

**The reporting of the Dr Mohamad Haneef story
By Jacqui Ewart**

Contents	Page
1. Background	3
2. This study	3
3. Literature: Terrorism, Islam and the media	4-12
4. Methodology	13
4.1 Background to the Methodology	13-15
4.2 Applying the Methodology	16-17
5. Data and Analysis	18
5.1 Framing	18-19
5.2 Tone	20
5.3 Themes	21
5.4 Reporting Trends	22-23
5.5 Reporting Tools	23-24
6. Discussion	25-26
7. Conclusion	26
8. Tips for journalists	27-28
9. References	29-33

1. Background

The ‘Dr Mohamad Haneef’ story was one that captured the attention of Australian and international media from the moment news broke of the doctor’s arrest on suspicion of ‘providing material support to a terrorist organisation’. The Dr Haneef story continues to unfold at the time of writing this report.

Dr Haneef was arrested on July 2nd at the Brisbane International Airport and the rest of the story is now history. The events around Dr Haneef’s arrest, detention for twelve days without charge, charging and the eventual dropping of the charges against him have been the subject of much public discussion and debate. Those events have been extensively detailed in the media and researchers have, to a much lesser extent, examined the way the media covered these events (Dreher, 2007, McNamara 2009).

2. This study

The Dr Haneef case provided the opportunity to analyse what was and remains an excellent example of the media coverage and treatment of a rapidly unfolding news story that was significant in scale and scope. It was a story about a Muslim man of Indian background, who was working in Australia as a doctor, and who was suspected of being connected to an international terrorism-related event. The nature of the project Reporting Diversity meant this case provided the chance to analyse the way media dealt with some of the issues which the Reporting Diversity project was established to explore – specifically identifying how journalists report issues involving persons of diverse religious and ethnic backgrounds who are accused of terrorism, and how the media frames some of those issues.

This case study examines selected news media coverage of the Dr Haneef story to form an understanding of how these media outlets covered the story as it unfolded in its first month. The aim of the study was to examine the way in which the media framed and positioned the story, through an analysis of the kind of language used.

Although it was not an expected output from this case study, the author has added value to the study by identifying a series of tips for journalism students, journalists and journalism teachers, in relation to reporting stories about terrorism, terrorists and those suspected of involvement in terrorism-related activities.

Before examining the material analysed as part of the case study, it is useful to give some attention to existing research in the area of terrorism studies. Thanks to senior research assistant Dr Kate Holland for preparing this part of the study and for providing the review of the literature contained in the methodology section.

3. Literature: Terrorism, Islam and the media

Media reporting and framing of terrorism has attracted considerable attention internationally from researchers and there is now a substantial body of work which deals with this area (Alali & Eke, 1991; Leurs, 2007; Norris, Kern & Just, 2003; Papacharissi & de Fatima Oliveira, 2008; Ryan, 2004; Schaefer, 2003; Simmons, 1991; Willcox, 2001), much of which has been prompted by the September 11 terrorist attacks on the United States and the subsequent declaration of the ‘War against terror’. While it has been suggested that September 11 profoundly changed the nature of journalism (Zelizer & Allen, 2002), there is also an argument that media coverage of terrorism and the approach journalists took to these issues was problematic even before the events of September 11, 2001. Apart from studying the aforementioned event, researchers have also examined the use of the media by terrorists and terrorism organisations (Torres Soriano, 2008); the role of the media in publicising and potentially aiding the terrorist’s cause (see Cohen-Almagor, 2005); and the roles of journalists in reporting terrorist attacks (Picard, 1991).

There are far fewer studies that look at the way in which the media reports news of terrorism suspects, people alleged to have links to terrorist organisations and those who have been implicated in plans and acts of terrorism. Studies of media representations of Muslims and Islam since September 11, 2001 do, however, provide evidence to suggest that portrayals of Muslims as terrorists and Islam as a religion that condones terrorism have become commonplace. In this context, the following section focuses on those studies that have identified media portrayals of Muslims as ‘terrorists’ or Muslim connections to terrorism and some of the specific characteristics and possible consequences of these portrayals.

In his study of the connotations of various labels used in the coverage of terrorism in U.S. newsmagazines Simmons (1991) found that the labels most negatively perceived among respondents were terrorist, hijacker and attacker. Those identified as somewhat negatively valued included guerrilla, radical, gunman, leftist, armed man, rightist and extremist, while those identified as somewhat positively perceived included nationalist, revolutionary and militiaman. This study found that the way in which terrorists were labelled was also influenced by whether the perpetrators were U.S. citizens, the political orientation of terrorists, and the extent of the carnage. While these findings are by no means definitive in regard to the connotations of these terms for different people in different contexts, they are at least suggestive of some of the different labels available to journalists when reporting terrorism.

In an analysis of editorials on the war against terrorism in the 10 largest newspapers in the US, Ryan (2004) found that terms such as ‘patriotic’, ‘heroic’, ‘tolerant’ and ‘generous’ were frequently used to describe Americans and their allies (and later ‘good’ Arabs), whereas ‘cowardly’, ‘vicious’, ‘jealous’ and ‘extremist’ were terms used to describe everyone else (Ryan, 2004). This study also noted a heavy reliance by editorial

writers on official government sources as they constructed their frames (Ryan, 2004).

In a comparative frame analysis of the coverage of terrorism in the U.S. and U.K. press Papacharissi and de Fatima Oliveira (2008) found that the *New York Times* coverage more frequently and repetitively used elements associated with episodic framing than any other newspaper included in their sample. In this coverage terrorist suspects or perpetrators were typically introduced with the term ‘terrorist’ preceding their name and metaphors were frequently used to create a dramatic tone, a characteristic of episodic reporting. *The Washington Post*, on the other hand, made less use of stereotypical terms and adjectives and was less dramatic than that of the *Times*.

In the United Kingdom, coverage in the *Financial Times* was even further removed from the episodic framing of the *Times*, with terrorist suspects, known terrorists and terrorist plots frequently reported as “alleged”. *The Guardian* adopted a similar approach to that of the *Financial Times*, with a thematic approach to its reporting, focusing on “just-the-facts” and the frequent inclusion of editorials and features by internationally acknowledged ministers or professors. This study also identified a military frame, which was more evident in U.S. coverage, and a diplomatic frame, more evident in U.K. coverage. The authors suggested the most substantial finding of their study is the alignment of news frames with corresponding policy in the two nations, which they say points to a symbiotic relationship between the policy agenda and the press. These researchers used Capella and Jamieson’s criteria for recognising and classifying frames, which specifies that: frames should have “identifiable conceptual and linguistic characteristics”; should be “commonly observed in journalistic practice”; and should be “reliably distinguishable from other frames” (as cited in Papacharissi and Oliveira, 2008, p. 61).

Ambrosio de Nelson (2008) examined the media’s imaging of ‘terrorist’ in Singapore, focusing on three different periods of newspaper coverage: immediately after September 11, 2001; two months in 2002 when a group of men accused of ‘terrorism-related activities’ were arrested in Singapore; and one month in 2002 when a second group of suspects were arrested. She found the initial coverage in *The Straits Times*, following September 11, presented a “discourse on moralization about who are the virtuous (the moderate Muslim) and who are the dangerous (the deviant Muslim)” (p. 334).

Numerous studies of the media’s portrayal of Islam and Muslims invoke Said’s notion of Orientalism as an explanatory framework. Using Said’s framework, Saeed (2007) provided a review of research into the portrayal of Islam and Muslims in the media, particularly the British press, and suggested that British Muslims are portrayed as the ‘alien within’, which is linked to changing discourses of racism and issues of national identity. One of the major reasons for the problematic media portrayals, according to Saeed, is that the West has been representing Islam and Muslims instead of them representing themselves. This accords with Said’s notion of Orientalism, which provides a classical framework for understanding relationships between the West and the rest, particularly Muslims. From this perspective, European domination of the Middle East involved the construction of a particular discourse in which the Orient was constructed as

inferior to the West (as cited in Saeed, 2007).

Wilkins and Downing (2002) examined the 1998 film *The Siege*, in which the main characters are Arab/Muslim terrorists, focusing specifically on how it represented Arabs, Arab Americans, Muslims and Islam; news discourse in which critiques of the film were included; and the interpretation of the film among young viewers. They suggest the film can be seen as an illustration of how “mediated representations of terrorism serve as a vehicle for Orientalist discourse” (p. 419). The study found that while advocacy organisations did attract news attention to their critiques of the film’s representation of Arabs and Muslims, latent discourse “embodied rather than question Orientalist ideology” (p. 432). They also found that many viewers of the film accentuated the Islamic character of the terrorists and essentialised the Islamic faith as inseparable from terrorism. On the other hand, some viewers were critical of the film’s portrayal of Arabs and Muslims as terrorists in line with the protests of advocacy organisations. Wilkins and Downing suggest that their study confirms that contesting media portrayals of Arabs and Muslims, as with other social groups, demands an ongoing struggle.

The term Islamophobia has been used to describe the contemporary manifestation of Orientalist discourse. Like Orientalism, this discourse “does not allow for diversity; contradictions and semiotic tensions are ignored as the homogenising ethnocentric template of otherness assumes that there is only one interpretation of Islam” (Saeed, 2007, p. 457). In Britain, Saeed argued this discourse manifests in direct links being made between Muslims and support for terrorism and fundamentalism and with British Muslims being implored by voices in the media and politicians to make a more concerted effort to integrate into British society.

A study that examined Muslims in the UK media found: the dominant view in most of the UK print media is that there is no common ground between the West and Islam; Muslims are depicted as a threat to British customs and ways of life; facts are often distorted, exaggerated or oversimplified; language is frequently emotive, alarmist and abusive; coverage is likely to provoke feelings of insecurity amongst Muslims and suspicion and anxiety among non-Muslims; and that coverage is unlikely to diminish unlawful discrimination against Muslims. The overwhelming majority of newspaper stories examined in this study were judged to be negative in their associations. The study did, however, identify some examples of responsible reporting in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks and the London bombings in 2005 (Allen et al., 2007).

Poole (2006) examined coverage of Muslims in the British broadsheet press from 2003 using quantitative content analysis, the aim of which is to measure frequencies. She compared this coverage with that from 1994 onwards in order to examine the effects of September 11 and the Iraq war on coverage. One of the most significant changes she identified since 2003 was the emergence of the topic of terrorism and the space given to it. While acknowledging positive developments in the *Guardian*, such as stories about increased discrimination experienced by Muslims since September 11, she suggests this oppositional interpretation has been marginalised by the dominance of the conservative interpretative framework (see also Karim, 2002). She argued:

The huge shift to focus on terrorism now unifies coverage within the orientalist global construction of Islam. One image dominates, that of Islamic terrorism. (p. 102).

A similarly focused study of the US, particularly New York, media that examined the framing of Muslim Americans before and after September 11 produced somewhat different findings to those of Poole. Nacos and Torres-Reyna (2003) identified a wave of reports post September 11 that highlighted the patriotism of American Muslims and downplayed stereotypes of them as terrorism supporters. They also noted a surge in articles dealing with the identity problems experienced by some American Muslims. Prior to September 11 they say these were not prominent themes in news media coverage. This study also found that American Muslims and Arabs were more frequently sourced in news stories in the months after September 11 than in the months prior.

The most prominent news theme prior to September 11 related to Muslim and Arab-Americans accused of sympathising or supporting terrorists. Post September 11, the civil liberties of American Muslims and Arabs was the predominant theme, although Nacos and Torres-Reyna point out that coverage of this kind was by no means unproblematic in terms of reinforcing the stereotypical image of these minorities. On the basis of their study the authors suggested that the September 11 terrorist attacks forced the media to cover Muslim and Arab minorities more frequently and to provide news consumers with a more comprehensive picture of these groups. This apparent shift in coverage may also be explained by the limited and stereotypical associations of these groups in the media prior to September 11. The significance of this study is that it confirms that demonising Islam and Muslims was by no means the only or the most productive news media response to the terrorist attacks.

Within the cognitive framing paradigm the idea of associative framing, which focuses on the co-occurrence of news frames and their potential to influence strong mental associations of issues in the audience's mind, has been discussed (van Atteveldt, Ruigrok & Kleinnijenhuis, 2006). While not without its weaknesses, researchers within this paradigm have produced some tentative findings in regard to media coverage of immigrants, Islam and terror. In the Dutch press between 2000 and 2005, for example, van Atteveldt, Ruigrok & Kleinnijenhuis, (2006) found that after the September 11 attacks strong associations were made between Islam, migrants and terror relative to coverage prior to the attacks. However, as these authors acknowledge, the existence of an association between concepts or issues tells us little about the direction of the association or the extent to which and types of associations that are translated from the media to the audience. Caution must therefore be exercised when interpreting findings such as these.

Ali and Kahid (2008) used content analysis to examine the portrayal of twelve Muslim countries in *News Week* and *Time Magazine* between 1991 and 2001. They found that the proportion of coverage defined as 'negative' outweighed that of 'positive' coverage for all countries in both magazines. The somewhat crude content analytic method used in this study, with the unit of analysis being the sentence coded positive, negative or neutral, tells us little about the meaning of the stories included in their sample as a whole and,

thus, findings such as these need to be treated with caution.

Richardson (2006) examined the important question of which sources are quoted in newspaper coverage of Islam and Muslims in the British press in a sample period of October 1997 to January 1998. Significantly, he found that in this sample, illegitimate ('terrorist') organisations were the most frequently quoted Muslim primary source and that 'Muslim criminals' were also frequently quoted. In particular, Richardson found that Muslim sources were only included and quoted in reporting contexts that were critical of their actions and religion whereas they were almost entirely absent from stories in which Muslim activities were not criticised or when activities were not labelled as Muslim. According to Richardson,

Such an approach not only contributes to a popular association between Islam and negativity, it also distances Muslims from non-Muslims (since 'Their' opinions are often placed in opposition to 'Ours') and symbolically implies that Muslims are only qualified to speak in response to certain (negative) events. (p. 115)

In another study of the marginalisation of British Muslim communities in the broadsheet press Richardson (2001) focused on processes of division and rejection. Based on a four-month sample of coverage between October 1997 and January 1998, he found that the majority of articles pertained to international, rather than domestic, news. His study found that negativity dominated coverage, with violence, fundamentalism and terrorism well represented. Although rarely quoted, he found that when British Muslims were quoted it was done in such a way as to contrast with or exclude them from the position "British".

In his study of coverage of Muslims in the American media Karim (2006) observed that the adjective 'Islamic' is frequently used by journalists when describing the criminal activities of terrorists in ways that would not be conceivable when describing similar actions of people from other religions. He also identified some of the visual signifiers that have developed in the transnational media's imaginaries of 'Islamic fundamentalism', including the hijab, the cloak and turban worn by Muslim *ulama*, the Arab headdress and cloak, the face of Ayatollah Khomeini, people performing the pilgrimage at Mecca and domes of mosques, among others. He says these images are deployed in the media and communicate a vast amount of information without the need for words. He also notes that the frames used to portray Muslims are deeply entrenched and draw from cultural assumptions about Islam that have developed over many generations. He suggests that the persistent representation of the violent Muslim serves a propaganda function as well as being highly profitable. In discussing coverage of the September 11 terrorist attacks, Karim suggests:

Even though the events were extraordinary, their reporting – following the initial period of disorientation – was eventually put in frames that had been in place to cover such issues as violence, terrorism and Muslims. The dominant discourses about these issues shape the cognitive scripts for reporting the acts of terrorism carried out by people claiming to act in the name of Islam. (p. 125)

Media coverage, he said, focused on the incidents themselves, rather than the broader

issues, and alternative voices, when heard, were brushed aside as interviewers sought confirmation for their pre-existing stereotypes of Islam.

Distorted representations of Islam and Muslims have also been identified in the Dutch press (d'Haenens & Bink, 2006). In their content analysis of seven years of reporting of Islam in a popular Dutch newspaper d'Haenens and Bink (2006) found that 'terrorist attacks and related practices' as well as 'religion' were the most frequent main topics. This study also found that articles about terrorism were usually about foreign rather than Dutch Muslims and that Dutch opinion makers dominated coverage, with most Muslim actors being mentioned only, rather than quoted or paraphrased in newspaper articles.

Analyses of the Australian media's coverage of Islam and Muslims have produced similar findings (see Akbarzadeh and Smith, 2005; Aly, 2007; Kabir, 2005, 2006; Manning, 2006; Poynting & Noble, 2003; Susskind, no date). According to Aly (2007), the discourse on terrorism and Islam in the Australian media has subsumed a range of discourses prompted by national and international events, with the underlying message being that Islam is at odds with the principles of Liberal democracy. She also noted an enduring correlation of Islam with violence and the threat of terrorism since the September 11 attack and refers to raids by the Australian Federal Police on suspected terrorists and the media's portrayal of them as the 'enemy'. She references one newspaper story, headlined 'The Enemy Within', which she said collapsed the terms Muslim, illegal immigrant, terrorist and enemy, inferring that all Muslims in Australia were potential terrorists.

In his analysis of the Australian press between September 2000 and September 2002 Manning (2006) also found that the overwhelming image associated with Islam and Muslims was violence. In another study Manning (2003) examined coverage of 'Arabs' and 'Muslims' in Sydney's two major daily newspapers 12 months prior to and 12 months after the September 11 terrorist attacks, during which time a number of key events took place. In coverage of the Israel-Palestine conflict he identified some significant differences in the language used. For example, 'terrorism' is accepted as the defining term for Palestinian resistance, whereas 'military campaign' is used to describe the actions of Israel. He also says the religion of the terrorists – Islam – is often noted. Manning argues that this conflict constitutes much of the imagery of what it means to be Arab or Muslim in the two newspapers. He also cites revealing examples of articles in which the entire 'Muslim community' is framed as being responsible for gang rapes committed by men reported to be 'Lebanese Australians' and 'Muslims'.

Aly (2007) has discussed the difficulties Australian Muslims face when attempting to have their views heard in the media. She writes:

The dominant media construction of Muslims and culturally and ideologically incompatible with secular Australia and the permeation of this notion in the broader social and political context have effectively resulted in the depoliticization of Australian Muslims denying them recognition in the public spaces of citizenship. (p. 32)

Kabir (2006) examined representations of Islam and Muslims in the Australian media in the period 2001-2005 and found that since September 11 labelling of Islam and Muslims as the religious or cultural others has been particularly intense. Kabir also suggests that the media's failure to report violence against Muslims as major news is "because violence against Muslims is considered by the media as less important – or even as justifiable retaliation – than acts of violence committed by Muslims" (p. 316, see also Poynting, 2002). Poynting and Noble (2003) also cite examples of what they refer to as 'dog whistle journalism' in which stories involving Muslims – originally reported as sympathetic to the Muslim protagonists – provoked a backlash that generated extended, and often racist, news reporting.

On the basis of an analysis of the representation of Muslims in the Australian print media during the 1990 to 1991 Gulf War, Susskind (no date) found that central themes included: representations of Muslims as terrorists; questioning of Muslims' loyalty to Australia (see also Poynting, 2002); and the portrayal of Muslims as a homogeneous group. Blaming actions of an individual Muslim on the entire community was another common theme. Susskind argued that the media coverage was overwhelmingly negative due to a combination of stereotypes, distortions and generalisations.

In their analysis of the representation of Muslims and Islam in *The Age* and the *Herald Sun* newspapers in the period between September 11, 2001 and December 31, 2004, Akbarzadeh and Smith (2005) focused on the language used and changes in language use in response to major events; the frequency of coverage; the extent to which journalists referred to the diversity of Islam and Muslim cultures; and the typologies used to classify groups and practices of Islam. Among their quantitative findings was that coverage in both newspapers was dominated by news on terrorism, West-Islam relations and race and asylum seeker issues. One of the study's significant findings was that although there was a series of major international events during the period of analysis, the majority of news articles were about domestic issues. They suggested this could be a function of the search terms they used (Islam and Muslims), in that terms used in reporting international events may be 'Islamic terrorism', 'jihad', 'Muslim fanatics' and the like.

Akbarzadeh and Smith (2005) categorised news articles as positive, negative or neutral. The characteristics of positive articles included representations that enhanced the reader's knowledge of Islam and did not use inflammatory language. The criteria for negative articles included those that showed a lack of understanding of Islam and its diversity, reproduced the notion of Muslims and Islam as being alien and omitted details that would have contextualised the story. Neutral articles were neither positive nor negative, but did not use inflammatory language. Mixed articles were those that included elements of each. They found that the majority of articles in both newspapers were neutral, while the *Herald Sun* included substantially more negative articles than *The Age*. As these authors acknowledge, however, identifying stories as either positive, negative or neutral is highly subjective and does not account for the impressions that readers take from news stories. Moreover, while the majority of stories were identified as neutral, the authors note that the context in which they were reported – 'the war on terror' – was negative.

The terms used in both newspapers to describe Islam and Muslims in association with terrorism included: fanatic, fundamentalist, purist, terrorist, radical, hardline, extremist, and militant, as seen in referential strategies such as ‘radical Islamic group’ and ‘fundamentalist Islamic terrorists’, for example (Akbarzadeh and Smith, 2005, p. 21). The authors also note that the use of Islam and Muslim as adjectives (i.e. ‘Islamic fundamentalism’, ‘Muslim extremists’) implies that Islam sanctions terrorism. They also found that the use of the word Muslim to describe non-terrorist activities (eg ‘Muslim school children’) suggests that the editorial staff of both newspapers “feel compelled to continually mark Muslim identities in news stories” (p. 22). The authors also found that terms such as ‘moderate’ and ‘mainstream’ were used in articles to describe Muslims who are not to be ‘feared’. Their study also found further evidence that Muslims and Arabs tend to be portrayed as one and the same (see also Stoltz, 2007).

Aly (2007) sought to examine a gap in the research by examining the way in which Australian Muslims interpret and respond to the discourse of terrorism in the media, in which their religion is increasingly being implicated. Her data was collected from individual interviews and focus groups with Muslim Australians and members of the broader community. She found that the most common perception of the media among participants was the identification of Australian Muslim as ‘other’, which creates fear within the broader community by equating Islam with terrorism. Participants expressed an intense distrust of the media and a propaganda view of its influence on public opinion. Indeed, Aly suggested that the construction of the media as anti-Muslim has become the lens through which Australian Muslims interpret media discourse, even when other explanations for media reporting are available. Aly identified a tendency among some participants to engage with the media to substantiate the victim identity, while others, particularly younger female participants, rejected the victim identity and created alternative discourses of belonging.

In the context of studies showing that media representations of Muslims are highly negative Petley (2006) sought to examine the response of the UK’s Press Complaints Commission (PCC) to complaints about this coverage. He documents the inaction of the PCC in upholding complaints about press racism dating back to the early 1990s. With reference to stories the complaints about which have been rejected, Petley identified some of the standard responses of the PCC to complaints about newspaper representations of race and ethnicity. In particular, the PCC takes the view that columnists are free to express their own views on these matters, no matter how inaccurate the information on which these views are often based. The problem with this, according to Petley, is that due to the collapsing of the distinction between news and editorial in most of the British press the PCC’s code is “routinely breached on a daily basis” (p. 59). Another standard for the PCC’s rejection of complaints is that the article in question does not attack specific individuals, which means that third-party complaints are routinely rejected. Needless to say, Petley concluded that the PCC is “hopeless as a bulwark against negative representations of Muslims and Islam in the press” (p. 61).

It is in this research context that a pressing ethical and political obligation to counteract the distorted reporting that often characterises media coverage of Islam and Muslims has

been identified. Poole and Richardson (2006) argue:

It goes without saying that the potential effects of negative reporting patterns – from encouraging acts of individual street racism and giving succour to extreme right-wing political parties to encouraging discriminatory political policies such as racial profiling and the detention of Muslims without trial, validating the current ‘imperialist adventures’ of the US-UK and further excluding and disenfranchising Muslim communities – are issues of great social consequence. (p. 2)

Dreher (2007) examined the reportage of the Dr Haneef story by Australian media. She identified that the case was framed by the media as a story about ‘global threat and urgency (p.211) and found that there was a push by the media, at least in the initial stages of the story, to present him as ‘guilty until proven innocent’ (p.211). Dreher concludes that there is a need for more responsible reporting and suggests that such reporting might change how stories involving alleged terrorists are reported. Dreher believes that responsible reporting is necessary for a robust democracy.

McNamara’s (2009) study explored the impact of Australia’s counter-terrorism laws on the media through an analysis of how those laws impacted on the ability of journalists to report the Dr Haneef story. Through interviews with some of the journalists covering the story, he explores the “relationship between media freedom and public discussion of matters of public interest where national security is concerned” (http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1024586#891680).

Analyses and critiques of media coverage, these authors emphasise, must recognise the importance of recognising the pressures that journalists face, as well respecting and commending good journalism practice when it occurs. As discussed earlier, the news framing approach, in combination with methods of content analysis and critical discourse analysis, in particular, provide useful conceptual and methodological tools with which to examine and critique news reporting of links between Muslims/Islam and terrorism.

4. Methodology

4.1 Background to the Methodology

Goffman (1974) is widely credited with originating the idea of framing and drawing attention to its central role in defining the situation. According to Goffman a primary framework, or ‘schemata of interpretation’, renders what would otherwise be meaningless into something that is meaningful. Drawing on a sociological conception of framing Gitlin (1980) provides one of the earliest examples of framing research and a much-cited definition of frames. In his study of the relations between the news media and the Student New Left Movement he defined frames as “persistent selection, emphasis, and exclusion” (p. 7) and suggested that frames enable journalists to process and package large amounts of information quickly. Indeed the Dr Haneef story meant journalists had to do just this, manage and put together an emerging story that was full of complexities while grappling with uncertainties regarding legal issues as McNamara (2009) has pointed out.

Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes and Sasson (1992) described a frame as a “central organising principle that holds together and gives coherence and meaning to a diverse array of symbols” (p. 384). Drawing on the work of Goffman, they suggested that framing is a useful bridging concept between cognition and culture or structure and agency.

The notion of framing emphasises the ability of any entity – media, individuals, governments, organisations or social movements – “to delineate other people’s reality, highlighting one interpretation while de-emphasizing a less favored one” (Papacharissi & de Fatima Oliveira, 2008, p. 54). In the context of communication research, Entman (1993) provides one of the most cited definitions of framing:

To frame is 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. (p. 52)

Similarly, in their work on social movement framing Benford and Snow (2000) have identified three different types of framing: diagnostic; prognostic; and motivational. On a more general level Reese (2001) provides the following working definition of framing:

Frames are *organizing principles* that are socially *shared* and *persistent* over time, that work *symbolically* to meaningfully *structure* the social world. (p. 11, original italics)

These definitions neatly encapsulate some of the key features of frames and the foci of frame analysis, each of which is influenced by a range of potential factors. Based on previous research, Scheufele (2000) identifies five factors that may influence how journalists frame an issue: social norms and values, organisational pressures and constraints, pressures of interest groups, journalistic routines, and the ideological or

political orientations of journalists (p. 307). In differentiating framing from agenda-setting and priming approaches Scheufele suggested:

Framing ... is based on the concept of prospect theory; that is, on the assumption that subtle changes in the wording of the description of a situation might affect how audience members interpret this situation. In other words, framing influences how audiences think about issues, not by making aspects of the issue more salient, but by invoking interpretive schemas that influence the interpretation of incoming information. (p. 309)

Miller and Riechart (2001) have identified four phases of the ‘framing cycle’: emergence, definition/conflict, resonance, and resolution (p. 111). During the emergence phase reporting focuses primarily on the event that triggered the news report. Once an issue is on the public agenda stakeholders seek to establish their point of view as the appropriate frame for the issue by highlighting certain aspects of it and downplaying others. During the resonance phase one frame becomes ascendant because it resonates with the values and experiences of the public. The resolution phase is when one frame comes to dominate and decision makers set policy to conform to it. Of this phase, Miller and Riechart suggest:

The winning frame can so dominate that others are delegitimized and given no credence in the media and public discourse. When this occurs the dominant frame could be said to be acting hegemonically, rendering “natural” the prevailing definition of the situation. (p. 114)

Pan and Kosicki (1993) provided a comprehensive discussion of framing analysis as a constructivist approach to news discourse. They say:

...we may conceive a news media frame as a cognitive device used in information encoding, interpreting, and retrieving; it is communicable; and it is related to journalistic professional routines and conventions. (p. 57)

They say that frames can be studied as “a strategy of constructing and processing news discourse or as a characteristic of the discourse itself” (p. 57). Frames are made up of signifying elements or framing devices. In news discourse, Pan and Kosicki suggest these devices can be classified into four categories: syntactic structure, script structure, thematic structure, and rhetorical structure. The headline is the most powerful framing device of the syntactical structure. Scripts refer to the recognisable organisations in news discourse, such as a beginning, a climax and an end. Thematic structures refer to the hypothesis-testing elements of news discourse, such as the way events are cited, sources quoted and propositions pronounced. According to Pan and Kosicki, a thematic structure consists of a summary, usually represented by the headline, lead or conclusion, and a main body, where evidence to support a hypothesis is introduced. Rhetorical structure refers to the stylistic choices journalists make. These can be shaped by sources but they are also used by journalists to “invoke images, increase salience of a point, and increase vividness of a report” (Pan & Kosicki, 1993, p. 62).

Lexical choices made by journalists and the “designators” they use to label actors or events in a story are an important aspect of news discourse and powerful cues that signify an underlying frame, as Pan and Kosicki suggest:

Choices of words and their organization into news stories are not trivial matters. They hold great power in setting the context for debate, defining issues under consideration, summoning a variety of mental representations, and providing the basic tools to discuss the issue at hand. (p. 70)

Various framing devices, elements of the framing process and enduring frames have been identified in news discourse. Gamson and Modigliani (1989) identify five framing devices: metaphors, exemplars, catchphrases, depictions and visual images. Pan and Kosicki suggest these fall into the category of rhetorical structures of news discourse, another of which they says is the journalist's use of the claim that the news is a mirror of reality in constructing news stories. The identification of news analysis or opinion pieces as such helps to reinforce the legitimacy and authority of other news stories as being factual and enhances the truth value of news frames and the likelihood of such frames being accepted (Pan & Kosicki, 1993).

Strömbäck, Shehata and Dimitrova (2008) used a quantitative content analysis to analyse the frequency of predefined frames in the coverage of the Mohammed cartoon issue in the Swedish and US press. This approach involved coding newspaper reports for the presence/absence of the following frames: conflict, religion, freedom of speech, democratic values, West versus Islam, and intolerance. They identified these frames as relevant to coverage of the cartoon issue because they followed lines of argument of actors that tried to define the issue in the press. They also coded for the tone (positive, negative and mixed neutral) adopted in articles to the publication of the original cartoons, reasons or explanations for publishing the cartoon and the reasons provided for Muslim reactions to the cartoons. Stories were coded according to the presence/absence of these reasons. These researchers also supplemented their approach with what they described as qualitative content analysis, which focused specifically on the "real world" events that triggered the different news waves in the coverage. They used the quantitative analysis to track where the news frames started and carefully read the articles at the beginning of the news waves in order to identify the sources that were prominent and the frames they promoted. This study is a good example of the use of content analysis in framing research.

News framing is an important element in the construction of social problems. There are numerous angles from which journalists can report issues and events and framing theory recognises the important role of news frames in alerting audiences to certain explanations and courses of actions at the expense of others. In this sense, frames can be seen as having a considerable influence on the way in which audiences, including policy-makers, understand and respond to issues and events.

4.2 Applying the Methodology

This project was able to examine only a portion of the media coverage of the Dr Haneef story. This was because of the enormous amount of media coverage that the case attracted in the second half of 2007 and throughout 2008.

The story drew some of its most intense media coverage during the initial weeks following Dr Haneef's arrest and so the analysis focused on the first month of the story, from July 3, 2007 to August 3, 2007. While the original intention was to analyse more media sources than included in the final sample, the need to undertake a literature review to contextualise the study and an extensive analysis of aspects of the media coverage meant that only two media sources were included in the final analysis. The two news media outlets selected were included for different reasons. The first, The Courier-Mail was chosen because it the only Queensland daily newspaper whose brief is to cover the whole state. The Dr Haneef story largely unfolded in Brisbane and at the Gold Coast in its first month, so the inclusion of this newspaper for analysis was a logical choice. The ABC online was included because it is a national media source and the story was of national significance. It was also included to determine if an online media source treated the story any differently than a traditional print media source.

The study aimed to examine the ways in which the Mohamad Haneef story was presented and framed by these media outlets.

The database Factiva was used to identify articles for inclusion in the data sample. A research assistant undertook a search of the database for relevant news coverage using a series of key words. To be included in the analysis stories had to be primarily about the Dr Haneef case and articles that only briefly mentioned him or that mentioned him in passing in associated with other events or issues in Australia were not included in the data set. For example within the articles returned in the search of FACTIVA many briefly referenced the Dr Haneef case in connection to cases such as those of Mamdouh Habib and David Hicks and these were not included in the sample for analysis.

In all, 226 articles that were primarily about the Dr Haneef case were identified as being published by The Courier-Mail and the ABC online between July 3, 2007 and August 3, 2007.

The analysis was undertaken in order to explore how the story was treated by these media collectively and individually in the following areas:

1. Framing
2. Tone
3. Themes
4. Reporting trends
5. Reporting tools used

Drawing on the work of the aforementioned researchers a methodology was designed that involved the following:

Each story was read and a list of key coding criteria was identified across a range of areas including frames used, tones, themes, reporting trends and reporting tools. Each story was re-read and coded using the resultant key coding categories.

5. Data and Analysis

Table 1: Amount of coverage – July 3, 2007 to August 3, 2007.

Media Outlet	Frequency	Percent
The Courier-Mail	97	42.9
ABC Online	129	57.1
Total	226	100

A total of 226 articles from the two media organisations were included in the analysis. The ABC Online led the coverage with 129 stories and The Courier-Mail published 97 stories.

5.1 Framing

Print and online news stories are framed by the headlines that precede the body of the story. In other words, the headline attached to a story tells readers what they can expect from the article and provides a context for understanding the events and issues discussed within the body of the news story. The language used in headlines was examined because as Pan and Kosicki (1993) suggest, the headline is viewed as the most powerful framing device in a news story. A headline is designed to attract readers to its accompanying story and headlines usually focus on what is considered to be the most significant aspect of the news contained within the story.

Headlines accompanying stories about the Dr Haneef case were analysed to determine how they framed the story. In other words the aim was to determine what each headline told readers to expect from the story and what they indicated the story was about. All headlines were read to gain a sense of the types of key words/themes in them and a list of the most commonly used was drawn up and used to code each headline.

At The Courier-Mail and ABC online the story was most frequently framed through the human-interest lens – that is the headlines most frequently focussed on Dr Haneef the man and or his family.

The ‘human interest’ frame dominated 29.9% of The Courier-Mail’s headlines and 64.3% of the ABC online headlines. The ABC relied on the ‘human interest’ frame to a much greater extent than its competitors and preferenced its framing the story through this lens over more serious news frames such as ‘government and politics’, ‘human and civil rights’ and ‘terrorism’.

The data were also examined to identify the second most frequently used news frame. The Courier-Mail preferred the framework of ‘legal aspects’ as its second most common frame, using it in 14.4% of its headlines. In contrast The ABC online used two different frames in equal percentages including ‘police operations’ in 7.8% of its headlines and politics and government also in 7.8% of headlines.

Table 2: Primary and secondary framing themes used by media outlet

Media organisation	Primary theme	Frequency of use – percentage and number of headlines	Secondary theme	Frequency of use – percentage and number of headlines
The Courier-Mail	Human interest	29.9% 29 headlines	Legal aspects	14.4% 14 headlines
ABC online	Human interest	64.3% 83 headlines	Police operation	7.8% 10 headlines
			Politics and Government	7.8% 10 headlines

* Note: There were across both of the media organisations a number of headlines that were categorised as framing the story through none of the identified news frames. An examination of the stories allocated to the ‘other’ revealed a broad range of frames, none of which were able to be allocated to any of the key categories of news frame.

5.2 Tone

The tone of a story was often identifiable from the first few paragraphs of the news item, but to ensure a clear sense of the tone, the entire article was read. A list of tones was drawn up and a research assistant coded each story for its tone. Stories across all of the news outlets most commonly adopted a tone that was critical of the government. And, stories also frequently focussed on the arguments between various parties involved in the story. Stories that were also questioning in tone, that is they questioned the government's actions in the case, also frequently appeared among the data sample.

Table 3: Tone of stories by media outlet

Media Organisation	Primary tone	Percentage and number of stories using this tone	Secondary tone	Percentage and number of stories using this tone
The Courier-Mail	Conflict	14.4% 14 stories	Critical of Government	13.4% 13 stories
ABC online	Conflict AND Questioning of Government	11.6% 15 stories 11.6% 15 stories	Questioning of government's actions	11.6% 15 stories

5.3 Themes

The theme of each story was identified. The most commonly occurring themes were identified and used to guide coding. Those themes were:

1. the event (the attempted bombing in London/Glasgow);
2. celebrity/personalities (of key people involved in the story);
3. law (legal proceedings and appearances);
4. crime (in relation to the police operation associated with the events);
5. security (national security issues);
6. threat (posed by terrorism to society);
7. rights (human and civil rights);
8. health (impacts on the health system);
9. domestic politics;
10. international politics;
11. religion;
12. social issues and policies.

Where stories did not fit these categories they were coded as ‘other’. Less than 10 per cent of the total story count across both newspapers was categorised as ‘other’.

The Courier-Mail most frequently used the themes of celebrity and personality, law, crime, human and civil rights and domestic politics. The ABC online themes included the law, national security issues, human and civil rights issues and crime.

Table 4: Themes used in reporting the Dr Haneef story

Media Organisation	Primary theme	Percentage and number of stories using this theme	Secondary theme	Percentage and number of stories using this theme
The Courier-Mail	Celebrity and personality	17.5% 17 stories	Law	16.5% 16 stories
ABC online	Law	19.4% 25 stories	National security issues	14% 18 stories

5.4 Reporting Trends

The data was examined to determine if there were any trends in relation to the way the story was covered by these media before and after the first ten days of the story. A reading of the data sample revealed that for the first ten days the majority of information provided to the media about the case was attributed to police, government and political sources. During this period court hearings were mostly closed to the media and at one stage even to Dr Haneef’s legal representatives. It was also of significance that during this period Dr Haneef was detained without charge – in fact he was eventually held for 12 days before he was charged.

During the first ten days of the story’s coverage stories most often focussed on aspects associated with alleged terrorism and criminal activity. This trend was almost matched by the focus on ‘national security. In this period The Courier-Mail published 25 stories and the ABC Online published 37. ABC’s online coverage most commonly focussed on stories with a crime theme, while this theme was also popular in stories published by The Courier-Mail during this period.

The theme of human/civil rights was among those that received the least attention in the ten-day period. Only three ABC stories used this theme and none of the stories published by The Courier-Mail drew on this theme.

After the first ten days of coverage the focus of the coverage shifted somewhat. During the remaining period from July 14 to August 3, 2007, a total of 162 stories were published by the two news media organisations during this period. The court hearings associated with the story and the legal wrangling that occurred outside of the court system were the key sources of stories for journalists and hence many of the stories were about the legal processes associated with the case. Domestic politics also continued to be a focus of the coverage, while the celebrity and personality theme dominated many of the stories published by The Courier-Mail. The human and civil right aspect of the case gained a little more attention, with the ABC publishing significantly more stories with this theme than it did in the early days of the case.

Table 5: Trends in reportage first ten days

Theme	The Courier- Mail Top three themes	ABC online Top three themes
Crime	7 (28%)	11 (30%)
National Security	4 (16%)	7 (19%)
Court	4 (16%)	7 (19%)

**Table 6: Trends in reportage after ten days
The Courier-Mail**

Theme	No. of articles
Celebrity and personality	14 (19.4%)
Court	12 (16.6%)
Domestic politics	10 (13.8%)

**Table 7: Trends in reportage after ten days
The ABC Online**

Theme	No. of articles
Court	18 (20%)
Human and Civil Rights	13 (14.4%)
Domestic Politics	12 (13.3%)

5.5 Reporting Tools

Articles were examined to determine what reporting tools were used by journalists. This was done because a key aim of the Reporting Diversity project is to improve journalistic practice in relation to reporting cultural diversity. Each of the articles was read once and a list of common reporting tools was collated. Articles were then re-read and coded for reporting tools. Journalists who wrote the stories for both The Courier-Mail and ABC online relied on interviews as their primary method of reportage. This method was the main mechanism used to gather information. The next most frequently used tool was attendance at press conferences. Organised events such as court hearings were the primary reporting tool for a minority of the stories analysed and journalists also used other news media as a source, that is they reported on news carried by other news media outlets in a small number of instances. In a few instances it was not possible to determine the source of information contained in stories. A tendency on the part of reporters not to mention that material was taken from press releases or to reveal the method by which the information was gathered may account for this.

Table 7: Primary Reportage tools – percentage and number by media outlet

Primary Tool	Media outlet	Percentage and number of articles
Interviews	The Courier-Mail	64.9 63 articles
	ABC online	81.4 105 articles
Press Conferences	The Courier-Mail	5.2 5 articles
	ABC online	3.1 4 articles
Investigative Journalism	The Courier-Mail	0 0 articles
	ABC online	0 0 articles
Organised Events	The Courier-Mail	4.1 4
	ABC online	5.4 7 articles
Other Media	The Courier-Mail	2.1 2 articles
	ABC online	3.1 4 articles

6. Discussion

Several surprises emerged from the analysis of the data sample. The first of these was the amount of coverage the ABC online gave to the story, especially as another media outlet whose coverage is not included in this analysis quickly took ownership of the story breaking several exclusives. This indicates that although media are often reluctant to follow a story broken by a rival media organisation, there is still potential for competing media organisations to continue reporting on the story and not to be driven away from it. The second unexpected outcome of the analysis was that The Courier-Mail did not publish more stories on the case. This was surprising because the story largely took place in or near Brisbane in its first month. This may indicate that The Courier-Mail did not place a high priority on the story because of the coverage and resources the case was garnering from its sister News Limited paper The Australian.

Although there are, according to Simmons (1991), a variety of ways of describing and labelling people involved in or suspected of being involved in terror-related activities, in the case of the Dr Haneef story, for at least the first ten days the labels used by journalists to describe Dr Haneef were largely negative and they had a significant impact on the framing of the story. During this time these stories were largely presented to readers as stories about criminal activity and the human rights issues associated with the story received very little attention.

However, when the media began to break stories in the case, which caused its trajectory to change markedly, the story was largely framed through the lens of human interest and this made a considerable contribution to humanising the man accused of providing material support to terrorists. While The Courier-Mail preferred the human-interest frame to some extent, the ABC overwhelmingly relied on it, often at the expense of hard news frames such as politics, justice and human and civil rights. This may be reflective of a softening of the approach to news taken by the ABC and a particular approach by ABC online that may be aimed at catering to a different demographic than its radio broadcasts. Significantly, the reliance on the human-interest frame went a considerable way to humanising the Indian doctor and to revealing in stark detail the impact the events had on him and his family. This is a significantly different approach than journalists usually take to reporting stories about terrorism suspects with such stories usually framed around empathy for and the suffering of victims (Norris, Kern and Just, 2003).

A number of factors may have contributed to this. The bombs planted in the United Kingdom did not explode and there was no loss of life or significant injury to innocent bystanders. Given that the journalists covering the story may have been used to approaching these types of stories through particular frames that emphasize the victims' suffering, it may have been difficult for them to find other frames through which to report the story. Therefore they may have found themselves continuing to rely on the dominant frame of human interest, but with minor shifts to accommodate the emerging story. What the analysis indicates is that journalists have some difficulty shifting frames during the reporting of a story and it is only when significant developments in the trajectory of a

story occur that the possibility of a shift in framing arises. While empathy and suffering are the aspects of the human interest news frame which are usually emphasized in the reporting of stories involving terrorism, impact on individuals is also an aspect of that news frame and as the weakness of the police case against Dr Haneef was revealed, this news frame may have been seen by Australian journalists as a legitimate way of presenting the story.

In focussing on the man, the media failed to shine a light on the bigger issues at stake in the story. Karim (2006) found media coverage of terrorism in which Muslims are implicated tends to focus on the events rather than the bigger issues. In the case of Dr Haneef, coverage concentrated almost totally on the events surrounding his arrest and detention as well as the impact on his family. This was at the expense of exposing significant issues around human and civil rights. This led to a failure by the media to cover the issue of how the laws under which Dr Haneef was held might impact on Australian residents and citizens.

Whatever the reasons for the approach taken by The Courier-Mail and the ABC online to reporting this case, it was clear from the analysis that the Dr Haneef story pushed the same buttons for the two media outlets included in the study. It is of particular note that in the analysis presented here the reliance on the human interest frame prevented hard news frames such as those of civil and human rights from being used. Indeed the Australian media largely overlooked the serious civil and human rights implications of the doctor's ongoing detention for 12 days without charge. This was particularly the case during the first ten days of coverage when the focus was on the criminal aspects of the story.

It is also noteworthy almost all of the stories sampled mention Dr Haneef's religious affiliations – that he is a Muslim – but the primary theme of stories was almost always not associated with religion, but with other issues such as terrorism. This may have been because more prominent news values superseded this one or it may have been related to the way the story developed and the direction the story took. It is however, another example of the media conflating terrorism and religion and as Poole (2006, p.102) suggests the media yet again used the dominant conservative interpretive framework to report this story.

The data reveal that there was a lack of investigative journalism at the two news media outlets analysed. There was also a very limited focus on the international events associated with Dr Haneef's arrest. While The Australian newspaper put significant resources into investigative journalism during the case, The Courier-Mail and ABC online relied largely on standard journalistic techniques and tools to report the story.

Despite the surprises revealed by this research, it is somewhat reassuring that the tone of stories in the sample analysed was overwhelmingly critical or questioning of the government. This indicates that despite the apparent flaws in some aspects of the framing and presentation of the story, the media is at least to some extent fulfilling its role as the fourth estate – in this case as a watch dog on government and the executive. Researchers

have identified the tendency to present terrorism through the type of conservative interpretive frames as used by The Courier-Mail and the ABC online as archetypal to the media. The challenge for research into media coverage of terrorism and alleged terrorism is to identify where cases have been covered using non-traditional and non-conservative interpretive frames and explore how and why that occurred. The lessons to be learnt from that research will be instructive to journalists, journalism students, journalism educators and communities wanting to change the way they are represented in the media.

7. Conclusion

The Doctor Haneef story provides memorable lessons for journalists. The story will continue to garner coverage and indeed Dr Haneef's name has now entered the lexicon. The findings of this study are taken up in the next section of this report in the provision of tips for journalists reporting on stories involving those accused of terrorism, terrorism-related events and terrorists. These tips and tools have been developed from the analysis, and from the author's experience as a journalist and journalism educator and from the available body of research in the field.

8. Tips for journalists reporting on terrorism-related events, terrorists and suspected terrorists

1. **Don't bury the lead** – while the human interest aspects of these stories are always important, it is vital that this frame does not shift the focus away from the issues associated with the impact of terrorism laws on human and civil rights and from the actions taken by governments during these cases.
2. **Don't fall for the spin** – governments and their agencies have access to significant resources that are devoted to media management around these types of stories. It is incumbent on journalists to remember the old adage – never assume and to ensure they question any public statements provided by governments and their agencies. Actively look for sources beyond the 'usual suspects'.
3. **Tell all sides of the story.** Terrorism related stories are often complex and involved multiple viewpoints and parties. While it is not always possible to access all of those involved, especially if they are being detained by police, there are plenty of activist groups and organisations who can contribute alternative opinions and views to stories. Use a variety of sources.
4. **Be aware of legal pitfalls** – find out early on which laws can be invoked in relation to the specific story you are covering and get good legal advice early. Understand what laws suspects are being held under and how that impacts on your ability and rights to report.
5. **Develop new approaches** - Find new ways of reporting these types of stories. Avoid cookie cutter journalism and think of new approaches to reporting such stories. Literary journalism offers an alternative way of providing insights into these types of stories. An excellent example of a literary journalism approach to the Dr Haneef story is David Marr's feature 'Just An ordinary life' which can be found at <http://www.smh.com.au/news/national/just-an-ordinary-life/2007/07/20/1184560040326.html>
Humanising those accused of terrorism is an essential part of debunking the myths that have been created about terrorists and terrorism.
6. **Tracking the story** - If you can follow all of the stories, events, court hearings, etc that unfold on the story then you will have a better, more complex grasp of the issues and details of the story. If you can't report on all of these, make sure you read what others have reported and speak to those who cover the events and issues associated with the story. There is nothing like deep knowledge to prepare you for breaking the big story. Use a forward file to remind yourself of dates of court hearings and other events associated with the i.e. anniversaries etc that other journalists often miss. Don't overlook what may appear to be a small story associated with the issue, it may be your big break.
7. **Objectivity** - Do work closely with all parties involved and accessible on the story but don't lose your independence and ability to make judgements about those involved with the story. While it is not your job to judge an individual guilty or not guilty, it is your job to ensure that the facts and information in the story are exposed to the public so they are fully informed of the story.
8. **Reporting tools** - Use Freedom of Information to its full extent and make sure

- you know what you are asking for. If provided with documents read them thoroughly. Tools such as those used by investigative journalists are essential during the reportage of these types of stories. If using material from a press release, then be sure to make mention of that so that readers can judge the veracity of the information for themselves.
9. **Building Relationships** - Contacts in court, police, public service, media, journalism, and within the many publics that make up Australian communities are often vital in these cases and can provide leads and information that might otherwise not be revealed.
 10. **Embed yourself in the communities you are reporting on** – Spend time getting to know people in Australia’s various Muslim communities and communities that have also come under attack or been labelled as being associated with terrorism or being potential ‘breeding grounds for terrorists’. Engage in and with local level conversation with communities to discover the impact these stories have on various communities.
 11. **Recognise the plurality of identity** – Recognise the varied nature of identity, that Australian Muslims are not just Muslims, but that they can be any or many of the following: parents, siblings, friends, employees, professionals, artists, neighbours, volunteers, careers and colleagues.
 12. **Language** – recognise and be mindful of the power of language. Avoid tired, overused, simplified and incorrectly used terms such as ‘war on terror’, extremist, Islamist and jihad to name a few.

9. References and Related Readings

Akbarzadeh, S. & Smith, B. (2005). *The representation of Islam and Muslims in the media (The Age and Herald Sun newspapers)*. Monash University: Melbourne. Retrieved 12 May, 2008 from <http://www.arts.monash.edu.au/politics/cmmips/news-and-events/islam-in-the-media.pdf>

Alali, A. O. & Eke, K. K. (1991). *Media coverage of terrorism*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Ali, S. & Khalid. (2008). US mass media and Muslim world: Portrayal of Muslim by “News Week and “Time” (1991-2001). *European Journal of Scientific Research*, 21(4), 554-580.

Allen, C., Mohammed, A. A., Bunglawala, I., Gluck, A., Hameed, T., Muir, H., Petley, J., Richardson, R. & Smith, L. (2007). *The search for common ground: Muslims, non-Muslims and the UK media*. A report commissioned by the Mayor of London. London: Greater London Authority.

Aly, A. (2007). Australian Muslim responses to the discourse on terrorism in the Australian popular media. *Australian Journal of Social Issues*, 42(1), 27-40.

Ambrosio de Nelson, S. (2008). Understanding the press imaging of ‘terrorist’: A pragmatic visit to the Frankfurt School. *The International Communication Gazette*, 70(5), 325-337.

Benford, R. D. & Snow, D. A. (2000). Framing processes and social movements: An overview and assessment. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 611-639.

Berelson, B. (1971). *Content analysis in communication research*. New York: Hafner Publishing Company.

Brown, M. D. (2006). Comparative analysis of mainstream discourses, media narratives and representations of Islam in Britain and France prior to 9/11. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 26(3), 297-312.

Capella, J. N. & Hall Jamieson, K. (1996). News frames, political cynicism, and media cynicism. *ANNALS, AAPSS*, 546, 71-84.

Caragee, K. M. (2004). The neglect of power in recent framing research. *Journal of Communication*, 214-233.

Cohen-Almagor, R. (2005). Media coverage of acts of terrorism: Troubling episodes and suggested guidelines. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 30, 383-409.

D'Angelo, P. (2002). News framing as a multiparadigmatic research program: A response to Entman. *Journal of Communication*, 870-888.

d'Haenens & Bink, S. (2006). Islam in the Dutch press; with special attention to the Algemeen Dagblad. *Media, Culture and Society*, 29(1), 135-149.

Dreher, T, 'News media responsibilities in reporting on terrorism', in A Lynch, E McDonald, and G Williams (eds), *Law and Liberty in the War on Terror*, Federation Press, Annandale, 2007.

Entman, Robert M. 1993. Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm, *Journal of Communication*, 43 (4), 51-8.

Gamson, W.A. & Modigliani, A. (1989). Media discourse and public opinion on nuclear power: A constructionist approach. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 95(1), 1-37.

Gamson, W. A., Croteau, D., Hoynes, W. & Sasson, T. (1992). Media images and the social construction of reality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 18, 373-393.

Garrett, P. & Bell, A. (1998). Media and discourse: a critical overview. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse (pp. 1-20)*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Gitlin, T. (1980). *The Whole World Is Watching: Mass Media in the Making and Unmaking of the New Left*. Berkeley, CA, Los Angeles, CA & London, U.K.: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974). *Frame analysis: an essay on the organization of experience*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Hertog, J. K. & McLeod, D. M. (2001). A multiperspectival approach to framing analysis: A field guide. In S. D. Reese, O. H. Gandy & A. E. Grant (Eds.), *Framing public life: perspectives on media and our understanding of the social world (pp. 139-161)*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Iyengar, S. (1991). *Is anyone responsible? How television frames political issues*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Iyengar, S. (1996). Framing responsibility for political issues. *ANNALS, AAPSS*, 546, 59-70

Kabir, N. (2006, Sep). Depictions of Muslims in selected Australian media: Free speech or taking sides. *M/C Journal*, 9(4). Retrieved 17 December, 2008, from <http://journal.media-culture.org.au/0609/1-kabir.php>

Kabir, N. (2006). Representation of Islam and Muslims in the Australian media, 2001-2005. *Journal of Muslim Minority Affairs*, 25(3), 313-328.

Karim, K. H. (2002). Making sense of the “Islamic peril”: Journalism as cultural practice. In B. Zelizer & S. Allen (Eds.), *Journalism after September 11* (pp. 101-116). London: Routledge.

Kitzinger, J., & Barbour, R. S. (1999) *Developing focus group research: Politics, theory and practice*, London: Sage.

Karim, K. H. (2006). American media’s coverage of Muslims: the historical roots of contemporary portrayals. In E. Poole & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *Muslims and the news media* (pp. 116-127). I. B Tauris: London.

Leurs, K. (2007). Framing terrorism: Good versus evil? Masters Thesis Media Studies, Utrecht University. Retrieved 9 October, 2008, from <http://igitur-archive.library.uu.nl/student-theses/2007-0911-200748/UUindex.html>

McNamara, L. (2009). Closure, Caution and the Question of Chilling: How Have Australian Counter-Terrorism Laws Affected the Media?” *Media and Arts Law Review*, Vol 14(1), 1-30.

Manning, P. (2003). Arabic and Muslim people in Sydney’s daily newspapers, before and after September 11. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*, 109, 50-70.

Manning, P. (2006). Australians imagining Islam. In E. Poole & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *Muslims and the news media* (pp. 128-141). I. B Tauris: London.

Mishra, S. (2008). Islam and democracy: Comparing post 9/11 representations in the U.S. prestige press in the Turkish, Iraqi and Iranian contexts. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 32(2), 155-178.

Nacos, B. L. & Torres-Reyna, O. (2003). Framing Muslim-Americans before and after 9/11. In P. Norris, M. Kern & M. Just (Eds.), *Framing terrorism: the news media, the government and the public* (pp. 133-157). New York: Routledge.

Norris, P., Kern, M. & Just, M. (Eds.) (2003). *Framing terrorism: the news media, the government and the public* (pp. 3-23, 281-302). New York: Routledge.

Pan, Z. & Kosicki, G. M. (1993). Framing analysis: An approach to news discourse. *Political Communication*, 10, 55-75.

Papacharissi, Z. & de Fatima Oliveira, M. (2008). News frames terrorism: A comparative analysis of frames employed in terrorism coverage in U.S. and U. K. newspapers. *Press/Politics*, 13(1), 52-74.

Petley, J. (2006). Still no redress from the PCC. In E. Poole & J. E. Richardson (Eds.),

Muslims and the news media (pp. 53-62). I. B Tauris: London.

Picard, R. G. (1991). The journalist's role in coverage of terrorist events. In A. O. Alali & K. K. Eke (Eds.), *Media coverage of terrorism* (pp. 40-48). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Poole, E. (2006). The effects of September 11 and the war in Iraq on British newspaper coverage. In E. Poole & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *Muslims and the news media* (pp. 89-102). I. B Tauris: London.

Poole, E., & Richardson, J.E. (Eds) (2006) *Muslims and the news media*, Tauris: London.

Poynting, S. (2002). 'Bin Laden in the suburbs': Attacks on Arab and Muslim Australians before and after September 11. *Current Issues In Criminal Justice*, 14(1), 3-64.

Poynting, S. & Noble, G. (2003). 'Dog-whistle' journalism and Muslim Australians since 2001. *Media International Australia Incorporating Culture and Policy*, 109, 41-49.

Richardson, J. E. (2001). British Muslims in the broadsheet press: a challenge to cultural hegemony? *Journalism Studies*, 2(2), 221-242.

Richardson, J. E. (2006). Who gets to speak? A study of sources in the broadsheet press. In E. Poole & J. E. Richardson (Eds.), *Muslims and the news media* (pp. 103-115). I. B Tauris: London.

Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire.

Ryan, M. (2004). Framing the war against terrorism: US newspaper editorials and military action in Afghanistan. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies*, 66(5), 363-382.

Saeed, A. (2007). Media racism and Islamophobia: The representation of Islam and Muslims in the media. *Sociology Compass*, 1/2, 443-462.

Schaefer, T. M. (2003). Framing the US embassy bombings and September 11 attacks in African and US newspapers. In P. Norris, M. Kern & M. Just (Eds.), *Framing terrorism: the news media, the government and the public* (pp. 93-112). New York: Routledge.

Scheufele, D. A. (2000). Agenda-setting, priming and framing revisited: Another look at cognitive effects of political communication. *Mass Communication & Society*, 3(2&3), 297-316.

Simmons, B. K. (1991). U.S. newsmagazines' labelling of terrorists. In A. O. Alali & K. K. Eke (Eds.), *Media coverage of terrorism* (pp. 23-39). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Stoltz, G. I. (2007). Arabs in the morning paper: A case of shifting identity. In A. Hodges & C. Nilep (Eds.), *Discourse, war and terrorism* (pp. 105-121). Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Strömbäck, J., Shehata, A. & Dimitrova, D. V. (2008). Framing the Mohammed cartoons issue: A cross-cultural comparison of Swedish and US press. *Global Media and Communication*, 4(2), 117-138.

Susskind, R. (no date). Representation of Muslims in the Australian print media. Retrieved 17 October, 2008, from <http://mams.rmit.edu.au/q1hjn8jgweyz.pdf>

Torres Soriano, M. R. (2008). Terrorism and the mass media after Al Qaeda: A change of course? *Athena Intelligence Journal*, 3(2), 1-20.

van Atteveldt, W., Ruigrok, N. & Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2006, June 16). *Associative framing: A unified method for measuring media frames and the media agenda*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communications Association, International Congress Centre, Dresden, Germany. Available from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p92735_index.html

van Dijk, T. A. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4(2), 249-283.

van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Opinions and ideologies in the press. In A. Bell & P. Garrett (Eds.), *Approaches to media discourse* (pp. 21-63). Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Wilkins, K. & Downing, J. (2002). Mediating terrorism: Text and protest in interpretations of *The Siege*. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 19(4), 419-437.

Willcox, P. (2001). Newspapers and the terrorism war: news priorities, public duty, and the bottom line. *Australian Journalism Review*, 23(2), 7-20.

Zelizer, B. & Allen, S. (2002). *Journalism after September 11*. London: Routledge.

Acknowledgements: Thanks to Dr Kate Holland for her work on the literature review contained in this report and to Dr Heather Anderson for her work on the coding of the data. Some of the content of this report was removed prior to publication

Author contact details: Dr Jacqui Ewart is a senior lecturer in journalism at Griffith University in Brisbane. She is a former journalist. She can be contacted via email: j.ewart@griffith.edu.au