Review of: "Media Framing of African Refugee Migration to Europe: An Analysis of Narrative Constructions From Selected Global Media Houses in 2023"

Sergio Splendore[1]

1 University of Milan

If this article is to have scientific ambitions, before the background (for which a brief note with streamlining of rhetoric would suffice), I would start with a theoretical framing, reinforcing in this part the academic contribution (here instead, the attention is focused on reports; for example, the first contributions cited are not "scientific," as they do not come from international peer-reviewed journals).

"Global media" cannot be a definition taken for granted; one understands what is meant by reading the methodology, but it would be advisable to spend a few lines at the beginning to explain what they are, if there is a definition that actually unites them, especially if one then includes "The Eastern Africa," which has little to do with CNN and BBC.

Stating, "The manner in which media tells a story is quite critical as it has the potential to influence the discernment of the public from different parts of the world," needs at least some reference, if possible related precisely to immigration coverage. The question of the "effects" or "influence" of the media is as much debated as it is critical, contrasted. Exactly: it cannot be taken for granted.

Discussion of framing theory cannot be limited to Goffman, let alone a brief citation in the methodology; it is advisable to introduce and discuss it.

The absence of the political issue (immigration issues are a big thing both in Italy and in the UK - Ukip won the referendum promising to have less and fewer immigrants; Sunak is losing consensus on immigration).

The interpretation of the "data" is a bit naive; one has to explain the criteria by which one determines that one thing is positive and another negative. Even asking, "The bottom-line question is, has this coverage helped or worsened the matter?" for one single article is naive--is that a real question? Is that what we do while we scientifically analyze media coverage? We try to understand that coverage or forecast possible consequences?

Just for instance, when the A. writes: "The framing of this coverage by the BBC proposes a serious challenge, showcasing that such large numbers cannot be
processed. The BBC mentions that, the urgency." It seems to be interpreted as negative, but I could interpret it as positive, the fact that the BBC highlights the anomaly and problem. Here, the BBC is going beyond the objectivity attitude to tell that this situation is not possible anymore. Even overlapping the politicians' perspective (e.g., Salvini) with the coverage

implies more layers that need to be distinguished. Is the BBC just reporting what Salvini said, or is it criticizing him?

At the end of the day, I did not even understand the selection criteria for the news articles examined here. It's necessary to be accountable about how that selection has been made.

In the data returns, there is too much lingering in the mere repetition of news facts instead of making an accurate and rigorous analysis of the data at hand.

To summarize:

- do a rigorous and extensive literature review
- justify the research design
- pose a research question
- justify the research method against the objectives
- present the research method in a rigorous way to make it clear what the criteria are for selecting and analyzing articles
- discuss the coverage of the three journals in a comprehensive and interrelated manner, not just do the "summary" for each media outlet

English proofreading is advised.