), showed a similar style of writing and framing. The editorials were also found to conform more with the Democratic Corporatist Model as opposed to the Polarized Pluralist Model and the Liberal Model, indicating agreement with authoritarian decisions but not being guided by the government in doing so (Hallin & Mancini, 2004).

5.1.7 The Nordic perspective

Findings within this research did not directly show a negative prejudice towards Muslims, however did find a potential bias towards the reporting of Islamic features if deemed involved with acts of terror. Syvertsen and colleagues (2004) suggest that the Nordic countries hold a high degree of trust in regards to news publishers, and as such a bias or a more prominent display regarding Muslims and men in regards to acts of terror may have negative consequences for both Muslim and male populations, perhaps especially if combined. The study was however not intended to find out whether or not this potential bias may contribute to negative prejudice towards the Muslim population within the Nordic countries, and thus it is suggested that alternative research should be conducted in order to find if the editorials contribute to negative prejudice in regards to Muslims with the Nordic public, in accordance with studies from Saifuddin (2017) and Gorham (2006). Exclusion of the Muslim population was also not indicated within the scope of this research, though the potential bias may be of influence here, providing grounds for another study linking the experiences of communication on acts of terror and the experiences of Islamic followers.

The study did not find that the media may be involved with radicalization of lone-wolfs as mentioned by Misiak et al. (2019). As goals and motives were generally left out, potential ideologies of terror organizations were not likely to be found to transfer to isolated people, contributing to making them more ‘open’ to extreme beliefs, perhaps suggesting that some form of maintaining public safety and security is tried to be employed within the communication regarding acts of terror.
Lastly, the study did not find any key indicators that the reporting on acts of terror pointed towards anti-immigration-like behaviour from either the editorials themselves, the articles, or the public. Measures against immigration were not something that showed up in the articles, nor were those of foreign descent portrayed as potential danger. The earlier thesis of Essess, Medianu and Lawson (2013) is hereby countered in regards to the reporting themselves, though since the study did not look into the effects that the articles had on the public, it cannot be completely denied either. Hostility towards immigrants and refugees, in accordance with work of Louis, Esses and Lalonde (2013) was also not found to be present.

5.2 Validity, reliability, and generalizability

Ensuring validity and reliability was approached from a few different perspectives, of which the first was to follow guidelines on developing a theoretically valid protocol as provided by Rourke and Anderson (2004, pp. 8). The guidelines were presented as: (1) identifying the purpose of the coding data, (2) identifying behaviours that represent the construct, (3) reviewing the categories and indicators, (4) holding preliminary tryouts, and (5) developing guidelines for administration, scoring, and interpretation of the coding scheme. All these steps were followed during the development of the coding manifest, as first was identified that the subject of terrorism was to be approached from a framing perspective, after which the behaviours, or functions of framing, were determined to be the main coding behaviours to be noted. The categories, which included a problem, a diagnosis, a moral evaluation, a treatment recommendation, and the presence of a political message were afterwards examined and found to be relating to the topic of framing terrorism. All functions of framing terrorism were therefore included, providing face validity for the study (Haele & Twycross, 2015). The coding scheme was afterwards tested in multiple rounds on accuracy and used terminology, resulting in a codebook tested by multiple external individuals having no relation to the study. Additionally, this provided an inter-rater agreement, or inter-rater reliability, concluding that the different testers agreed on the codebook being interpreted as consistent. Instructions for each variable were added to ensure maximum clarity during the coding process. The method was not tested on criterion validity, as no future predictors were analyzed, nor were any methods related to the same subject found to test whether or not they held correlating results (Haele & Twycross, 2015). The method was also not tested in regards to stability as multiple participants were not present and a test-retest procedure was not necessary.
Generalizability is a point of interest, as only English written news editorials were analyzed. This raises the issue that the narrative here may differ from outlets written in the Native language, either Danish, Swedish, or Norwegian, and raises the question how transferrable the results from this study are to other outlets written in languages other than English. It may be that writers and outlets may cater more towards their ‘own’ people when reporting the news, and may therefore approach news items from a different, perhaps more, or less opinionated perspective. It may be that when the newspaper is more focused towards the native population that more focus is put on providing a political message seemingly important for the future of the country and the general public opinion. In conclusion it can be said that one can raise questions in regards to the generalizability when looking at newspapers written in the native language. In regards to other Nordic newspapers however, written in English, the assumption can be made that these will provide information in a similar style. As it was found that the news editorials merely appear to be stating facts without a political charge, which is perhaps of less importance for the English reading or international population, one can reason that other similarly oriented newspapers may follow a similar structure. This is however a matter that should be tested for it to be deemed true, as well as that it should be tested whether or not native language newspapers follow a similar structure, to either dispute or confirm their pattern in regards to the usage of the functions of framing when it comes to terrorism.

5.3 Conclusion

The conclusion is divided in two sections: (1) Future research recommendations, and (2) Concluding remarks.

5.3.1 Future research recommendations

The discussion provided a few matters which could not be proven with the data gathered during this study, and provides grounds for future studies. Questions such as why specific details surrounding acts of terror are left out of the narrative can only be speculated about. A reason for a potential bias towards men and followers of Islam was also pointed out, but answers as to what causes this remain unknown, as well as the existence of deeper buried political agendas for which this study did not provide any proof and requires more qualitative analysis. Therefore, the following three opportunities for conducting future research were proposed:
● Research into why tabloids do leave out more descriptive characteristics of victims, goals of perpetrators, and motives of perpetrators, as this may contribute to ensuring public safety;
● Research into whether the potential bias when reporting on terrorism in regards to men and Muslims is present, and why this happens, whether intentionally or not;
● Research into potentially deeper hidden political messages within news articles in regards to terrorism, perhaps better approached from a more qualitative perspective involving more distinctions in line with content analysis.

5.3.2 Concluding remarks

As a concluding remark it appears that all three editorials seemingly followed a similar pattern consisting of five functions surrounding the framing of terrorism: (1) a problem definition, (2) a diagnosis, (3) a moral evaluation, (4) a treatment recommendation, and (5) a political message. The diagnosis generally considered the presence of an act of terror, though specific details such as what method was used or was to be used were left out, as well as perpetrator descriptions being left out of around one third of the articles, and victim profiles lacking over three quarters of the time. It was found that there was a potential bias against men, as well as Muslims, however the reason why remains uncertain. The reason for this being a potential bias is that usually only men were mentioned, and if not the case, a non-description took its place. The same happens in case of highlighting whether perpetrators were following a religion, where only Islam was regularly or at all mentioned. Other religions or absence of religion never really surfaced. Diagnoses and treatment recommendations were found to not be present, but as Entman (1993) mentions, absence is just as important of presence within content, and the current theory based on this study is that this may play a role in ensuring public safety. A treatment recommendation, or government response, was if present always related to an action or message ensuring that the ‘problem’ is being worked on, however no main trends within the treatment were found asides from arrest and prosecution of perpetrators. Political messages were found to not be heavily present, and no ‘good-versus-evil’ or ‘West-versus-East’ mentality was found in the articles, suggesting that the reporting on terrorism both holds an objective attitude but also a ‘to-maintain-the-public-safety’ tone.
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APPENDIX I, LITERATURE REVIEW

For the literature review it seemed of importance to find more material on the victims and perpetrators involved with terrorist events, as well as the involvement of the government, the frequency of coverage regarding the characteristics of terrorist events, and how a threat or attack was viewed when depicted as either domestic or international. All these elements of the search had to be placed within the framework of the news media, which yielded the following boolean phrase that was used as an initial search query in the EBSCO Discovery Service database:

\[
( \text{terrorism OR terrorist OR terror OR terrorist crime} ) \text{ AND (news coverage AND reporting ) AND media AND attack AND (danger OR threat) AND (victims OR perpetrators) AND (Analysis OR review) AND attention AND violence AND coverage AND (domestic OR international)}
\]

The first search yielded many useful articles on the general global narrative regarding terrorism, though did not include any specific entries from the Nordic perspective. As such, a second search was conducted in the EBSCO Discovery Service database, which included the following boolean phrase:

\[
\text{terrorism AND news media AND (Swedish OR Norwegian OR Danish)}
\]

Only articles which provided a full text and were published after the year 2000 were included in the search, as well as only articles written in English. Articles were then included based on the following criteria:

1. Described effect(s) of terrorism on media;
2. Described effect(s) of media on terrorism;
3. A narrative in regards to terrorism in the news media;
4. A narrative involving a description of perpetrators, victims, and/or authorities.

The first search yielded 725 articles, of which due to quantity and time limitations only the first 100 were reviewed. Some important findings may therefore not be included within the literature review. The second search yielded 5,572 articles of which the first 150 articles were reviewed. In total 24 articles of the first search and five articles of the second search were included in the literature review. The results of the findings have been grouped in the following categories to be discussed in the following sections:
(4) The characteristics of perpetrators, victims, and the government/authorities;
(5) News outlets focus and differences;
(6) News coverage effect(s).
APPENDIX II, CODEBOOK

Below one will find the codes that will be used during the data gathering process. The codebook is split up in six sections, with each section having their own distinct attributes. The sections are:

A) Physical properties, in which the physical properties of the article will be noted;
B) General characteristics, in which general characteristics around the writings in regards to terror attacks/threats will be noted;
C) Characteristics of perpetrators, in which the description of the perpetrators of terror attacks/threats will be noted;
D) Characteristics of victims, in which the description of the victims of terror attacks/threats will be noted;
E) Characteristics of governmental bodies and/or authorities, in which the presence and/or absence of governmental/authoritarian actions will be noted;
F) The writing properties of the article.

Each section holds a set of variables, which are marked first with the corresponding section, as followed by a number, as for example A1, which asks to indicate which news outlet published the article. The variable can be noted in SPSS, which is also named A1. There are 46 variables.

Section A, physical properties

ID, Set ID number to later be able to find an article again. The ID number must correspond with an ID number in the sample file.
  ● Open answer, ID number

A1, Note the article link.
  ● Open answer, article URL

A2, Indicate which news outlet published the article.
  ● The publisher was The Local Denmark = 1
  ● The publisher was The Local Sweden = 2
  ● The publisher was The Local Norway = 3

A3, Note the name of the author.
  ● Open answer, author name

A4, Indicate the year of publication.
  ● The year of publication was 2014 = 1
  ● The year of publication was 2015 = 2
  ● The year of publication was 2016 = 3
  ● The year of publication was 2017 = 4
  ● The year of publication was 2018 = 5

A5, Indicate the month of publication.
  ● The month of publication was January = 1
  ● The month of publication was February = 2
  ● The month of publication was March = 3
  ● The month of publication was April = 4
FRAMING TERRORISM IN NORDIC NEWS MEDIA - MICK BOLLAND

- The month of publication was May = 5
- The month of publication was June = 6
- The month of publication was July = 7
- The month of publication was August = 8
- The month of publication was September = 9
- The month of publication was October = 10
- The month of publication was November = 11
- The month of publication was December = 12

A6, Indicate the length of the article (excluding title).
- Open answer, amount of words

A7, Indicate the length of the article (excluding title).
- Short article (1-99 words) = 1
- Short to medium article (100-199 words) = 2
- Medium article (200-299 words) = 3
- Medium to long article (300-399 words) = 4
- Long article (>400 words) = 5

Section B, general characteristics

B1, Indicate whether or not a terror attack or terror threat (further referred to as act of terror) took place.
- There was a terror attack, but no threat = 1
- There was a terror threat, but no attack = 2
- There was neither a terror attack nor terror threat = 5

B2, Indicate the location (area) in which the act of terror took place. This is based on B2.1.
- The act of terror took place in the Nordic countries (Sweden [1], Denmark [2], Norway [3]) = 1
- The act of terror took place in Europe other, excluding the Nordic countries (Germany [9], France [5], United Kingdom [13], Greece [18]) = 2
- The act of terror took place in the Middle-East (Egypt [17], Turkey [19], Syria [7], Iraq [12], Iran [15], Yemen [16], Lebanon [14]) = 3
- The act of terror took place in Africa (Morocco [10], Kenya [6], Somalia [4]) = 4
- The act of terror took place in Asia (Philippines [8], Malaysia [11]) = 5
- Non-described = 998

B2.1, Indicate the location (country) where the act of terror took place.
- The act of terror took place in Sweden = 1
- The act of terror took place in Denmark = 2
- The act of terror took place in Norway = 3
- The act of terror took place in Somalia = 4
- The act of terror took place in France = 5
- The act of terror took place in Kenya = 6
- The act of terror took place in Syria = 7
- The act of terror took place in the Philippines = 8
- The act of terror took place in Germany = 9
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- The act of terror took place in Morocco = 10
- The act of terror took place in Malaysia = 11
- The act of terror took place in Iraq = 12
- The act of terror took place in the United Kingdom = 13
- The act of terror took place in Lebanon = 14
- The act of terror took place in Iran = 15
- The act of terror took place in Yemen = 16
- The act of terror took place in Egypt = 17
- The act of terror took place in Greece = 18
- The act of terror took place in Turkey = 19
- The location of the act of terror was not described = 998

B3, Indicate the frequency of terror markers appearing within the text. This code is based on variable 3.1.
- There were no terror markers present = 1
- There were one or two terror markers present = 2
- There were three or four terror markers present = 3
- There were five or six terror markers present = 4
- There were seven or more terror markers present = 5

B3.1, Indicate the amount of times that the words 'terrorist', 'terrorism', and 'terror' were used within the text. Non-codeable, this is a calculation in SPSS, the sum of variables B3.1, B3.2, and B3.3.

B3.2, Indicate the amount of times that the word 'terrorist' was used, including the title. Combination words such as 'counter-terrorist' are excluded from the count.
- Open answer, number

B3.3, Indicate the amount of times that the word 'terrorism' was used, including the title. Combination words such as 'counter-terrorism' are excluded from the count.
- Open answer, number

B3.4, Indicate the amount of times that the word 'terror' was used, including the title. Combination words such as anti-terror are excluded from the count.
- Open answer, number

B4, Indicate whether the act of terror was domestic or international.
- The act of terror was domestic, from a non-native (if a perpetrator committed the attack in their country of citizenship on fellow citizens/residents) = 1
- The act of terror was domestic, from a native (if a perpetrator committed the attack in their country of birth and citizenship on fellow citizens/residents) = 4
- The act of terror was international (if a perpetrator from a foreign country commits an act on national ground, this includes a resident in a foreign country) = 2
- It was not described whether the act of terror was domestic or international = 998

B5, Indicate what method was used during the act of terror. In case of multiple methods, choose the method referred to primarily (for example, most casualties, or focus of article).
- The method (to be) employed was (a) bombing(s) = 1
- The method (to be) employed was (a) firearm(s) = 2
The method (to be) employed was toxic gas = 3
The method (to be) employed was (a) stabbing(s) = 4
The method (to be) employed was (a) kidnapping(s) = 5
The method (to be) employed was threatening to engage in attacks = 6
The method (to be) employed was torture = 7
The method (to be) employed was (a) driving vehicle(s) = 8
The method (to be) employed was recruitment of (a) new fighter(s) = 9
The method (to be) employed was crucifixion = 10
The method (to be) employed was decapitation = 11
An act of terror was mentioned, but not which method = 998

B6, Indicate whether or not the article mentions any acts of terror besides the main subject. If this is the case, proceed with answering in the following sections (C, D, and E) only in regards to the main subject.

- The article mentioned another act of terror (1) = 1
- The article mentioned other acts of terror (2) = 2
- The article mentioned other acts of terror (3 or more) = 3
- The article did not mention any other act of terror = 999

Section C, characteristics of perpetrators, only discuss the main event (primary attack/threat of interest)

C1, Indicate whether the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were the state, a single individual, or a group of perpetrators.
- The state was exerting aggression towards the public by using terrorist (a) terrorist method(s), in which case it will be called an act of aggression instead of an act of terrorism = 1
- A single civilian was the perpetrator/suspect = 2
- A group of civilians were the perpetrators/suspects = 3
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were not described = 998
- There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C2, Indicate whether the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as a sole-operator or part of a larger movement (for example a terror-organization such as ISIS). Affiliation with a terror organization may also be used to indicate one operates as a group.
- The perpetrator/suspect was described as a sole-operator = 1
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were part of a larger movement/organization = 2
- It was not described whether or not the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were part of a larger organization or worked as a sole-operator = 3
- There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C3, Indicate whether the perpetrator/suspect was described as ‘Islamic oriented terrorist’, ‘terrorist’, or ‘right-wing terrorist’. This is based on C3.
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as terrorist(s) (terrorist [1], militant [2], extremist [4], foreign fighter [13]) = 1
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as Islamic oriented terrorist(s) (jihadist [3], Islamist [5], extremist Islamist [6], Islamic militant [8]) = 2
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as right-wing terrorist(s) (right-wing extremist [10], right supremacist [11], neo-nazi [12], right-wing terrorist [14]) = 3
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were present in the text but not described in regards to the terms = 7
There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C3.1, Indicate whether the perpetrator/suspect was described as ‘terrorist’, ‘militant’, ‘jihadist’, ‘extremist’, ‘islamist’, or else. In case of an unclear or lacking description, choose option 7.
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) terrorist(s) = 1
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) militant(s) = 2
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) jihadist(s) = 3
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (an) extremist(s) = 4
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (an) Islamist(s) = 5
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (an) extremist Islamist(s) = 6
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (an) islamic militant(s) = 8
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) right-wing extremist(s) = 10
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) right supremacist(s) = 11
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) neo-nazi(s) = 12
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) foreign fighter(s) = 13
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were defined as (a) right-wing terrorist(s) = 14
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were present in the text but not described in regards to the terms = 7
There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C4, Indicate the are of origin of the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s). This is based on variable C4.1.
The area of origin was the Nordic countries (Sweden [1], Norway [2], Denmark [3]) = 1
The area of origin was Europe, excluding the Nordic countries (Ireland [13]) = 2
The area of origin was the Middle-East (Syria [4], Iran [6], Iraq [9], Turkey [11]) = 3
The area of origin was Asia (Philippines [5], Malaysia [8], Pakistan [10], Uzbekistan [15], Palestine [14]) = 4
The area of origin was Africa (Morocco [7]) = 5
The area of origin was the United States of America = 12
Multiple countries have been defined as the country of origin = 997
The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were present in the text but country of origin was not described = 998
There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C4.1, Indicate the country of origin of the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) (country in which the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) have residency or citizenship).
The country of origin was Sweden = 1
The country of origin was Norway = 2
The country of origin was Denmark = 3
The country of origin was Syria = 4
The country of origin was the Philippines = 5
The country of origin was Iran = 6
The country of origin was Morocco = 7
The country of origin was Malaysia = 8
The country of origin was Iraq = 9
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- The country of origin was Pakistan = 10
- The country of origin was Turkey = 11
- The country of origin was the United States of America = 12
- The country of origin was Ireland = 13
- The country of origin was Palestine = 14
- The country of origin was Uzbekistan = 15
- Multiple countries have been defined as the country of origin = 997
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were present in the text but country of origin was not described = 998
- There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C5, Indicate whether the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as male(s), female(s), or both.
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as male(s) = 1
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as female(s) = 2
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as male(s) and female(s) = 3
- The gender of the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was not described = 998
- There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C6, Indicate which religion the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were following.
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) followed no religion = 1
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were followers of Islam = 2
- The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were followers of Christianism = 3
- The religion of the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was not described = 998
- There was/were no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) implicated = 999

C7, Indicate whether or not, and what the goal of the terror activity was for the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s).
- The goal was to defend religious beliefs = 1
- The goal was to demand financial aid = 2
- The goal was to recruit new fighters = 3
- The goal was to fight multiculturalism = 4
- The goal was not mentioned = 998
- There were no terror activity implicated, and thus no goal implicated = 999

C8, Indicate the motivators of the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) described to engage in an act of terror.
- The motive was described to be personal, such as mental instability or financial issues = 1
- The motive to be that of nationalism = 2
- The motive was described to be that of having (a) conflict(s) with the state = 3
- The motive was described to be that of religious reasons = 4
- The motive was described to be that of gaining international attention = 5
- The motive of the act of terror was not described = 998
- There was no act of terror implicated, and thus no goal implicated = 999

C9, Indicate whether or not the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described with a negative tone, meaning if the perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were in some way described as ‘evil’. The tone implies one is evil when the opposition (the terror instigator) is described in a derogatory fashion and/or appears at war with the anti-terror party on an existential level.
● The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were described as evil = 1
● The perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were not described as evil = 2
● There was no terror activity implicated, and thus no perpetrator(s)/suspect(s) was/were labeled as ‘evil’ = 999

Section D, characteristics of victims, only discuss the main event (primary attack/threat of interest)

D1, Indicate on who/what the attack was executed. In case of a prevented attack, still use codes 1-5 and 998.
  ● The act of terror was aimed towards a business = 1
  ● The act of terror was aimed towards governmental bodies, such as parliament = 2
  ● The act of terror was aimed towards the safety and security forces, such as the police, non-combatants (armed forces), and services such as hospitals = 3
  ● The act of terror was aimed towards the public = 4
  ● The act of terror was aimed towards a single citizen = 5
  ● There was an act of terror, but the target(s) was/were not described = 998
  ● There was an act of terror, but (a) victim(s) was/were implicated = 999

D2, Indicate the religion of the victim(s). In case of a prevented attack, still use codes 1-3 and 998.
  ● The victim(s) was/were followers of Islam = 1
  ● The victim(s) was/were followers of Christianism = 2
  ● The victim(s) followed held no religion = 3
  ● There was an act of terror, but religion was not described = 998
  ● There was an act of terror, but (a) victim(s) was/were implicated = 999

D3, Indicate the gender of the victim(s). In case of a prevented attack, still use codes 1-3 and 998.
  ● The victim(s) was/were male = 1
  ● The victim(s) was/were female = 2
  ● The victim(s) was/were male and female = 3
  ● There was an act of terror, but gender was not described = 998
  ● There was an act of terror, but (a) victim(s) was/were implicated = 999

D4, Indicate the country of origin of the victim(s). In case of a prevented attack, still use codes 1-4 and 998.
  ● The country of origin was Norway = 1
  ● The country of origin was Sweden = 2
  ● The country of origin was Denmark = 3
  ● There were multiple countries or origin = 4
  ● The country of origin was Kenya = 5
  ● The country of origin was the United States of America = 6
  ● The country of origin was Turkey = 7
  ● There was an act of terror, but country of origin was not described = 998
  ● There was an act of terror, but (a) victim(s) was/were implicated = 999

D5, Indicate whether the victim(s) were children (<18 years), adults (19-64 years), or elderly (>65 years). In case of a prevented attack, still use codes 1-7 and 998.
  ● The age group was described as children = 1
The age group was described as adults = 2
The age group was described as elderly = 3
The age group was described as children and adults = 4
The age group was described as children and elderly = 5
The age group was described as adults and elderly = 6
The age group was described as children, adults and elderly = 7
There was an act of terror, but the age group was not described = 998
There was an act of terror, but (a) victim(s) was/were implicated = 999

D6, Indicate whether or not casualties (death) were mentioned in the article.
- Casualties (death) were mentioned in the article = 1
- Casualties (death) were not mentioned in the article = 2
- Casualties (death) were not implicated within the article = 999

D6.1, Indicate the amount of casualties (death). Leave open if there was no mention of (the amount of) casualties.
- Open answer, amount of casualties (death)

D7, Indicate whether or not casualties (wounded) were mentioned in the article.
- Casualties (wounded) were mentioned in the article = 1
- Casualties (wounded) were not mentioned in the article = 2
- Casualties (wounded) were not implicated within the article = 999

D7.1, Indicate the amount of casualties (wounded). Leave open if there was no mention of (the amount of) casualties.
- Open answer, amount of casualties (wounded)

Section E, characteristics of governmental bodies and/or authorities, only discuss the main event (primary attack/threat of interest)

E1, Indicate whether or not the act of terror was apprehended.
- The act of terror was apprehended = 1
- The terror attack was not apprehended = 3
- The terror threat did not take place yet = 4
- There was no mention of apprehension of any kind = 998

E2, Indicate whether or not the text included a critical and/or approving attitude towards the functioning of the government and/or the safety and security forces during a terrorist attack/threat.
- The government and/or the safety and security forces received only critical commentary for their handling of the act of terror = 1
- The government and/or the safety and security forces received only approving commentary for their handling off the act of terror = 2
- The government and/or the safety and security forces received neither critical comments nor approving comments for their handling of the act of terror = 4
- The government and/or the safety and security forces were not mentioned in the article = 999
E3, Indicate whether or not a government response was present within the text in case of a terror attack/threat, also mention government action in case of absence of an attack/threat.

- There was no mention of a government response = 1
- There was mention of increased border control = 2
- There was mention of increased street patrolling = 3
- There was mention of police being more vigilant on the streets (without increased amounts of presence) = 4
- There was mention of increased reprimands for those wanting to join terrorist organizations = 5
- There was mention of multiple measures = 6
- Other, define as, = define number
- There was mention of re-evaluation of security procedures = 7
- There was mention of arming the police forces more heavily = 8
- There was mention of sending troops abroad = 9
- There was mention of questioning a foreign government = 10
- There was mention of arrested and/or prosecuted perpetrators = 11
- There was mention of not conforming with terrorist demands = 12
- There was mention of removal of arms from perpetrator = 13
- There was mention of extended incarceration = 14
- There was mention of a rescue mission = 15
- There was mention of revoking citizenship = 16
- There was mention of collection of traveller data = 17
- There was mention of a warning against fake news = 18
- There was mention of an unchanged terror threat level = 19
- There was mention of preventive measures against homemade bombs = 20
- There was mention of terror response training for the police and/or military = 21
- There was mention of new legislation to combat terrorism = 22
- There was mention of police receiving more equipment = 23
- There was mention of increased suspect surveillance = 24
- There was mention of a travel warning = 25
- There was mention of a government response, but not which = 998
- The government was not mentioned in the article = 999

E4, Indicate whether or not the government and actors are described with a tone that could indicate the government and safety and security forces as ‘heroes’, for example if the article makes statements such as ‘these people have saved many and should be rewarded for their actions’. The intent tone of the commentary should exceed regular approving commentary. The tone implies one is a villain when the opposition is described in a derogatory fashion.

- The government and/or the safety and security forces were described as ‘heroes’ = 1
- The government and/or the safety and security forces were not described as a ‘heroes’, but not as ‘villains’ = 2
- The government and/or the safety and security forces were described as villains = 3
- The government and/or security and safety forces were not mentioned in the article = 999
Section F, Writing properties

F1, Indicate whether the article made use of speculations, such as unverified sources, or the usage of unverified claims, or numbers that have no basis and appear unchecked.

- The article made use of speculation (use no or undocumented sources, also includes quoting people without mentioning name/affiliation) = 1
- The article did not make use of speculation = 2

F2, Indicate whether the article was informative (meaning the article used for example graphs, numbers, and/or used documented sources).

- The article used sourced numbers = 1
- The article used a sourced graph = 2
- The article used an official document = 3
- The article quoted a verifiable person within positions of authority = 4
- The article used methods/sources (codes 1-4), meaning for example one referenced spokesperson and one referenced official document = 996
- The article used three or more methods, meaning for example two references to spokesperson and one reference to an official document (codes 1-4) = 997
- The article was not informative = 998

F3, Indicate whether or not the article called for action from the readers, such as voting for specific rules and/or follow certain guidelines.

- The article was not activating = 998
## APPENDIX III, EXTENDED TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>TLD (N=55)*</th>
<th>TLS (N=50)</th>
<th>TLN (N=43)</th>
<th>Average (N=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TTA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TTA (N=30)</td>
<td>TTA (N=23)</td>
<td>TTA (N=27)</td>
<td>TTA (N=16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TA (N=30)</td>
<td>TA (N=23)</td>
<td>TA (N=27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=16)</td>
<td>TA (N=27)</td>
<td>TA (N=20)</td>
<td>TA (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=20)</td>
<td>TA (N=30)</td>
<td>TA (N=27)</td>
<td>TT (N=73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>83.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phillipines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.

Note**: TTA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.
Table 1a: Extended variables (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLD (N=65)*</td>
<td>TLS (N=50)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>74.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippinae</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple countries</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLN = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable name (number)</th>
<th>Variable option</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
<th>Publisher (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TLD (N=45)</td>
<td>TLS (N=50)</td>
<td>TLL (N=43)</td>
<td>Average (N=138)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TA (N=15)**</td>
<td>TT (N=30)</td>
<td>TA (N=23)</td>
<td>TA (N=27)</td>
<td>TA (N=16)</td>
<td>TA (N=63)</td>
<td>TT (N=73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single citizen</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governmental body</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety and security forces</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-described</td>
<td></td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-implicated</td>
<td></td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>85.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note*: TLD = The Local Denmark, TLS = The Local Sweden, TLL = The Local Norway.
Note**: TA = Terror attack, TT = Terror threat.
I am a 26 year old student passionate about research from the Netherlands. I have always had an interest to dive into and acquire new knowledge and tools, to promote health and abandon stereotypes, and to ultimately pursue a healthier world for all.