

**The Institutional Logic of Images of the Poor and
Welfare Recipients**
A Comparative Study of British, Swedish and Danish Newspapers

Christian Albrekt Larsen & Thomas Engel Dejgaard, Centre for Comparative
Welfare Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark

Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies
Working Paper
Editor: Per H. Jensen
E-mail: perh@epa.aau.dk

www.ccws.dk

Working papers may be ordered from:
Inge Merete Ejsing-Duun
Fibigerstræde 1
9220 Aalborg Ø

E-mail: ime@epa.aau.dk

Tlf: (+45) 99 40 82 18
Fax: (+45) 98 15 53 46

Layout: Connie Krogager
Aalborg 2012

ISBN: 978-87-92174-44-4
ISSN: 1398-3024-2012-78

The Institutional Logic of Images of the Poor and Welfare Recipients

A Comparative Study of British, Swedish and Danish Newspapers

Christian Albrekt Larsen & Thomas Engel Dejgaard, Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark

Centre for Comparative Welfare Studies,
Department of Political Science,
Aalborg University

Abstract: The article investigates how the poor and welfare recipients are depicted in British, Danish and Swedish newspapers. The study was inspired by American media studies that have documented a negative stereotypic way of portraying the poor and welfare recipients; especially in the case they are African-Americans. The article argues that there is an institutional welfare-regime logic behind the way the poor and welfare recipients are depicted in the mass media. It is not only a matter of race. This argument is substantiated by showing that the poor and welfare recipients are a) also depicted negatively in a liberal welfare-regime, the UK, where most of the poor and welfare recipients are perceived to be white, and b), depicted positively in two social-democratic welfare regimes, Sweden and Denmark, where the poor and welfare recipients increasingly have come to be perceived as non-white, especially in Denmark. The empirical analyses are based on a sample of 1750 British, 1750 Danish and 1750 Swedish newspapers covering the period from 2004 to 2009.

Key words: welfare regime, public opinion, mass media, poor, welfare recipients

The institutional and ethnic logic behind public deservingness discussions

Why public support for anti-poverty policies is so weak in liberal welfare regimes and so strong in social-democratic regimes (Esping-Andersen, 1990, 2000) is a puzzle that has occupied a number of scholars (e.g. Albrekt Larsen 2006, Alesina & Glaeser 2004, Svallfors 2003). The comparative welfare-state literature (see below) suggests that there is an institutional logic behind the cross-national differences in public support for anti-poverty policies. The aim of this article is to improve this line of reasoning by showing that these institutional logics can be linked to the way that the mass media present “reality” to the public. More concretely, we analyse how British, Swedish and Danish newspapers describe and depict the poor and welfare recipients.

It is a classic thesis that systems dominated by universal benefits and services (the ideal-type policy of the social-democratic welfare regime) on the one hand, and systems dominated by selective benefits and services (the ideal-type policy of the liberal welfare regime) on the other, generate quite different public discussions and perceptions of recipients (e.g. Titmuss 1974, Rothstein 1998, Albrekt Larsen 2006, 2008, Crepaz & Dameron 2009). Following Rothstein (1998), “*the public discussion of social policy in a selective system often becomes a question of what the well-adjusted majority should do about the less well-adjusted, in varying degrees, socially marginalized minority*” (Rothstein, 1998, p. 158). The general fairness of the policy is also open to challenge, as the majority might start asking “*a) where the line between the needy and the non-needy should be drawn; and b), whether the needy themselves are not to blame for their predicament*” (p. 159). Selective systems also fuel discussion about welfare fraud as the poor and welfare recipients have a strong incentive to be among the target group. The logic of a system dominated by a universal welfare policy is in all aspects contrary to the logic within a system dominated by selective policies. In a universal system no line needs to be drawn be-

tween the needy and the non-needy. As Rothstein (1998) argues, welfare policy does not, therefore, turn into a question of what should be done about “the poor” and “the maladjusted”, but rather a question of what constitutes general fairness in respect to the relation between citizens and the state. Finally, the low number of poor might, in itself, hinder intense deservingness discussions.

These institutional effects have been illustrated by survey studies in different countries. For example, Albrekt Larsen (2006; 2008) shows that those living in countries dominated by residual welfare policies are much more likely to explain poverty by laziness than those who live in countries dominated by universal welfare policies. He explains this result with the way the selectivism, the low generosity and the labour market of the liberal welfare regime fuel harsh deservingness discussions and how the opposite is the case in social-democratic regimes. However, little has been done to actually document that the discussions in the mass media of liberal and social-democratic regimes do in fact greatly vary from each other. This is what this study intends to document.

Our main argument is that the institutional structure of welfare regimes generates very different inputs to the mass media. In liberal welfare regimes, the incentives to abuse benefits and services are likely to generate instances of abuse which the mass media are inclined to report. These abuse stories are made further newsworthy by the clear divide between those who receive and those who finance welfare benefits. As everybody in social-democratic regimes is entitled to many of the welfare services and benefits, this institutional setup simply produces less abuse and abuse stories. Another mechanism is the economic security provided to the poor and unemployed in the different regimes. The low generosity of liberal regimes increases the amount of social problems such as crime, teenage pregnancy and underclass culture (e.g. Wilkinson & Pickett 2010). Furthermore, the high level of poverty causes residential segregation that decreases everyday contact be-

tween “them” and “us”, thereby increasing the likelihood of severe negative stereotyping. This is the perfect environment for establishing an input of negative stories and stereotypes (see below) which can be spread by the mass media. In contrast, the low level of poverty found in social-democratic regimes reduces both the social problems and the level of residential segregation, which reduces the likelihood of severe negative stereotyping. This is the perfect environment for establishing an input of positive stories and stereotypes of the poor and welfare recipients to the mass media.

The stories and pictures in the mass media form an important basis for creating the deservingness judgements and attitudes towards anti-poverty policy measured in survey studies. The media content is likely to influence who we (politicians, journalists, social scientists and ordinary citizens) think the poor and welfare recipients are. This is exactly the process of categorisation and labelling described by Allport (1954) whereby we create images and stereotypes. The American journalist Walter Lippman (1889-1979) is said to be the first to use the term stereotype in its current meaning of a metaphor for “pictures in our heads” (1922), arguing in the introduction to the 1961 edition that “*whether right or wrong, . . . imagination is shaped by the pictures seen Consequently, they lead to stereotypes that are hard to shake.*” (1961:2). Thus, media content – and especially pictures – we believe to be a good place to find the stereotypes of the poor and welfare recipients present in different societies. Naturally, the media content is not a mere reflection of the available input. The mass media also have an impact on their own. The pictures of the poor and welfare recipients have been through a long selection process which is influenced by stereotypes. The photographer decides where and how to take the pictures, and among the large amount of pictures taken, the editors pick the single picture which is seen in the newspaper. Therefore one cannot expect a one-to-one-relationship between the poor

and what below will be labelled “the media poor”, i.e. the poor and welfare recipients as depicted in the mass media.

Comparing media content in different welfare regimes

Comparative studies of media content across countries are rare and to our knowledge no previous study has ever embarked on testing the regime argument discussed above. Even national media studies of how the poor and welfare recipients are depicted are rare except for in the US where there is a research tradition in this area; most notable are the studies by Martin Gilens (1996, 2000; see also Iyengar 1991). Gilens had a strong focus on the visual element and documented that African Americans were overrepresented in pictures in articles about poverty. African Americans were often also shown in age categories and in connection with topics which made them seem less deserving than non-African Americans. American survey studies have also consistently shown a strong relationship between negative attitudes towards black people and the public’s lack of support for welfare policies (Gilens 1995, 1996, 2000, Alesina et al. 2001, Lind 2007). This focus on the racial logic behind the negative representation of the poor and welfare recipients is symptomatic for the American studies in this field. Given American race history this is understandable, but it is also a matter of the empirical scope of the American studies. As only the US is included in them, it has been impossible to discover the institutional logic described above. To put it boldly, the regime argument suggests that the negative stereotyping found in the US might more be a matter of African Americans being poor and living in deprived areas than a matter of African Americans being black.

This article investigates the possibility of regime effects by replicating Gilens’ analyses in another liberal welfare regime (UK) and two social-democratic regimes

(Sweden and Denmark). If welfare-regime type is the crucial determinant of media content about the poor and welfare recipients, we should expect to find harsh deservingness discussions (like those in the US) in the British media but not in Danish and Swedish media. As mentioned, the UK provides a good case for studying the “isolated” effect of a liberal welfare regime as it is much “whiter” (according to the 2001 census whites make up 92.8% of the population) and has not had the same level of racial tension as the US. As described below, most of the British “media poor” are of white skin-colour. Despite this “whiteness”, a previous study leads us to believe that the British media poor are presented negatively. Golding & Middleton’s (1982) content analysis of all British newspapers in the second half of 1976 found that of all articles about “welfare” (defined as stories dealing with aspects of welfare linked to the responsibilities of the Secretary of State for Social Services), around 31 percent dealt with abuse (Golding & Middleton 1982:68). As abuse was the most frequent topic, they argued that 1976 was a “scroungerphobia period” in which the British welfare consensus was broken. Though time series are not available, it might be the case that “scroungerphobia” increased in the mid-1970s in the UK. However, our findings below indicate that the abuse stories are still frequent in the UK, which supports the argument that their presence is systemic for liberal welfare regimes.

The depiction of the poor and welfare recipients in social-democratic welfare regimes has not previously been systematically investigated. However survey results in these countries lead us to expect positive stories and pictures of the poor and welfare recipients in Sweden and Denmark. The Swedish and Danish “media poor” are indeed framed in a very positive way, see below, which naturally supports the argument that social-democratic welfare regimes create an environment in which negative stories about the poor and welfare recipients rarely emerge. However, another possibility (which the American research tradition could suggest, e.g. Alesina & Glaeser, 2004) is that it all comes down to

ethnic homogeneity. Nevertheless, as the number of non-Western immigrants has increased dramatically in Sweden and Denmark in the last three decades, the poor and welfare recipients have actually become much more “coloured”. In 2009, immigrants and their children made up 10.6 percent of the Danish population and since the increase was caused by refugees and family reunification, non-Western immigrants (and their children) made up 67 percent of all immigrants in the country. The development is even more dramatic in Sweden. In 1960, 4.0 percent of the Swedes were foreign-born, in 1980 the share was 7.5 percent, and by 2008 it had increased to 13.8 per cent. Most of the increase was caused by non-white immigrants. These “coloured” immigrants have had difficulty finding jobs in the post-industrial labour market offering too few low-paid service jobs (e.g. Kogan 2007). In Denmark in 2008, 28 per cent of those receiving social assistance were non-Western immigrants (figures are not available for Sweden). Furthermore, in Denmark, political tensions surrounding this issue have been severe. The parliamentary basis for the present (2010) centre-right government (in power since 2001) is the Danish People’s Party, an anti-immigration party established in 1995. The coalition has in a number of reforms retrenched on social assistance given non-Western immigrants (Goul Andersen 2007); the pattern is known from the US. Finally, recent survey studies have documented that Swedes and Danes perceive the out-group of non-Western immigrants as negatively as non-black Americans perceive African Americans (Albrekt Larsen, forthcoming). Thus, it would support the regime argument if – despite the salience of the ethnic logic – one could still find “soft” media content in Denmark. ¹

Data material

The collection of British, Swedish and Danish media content was designed to match data collections conducted in the US. Gilens studied the pictures and stories of three leading

weekly news magazines in the five-year period from 1988 to 1992 (Gilens 1996) – *Time*, *Newsweek* and *U.S. News and World Report*. Clawson & Trice conducted a follow-up study covering the five-year period from 1993 to 1998 (2000). Besides Gilens’ three magazines, Clawson & Trice included the stories and pictures in *Business week* and the *New Your Times Magazine*. Finally, Gilens in his 2000 book expanded the 1996 analysis with a rough coding of pictures from 1950 until 1992. Because news magazines are not as common in Europe as in the US, we sampled newspaper stories on poverty and welfare recipients that included pictures of the “target group” (see below). In each of the three countries we selected five of the largest nation-wide newspapers (local and regional papers were omitted). Papers available for free were excluded because many are local and their archives are scattered.

The study tried to balance the newspaper selection in each country. It was done by including three of the largest newspapers from what can be labelled “semi-serious” or “serious popular” press (see below) and two of the largest from what can be labelled the “newsstand tabloid” press (see below). We use the terms “broadsheet” and “tabloid” for these two groups. Thereby the study avoided the risk that country differences in the portraits of poverty were only caused by, for example, our comparing the large British tabloid press with the Swedish broadsheet press. By using Sparks’ (2000) typology of newspaper types it was possible to differentiate between the most circulated national newspapers in the UK, Sweden and Denmark. The classification was made by reading national media researchers’ descriptions of the content of the different newspapers. The result is shown in Table 1. The highlighted papers are those that were selected. The categorisation is not authoritative and should be understood as a rough estimate.

Table 1. Grouping of British, Swedish and Danish newspapers. Selected newspapers in bold

	The “serious” press [archetype “broadsheet”]	The “semi-serious” press	The “serious- popular” press	The “newsstand tabloid” press	The “super- market tab- loid” press [archetype “tabloid”]
UK	Financial Times	The Times Daily Telegraph	Daily Mail Daily Express	The Sun Daily Mirror Daily Star Daily Record	
SW	Dagens Industri	Dagens Nyheter Svenska Dagbladet Sydsvenskan Dagen	Göteborgs- Posten	Aftonbladet Expressen	
DK	Børsen Information	Jyllands-Posten Politiken Berlingske Tidende		Ekstra Bladet BT	

Sources: Conboy 2006; Sparks 2000; Clement & Foster 2008; Johansson 2008; Gardikiotis, Martin & Hewstone 2004; Rosie et al. 2004; Andersen 2006.

The media study did not include what Sparks labels the “serious” press because its readership is more modest than that of the other papers and because these papers have a strong focus on business (except for the Danish “Information”), by which we assumed that they contain few portraits of poverty. Nor did the study include the “supermarket tabloid” press papers because they feature so little concentration on politics, economics, and society that we also assumed them to contain very few portraits of poverty.

The selected Danish broadsheet newspapers were Jyllandsposten, Politiken and Berlingske tidende. These are labelled “broadsheet”. The selected Danish tabloid newspapers were BT and Ekstrabladet. These are also the five biggest newspapers in Denmark (Dansk Oplagskontrol 2009). The selected Swedish broadsheet newspapers were Dagens nyheter, Svenska Dagbladet, and Göteborgs-Posten, and the tabloid newspapers, Aftonbladet and Expressen. These are also the five biggest newspapers in Sweden (Tidningsutgivarna 2009). In the UK the selected broadsheet newspapers were The Times, Daily Telegraph and the Daily Express, and the selected tabloid newspapers, Daily Mirror and Daily Star (Sunday edition included). The Daily Mail and The Sun are larger than the Daily Express and Daily Star but the latter two were chosen because of better archives. Still, both the Daily Express and Daily Star are among the top six largest UK newspapers (Audit Bureau of Circulations 2009).

The media study operated over the five-year period between 2004 and 2009. The fairly long time period was chosen because it enabled us to compare with Gilens (1996) and Clawson & Trice (2000), and to catch general country effects. If a shorter time period had been chosen the study might have been distorted by a given event such as an election campaign, etc. As European newspapers are published daily (in contrast to American magazines that are published weekly), a complete search in all five newspapers (see procedure below) over a five-year period would result in a very large amount of relevant articles, so that instead of a complete search we sampled random days (stratified on year and weekday). In practice we sampled one random week at a time, meaning that we drew a random Monday, a random Tuesday etc. until we had a constructed a week. Ten such constructed weeks were sampled within each of the five years: In each country we sampled 50 constructed weeks, which added up to 350 days and 1750 newspapers for each country (the actual dates can be seen in the technical report).

Selection of articles and pictures and the coding

Gilens (1996) and Clawson & Trice (2000) used an index, the Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature, to locate the relevant articles. They selected the core categories of "poor", "poverty" and "public welfare". In the American context "public welfare" primarily referred to the former AFDC program (the current TANF program), food stamps, Medicaid and General Assistance; all targeted, means-tested benefits. For Britain, Sweden and Denmark we could not find a reliable index to locate the relevant articles. Therefore we conducted a full text search for Britain, Sweden and Denmark. We searched for the words "poor*" (i.e. poorest, poorer also included), "poverty*" and the dominant social assistance scheme(s) in the country (the term "welfare" cannot be used as it has a much broader meaning in Europe than in the US (see technical report for the full search string).

The large amount of articles from this full text search (from the sampled dates) was manually sorted. Articles that dealt with poor, poverty and social assistance clients in the relevant country were selected, i.e. the many articles about poverty in foreign countries, typically African, were discarded. Poverty did not need to be the dominant topic of the article. If the article contained the word "poverty" (and a relevant picture was present, see below) but primarily dealt with, for instance, crime, then the article was still included. We also included articles (with a relevant picture) that described persons who previously had been poor. The same applied to articles about the general macro-economic crisis that hit the countries in 2008; if a relevant picture and the word "poor", "poverty", or name of the dominant means-tested social assistance program was present, then the article was included. Despite variations in the data collection we ended up with articles that largely covered the same topics as in Gilens' articles (see below and Gilens 1996:525).

Among the relevant articles we selected those that were accompanied by a picture or drawings of relevant persons. A relevant person was defined as a person that potentially is, has been or might become poor. Pictures of authors, commentators, researchers, case workers etc. were not perceived as relevant persons. The term “potentially” was used because often it could not be taken for granted that the depicted person was poor. If an article about child poverty was accompanied by a picture of a child outside an apartment complex, the reader of the newspaper might perceive the child as poor, but naturally one cannot be sure (except in cases where information was provided in the text). The term “has been poor” was used because pictures of previously poor people and citizens previously receiving social assistance were also included. In most cases, it was easy to see whether the picture contained relevant persons or not. There were, however, some borderline cases. A Danish article about the economic crisis which also mentioned the prospect of poverty, showed a number of working men. This picture was included. Relevant foreground persons as well as relevant background persons were coded (see Technical Report for details on the picture archives used).

Finally, the pictures and stories were coded. The persons in the pictures were coded as to gender, age, skin color and work status. Below we only make use of the skin-color coding for which Gilens reported an intercoder reliability of 0.97. With an expansion of the categories (see below) and an inexperienced coder, we reached an intercoder reliability of 0.89, which was still acceptable (see technical report). Furthermore, the article uses a topic coding, which is discussed below.

The presence of the poor and welfare recipients in the mass media

The data material was primarily used to explore qualitative differences in how the poor and welfare recipients are depicted, but it also allowed us to establish a rough measure of the

“media-salience” of the poverty and welfare issues. In the 780 magazines studied by Gilens (three magazines over 52 weeks for five years, 1988-92) he found 182 stories accompanied by 206 pictures showing 560 poor people. These persons will be labelled the “media-poor”. Thus for every 100 issues, on average, there were 23 stories related to poverty and 26 pictures (see Table 2). Using the same procedure but two more journals, Glawson & Trice found a less intense coverage in the period from 1993 to 1998, and the difference was not caused by *Business Week* and the *New York Times Magazine* showing fewer pictures than *Newsweek*, *Time* and *U.S. News & World Report*. Of the 1300 issues they studied (five magazines over five years, times 52 weeks) they found 74 stories accompanied by 149 pictures showing 357 media-poor. Thus in this period there were on average six stories and 11 pictures per hundred magazines. Apparently the media coverage prior (1988-1992) to the welfare reform of 1994 was greater than the media coverage during and after the reform period (1993-98).

Table 2. The presence of the poor and welfare recipients in mass media in the US, UK, Sweden and Denmark

	Number of issues stud- ied	Number of stories	Number of pictures	Number of poor people pictured	Stories per hundred issues (aver- age)	Pictures per hundred issues (aver- age)
US 88 – 92	780	182	206	560	23	26
US 93-98	1300	74	149	357	6	11
UK 04-09	1750	188	257	545	11	15
SW 04-09	1750	73	102	180	4	6
DK 04-09	1750	152	190	376	9	11

Because the American studies used magazines and articles selected by means of an index it was difficult to compare directly these intensity measures with our results. However, in the 1750 selected British newspapers we found 188 stories related to poverty, each accompanied by one or more relevant pictures. The 257 pictures depicted 545 media-poor. Thus, in the UK there were on average 11 poverty-related stories and 15 pictures of media-poor per 100 newspapers. Whether this was more or less than occurs in the US is difficult to judge, but British figures can be compared with the Danish and Swedish ones, as we used the same selection method in these countries.

As one might expect from the low poverty levels found in Scandinavia, the Swedish and Danish newspapers contained fewer pictures of the poor than did the British. In the 1750 Swedish newspapers we found only 73 stories with 102 pictures that depicted 180 persons. Thus, the British papers contained 2.5 times more pictures of poor persons than did the Swedish newspapers. So the British newspaper readership is much more exposed to pictures of the poor than is the Swedish. This is what one might expect. The Danish case is more challenging. In the selected 1750 Danish newspapers we found 152 stories accompanied by 190 pictures that depicted 376 poor persons. Thus, the Danish newspapers contained 1.9 times more pictures of the poor than did the Swedish newspapers. The figures reflect that, despite low poverty levels, Denmark had in the period between 2004 and 2009 a rather intense discussion about poverty. The 190 Danish pictures could not match the 257 pictures found in UK, but the Danish figures indicate that the lack of resistance to spending on anti-poverty measures in Sweden and Denmark cannot simply be explained by Swedes and Danes not seeing pictures of the poor and social assistance recipients. It is also a matter of how these groups are described and portrayed.

The colour of the media-poor

The most prominent finding in Gilens' study was that African Americans were strongly overrepresented in the media pictures. Blacks made up 62 percent of the media-poor, while the official share was 29 percent. Clawson & Trice also found African Americans to be overrepresented in the magazine pictures from 1993-98. In this period, the share was 49 percent compared to the census estimate of 27 percent. As discussed in the introduction, the perception of the poor and welfare recipients as belonging to an ethnic minority might matter quite a lot in deservingness judgements.

Table 3. The skin-colour of the media poor in UK, Sweden and Denmark (2004-09) and the US (1988-92)

	US		UK		SW		DK	
	n	%	n	%	N	%	n	%
White	-	-	449	86 %	110	75 %	227	67 %
Black	347	62 %	45	9 %	8	5 %	11	3 %
Other non-white	-		25	5 %	29	20 %	100	30 %
Non-white:	212	38 %						
Could not be determined	75		27		33		36	
N persons (max)	635		546		180		374	

To judge by the media pictures, the American scholars are right in arguing that the racialization of the poverty issue is extreme in the US. None of the other three countries come close to portraying as many black persons as was the case in the US. Blacks made up nine percent of the British media-poor, five percent of the Swedish and three percent of the Danish. Thus, if one believes that the negative stereotypes are directly associated with African origin, then the poor are presented as somewhat less deserving in the UK than in Sweden and Denmark. However, in a European context, it is more a matter of white versus

non-white. It is a matter of the white natives and the non-white immigrants. Therefore we not only coded “black” and “non-black”, but distinguished between “whites”, “blacks” and “other non-whites”. Clawson & Trice (2000) also expanded Gilens’ colour coding. They found that the whites made up only 34 percent of the American media-poor. In the British media pictures, the “other non-white” made up five percent, i.e. in total 14 percent of the British media-poor were non-white. Thus, the vast majority, 86 percent, of the British media-poor were white, so that, as argued in the introduction, if public attitudes are dominated by the ethnic logic, the British poor and welfare recipients should be perceived as more deserving than the American.

The Swedish and Danish media-poor are also less non-white” than those in the US. But they are more “non-white” than in the UK. The “other non-whites” made up 20 percent of the Swedish media-poor and 30 percent of the Danish, i.e. the non-white made up 25 percent in Sweden and 33 percent in Denmark. That the Danish media-poor are “more non-white” than the Swedish (the difference is significant) was expected due to the greater salience of this issue in Denmark. In the European context it is difficult to find poverty statistics broken down as to skin-colour, but in Sweden and Denmark non-white persons are probably somewhat overrepresented. In Denmark non-Western immigrants made up around 12 percent of the relatively poor in 2007 (calculation based on AE 2010). However, if one uses instead the yardstick of how large a share non-whites make up of social assistance clients, then the distribution among the media-poor is almost in accordance with the Danish estimates from 2008 (DA 2008). In any case, the findings indicate that if the ethnic logic is the dominant driver behind the representation of the poor and welfare recipients, then we should expect the media content to be the harshest in the US and softest in the UK. But when we look at the character of the stories, the UK media content is by no means “soft”.

Categorizing the stories about the media-poor

Gilens categorised his 182 stories into nine overall brackets. The most frequent topic was housing and homelessness. Of the 182 stories, 96 (53 percent) were in this bracket. Three other frequent topics in Gilens' material was "poor children" (24 stories), "public welfare" (25 stories) and "the poor" in general (33 stories). Finally, there were a number of less frequent topics: "employment programs for the poor" (nine stories), "Medicaid" (7 stories) "the underclass" (six stories) and "education for the poor" (4 stories). Gilens also had a group of miscellaneous stories (14 stories) that was not grouped. As we had no access to these 182 stories, it was difficult to judge how undeserving the poor and welfare clients described there were, and in any case the differences in data collection makes a direct comparison problematic. However, our own data material allowed a systematic comparison of the stories found in the UK, a liberal welfare regime, and the stories found in Sweden and Denmark, two social-democratic welfare regimes.

Table 3 shows the main topics grouped into two main categories, "positive" and "negative", and two subcategories, "out-of-poverty stories" and "miscellaneous others". We started with describing the positive stories. Child poverty is one of the topics that typically puts the depicted media-poor in a positive light. For Britain, we found 12 such stories (six percent). For Sweden and Denmark, we found six stories in each country (respectively eight percent and six percent). Another positive topic is "Christmas help", an especially Danish phenomenon. Ten Danish stories (seven percent) described how needy families were helped during Christmas time. For Sweden we found one such story, and for Britain, we did not find any. Pension poverty is also a positive topic, more frequent in the UK than in Sweden and Denmark. We found 19 stories about old-age poverty in the UK (ten percent), but only three stories in Sweden and one story in Denmark (respectively four

and one percent). Old-age poverty was the most frequent “positive” story in the UK. Stories about “bad labour-market conditions”, stories about “economic need and social stratification in general” and stories about “housing prices and homelessness” also tend to leave a positive impression of the media poor. On these topics there were no clear country variations; together they made up 14 percent of the British, 29 percent of the Swedish and 14 percent of the Danish stories.

Table 4: Topic of articles in Denmark, Sweden and UK

	UK		SW		DK	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Child poverty	12	6 %	6	8 %	6	4 %
Christmas help (charity)	0	0 %	1	1 %	10	7 %
Pensioner poverty	19	10 %	3	4 %	1	1 %
Bad labour-market situation	4	2 %	3	4 %	5	3 %
Poverty and economic need in general	11	6 %	9	12 %	14	9 %
Social stratification in general	10	5 %	3	4 %	0	0 %
Housing conditions (lack of supply at fair prices and homelessness)	1	1 %	4	5 %	2	1 %
“Stuck in the system”	2	1 %	9	12 %	16	11 %
Poverty among immigrants due to structural problems	0	0 %	3	4 %	12	8 %
Single mothers in poverty, including female exposure to violence	4	2 %	4	5 %	9	6 %
Anti-poverty policies that “ease” living conditions of the poor	11	6 %	0	0 %	3	2 %
Student poverty	3	2 %	2	3 %	4	3 %
<i>Percent with “positive” topic:</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>41%</i>	<i>47</i>	<i>62%</i>	<i>82</i>	<i>55%</i>
Benefit fraud in general (illegal)	19	10 %	1	1 %	0	0 %
Single mothers abusing the system (legal)	12	6 %	0	0 %	1	1 %
Abusing the system in general (legal)	5	3 %	0	0 %	2	1 %
Crime, gang, terror, antisocial behaviour	21	11 %	1	1 %	5	3 %
Deprived area	1	1 %	9	12 %	12	8 %
Good labour-market situation	0	0 %	0	0 %	8	5 %
Immigration issues	10	5 %	4	6 %	3	2 %
Erosion of middle-class family	5	3 %	0	0 %	0	0 %
Incentive problems	4	2 %	0	0 %	1	1 %
Anti-poverty policies that “press” the target group	3	2 %	5	7 %	8	5 %
<i>Percent with “negative” topic:</i>	<i>80</i>	<i>43 %</i>	<i>20</i>	<i>27 %</i>	<i>40</i>	<i>26 %</i>
Out-of-poverty stories	18	10 %	3	4 %	15	10 %
Miscellaneous	13	7 %	3	4 %	15	10 %
	188	100 %	73	100 %	152	100 %

What we have labelled “stuck-in-the-system” stories also presented the media-poor in a positive light. These stories seem to be a particularly Scandinavian phenomenon. The typi-

cal framing is that a person cannot be helped, which is due to red tape or problems with the welfare system. Thus, the blame is put on the system and the motivation of the citizens is not questioned. Together with general stories about economic need, this is the most frequent positive story found in Sweden and Denmark. We found nine of these stories in the Swedish papers (12 percent) and 16 of these stories in the Danish ones (11 percent). In the UK papers, we only found two such stories (one percent). There is also a Scandinavian tendency to write “positive” stories about poor immigrants. The deservingness literature suggests that just depicting immigrants hardens attitudes towards the poor and welfare recipients. But this effect might be of less importance where the attached story deals with structural problems (typically discrimination) that cause economic hardship for immigrants. In the Danish papers we found 12 such stories (eight percent), in the Swedish, three such stories (four percent) and in UK papers, none. Single-mother poverty is another topic that can have “positive” and “negative” framing: A number of the stories present single-mothers as abusing the system. However, especially in the Danish and Swedish papers, we found stories not on the topic of abuse. Instead, the main topic is the economic hardship experienced by this group, which by comparative standards is actually very well protected in Sweden and Denmark. We found nine such stories in the Danish (six percent), four in the Swedish (four percent) and four in the UK newspapers (two percent). Finally, stories about public-policy initiatives that ease the living conditions of “the poor” also tend to leave the reader with a positive image of the target group. Descriptions of such policies were most frequent in the UK. We found 11 such stories for the UK (six percent), three for Denmark (two percent) and zero for Sweden. It is open to discussion whether students are a deserving or undeserving group. However, the few stories we found (three for the UK, two for Sweden and four in for Denmark) were generally positively framed. Therefore they were added to the “positive” bracket.

Categorised this way, the overall finding is that 41 percent of the British stories depict the media-poor in a “positive” light. As expected, the share is larger for Sweden and Denmark. For Sweden, positive stories make up 62 percent, for Denmark, 55 percent. The difference between the UK and the two social-democratic regimes is clearly statistically significant (0.01 level). Thus as expected, the Swedish and Danish media-poor are framed in a more positive way. Whether the size of this difference is larger or smaller than expected is difficult to judge. On the one hand the studies that claim that the discourse of liberal regimes is particularly “harsh” (see the introduction) could make one expect larger differences. What keeps the British stories somewhat positive is the overrepresentation (compared to Scandinavia) of the issue of old-age poverty and anti-poverty policies that ease the living conditions of those at the bottom of society. On the other hand, one could argue that, as living conditions of the poor and welfare recipients worsen in the UK, it is quite telling that the British media still publish fewer “positive” stories than do the Scandinavian. However, in any case it is not the “positive” topics that cause a public uprising. It is the negative stories that have the potential to cause what Stanley Cohen (1972) labelled “moral panic”.

The negative stories about the media-poor

The most negative topic on poverty is properly the abuse of benefits and services. This abuse can take various forms. A frequent story about the British media-poor deals directly with fraud. These stories are typically based on a preliminary charge or court conviction of persons that have cheated on welfare benefits. For the UK we found 19 such stories (10 percent). For Sweden, we found one. For Denmark, we did not find a single story. Another frequent British story is single mothers abusing the welfare system. This abuse is typically not illegal, but the stories clearly indicate that these single mothers have made a living out

of producing children to be supported by the welfare state. Thus, the black American “welfare queen” is found in a “white” version in the UK. We found 12 such stories in UK, one in Denmark and none in Sweden. Finally, we found five other stories about legal abuse of welfare benefits in the UK (three percent). In Denmark we found two, and in Sweden, none. Together stories about abuse of benefits made up 19 percent of the British stories about the media-poor (36 stories). In contrast, these abuse-stories only made up two percent of the Danish stories and one percent of the Swedish stories. Thus, here we found the expected difference between the liberal and social-democratic welfare regimes. This supports the classic argument already that it simply lies in the nature of selective benefits that they fuel a discussion about abuse, while more universal benefits hamper such discussions.

Crime, gang issues, anti-social behaviour and terrorism are other clearly “negative” topics. Though neither of these words were included in the search string, we found 21 such stories in the UK (11 percent) in which this was the main topic of the article. In contrast, we found only five such stories in Denmark (three percent) and one in Sweden (one percent). As the living conditions of the poor and welfare recipients are worse in the UK than in Sweden and Denmark, this pattern is also what could be expected. In the British context, many of these stories had a reference to “deprived areas” but that was not the main topic. We found only one British story (one percent) with the “ghetto topic” was the main topic. In contrast, the “ghetto-topic” was the most frequent negative story found in Sweden and Denmark, with nine “ghetto-stories” in Sweden (12 percent) and 12 in Denmark (8 percent). This issue is definitely also a “negative” frame, but there was a qualitative difference between the British “crime stories” and the Scandinavian “deprived-area stories”.

When they are not describing structural problems that hinder the integration of immigrants, stories about immigration are typically also a “negative” topic. We found

ten British stories (five percent) in which the main topic was immigration (but without reference to structural problems such as discrimination). We found five such stories for Sweden (seven percent) and three such stories for Denmark (two percent). Stories in which the main topic is new public policies that “press” the target group typically also leave a “negative” impression of the media poor. These stories typically focus on new requirements for job-search activity etc. We found three such stories for the UK (two percent), five such stories for Sweden (seven percent) and eight such stories for Denmark (five percent).

Finally, there were a number of negative stories that, though being “soft” in tone, still leave a negative impression of the media-poor. For Britain we found five stories (three percent) about the erosion of the middle-class family. Despite the fact that Sweden and Denmark have experienced the same kind of break-up in the nuclear family structure, we did not find a single story on this topic for Sweden and Denmark. Another British topic was about incentive problems caused by welfare benefits. This is a classic academic debate, and in the four British articles on the “incentive-topic” the tone taken towards welfare recipients was decidedly neutral. However, the very topic questions the work ethic of the poor, and therefore we grouped these stories as having a negative topic. Finally, we found eight Danish stories about very good labour-market conditions; the Danish economy picked up in 2007 with an unemployment level as low as 3.8 percent (OECD standardised). Though being “soft in tone”, these stories also leave the impression that the poor do not take the available jobs (a lot of the stories were about employers unable to recruit enough labour). Therefore these were also grouped as examples of a “negative story”.

In this way, 43 percent of the British stories were “negative”, which should be compared to 27 percent in Sweden and 26 percent in Denmark (the difference is statistically significant at the 0.01 level). So not only do the British media show more pictures of

the poor and welfare recipients than the media of the other countries, when they do so, they also tell more negative stories about the media-poor. Furthermore, if one looks at the distribution of negative stories, the most negative ones, i.e. about abuse and crime, are much more frequent in the UK than in Sweden and Denmark. In Sweden and Denmark the topics of abuse and crime were almost completely absent. Finally, there were a number of “out-of-poverty” stories about previously poor, unemployed or homeless persons (not described here).

The harsh British versus the soft Swedish and Danish tabloid press

It is often claimed in media research that a negative story is more sensational than a positive story. Thus, as the tabloid “genre” is defined by its tendency to be sensational, one could expect that the tabloid press features more of the stories that we categorise above as negative. This turns out to be the case in the UK: When the British tabloid press brought out a poverty-story with one or more pictures included, the main topic was “negative” in 56 percent of the cases. Forty percent had a “positive” main topic, and four percent were in the “others” category. In contrast, 39 percent of the stories in the British broadsheet press had a “negative” main topic, 41 percent had a “positive” main topic and 20 percent belonged among “others”. Thus, there is a tendency to bring out more “negative” stories in the British tabloid press. This turns out to be a very clear difference if one looks specifically at abuse and crime stories. These make up 49 percent (22 stories) of the tabloid stories, but only 25 percent (35 stories) in the broadsheet press. The difference is significant at 0.01 levels.

Table 5: The relation between newspaper genre and type of poverty-story

	UK				SW				DK			
	Broadsheet		Tabloid		Broadsheet		Tabloid		Broadsheet		Tabloid	
	N	%	n	%	N	%	N	%	n	%	n	%
“Negative” stories	55	39%	25	56%	14	30%	6	23%	34	29%	6	18%
“Positive” stories	59	41%	18	40%	30	64%	17	65%	57	48%	25	76%
Other stories	29	20%	2	4%	3	6%	3	12%	28	24%	2	6%
Total	143	100%	45	100%	47	100%	26	100%	119	100%	33	100%

UK country-difference significant at 0.03 level (“negative” versus “positive” plus “others”), one-sided

This relationship, however, cannot be found in Sweden and Denmark, which is somewhat surprising. In Sweden, the “negative” stories make up 23 percent (6 stories) of the tabloid stories and 30 percent (14 stories) of broadsheet stories. In Denmark, the equivalent figures are 18 percent (six stories) and 29 percent (34 stories). Thus, the Swedish and Danish broadsheet press actually seem to bring more “negative” stories than the tabloid press (though not statistically significant due to the limited sample size). And the expected pattern did not emerge even though we specifically looked for abuse and crime stories. The two Swedish tabloid newspapers do not bring out a single story on abuse or crime in the sampled period. The two Danish tabloid newspapers feature four such stories. Thus, in contrast to the British tabloid press, the typical Swedish and Danish tabloid poverty-story is actually “positive”. Seventeen of the 26 Swedish tabloid poverty stories have a positive main topic. For Denmark, 25 out of 33 stories are positive. This is a remarkable difference between the British, and the Swedish and Danish tabloid press. These newspapers largely work under the same conditions. They all have a focus on sensational stories and they all

have their readership primarily among lower social classes. Still, they feature stories and pictures that are very different.

The “colour” of positive and negative poverty stories

So far, our findings support the regime argument presented in the introduction. “Harsh” media content was found in the UK despite most of the “media poor” being white. And “soft” media content was found in Sweden and Denmark despite the fact that non-white persons have come to make up a sizeable share of the poor and welfare recipients. However, this is not to say that there is no ethnic logic at all behind the negative stereotyping found in the US. One of Gilens’ most striking findings was that pictures of African-Americans were overrepresented in the “negative” stories and underrepresented in the “positive” stories. This was the case in the five-year period from 1988 to 1992 (Gilens 1996), but also in the whole period from 1950 to 1992 (Gilens 2000). One-hundred percent of the persons in the pictures were blacks when the topic of the article was “underclass”. Eighty-four percent were blacks when the topic was “urban problems and urban renewal”. When the topic was “old-age assistance”, the pictures did include a single black person (Gilens 2000:128). Our data material actually indicates that the same link between the topic of the stories and the skin-colour of depicted persons can be found in UK, Sweden and Denmark. One of the strengths of the applied method is that it enabled us to study the interaction between the pictures and the stories.

Table 6: The skin-colour of persons depicted in pictures related to “positive” and “negative” article about the poor

	UK				SW				DK			
	“Positive top-ic”		“Negative topic”		“Positive top-ic”		“Negative topic”		“Positive top-ic”		“Negative topic”	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
White	178	92%	222	82%	87	90%	15	36%	152	76%	30	38%
Non-white	16	8%	50	18%	10	10%	27	64%	49	24%	48	62%
Cannot be determined	12		14		4		28		16		18	
Total	206	100%	286	100%	101	100%	70	100%	217	100%	96	100%

All country differences are significant at 0.01 levels.

In the UK, the “positive” poverty stories were accompanied by pictures of 206 persons, and the vast majority (92 percent) had white skin-colour. Only eight percent of the media-poor in the “positive” stories were non-white. The “negative” British poverty stories were followed by pictures of 286 persons. The vast majority, 82 percent, were also whites. Thus, in UK, a “negative story” was typically associated with white persons. Thus, although the link between negative topics and skin-colour is definitely stronger in the US than in the UK, with 18 percent of the persons in the negative UK stories being non-white, there is also a significant tendency in the UK to depict more non-white persons in the “negative” than in “positive” stories (significant at 0.01 level).

In Sweden and Denmark, the link between negative stories and the skin-colour of the media-poor come closer to the American pattern. As we have seen, both countries have much fewer “negative” stories than the British media. But when these stories do occur, the depicted persons are much more likely to be non-white. In Sweden, 90 percent of the persons in the “positive” stories were white and 10 percent were non-white. In the “negative” stories, only 36 percent were white and 64 percent were non-white. Thus, one out of ten is non-white in the “positive” stories compared to six out of ten in the “nega-

tive” stories (the difference is significant at 0.01 levels). The figures are more or less the same in Denmark. In the “negative” Danish stories, 62 percent of the depicted persons are non-white and 38 percent are white. With 24 percent, the Danish media do show more non-white in the “positive” stories than is the case in the UK (8 percent) and Sweden (10 percent). However, with 76 percent of the persons in the “positive” stories being white, one also finds a significant tendency to show more non-white persons in “negative” stories in Denmark (significant at 0.01 levels).

This finding naturally relies on the categorisation of stories as explained above. One could argue that by categorising stories related to immigration (that are not about the structural difficulties of this group) as “negative”, this link between “negative” stories and the skin-colour of the persons is to be expected. However, even if these ten British, four Swedish and three Danish stories about migration are removed from the sample, one still finds significantly more non-whites in the “negative” stories (significant at 0.01 within each country). In terms of gender and age composition, there were not any noteworthy differences between the “positive” and “negative” stories.

Conclusion

The article is a first attempt to provide a systematic cross-national analysis of the media stories and pictures of the poor and welfare recipients in liberal and social-democratic welfare regimes. The results broadly support the classic argument that the public discourse about the poor and welfare clients is harsh in liberal regimes and soft in social-democratic regimes. In the sampled newspapers, we estimated that the “positive” stories made up 62 percent of the Swedish stories, 55 percent of the Danish stories and 41 percent of the British stories. What contributed to the relatively large share of “positive” stories in the UK were stories about poverty among pensioners and stories about public policies that ease the

living conditions of the poor.. Still, the difference between the UK and the two social-democratic welfare regimes is clearly significant.

The regime differences, however, are most strongly reflected in the “negative” stories. As expected, there were many more stories on abuse of benefits in the UK than in Sweden and Denmark. In the UK, these stories made up 19 percent, whereas such stories were almost absent in Sweden and Denmark (respectively, one and three stories in the sampled newspapers). This supports the classic argument that welfare systems dominated by selective benefits and services tend to produce public discussion about abuse. Another classic argument is that the economic inequality and high poverty rates in liberal welfare regimes tend to generate negative stories. Our analyses also support this argument. The stories about crime, gangs, terrorism and anti-social behaviour made up 11 percent of the British sample compared to, respectively, one and three percent of the Swedish and Danish sample. The overall finding was that, if a range of other “negative” topics are also included, the “negative” stories end up making up 43 percent of the British stories compared to 27 percent and 26 percent respectively of the Swedish and Danish stories; again a statistically significant difference.

This institutional logic seems to be present despite variations in ethnic divides. We found harsh British media content despite the fact that the poor and welfare recipients are primarily perceived to be white. We also found soft Swedish and Danish media content despite the fact that the poor and welfare recipients increasingly are perceived to be non-white. This finding supports the argument that there is an institutional logic behind the negative American attitudes towards the poor and welfare clients, which is more or less ignored in the American literature. To put it boldly, the negative American attitudes are not only a matter of race. It is also a matter of the institutions in place in liberal welfare regimes. However, this is not to say that ethnic divides are of no importance. On the contra-

ry, the data material documented that the American tendency to depict non-whites in negative stories and whites in positive stories were present in UK as well as in Sweden and Denmark. The link between negative stories and the colour of the depicted media-poor was weaker than in the US, but still strong enough to be statistical significant in all three countries. Thus, the US is (no longer) unique in this respect, which increases the relevance of alternative explanations for the negative stereotyping of the poor and welfare recipients found in the US and UK, and the positive stereotyping found in Denmark and Sweden.

Our interpretation of the results is naturally open to discussion. One question is whether these remarkable differences in media content really are caused by the institutional structure of welfare regimes. Another possibility is that the differences are also to be explained by deeper cultural values related to liberalism and social-democracy or differences in the structure of the media system (e.g. Hallin & Mancini 2004). That the British tabloid press is more inclined to print “negative” poverty-stories than the Swedish and Danish tabloid press, might point to the importance of different media traditions. Furthermore, there is always a discussion about the relationship between the “media reality” and the “real” reality, and whether it is the mass media that influence public opinion or public opinion that influences the mass media. As to the former discussion, in our point of view, the media reality will always be distorted in this field; “the poor” is simply one of the most heterogeneous groups and therefore the media images of “the poor” will also (whether positive or negative) be stereotypical. As to the latter discussion, public opinion and media content are likely to be mutually dependent and therefore the causal relationship is extremely difficult to sort out. The more modest contribution of this article has been to document a concurrence between welfare regimes and media content.

References

AE (2010). *Fordeling og Levevilkår*, Copenhagen: AE rådet

Albrekt Larsen, C. (forthcoming). "Ethnic Heterogeneity and Public Support for Welfare: Is the US Experience Replicated in Britain, Sweden, and Denmark?" *Scandinavian Political Studies*

Albrekt Larsen, C. (2008). The Institutional Logic of Welfare Attitudes: How Welfare Regimes Influence Public Support. *Comparative Political Studies*, vol. 41; 145-169.

Albrekt Larsen, C. (2006). *The institutional logic of welfare attitudes: How welfare regimes influence public support*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate.

Alesina, A., & Glaeser, E. L. (2004). *Fighting poverty in the US and Europe. A world of difference*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Alesina, A., Glaeser, E., & Sacerdote, B. (2001). *Why doesn't the U.S. have a European-style welfare system?* Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, pp. 187–278.

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Andersen, M. B. (2006). "Fra presseetik til markedsmoral", *Journalistica - Tidsskrift For Forskning I Journalistik*, vol. 1 pp 25-41.

Audit Bureau of Circulations (2009). *National daily Newspaper circulation May 2009*. guardian.co.uk

Crepaz, M. M. L. & R. Damron (2009). "Constructing Tolerance. How the Welfare State Shapes Attitudes About Immigrants", *Comparative Political Studies* vol. 42, no. 3.

Clement, S. & Foster, N. 2008, "Newspaper reporting on schizophrenia: A content analysis of five national newspapers at two time points", *Schizophrenia research*, vol. 98, no. 1-3, pp. 178-183

Cohen, Stanley (1972) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* London: MacGibbon and Kee

Conboy, Martin (2006): *Tabloid Britain – constructing a community through language*, Routledge.

Clawson, R. A. & R. Trice (2000). "Poverty as We Know It: Media Portrayals of the Poor", *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 64(1): 53-64

Dansk Oplagskontrol (2009). www.do.dk.

DA (2008). *Ikke-vestlige indvandrere på arbejdsmarkedet*: Copenhagen: DA

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (2000). *Social Foundations of Post-industrial Economies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Esping-Andersen, Gøsta (1990). *The three worlds of welfare capitalism*: Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gardikiotis, A., Martin, R. & Hewstone, M. 2004, "The representation of majorities and minorities in the British press: A content analytic approach", *European Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 34, no. 5, pp. 637-646.

Gilens, M. (1995). "Racial attitudes and opposition to welfare". *Journal of Politics*, vol. 57 no. 4, 994–1014.

Gilens, M. (1996). "Race and poverty in America. Public misperceptions and the American news media". *Public Opinion Quarterly*, Volume 60: 515-541.

Gilens, M. (2000). *Why Americans hate welfare. Race, media, and the politics of anti-poverty policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Golding, P. & S. Middleton (1982). *Images of welfare. Press and Public Attitudes to Poverty*, Oxford: Martin Robertson & Company Ltd

Goul Andersen, Jørgen (2007), "Restricting Access to Social Protection for Immigrants in the Danish Welfare State", *Benefit*, vol 4 (3).

Green-Pedersen, C. & P. Odmalm, P. (2008), "Going different ways? Rightwing parties and the immigrants issues in Denmark and Sweden", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 15, no. 3.

Hallin, D. C., & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Iyengar, Shanto (1991). *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press

Johansson, S. 2008, "Gossip, Sport And Pretty Girls: What does "trivial" journalism mean to tabloid newspaper readers?", *Journalism Practice*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 402-413.

Kogan, I (2007). *Working through barriers: host country institutions and immigrant labour market performance in Europe*, Springer

Lind, J. T. (2007). 'Fractionalization and the size of government'. *Journal of Public Economics*, vol. 91, 51–76.

Lippmann, Walter (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York: Harcourt, Brace.

Lippmann, Walter (1961) *Public Opinion*, New York: Macmillan.

Rosie, M., MacInnes, J., Petersoo, P., Condor, S. & Kennedy, J. 2004, "Nation speaking unto nation? Newspapers and national identity in the devolved UK", *Sociological Review*, vol. 52, no. 4, pp. 437-458.

Rothstein, B. (1998). *Just institutions matter: The moral and political logic of the universal welfare state*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rydgren J. (2006). *From tax populism to ethnic nationalism: Radical right-wing populism in Sweden*, Berghahn Books

Sparks, Colin (2000): "Introduction – the panic over tabloid news", in Sparks, Colin & Tulloch, John (Ed.), *Tabloid Tales – global debates over media standards*. Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.

Svallfors, Stefan (2003). "Welfare regimes and welfare opinions: A comparison of eight Western countries", *Social Indicators Research*, vol. 64, pp. 495-520

Tidningsutgivarna (2009). *Svensk Dagspress 2009. Fakta om marknad ofh medier*. Stockholm

Titmuss, R.M. (1974), *Social Policy: An Introduction*. London: Allen and Unwin

Wilkinson, R. & K. Pickett (2010). *The Spirit Level. Why Equality is Better for Everyone*. Penguin Books

Notes

¹ The varying salience of the ethnicity issue might be given different historical explanations, but one simple argument is that party competition matters (e.g. Green-Pedersen & Odman 2008). In the British electoral system the anti-immigration party, the British People's Party, is no real threat and is not even represented in parliament. With a proportional election system, the Swedish case is more difficult to explain. But until recently (the 2010 election) the higher threshold for entering parliament in Sweden (four percent compared to two percent in Denmark) has largely kept the anti-immigration parties out. Furthermore it is well documented that the Swedish media have had an implicit strategy of not politicising the ethnicity issue, e.g. by refusing to show advertisements for the Swedish Democratic Party during election campaigns (Rydgren 2006).