

**Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine  
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv  
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology  
Department of English Philology and Intercultural  
Communication**

**Master's Thesis**

**STEREOTYPING REFUGEES IN MASS MEDIA  
(BASED ON MODERN ENGLISH)**

**Anhelina Kazantseva,**

2nd year student of the Education Program  
'English Communication Studies and Translation  
and Two Western European Languages'

Field of science: 03 "Humanities"

Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Supervised by:

**Larysa Pavlichenko, PhD**

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 9 від 28.04.2025

Зав. кафедри \_\_\_\_\_ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БСЛОВА

KYIV – 2025

## АНОТАЦІЯ

Магістерська робота присвячена дослідженню стереотипного зображення біженців в англомовних ЗМІ та детальному аналізу лінгвістичних засобів, які медіа вживають для їхньої репрезентації.

Для досягнення мети було поставлено такі завдання: дослідити формування та еволюцію стереотипів; вивчити соціально-культурний та політичний вплив на стереотипне зображення біженців; проаналізувати позитивні та негативні образи біженців в британських та американських ЗМІ та дослідити їхню креолізацію.

За допомогою методу контент-аналізу було проаналізовано тексти англомовних медіа та виявлено найбільш уживані теми, поняття та лексичні одиниці в зображенні біженців. Застосовуючи критичний дискурсивний аналіз, досліджено протиставлення "свій/чужий" у медійному дискурсі про біженців та лінгвістичні засоби реалізації, зокрема номінації, метафори, епітети та граматичні структури, що сприяють формуванню упередженого сприйняття. Мультимодальний дискурсивний аналіз допоміг дослідити, як візуальні та вербальні елементи взаємодіють у створенні цілісного образу біженців. Було проаналізовано фотографії, заголовки, підписи до зображень, їхня кольорова гама, позиціонування як окремих осіб, так і груп певних національностей. Оскільки проблема стереотипізації біженців охоплює соціальні, політичні, культурні та лінгвістичні аспекти, було застосовано міждисциплінарний підхід. Він дозволив об'єднати знання з лінгвістики, соціології, культурології та комунікацій для всебічного аналізу.

В результаті проведеного дослідження вдалося з'ясувати, що українських біженців переважно зображено позитивно, тоді як мігрантів з Близького Сходу чи Північної Африки негативно, що вказує на наявність подвійних стандартів у медійному висвітленні. Водночас, спостерігаються

винятки, які свідчать про поступове зміщення дискурсу та спроби медіа подати більш збалансоване бачення. Отримані висновки можуть бути використані для подальших досліджень у галузі медіакомунікацій та міжкультурної комунікації.

**Ключові слова:** стереотипи, біженці, медіа, дискурсивний аналіз, англомовні ЗМІ, британські ЗМІ, американські ЗМІ.

## ABSTRACT

This Master's thesis is dedicated to the study of stereotypical representations of refugees in English-language mass media and a detailed analysis of the linguistic means used by the media to portray refugees.

To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: to explore the formation and evolution of stereotypes; to examine the socio-cultural and political influences on the stereotypical portrayal of refugees; to analyze both positive and negative representations of refugees in British and American media; and to investigate their creolization.

Using content analysis, texts from English-language media were examined to identify the most commonly used themes, concepts and lexical items in the portrayal of refugees. Using critical discourse analysis, the study examined the opposition of "us/them" in media discourse about refugees and the linguistic means of its realization, including nomination, metaphors, epithets, and grammatical structures that contribute to the formation of biased perceptions. Multimodal discourse analysis made it possible to investigate how visual and verbal elements interact in shaping the overall image of refugees. This included analysis of photographs, headlines, image captions, color schemes, and the positioning of individuals or groups of specific nationalities. As the issue of refugee stereotyping encompasses social, political, cultural, and linguistic aspects, an interdisciplinary approach was applied. It enabled the integration of knowledge from linguistics, sociology, cultural studies and communication in order to conduct a comprehensive analysis. This approach contributed to a better understanding of how language in the media not only reflects but also shapes public attitudes toward refugees.

The study revealed that Ukrainian refugees are predominantly portrayed positively, while migrants from the Middle East or North Africa are depicted more

negatively, that indicates the presence of double standards in media coverage. At the same time, there are exceptions that point to a gradual shift in discourse and attempts by the media to present a more balanced perspective. The conclusions drawn may serve as a foundation for further research in the fields of media communication and intercultural communication.

**Keywords:** stereotypes, refugees, media, discourse analysis, English-language media, British media, American media.

## CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>8</b>
1.1 Study of stereotyping in modern disciplines .....	13
1.2 The discursive aspect of the study of stereotypes .....	17
1.4 Typology of stereotypes .....	25
1.5 Verbalisation of ethnic stereotypes .....	30
<b>CONCLUSION to Part I.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>PART II. CROSS-CULTURAL STEREOTYPING OF REFUGEES IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN MASS MEDIA .....</b>	<b>36</b>
2.1. Historical, socio-cultural and political context of stereotypical images of refugees in British and American mass media .....	36
2.2 Ethnic stereotypes and refugees image in British and American mass media	48
2.3 Negative stereotyping of refugees in British and American mass media .....	57
2.4 Positive statements in the stereotyping of refugees in British and American mass media .....	65
<b>PART III. STEREOTYPICAL PORTRAYAL OF UKRAINIAN REFUGEES IN MASS MEDIA OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES .....</b>	<b>73</b>
3.1. Portrayal of Ukrainian refugees in the US mass media .....	73
3.2. Stereotypical representations of Ukrainian refugees in the UK mass media	82
3.3. Creolization of Ukrainian refugees stereotypes in the media texts in British and American mass media .....	92
<b>CONCLUSION to Part III.....</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>101</b>

**REFERENCES..... 103**

## INTRODUCTION

As we live in a more connected world, the complexities of cross-cultural exchanges have become increasingly important. Thousands of people move from country to country annually, progressing from one cultural context to another while attempting to navigate social constructs. In such a way they hope to find a safer place to live or better living conditions. Mass media play a powerful role in contributing to the perceptions and attitudes toward different cultural groups, especially refugees. Stereotypes in mass media are not a just depiction of society. They help us make sense of social realities by building hypotheses to maintain societal viewpoints.

Scholars such as Aleksenko [1], Malkki [28], De Genova [13], Threadgold [29], Nguyen and Catherine Fung [30] have studied how the media and politicians show refugees without their history. This makes the images of refugees seem less personal and more neutral, which separates real people from the actual refugee experience. Aleksenko analyzed how political correctness functions as a cooperative communicative strategy in English-language media discourse. She explored the ways the media use politically correct language to navigate sensitive topics, including the representation of refugees. Malkki referred to refugees as "speechless emissaries", referring to the humanitarian discourses that effectively silence the refugee within themselves, while De Genova notes the ideological function of refugee representations in making border regimes legitimate. Threadgold argue that media depictions are subsumed within intercultural discourse around race, class, and national identity. Marguerite Nguyen and Catherine Fung emphasized that dominant humanitarian discourses often frame refugees solely as victims. This perspective overlooks the political and historical

factors contributing to their displacement, thereby depoliticizing their experiences and undermining their agency.

**The relevance** of the topic of stereotypes in mass media is emphasized by the global current events in the last few years. One of them is a continuing refugee crisis due to global conflict and a full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine in 2022. The numbers of people who become refugees due to war, persecution, and natural disasters continues to grow each year. Understanding how refugees are portrayed in the media is vital if we are to overcome stereotypes and build empathy. The mass media remains an important source of information for people everywhere.

The portrayal of refugees often cycles between negative and positive stereotypes. This creates ambiguity for people as they form opinions about refugee crises and take action with regard to policy about them or towards them. Therefore, it is important to understand how mass media in British and American sources describe refugees, particularly Ukrainian refugees. It is a worthwhile area of investigation in contemporary intercultural communication. This research intends to address how cultural narratives can shape the attitudes of a society and the lived realities of those displaced.

**The main aim** of this research is to analyze the discursive strategies employed in the portrayal of stereotypes in mass media, with a specific focus on cross-cultural stereotypes and their impact on refugees, especially Ukrainians in British and American articles and the linguistic means of their realization . Here are **the following tasks** to achieve this aim:

- 1) to examine the theoretical works on the stereotypical representation in linguistic research;
- 2) to explore the formation and evolution of cross-cultural stereotypes in language and media studies;

- 3) to examine the socio-cultural and political factors that influence the representational stereotypical construction of refugees;
- 4) to analyze both negative and positive portrayals of refugees, with a specific emphasis on Ukrainian refugees in English-speaking countries;
- 5) to investigate the discursive strategies and the linguistic structures of their realization;
- 6) to examine how the use of the language shapes public perceptions and reinforces stereotypes;
- 7) to study how the stereotypes of Ukrainian refugees are creolized in British and American mass media, examining how cultural, social, and racial perceptions blend to shape their representation in the context of the ongoing refugee crisis.

**The research material** is represented by US (The New York Post, The Washington Post, The New Republic, CNN, Los Angeles Times, etc) [64, 70, 73, 80, 74, etc] and UK (The Guardian, The Times, The Sun, BBC News, The Spectator, Positive News, The Telegraph, Mail on Sunday) [78, 82, 60, 59, 17, 61, 55, 71, 54, 62 etc] journal articles [3, 5, 7, 20], conference materials [4], dictionary abstracts [77-81], etc. The language data includes up to 89 scientific studies, articles and news articles in recent stereotypical refugee portrayal. We analysed stereotypes, ways of their formation, discursive strategies and linguistic tools that contribute to their development.

**The object** of this research is the phenomenon of stereotypes as represented in mass media.

**The subject** is the discursive strategies employed in the portrayal of Ukrainian refugees in British and American mass media and linguistic means of their realization.

This research employs several key **methods of analysis**:

- 1) Content Analysis: functions as a technique to systematically evaluate media texts
- 2) Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA): the theoretical basis of this research enables analysis of language as a tool within social frameworks to expose hidden power structures.
- 3) Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA): this analysis method explores how textual content and visual elements interact to create meaning across different semiotic modes.
- 4) Interdisciplinary Approach: language functions as social practice through combined insights from linguistics and media studies as well as sociology and cultural studies.

The combination of these methods forms an all-encompassing framework to study the development and transformation of refugee stereotypes in British and American mass media.

Although the portrayal of refugees has been extensively examined by scholars such as Aleksenko [1], Malkki [28], Teo [35], Lippi, K., McKay, F. H. & McKenzie, H.J [27], De Genova [13], KhosraviNik M. [102], Threadgold [29], Nguyen and Catherine Fung [30], this research is innovative due to its specific focus on linguistic tools. A deeper understanding emerges about how specific words and syntactical patterns used by the media influence both refugee representation and public perception. Studying the media's linguistic methods for describing refugees reveals how language affects public perception while reflecting power dynamics and reinforcing stereotypes to guide political choices.

**The theoretical value** of the research is to examine language-based mechanisms of stereotype development and provide deeper insights into the ways stereotypes shape public opinions about refugees.

**The practical value** of this research is the analysis of linguistic techniques in media content. These research results provide tools to improve media literacy and critical thinking by helping individuals recognize and deconstruct refugee stereotypes.

## **PART I. CROSS-CULTURAL STEREOTYPES IN LANGUAGE STUDY**

### **1.1 Study of stereotyping in modern disciplines**

The study of stereotyping falls within crucial areas of investigation in psychology, sociology, linguistics, media studies, and cultural studies. Stereotyping is the cognitive process through which individuals come to believe that a person has many traits and abilities because of being associated with a certain group (such as race, gender, or nationality). These generalizations may be wrong and simplistic but they greatly impact attitudes and behaviors as well as interactions positively or negatively.

From a mental view a good thing about stereotypes is that they let us quickly respond to situations using past encounters that seemed alike [23, p. 520]. But a flaw is that they make us miss personal traits, causing us to build wrong thoughts about folks by generalizing too much.

Stereotypes arise within the context of social structures and cultural settings. They are perpetuated by the processes of socialization, media exposure, and education. They allow an individual to easily process information regarding his social environment, although they reinforce inequalities and excommunicate certain groups. Stereotyping is a mechanism that maintains both social order and group distinction. Group membership may, however, induce some discrimination and prejudice [12].

Stereotyping should not be viewed only as an individual phenomenon. Rather, it is a social phenomenon which happens to reflect wider patterns of power and inequality in society. For instance, the dominant groups may stereotype the marginalized groups in such a way that their own social, economic, and political advantages are maintained. Thus, systemic oppression occurs — wherein

stereotypes become institutionalized and encased within laws, policies, and practices that constrict opportunities while reinforcing existing hierarchies.

Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. [11, p. 371] maintain that preconceptions develop during the child's earliest years. The parenting methods and folklore with which we raise our children plays an important role in developing the stereotypes and presumptions they will bear with them during their lifetimes. From the moment a child is born into the world, they start to experience differences related to their sex. Little girls receive separate treatment in clothing, toys, and conversation as opposed to little boys.

Cultural stereotyping affects both workplaces and social interaction among people. Overall it can be said that it is harmful as it leads to the formation of generalized beliefs about entire groups of people based on their cultural identity. Such stereotypes may cause misunderstanding and reinforce negative bias that can lead to discrimination. This results in fixed and often oversimplified views, without paying attention to the uniqueness and diversity of individuals.

From a cultural studies position, stereotypes also involve the way certain identities are constructed and normalized. For example, when the mainstream culture stereotypes non-Western or indigenous peoples they depict those peoples as "primitive" or "backward". But Western culture is framed as "civilized" and "modern" [25]. These stereotypes continue to embolden notions of cultural imperialism and uphold unequal power relations between Western culture and other cultures.

Cultural studies scholars Buchtel, E. E. [10] and Stephens, K. [34] remind us that language, identity and culture are all crisscrossed in terms of maintaining stereotypical depictions. The media portrayal of people or events often shapes public perceptions. Movies, TV shows and news media may invoke existing stereotypes, and from that reproduce other stereotypes as examples of how certain

groups are dangerous, inferior, or less able. Cultural studies concentrate on how people from these groups can successfully counter-offer and deter their power of replication. Counter-narratives, alternative media and cultural expressions challenge the stereotypical representations, establish new interpretations of identity and reclaim cultural power.

Ultimately Buchtel, E. E. [10] and Stephens, K. [34] state that stereotyping is understood as a social act associated with bio-political power, identity and culture. Stereotyping, with its ever-changing identity and political agenda, functions as a mode of social control of a population upholding dominant cultural beliefs of the society.

Stereotyping is not only present in fictional stories but is also present in news and documentary representations [2]. From a media studies perspective, stereotyping is not just about culture or power. It is more about how TV, movies, news, ads, and online media keep spreading simple, strong ideas about certain groups of people, and these messages can influence people everywhere.

Teun A. van Dijk [39] and Edward Said [32] directly analyzed racial and ethnic stereotypes in the media, including how the media portrays immigrants, Muslims, African Americans, and so on. News stories concerning racial or ethnic groups, for example, represent minority groups in the context of crime or poverty, but a white person — in the context of success or virtue. What is repeated within media representations of groups articulates what the audience believes and assumes about those groups.

People who study the media understand that these representations can often depict and maintain struggles for power in society by marking one group as powerful and the other as subordinate. For example, Aronson, J., & Steele, C. M. [6] claimed that women might be assimilated stereotypically as nurturing or docile, while men might be represented as assertive and powerful. In a similar assumption,

various racial and ethnic minorities could be represented in stereotypically negative and simple ways, thereby reinforcing damaging stereotypes and society's further cultural stereotypes.

Similarly, media studies give attention to a practice called "media framing", popularized by sociologist Erving Goffman in his 1974 book, "*Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*" [19]. Media framing refers to the way media constructs meaning often through the selection, omission and manner of presenting information. Media representations focus attention on particular features of a story or person to highlight certain individual traits, leading audiences to interpret them in a certain way. The process of framing can support a stereotype by focusing on a limited set of features or experiences that conform to cultural assumptions and beliefs about a group.

Moreover, media studies works examine how media stereotypes influence audience perceptions by analyzing how exposure to certain types of representations changes people's beliefs, behaviour, and attitudes. For example George Gerbner states: "*Television cultivates a shared conception of reality among diverse publics — particularly through repetitive patterns of representation*" meaning that repeatedly seeing stereotypical images and stories can legitimize a biased way of thinking and make it even harder to counteract those stereotypes [16].

At the same time, media studies scholars, such as N. Bernam and A. White also investigate how counter-stereotypes and alternative representations in media can challenge the traditional narratives about identity [9]. Many creators and activists are attempting to combat harmful stereotypes by depicting marginalized groups with greater diversity, therefore, shifting cultural perceptions and allowing for greater inclusivity.

Looking at it from a linguistic perspective, stereotyping is viewed as the way language represents or reflects generalized assumptions about individuals or

groups based on some characteristics, such as gender, ethnicity, social class, or other group identities [3]. Linguists study the way linguistic patterns or choices help construct or maintain stereotypes. For example, using gendered language reinforces stereotypical ideations of femininity and masculinity by using the words "nurturing" with women, and "strong" or "dominant" with men [8, p. 6]. This is how language contributes to maintaining expectations and social roles to their genders.

In summary, stereotyping is a complex process that allows us to consider the exploration of stereotyping through several disciplines. Psychologists relate stereotyping to cognitive activity, and relate it to shortcut choices that may lead to biases, and prejudice. Sociologists identify the stereotyping as a means of hegemony control and understand how power relates to social hierarchies that allow for distinctions and types of inequality. Linguists explain how language is created and used in the creation of stereotypes. Media studies typically talk about how media attributes to the formation and proliferation of stereotypes. Cultural studies provide ways to understand stereotypes by examining narratives of cultural groups that allow for distinctions of "us" from "them." Altogether, are pseudonym perspectives to explain the processes of stereotypes.

### **1.2 The discursive aspect of the study of stereotypes**

The way language, communication and discourse create and maintain societal stereotypes is referred to as the discursive component of the study of stereotypes. The study of discourse analysis looks at how stereotypes are upheld and contested in a variety of communication contexts, such as the media, politics, casual conversations and institutional settings. From a discursive standpoint, understanding stereotypes entails examining how language shapes meaning and social attitudes toward various groups of people. [33, p. 273].

Teun A. van Dijk is a pivotal figure in the study of stereotypes and discourse, especially because of his research on the connection between social cognition and discourse. As Van Dijk [38, p. 252] notes, discourse not only serves communication but also functions as a form of social power. This means that language gives prevailing social groups the ability to shape public perceptions, and even group behavior. Discourse can either legitimize exclusion and discrimination or foster solidarity and inclusion.

Dijk adds that the media often play a crucial role in the reproduction of ethnic prejudices and stereotypes, especially against refugees [38, p. 38]. Saying this he highlights the media's role in this process. Media narratives influence public opinion and help to sustain social inequality through deliberate discursive techniques like positive self-presentation ("we are tolerant") and negative other-presentation ("they are dangerous") [37].

The public's perception can be significantly impacted by the way news organizations cover particular topics or groups. The media uses headlines, visual language and word choices (such as "illegal immigrants" versus "refugees" or "undocumented workers"): *"Nearly 800 illegal immigrants — including convicted killer and suspected terrorist — arrested in massive Florida ICE raid"* (New York Post) [64] to influence public opinion and support or contradict stereotypes. According to van Dijk [39, p. 86], lexical choices such as "illegal aliens" or "floods of refugees" are part of a broader discourse strategy that dehumanizes immigrants and portrays them as threats. The media frequently presents marginalized groups in specific ways (for example, linking Muslims to terrorism or Black people to crime), which shapes public opinion. As van Dijk emphasizes, the press not only reflects but also contributes to the reproduction of racism by systematically emphasizing negative news about minorities, while ignoring or downplaying positive information [39, p. 92].

CDA scholars like van Dijk [38] and Norman Fairclough [24] examine how ideologies that support discrimination and stereotypes are perpetuated through discourses in politics, the media and other social institutions. People can disrupt and challenge the ways that particular groups are portrayed in society by examining the processes that lead to stereotypes and by presenting alternative narratives.

Moreover, van Dijk points out that the way refugees are talked about in elite discourse is not merely a matter of words, but of access, power, and representation [37]. This demonstrates how narratives about marginalized groups are constructed and the structural disparity in who has the opportunity to speak. While governments or host societies are portrayed as proactive, helpful entities, refugees are frequently portrayed as passive, voiceless subjects in need of control or surveillance. In addition to restricting refugees' capacity to establish their own identities in public discourse, this narrative of power perpetuates an unequal relationship.

The deliberate placement of identities is often a part of the discursive framing of stereotypes. By defining themselves against a stereotyped "other," dominant social groups frequently construct oppositions, such as "us" as civilized and "them" as dangerous or backward. As van Dijk argues, positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation are fundamental strategies of in-group favoritism and out-group derogation [37, p. 267]. This two-pronged strategy not only supports prejudice, exclusion or hostility toward out-groups, but it also enhances the in-group's positive reputation. Because of these polarizing depictions, discourse is necessary to maintain social hierarchies and defend unequal power relations.

Teun van Dijk not only studied discourse in general, but also developed his own discourse strategies within the framework of Critical Discourse Analysis

(CDA). He focused on the relationship between language, ideology, power, and social structures, and much of his work analyzes racism, media discourse, and political language.

Van Dijk developed a model of ideology analysis, where discourse strategies are used to:

- Emphasize positive self-presentation of the ingroup (e.g., "we" are good, humane, honest).
- Highlight negative other-presentation of the outgroup (e.g., "they" are a threat, lazy, aggressive).

These strategies include:

- **Emphasizing threats** (e.g., refugees as danger);
- **overgeneralization** (e.g., all refugees are criminals);
- **polarized language** (“us” vs. “them”);
- **implications and suggestions** rather than direct accusations (which helps avoid charges of discrimination).

He also developed a **cognitive model** to explain how knowledge and ideologies are stored in people’s “mental models” of the world — shaped heavily by media discourse.

Another prominent researcher of discourse and its strategies is Ruth Wodak. According to his studies, discourse is shaped by its broader social context, including events that occur simultaneously or have taken place in the past. Wodak identifies five key discursive strategies [42]:

- **Referential/nomination strategy** categorizes individuals or groups, typically distinguishing between an “in-group” (those seen as belonging) and an “out-group” (those seen as others).

- **Predication** refers to the assignment of specific qualities or characteristics to people. Descriptions can be either positive or negative and often make use of metaphorical language to frame individuals or groups.
- **Argumentation** aims to justify or challenge representations, speakers attempt to legitimize certain viewpoints or behaviors.
- **Perspectivization** covers the speaker's positioning and how they involve the audience, often through storytelling, quotation or attribution of statements to other sources.
- **Intensification** focuses on adjusting the emotional or rhetorical strength of a message to emphasize a point or tone it down to create distance or reduce impact.

Theo van Leeuwen [41], [40] developed a detailed framework for analyzing the representation of social actors in discourse. He identified several categories that reveal how individuals or groups are linguistically included, excluded or characterized in texts:

- **Activation and passivation:** whether people are depicted as active agents or as being affected by actions.
- **Personalization and impersonalization:** whether social actors are represented as human individuals or as abstract or inanimate entities.
- **Individualization and assimilation:** whether people are referred to individually or as part of a group (assimilation includes unification and aggregation).
- **Functionalization and identification:** referring to social actors by their roles or functions (e.g., “worker”) or by identity traits like age, gender, or nationality.
- **Nomination and categorization:** whether actors are named specifically (nomination) or described by group labels or attributes (categorization).

- **Foregrounding and backgrounding:** how some actions or actors are given emphasis while others are hidden or deemphasized.

Thus, through the discourse strategies developed by scholars such as **Theo van Leeuwen**, **Ruth Wodak** and **Teun van Dijk**, we gain deeper insight into how the representation of people in the media influences public perception, reinforcing certain ideologies and contributing to the maintenance or challenge of social inequalities.

### **1.3 Formation and evolution of cross-cultural stereotypes over time**

The formation and development of cross-cultural stereotypes over time is complicated because it is a process and sequence of historical, social, political, and economic factors. Stereotypes represent generalized beliefs about the traits, behaviours and values of people from some cultures or groups. The development of stereotypes captures the ways and means by which stereotypes are acted upon.

In early human history, stereotypes were often formed based on limited or skewed interactions between groups. For example, both ancient Greek and Roman writers typically portrayed non-Greek (barbarian) cultures as "*primitive*" or "*uncivilized*" [31]. These views were deeply connected to power dynamics, where dominant civilizations viewed themselves as superior to others. The term "barbarian" itself was derived from the Greek word "*barbaros*", which originally referred to anyone who did not speak Greek. The word itself mimicked the sound of unintelligible speech, symbolizing the "otherness" of those outside the Greek-speaking world. However, over time, it became associated with a broader set of stereotypes.

These stereotypes were embedded into everyday Greek and Roman life, affecting how individuals perceived and interacted with foreigners. The legacy of these early stereotypes has persisted throughout history. The cultural and racial

hierarchies established by the ancient Greeks and Romans continued to influence later periods, especially during the age of European colonialism.

Just as the Greeks and Romans justified their imperial actions by depicting "barbarians" as inferior, European powers in the 16th to 19th centuries did the same when colonizing large parts of Africa, Asia and the Americas [31]. During the European colonial period vast regions of Africa, Asia, and the Americas were colonized. European powers often depicted the native populations as inferior, backward, and in need of European civilization. These stereotypes served to justify exploitation, slavery and oppression.

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, pseudoscientific theories like eugenics and social Darwinism contributed to racial and cultural stereotypes. These theories falsely claimed that certain races or ethnic groups were biologically inferior to others. This led to deeply ingrained stereotypes that persist in some forms today. It emerged in the late 19th century and was used to promote the idea that certain races or cultures were more "evolved" or "superior" to others, based on the perceived principles of natural selection. This concept was a key part of many racial and cultural stereotypes, reinforcing the belief that some groups were inherently inferior to others [21].

Racial and cultural stereotypes tied to Social Darwinism often portrayed non-Western societies as less civilized. For example, indigenous populations, people of African descent, and other marginalized groups were viewed as "savages" or "unfit" in this framework. These stereotypes served to rationalize colonial domination, slavery, and the exploitation of resources and people. The idea was that "advanced" societies had the right, or even the duty, to dominate "less evolved" groups, as part of a natural order of progress.

These racial and cultural stereotypes had long-lasting effects. They were institutionalized in various fields, such as anthropology, psychology, and even

medicine, and they heavily influenced public policy. The idea that some races were biologically or culturally inferior persisted into the 20th century, even influencing the justification for segregation, eugenics programs, and the treatment of immigrants.

In more recent times, social media has played a major role in the creation, strengthening and dissemination of cross-cultural stereotypes [4]. The platforms allow for both the reinforcement and contestation of stereotypes, but linguistic strategies used in these spaces still draw on historical discourses. Social media uses hashtags and viral trends that can challenge stereotypes. For example, the hashtag #BlackLivesMatter has empowered marginalized communities to confront racial stereotypes and systemic oppression (Appendix 1).

By using animalistic language or reducing individuals to mere objects, media outlets and social narratives helped to perpetuate stereotypes. For example, referring to Africans as "*beasts*" or "*cannibals*" reduced their humanity and reinforced a sense of superiority among colonizers. Memes and internet slang perpetuate stereotypes by simplifying complex cultural issues into digestible content that reinforces existing biases. These often rely on humor or irony but can have subtle or overt racial or cultural connotations.

Overall, the formation and evolution of cross-cultural stereotypes is a complex process. From ancient civilizations like Greece and Rome, which used language and labels such as "barbarian" to mark cultural difference, to the colonial era and the rise of pseudoscientific theories like Social Darwinism, stereotypes have been shaped significantly. These beliefs were used to justify conquest, slavery, and oppression by portraying non-Western peoples as less civilized. Over time, such stereotypes became deeply embedded in societal media that used linguistic tools like "othering," metaphor, dehumanization and framing, for shaping and evolving cross-cultural stereotypes.

## 1.4 Typology of stereotypes

Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu [15] Lee, McCauley, and Jussim [26] explain that stereotypes can be categorized in different ways based on their focus and the groups they affect. They also can be classified based on the quality, whether it is positive or negative, the group being stereotyped (gender, race, age, class) and the context in which the stereotype is used.

The **Stereotype Content Model (SCM)** is one of the most influential scholarly approaches to classification proposed by Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, and Xu [15, p. 878]. The model identifies two core dimensions: warmth and competence, that underlie most stereotype content. For example, elderly people are often perceived as high in warmth but low in competence, while wealthy businesspeople may be seen as competent but lacking warmth [3]. This model shows how ambivalent stereotypes can be both admired and presented at the same time, depending on the perceived status and competition between social groups.

Another framework is the **Evaluation-Potency-Accuracy (EPA)** model developed by Lee, McCauley, and Jussim [26, p. 294], which categorizes stereotypes according to their emotional valence (evaluation), perceived power or influence (potency), and the extent to which they align with observable reality (accuracy). This model recognizes that stereotypes can have both positive and negative connotations and encourages critical assessment of the truthfulness of generalizations.

Additionally, Vlad Glăveanu [17] provides a more functional and contextual taxonomy of stereotypes. He proposes that stereotypes may be classified according to the social group they refer to — such as race, gender, age, or class — as well as the social context in which they operate (e.g., education, media, or politics). His classification underscores the importance of the societal role of stereotypes, including how they support group identity and justify social hierarchies.

Social context stereotypes are often shaped by social interactions and historical narratives within a society and media stereotypes that usually arise from the way people, groups, or behaviors are portrayed in films, television shows, news, and advertisements [63]. Media often reinforces stereotypes by presenting one-dimensional views of groups and cultures. For instance, Hollywood and Western television often portrayed the Middle East and Africa in ways that reinforce stereotypes of danger, primitiveness, or exoticism. The film "Iron Man" [56] through early depictions of the Middle East, particularly through the villainous "Ten Rings" terrorist group, reinforces stereotypes of Arab and Muslim people as associated with extremism and terrorism. This portrayal still relies on broad generalizations about the region as a hotbed of conflict.

By social group, stereotypes divide into gender stereotypes, racial stereotypes, age stereotypes and class stereotypes [17]. Gender stereotypes are beliefs about the characteristics, roles and behaviors of individuals based on their gender. These stereotypes are often rigid and narrow, and they shape social expectations regarding how people of different genders should think, feel, and behave. For example, women have historically been expected to take on roles as caregivers, homemakers, and nurturers. Stereotypes about women often emphasize their roles as mothers, wives, and daughters, associating them with domestic tasks such as cooking, cleaning, and child-rearing [18]. Men have traditionally been assigned roles that emphasize strength, leadership, and authority. Men are often stereotyped as providers and protectors, expected to be financially successful and career-focused. Women are often stereotyped as overly emotional or irrational, men, on the contrary, emotionally stoic or indifferent [8].

Peter Glick and Susan T. Fiske [18] introduced the **Ambivalent Sexism Theory** as a way to better understand how gender stereotypes operate in both hostile and positive forms. According to their theory, sexism is not a monolithic or

overtly negative force. It can manifest in two distinct but complementary dimensions: hostile sexism and benevolent sexism.

Hostile sexism refers to openly negative attitudes and beliefs about a gender. It is often used in depicting women, such as beliefs that women are inferior, manipulative, or unfit for leadership. It involves resentment and antagonism toward those who challenge traditional gender roles.

Benevolent sexism, by contrast, consists of subjectively positive beliefs. They depict women as needing protection, being more moral or nurturing, or best suited for domestic roles [18]. Though it may appear flattering or chivalrous on the surface, it reinforces traditional gender hierarchies by positioning women as weaker or dependent on men.

While hostile sexism creates overt barriers to gender equality, benevolent sexism can subtly discourage women from asserting themselves or taking on roles traditionally held by men. Together, these two forms of sexism reinforce one another, creating a system in which women are both idealized and limited, praised and restricted.

Many languages, including English, have gendered nouns, pronouns, and adjectives that reinforce the distinction between male and female roles. For example, words like "nurse" or "secretary" may be gendered as female, while terms like "doctor" or "engineer" may be stereotypically associated with men: *"In different ways, the letters all said the same thing: Women cannot be doctors. They should not be doctors"* [5]. The use of these terms reinforces that certain careers or roles are inherently tied to one gender. Using the phrase "female doctor" instead of just "doctor" suggests that the default or norm is a male doctor: *"At first, Elizabeth could not believe her ears. Even if a girl could be a doctor, why would she want to be one? But Mary's idea gnawed at Elizabeth. A female doctor"* [5].

Similarly, phrases like "male nurse" or "female engineer" perpetuate the idea that these roles are outliers for women or men. In many languages, diminutive forms are used to infantilize or reduce the perceived seriousness of a woman's role. This linguistic tactic reinforces gendered expectations, often implying that women are less competent or less serious than men [18].

Age stereotypes are generalized beliefs about people based on their age group [3]. These stereotypes often affect individuals across the lifespan, from youth to old age. Age stereotypes can be broadly categorized into those about younger people, middle-aged individuals, and older adults. Young people, particularly teenagers and young adults, are often portrayed as irresponsible, immature, overly emotional, addicted to technology or social media. However, they are also seen as energetic, open-minded, and progressive [3]. On social media, teenagers are frequently depicted as being obsessed with trends, reinforcing the idea that they are superficial or easily influenced. Middle-aged adults are considered as stressed or overworked, career-focused and financially stable. Older people are often depicted in advertisements as fragile, lonely or dependent, especially in marketing for healthcare or insurance [3].

Cultural stereotypes are inaccurate assumptions about the behaviors, values, customs, or traits of people from particular cultural or national backgrounds [3]. These stereotypes are tied to lifestyle and traditions, not physical appearance. For example, Italians are often seen as loud and passionate, Japanese people as overly polite and obsessed with order, and French people as romantic, with a love for wine and cheese [4]. Jokes, idioms, or slang can perpetuate stereotypes (such as Germans being strict, Italians being overly emotional, or British people being cold and overly polite). Phrases like "they all..." or "people from that culture always..." generalize diverse groups into narrow, often misleading categories [4].

James A. Bayton [7] explored the intersection of race and social class in the formation of stereotypes. He introduced the concept of "**race-class stereotypes**," emphasizing that participants' descriptions of individuals varied more significantly by class than by race. His findings suggest that socioeconomic status heavily influences stereotypical perceptions.

These stereotypes are typically rooted in assumptions that certain traits, such as behavior, intelligence, work ethic, or social status, are inherently linked to individuals with similar skin color, facial features, or hair texture. The language people use when discussing race can either reinforce these harmful stereotypes or help promote understanding, empathy, and inclusivity. But class often influences stereotypical perceptions more than race [7]. Class stereotypes are prejudiced beliefs about people based on their socioeconomic status — typically associated with being lower, middle, or upper class. Terms like “white trash” or “ghetto” carry classist undertones and are often racially coded [7]. “White trash” is used to denigrate poor white individuals, particularly in the United States. The term originated in the 19th century and reflects societal perceptions of the “inferiority” of certain white groups due to their poverty, lack of education, or so-called “uncivilized” behavior. It is also used to describe white individuals who fail to meet the expectations of racial superiority often implicitly associated with whiteness in dominant cultural narratives. Regional or non-standard accents are often perceived as “uneducated” or “lower class,” whereas standardized or elite accents, such as Received Pronunciation in the UK, are associated with intelligence, professionalism, or prestige [7].

Positive stereotypes attribute idealized or favorable qualities to a group. While they may seem flattering, they can create undue pressure for individuals to conform to expectations that are not realistic or fair. For example Asians are often stereotyped as being extremely intelligent and academically successful [14].

Negative stereotypes on the contrary focus on unfavorable, or undesirable characteristics associated with a particular group. These stereotypes often perpetuate bias, fear, and prejudice: black people are stereotyped as violent or criminals; muslims are stereotyped as terrorists or extremists; immigrants are stereotyped as illegal, lazy, or a drain on society [18].

In general, while gender, racial, age, class, and cultural stereotypes all share the common trait of oversimplifying individuals, each type operates in distinct ways that affect how we perceive and treat others. Gender stereotypes focus on societal expectations related to roles, behaviors, and characteristics based on one's sex. Racial stereotypes often link physical traits to broad assumptions about behavior, intelligence, and ability, perpetuating inequality. Age stereotypes shape how we view people based on their life stage, often reducing youth to irresponsibility and older adults to frailty. Class stereotypes reinforce assumptions about people's work ethic, intelligence, and worth based on their socioeconomic status, while cultural stereotypes reduce entire cultures to simplistic traits, ignoring the diversity within them.

### **1.5 Verbalisation of ethnic stereotypes**

Stereotypes are not only embedded in cultural attitudes but are also linguistically encoded and disseminated through everyday discourse, media narratives, jokes, and popular expressions because verbalisation of ethnic stereotypes refers to the act of expressing ethnic stereotypes through language, either in spoken or written form. When ethnic stereotypes are verbalised, they move from internal beliefs to social acts — which can influence how people treat each other. Once spoken or written, stereotypes gain social power, especially when repeated across time and media.

One of the most common linguistic tools for expressing ethnic stereotypes is lexical labelling. Ethnic or national identifiers are frequently used metonymically to stand for a set of assumed traits. Phrases such as “*a typical Italian*” or “*you know how the French are*” rely on shared cultural associations, often reducing complex identities to a single trait, whether positive (e.g. “hardworking Germans”) or negative (e.g. “lazy Greeks”). These expressions rely on generalization, which is a key mechanism in stereotyping [5, p.105]. Even when presented as neutral or humorous, such labels reinforce fixed social categories and can subtly reproduce othering - the perception of certain groups as fundamentally different or foreign.

Ethnic stereotypes are also reinforced through collocations and fixed lexical combinations. Adjectives like “*sneaky,*” “*loud,*” “*emotional,*” or “*stingy*” often become tied to specific ethnicities through repeated usage. For example: “*Greedy Jew*” (anti-Semitic trope), “*Loud American*” (cultural generalization), “*Disciplined German*” (positive but reductive) [23]. Such verbal patterns become normalized over time and can be internalized even by those who do not consciously endorse prejudice.

Cultural idioms and proverbial sayings often reflect long-standing ethnic and racial assumptions. Phrases like “*to Jew someone down*” (implying bargaining unfairly), or “*gypped*” (derived from “Gypsy,” meaning to cheat), have their roots in ethnic bias. Although some of these terms are fading due to greater cultural sensitivity, many still appear in colloquial speech, especially in older generations or uncritical media content. These idioms demonstrate how language serves as a historical carrier of prejudice, transmitting values and assumptions across time.

Another essential dimension of the verbalisation of ethnic stereotypes is the role of pragmatics, i.e., how meaning is shaped by context, speaker intention, and listener interpretation. The same lexical item or phrase may carry divergent stereotypical implications depending on tone, communicative setting, and

intergroup relations. For instance, an ethnic joke told in a seemingly benign context may function as a bonding mechanism within an in-group, while simultaneously reinforcing marginalisation of the targeted out-group. This dual function underscores the complexity of verbalisation.

As Peter Ustinov, a British actor, writer, and satirist, once joked, “I imagine hell like this: Italian punctuality, German humour and English wine” [23]. This witty remark combines three national stereotypes into a satirical vision of “hell,” humorously exaggerating perceived cultural shortcomings. Each element of the quote reflects a common, often caricatured view of a specific national trait.

“Italian punctuality” evokes the stereotype that Italians are habitually late or indifferent to strict scheduling, suggesting a cultural attitude that prioritizes flexibility and social interaction over rigid timekeeping. “German humour” alludes to the widespread perception that Germans are overly serious or lack a refined sense of humor, reinforcing the idea that their humor is mechanical or unintentionally awkward. Finally, “English wine” references the stereotype that Britain, unlike wine-producing countries such as France or Italy, lacks a strong tradition of winemaking and is associated with inferior wine quality.

While the quote is clearly crafted for comic effect, it reveals how national stereotypes are often condensed into single phrases or traits and then used to evoke laughter or shared understanding in multicultural settings. Such jokes can serve a dual purpose: within an in-group, they may promote bonding by invoking familiar cultural clichés, but they also risk perpetuating reductive and sometimes derogatory assumptions about entire populations.

The humor in Ustinov’s quote lies in its exaggerated contrast between idealized cultural expectations and these “worst-case” traits. Yet, when repeated uncritically, even humorous stereotypes like these can reinforce cultural biases and shape attitudes in both social and professional contexts. As such, this quote

exemplifies how the verbalisation of ethnic stereotypes operates pragmatically — its meaning and effect shaped by speaker intention, audience reception, and sociocultural context.

Mass media plays a significant role in spreading ethnic stereotypes through word choice and narrative framing. Terms such as “Muslim extremist”, “flood of refugees” or “illegal immigrant” [36] carry connotative meanings that evoke fear or alarm. The framing of events involving ethnic minorities often differs from that involving majority groups — for instance, white perpetrators might be described as “mentally unstable,” while minorities are labelled as “terrorists.” This lexical asymmetry subtly reinforces ethnic hierarchies and justifies unequal treatment.

Verbal expressions of ethnic stereotypes reveal how deeply language is intertwined with social cognition and cultural attitudes. The verbalization of ethnic stereotypes reflects how language encodes social attitudes. Through words, jokes, and media discourse, ethnic images are constructed, maintained, and transmitted.

### **CONCLUSION to Part I**

The phenomenon of stereotyping remains a complex and multidimensional subject of investigation, crossing disciplinary boundaries and evolving in relevance with the dynamics of contemporary society. The study of stereotypes, once predominantly rooted in psychology and sociology, has now expanded into diverse fields including linguistics, discourse analysis, media studies and intercultural communication. In modern academic discourse, stereotypes are no longer perceived merely as biased thoughts or discriminatory attitudes, but as socially constructed and linguistically encoded mechanisms that shape the way individuals and communities interpret the world around them.

Across disciplines, the consensus has emerged that stereotypes are not isolated individual beliefs but rather collective cognitive shortcuts influenced by

cultural, historical, and communicative contexts. In linguistics, stereotypes are approached as semantic and pragmatic constructs that influence meaning-making in discourse. In media and cultural studies, they are analyzed as tools for maintaining social hierarchies and reinforcing ideological narratives. The interdisciplinary approach reveals that stereotypes are both reflections of social norms and active instruments in their reproduction.

From a discourse-analytical perspective, stereotypes are seen not just as content, but as discursive practices because they are produced, maintained, and challenged through language. Verbal and textual expressions of stereotypes can appear in both overt and covert forms: from explicit ethnic jokes to subtle implications in media reporting or political speech.

Cross-cultural stereotypes are not static. They evolve alongside political events, media representation, migration, and globalization. What may have once been a colonial narrative of “savage natives” has transformed into modern stereotypes of the “immigrant threat” or “economic refugee.” These representations are shaped by historical experience and intercultural contact, and often perpetuated by mass media and popular culture. The digital age has accelerated the circulation of stereotypes, particularly through memes, social media, and online slang, allowing them to mutate, spread rapidly, and embed themselves into popular consciousness.

Stereotypes can be broadly categorized into positive and negative forms, though both contribute to reductive thinking. More specifically, social stereotypes are divided into several typologies: gender stereotypes, racial and ethnic stereotypes, age stereotypes, class stereotypes and cultural stereotypes. This classification allows for a more nuanced understanding of how stereotypes function differently across social categories and how they intersect to produce

compound biases (e.g., an older woman of color may face age, gender, and racial stereotyping simultaneously).

Language is the primary tool through which ethnic stereotypes are expressed, circulated, and reinforced. These stereotypes are verbalized through a variety of means: jokes, idioms, fixed expressions, media headlines, and casual speech. Even in politically correct discourse, stereotypes persist through euphemisms, vague generalizations, or framing strategies. In online spaces, ethnic stereotypes are increasingly encoded through visual-verbal hybrids such as memes, which rely on cultural scripts and humor to spread biased representations under the guise of entertainment. Recognizing and deconstructing these forms of verbalisation is essential for promoting inclusivity and intercultural respect.

Stereotypes are not simply linguistic ornaments or innocent jokes — they are cognitive, social, and communicative constructs that influence how individuals perceive and relate to others. As this study has shown, stereotypes are shaped by history, maintained through discourse, and evolve with changing cultural and technological landscapes. Grasping how these mechanisms work, whether through speech, media framing, or cultural stories, is essential for confronting discrimination and fostering deeper understanding of people.

## PART II. CROSS-CULTURAL STEREOTYPING OF REFUGEES IN BRITISH AND AMERICAN MASS MEDIA

### 2.1. Historical, socio-cultural and political context of stereotypical images of refugees in British and American mass media

Stereotypical representations of refugees in British and American mass media are deeply rooted in the historical evolution of both countries' relationships with migration, imperialism and global conflict. Over time these portrayals have evolved in response to key historical events, including colonial expansion, the Cold War and major geopolitical crises, all of which have influenced public perceptions and media narratives about refugees.

Historically, both Britain and the United States have used mass media to shape public attitudes toward refugees. The colonial era, for instance, left a legacy of racialized representations of people from colonized regions. Refugees were often depicted as exotic, backward or threatening. This racialized framing has persisted over time, especially in the depiction of refugees from the Middle East, Africa and South Asia, whose struggles have often been reduced to simplistic tropes of victimhood or illegality. In contrast refugees from European countries have typically been portrayed more sympathetically, in part due to shared cultural and racial backgrounds with the Western media audience. The use of specific linguistic choices, such as terms like "*illegal*," "*migrant crisis*" or "*economic refugee*" has played a significant role in reinforcing these stereotypes, casting some refugees as threats while others are portrayed as deserving victims [61].

A pertinent example of the term "*illegal*" applied to refugees can be found in a BBC News report titled "*Police: Illegal immigrants' found in lorry*", dated August 19, 2014 [61]. The article states: "*Fifteen people suspected of being illegal immigrants have been discovered by police in the back of a lorry in Somerset.*" The term "*illegal*" in the phrase "*illegal immigrants*" functions as a pre-

modifying adjective, attributing the quality of illegality directly to the noun "*immigrants*." This linguistic construction carries significant implications.

By using "*illegal*" as an adjective, the language nominalizes the act of unauthorized entry and transforms a legal status into an inherent characteristic of the individuals. This shifts the focus from the legality of actions to the identity of persons, effectively labeling them as "*illegal*" beings. This framing can evoke associations with criminality and wrongdoing, which may overshadow the complex socio-political factors that compel people to migrate. The choice of "*illegal*" over more neutral terms like "*irregular*" or "*without authorization*" reflects a deliberate lexical decision that aligns with certain political or ideological stances. Alternative phrasing could convey the same factual information without the pejorative connotations. From a discourse analysis perspective, this lexical choice contributes to a framing that aligns with restrictive immigration ideologies. It emphasizes the breach of law over humanitarian considerations, potentially influencing public opinion to view such individuals primarily as lawbreakers rather than as refugees or asylum seekers in need of protection. The phrase omits the reasons behind the individuals' migration, such as fleeing persecution or conflict. This absence of context dehumanizes the subjects and strips them of agency, reducing complex personal narratives to a legal infraction.

In a New York Times article discussing Venezuelan migrants, journalist Miriam Jordan notes: "*The migrants I've talked to were impoverished after living in those conditions. Many had once been solidly middle-class. If they had jobs or small businesses, they were earning very little money, and their savings were depleted. So they made this decision to leave, however they could*" [88]. This description aligns with the characterization of individuals as "*economic refugees*," highlighting their migration primarily due to economic hardship rather than direct persecution. The term "*economic refugee*" functions as a compound noun

combining "*economic*," relating to the economy or financial considerations, with "*refugee*" denoting someone who has been forced to leave their country to escape war, persecution or natural disaster. By prefacing "*refugee*" with "*economic*" the term suggests that first of all such people were fleeing because of economic hardship rather than political persecution. This distinction can influence public perception and policy decisions, as economic migrants are often viewed as less deserving of asylum than those who were fleeing to avoid threats and find safety. The use of "*economic refugee*" frames the individual's plight within the context of economic necessity, potentially downplaying other factors such as political instability or violence. Labeling someone as an "*economic refugee*" might evoke images of opportunism rather than desperation and lead to reduced public support for their cause.

During the Cold War, refugees from communist countries were often depicted as victims fleeing oppression, gaining media sympathy due to their alignment with the Western bloc. In contrast, refugees from the Global South were framed as either economic migrants or security risks, particularly as the U.S. and Britain sought to maintain control over immigration in the context of the ideological battle against communism. The portrayal of Cuban refugees in the 1980s, for example, was largely shaped by Cold War politics, with the media emphasizing their political alignment with U.S. values [20].

In the context of the Cold War, Cuban refugees were often depicted in U.S. media as victims fleeing oppression, aligning with American ideological narratives. Here is an example from the New York Times: "*The United States has long prided itself on being a haven for the oppressed. Yet, 1,774 Cubans who fled the Castro regime are now languishing in American jails, caught in a legal limbo.*" [20] The language used in this article reflects a sympathetic framing of Cuban refugees, emphasizing their victimhood and the ideological contrast between the U.S. and

communist regimes. Terms like *"haven for the oppressed"* and *"fled the Castro regime"* position the United States as a benevolent sanctuary and Castro's Cuba as a source of oppression. This dichotomy reinforces the U.S.'s self-image during the Cold War as a defender of freedom. The phrase *"caught in a legal limbo"* employs metaphor to evoke a sense of entrapment and injustice, eliciting empathy for the refugees and criticism of bureaucratic failings. By stating that the refugees *"fled the Castro regime,"* the article attributes agency to the individuals while simultaneously casting them as victims of an oppressive government, aligning with the broader Cold War narrative.

The *Washington Post* article described 750 Cuban refugees living beneath an expressway in Miami after the Mariel boatlift. The report states: *"To some of the hundreds of Cuban refugees encamped here, the three huge concrete spans of the expressway directly above them are symbols of the new world they have entered"* [70]. This metaphorical framing not only underscores the contrast between the refugees' past under the Castro regime and their imagined future in the United States, but also aligns with Cold War narratives that positioned America as a bastion of freedom and opportunity. The phrase *"symbols of the new world"* serves as a metaphor for ideological salvation, reinforcing the dichotomy between communism and liberal democracy and constructing the refugee subject as one deserving of Western protection and assimilation.

The representation of refugees as cultural or economic **threats** is also influenced by contemporary fears about terrorism and security. Following significant terrorist attacks in the U.S. and Europe, refugees, especially those from Muslim-majority countries, have often been framed as potential security risks. This is compounded by the fact that refugees are often depicted as a "faceless mass," rather than as individuals with distinct stories and experiences. The 9/11 attacks in the United States marked a dramatic shift in how refugees were represented. Media

portrayals became increasingly linked to national security concerns, with refugees, for example those from Muslim-majority countries, framed as potential terrorists. This narrative was amplified by political rhetoric emphasizing border security and the need for tighter immigration controls. Here is a clear example: “*Border security is homeland security. In a post-9/11 world, protecting our borders has taken on a whole new importance. It’s not just about economics or even quality of life. It’s about preventing the next September 11th*” [84]. This quote exemplifies how the language of security was embedded into immigration discourse. Linguistically, the statement employs **parallelism**: “*Border security is homeland security*” to equate immigration control directly with national safety, thereby reframing humanitarian and migration issues as matters of counterterrorism. The temporal clause “*In a post-9/11 world*” serves to construct a new socio-political reality in which previous norms are no longer valid, justifying exceptional measures. Furthermore, the escalation in the final clause: “*It’s not just about economics or even quality of life. It’s about preventing the next September 11th*” utilizes climactic structure to build urgency and redirect the reader’s focus from traditional immigration concerns to existential national threat. This rhetorical strategy contributes to the securitization of refugee discourse, influencing both media framing and public perception by foregrounding fear and crisis over humanitarian responsibility.

In the UK, the legacy of imperialism continued to influence how refugees were portrayed. In the lead-up to the 2016 Brexit referendum, political and media discourses conflated refugees with EU migrants, reinforcing the idea of an uncontrolled “migrant crisis” that threatened Britain’s economic stability. An example of this term can be found in a BBC News article titled “*Migrant crisis: Why do politicians seem unable to act?*”, dated August 28, 2015 [89]. The article states: “*This may be Europe’s biggest migration crisis since World War Two, but*

*it is nothing compared to the challenges facing neighbouring countries in the Middle East.*" The phrase "*migrant crisis*" functions as a **noun compound**, combining "*migrant*," denoting individuals who move from one region to another, with "*crisis*," indicating a time of intense difficulty or danger. The use of "*migrant crisis*" abstracts complex socio-political phenomena into a singular event or condition. This nominalization simplifies multifaceted issues, such as migration patterns, policy responses and humanitarian concerns, into a monolithic "*crisis*," potentially obscuring underlying causes and individual experiences. This term invokes a sense of urgency and emergency, framing migration as a sudden and overwhelming problem. This framing aligns with the **metaphor of natural disasters**, where migration is likened to floods or waves, suggesting an uncontrollable and threatening force. Such metaphors can influence public perception, leading to support for restrictive policies. By labeling the situation as a "*migrant crisis*," the phrase implicitly attributes the cause of the crisis to the migrants themselves rather than to factors such as conflict, economic disparity or policy failures. This shifts responsibility onto the migrants, potentially fostering negative attitudes and reducing empathy.

The media played a key role in framing refugees as a drain on resources, reinforcing negative stereotypes and fueling anti-immigrant sentiment. The Conservative government's "hostile environment" policies, explicitly designed to deter immigration, were justified through media narratives depicting refugees as undeserving of asylum or as opportunistic. The article from *The Spectator* titled "*How the Government Endangers British Lives*," claims: "*By promoting mass immigration from the Third World, New Labour has been importing killer diseases, says Anthony Browne. And it is trying to hide what is happening from the public*" [55]. This statement exemplifies how media language can construct refugees as a burden. The phrase "*importing killer diseases*" employs a metaphor of goods

being imported, dehumanizing individuals by reducing them to commodities. The term “*killer diseases*” evokes fear and associates immigrants with danger. Such lexical choices contribute to a narrative that positions refugees not as individuals seeking protection but as threats to national well-being, thereby legitimizing restrictive immigration policies.

Stereotypical representations of refugees in British and American mass media are deeply rooted in the socio-cultural fabric of both nations. The portrayal of refugees has been shaped by cultural anxieties, national identities and historical experiences of migration, creating a framework that often distorts refugees' realities. Media narratives surrounding refugees reflect, reinforce and sometimes challenge dominant societal norms and values, contributing to the public's understanding of who refugees are and what they represent.

One of the key socio-cultural factors influencing these media portrayals is the long-standing history of colonialism and its aftereffects. Both Britain and the United States have colonial legacies that shape their social attitudes toward refugees, particularly those from former colonies. The British Empire's colonial presence in regions such as Africa, India, and the Middle East, as well as the U.S.'s history of intervention in Latin America and the Middle East, has created a framework where refugees from these regions are often seen through a lens of racial and cultural difference. These racialized representations have led to refugees being depicted as either dangerous "others" or helpless victims in need of Western intervention. This framing is particularly evident in the way refugees from the Middle East and Sub-Saharan Africa are portrayed in contrast to refugees from Europe, who are often shown in a more sympathetic light.

Especially in recent years, while Afghan refugees, many of whom are brown-skinned and fleeing violent conflict, were previously denied entry at several European borders. The open reception of over one million Ukrainians following

Russia's 2022 invasion shows a clear difference. Within a single week, Ukrainian refugees received protection and support in neighbouring countries. It was a great humanitarian response, but at the same time it has drawn criticism for exposing underlying racial biases.

For example, despite Poland's earlier rejection of Afghan asylum seekers, its government responded with compassion and urgency to the Ukrainian crisis. However, allegations of discriminatory practices persist, particularly towards non-white individuals fleeing the same war. According to The Guardian, an incident occurred in which *“three Indians were beaten up by a group of five men, leaving one of them hospitalised”* [68]. Additionally, African students attempting to evacuate Ukraine have reportedly faced delays and obstruction at the Polish border. Such incidents have prompted strong critiques, suggesting that implicit racial preferences may be influencing refugee reception policies.

A clear example of discursive asymmetry in media representation of refugees can be found in a BBC report, which states: *“A charity that helps refugees has said there is a big variation in how the UK helps people from different countries. The Harbour Project charity said many Ukrainians received immediate refugee status and lived in people's homes but Afghans were left in hotels for months”* [72]. This excerpt illustrates both semantic contrast and implicit ideological positioning. The juxtaposition of the phrases *“received immediate refugee status”* and *“left in hotels for months”* highlights **unequal treatment**, where Ukrainians are associated with prompt and humane integration, while Afghans are portrayed as passive subjects of prolonged institutional neglect. The lexical choice of *“left”* suggests abandonment and lack of agency, subtly reinforcing a narrative of exclusion. The structure of the sentence presents Ukrainians as active recipients of hospitality: *“lived in people's homes”*, whereas Afghans are grammatically objectified, reinforcing a hierarchical categorisation of

refugee worthiness. Such linguistic framing not only reflects but also perpetuates socio-political biases rooted in ethnicity and perceived cultural affinity.

The media's portrayal of refugees also intersects with cultural anxieties about national identity. In both the UK and the U.S., there has been a tendency to equate national identity with cultural homogeneity. The arrival of refugees, especially from non-Western cultures, can be framed as a threat to this identity, with concerns over the preservation of "traditional" cultural values. This fear is often exploited in media narratives that highlight cultural differences, reinforcing the idea of refugees as "*outsiders*" who may not assimilate into the host society. The phrase "*Europe's immigration crisis is a clash of civilizations*" was coined by Richard Palmer in his 2015 article for *The Trumpet* [51]. This statement draws upon the well-known "*clash of civilizations*" theory popularized by political scientist Samuel Huntington, which posits that cultural and religious differences between the West and other civilizations, particularly Islamic societies, will lead to conflict. By framing Europe's immigration crisis through this lens, Palmer suggests that the influx of refugees, many from Muslim-majority countries, constitutes not merely an economic or humanitarian challenge, but a profound cultural clash. The term "*clash*" carries connotations of violent conflict, opposition and irreconcilable differences and emphasizes the incompatibility between Western and non-Western (specifically Islamic) cultures. The phrase paints refugees as agents of disruption rather than individuals seeking refuge and associates them with a threat to European values and identity. The term "*civilizations*" further intensifies this opposition by framing entire cultural groups as monolithic entities, stripping them of the diversity and nuance inherent in human societies. The framing of the crisis as a "*clash*" rather than a humanitarian issue influences how the public perceives refugees, aligning with broader narratives of fear and division. By using this loaded vocabulary, Palmer's

statement contributes to the ideological polarization surrounding migration and reinforces the perception of refugees from Muslim-majority countries as an existential threat to Western civilization.

Moreover, media representations of refugees are also influenced by broader socio-economic concerns, particularly in times of economic downturn or perceived scarcity of resources. In both the USA and Britain, refugees are frequently portrayed as a **burden** on welfare systems, especially in times of economic crises or austerity measures. During such periods public anxiety about job competition, housing shortages and strains on healthcare services become linked to the influx of refugees. Media outlets, especially tabloid newspapers in the UK and certain conservative outlets in the U.S. often amplify these concerns, **framing refugees as taking resources away from "deserving" citizens: "UK spends £3.5bn on public services for migrants on benefits"** [82]. This headline underscores the significant financial expenditure associated with providing public services to migrants receiving benefits. The sum of £3.5 billion highlights the scale of resources allocated to this demographic group, which includes refugees. Such portrayals can contribute to the perception of refugees as economic burdens. It influences public perception of refugees and policy decisions regarding immigration and welfare.

At the same time, media portrayals of refugees can also reflect a counter-narrative of **compassion and moral duty**, particularly in the face of humanitarian crises. Left-leaning outlets, non-governmental organizations and certain public figures often emphasize the suffering of refugees, framing them as victims of war, displacement and human rights violations. It highlights the ethical responsibility of Western nations to offer asylum and support to those in need, and contrasts with the more cynical, security-driven narratives of refugees as threats. However, even in these portrayals, refugees are often framed as **passive victims** rather than active agents in their own right, reinforcing a stereotype of helplessness [30]. *"We have*

*allowed the demonisation and dehumanisation of male refugees. They are victims too*" [59]. This headline depicts refugees, particularly Vietnamese and male refugees, as victims of exploitation and dehumanization. Such portrayals align with the discourse of victimhood, emphasizing their suffering and need for protection. While this can elicit sympathy and support, it also risks reducing refugees to mere symbols of victimization, potentially overshadowing their agency and resilience.

Moreover, the media's construction of refugees as either passive victims or active threats reflects broader political interests. While left-leaning parties may frame refugees in humanitarian terms, emphasizing moral responsibility and international law, right-leaning parties often instrumentalize refugee narratives to consolidate nationalist support, especially during election cycles or moments of political instability. This dichotomy turns refugees into political symbols, rather than individuals with agency, reinforcing polarized public discourse.

Media stereotypes also serve to normalize exclusionary policies, such as detention, deportation and offshoring of asylum processing (e.g., the UK's Rwanda policy). By framing refugees as either culturally incompatible or economically burdensome, politicians can more easily form part of a feedback loop where media narratives justify policy and policy decisions shape media coverage. For instance, Gillian Triggs, Assistant High Commissioner for Protection at UNHCR, criticized the UK's Rwanda plan, stating: *"People fleeing war, conflict and persecution deserve compassion and empathy. They should not be traded like commodities and transferred abroad for processing"* [59]. This statement exemplifies how media language can depict refugees as a burden. The use of the phrase *"traded like commodities"* dehumanizes individuals by reducing them to objects. Such lexical choices position refugees not as individuals seeking protection but as threats to national well-being, thereby legitimizing restrictive immigration policies [29] .

Political rhetoric provides the storyline, and the media amplifies it. This is particularly visible in tabloids (e.g., the UK's *Daily Mail*, *The Sun*) and right-wing outlets like *Fox News* in the U.S. Terms like “flood,” “swarm,” “invasion,” and “illegals” are politically loaded and often trace back to speeches or policy documents before making their way into headlines. For instance: “*As enough migrants to fill YORK flood our borders from France...*” [59]. Similarly, Stuart Varney described the situation as: “*The flood began when Joe Biden walked into the Oval Office. Now it's a tidal wave*” [59]. By stereotyping refugees as criminals, governments can justify harsher border controls and reductions in refugee intake. This also shifts public attention from systemic issues (e.g., housing crises, austerity measures) toward external scapegoats. By framing refugee movements as a “flood” or “tidal wave,” discourse reduces human beings to an uncontrollable natural force, stripping them of individuality, agency and human complexity. This dehumanising language not only distances the public from the lived realities of displaced people but also justifies restrictive and defensive state responses, such as border militarisation or offshore detention.

The analysis of stereotypical representations of refugees in British and American mass media reveals a consistent reliance on linguistic and discursive strategies that frame refugees through ideologically charged narratives. Across historical contexts, from colonial legacies to the Cold War and post-9/11 security regimes, media discourse has employed specific lexical choices and grammatical constructions to shape public perception. Adjectival constructions such as “*illegal immigrants*,” compound nouns like “*economic refugee*” and metaphorical terms such as “*migrant crisis*,” “*flood*,” or “*invasion*” function as discursive tools that recontextualize refugee experiences within broader political agendas.

These expressions often operate through nominalization, which abstracts and depersonalizes refugee identities and metaphor, which frames migration as a threat.

Additionally, the use of evaluative and affective language, such as “*deserving*” versus “*undeserving*,” or “*compassion*” versus “*control*,” reinforces binary oppositions that align with underlying ideologies of conditional empathy. Syntactic structures are also important: agentless constructions (e.g., “*left in hotels for months*”) erase institutional responsibility, while active-passive asymmetries (e.g., “*Ukrainians received refugee status*” vs. “*Afghans were left*”) encode implicit value judgments.

The cumulative effect of these strategies is the discursive depiction of refugees either as threats to national security or as passive victims devoid of agency. In both cases linguistic choices serve to legitimate policy decisions, such as different treatment based on race, religion or origin. Thus, language does not merely reflect attitudes toward refugees — it actively constructs and perpetuates them, embedding social hierarchies and ideological biases into public discourse.

## **2.2 Ethnic stereotypes and refugees image in British and American mass media**

The representations of refugees in the English media draw heavily on ethnic stereotypes, thereby influencing the way the public comes to understand them. Refugees are often presented in a manner that has simplified their human distinctions, recasting them as categories of race, ethnicities or cultures. Such stereotypes possess social significance that is never neutral and can shape how refugees are treated by subsequent government policy, as well as public sentiment.

Media representations offered by the English and American news sources tend to have reliance on constructions of ethnic and cultural “*otherness*” that derive from representational ideas of refugees as simply foreign and incompatible with the host society. This is common in tabloid discourses that routinely proclaim that refugees are associated with fear, contamination and decline. “*The diseases that*

*mass immigration is bringing to Britain will probably claim more British lives in the long run than any terrorist acts*" [62] from the Mail on Sunday illustrates several of the stark discursive strategies and linguistic means employed to create a threat out of the refugee.

First of all this quote illustrates how refugees are depicted with negative other-presentation using **polarized language** ("us vs. them"). The contrast between "*British lives*" and "*mass immigration*" sets up a clear in-group vs. out-group division and reinforces ideas of national purity versus foreign danger. **Argumentation strategy** is applied to convince people that immigration will kill more people than terrorism. It functions as **justification** for anti-immigration attitudes. **Intensification** is used in the phrase "*will probably claim more lives ... than any terrorist acts*". It increases the emotional intensity, evokes fear and moral panic. The phrase "*mass immigration*" abstracts people into a process or force, rather than recognizing them as individuals. This **dehumanizes** immigrants and makes it easier to portray them negatively. This phrase refers to refugees as a collective group, suggesting they are all the same and responsible for the same outcomes. Moreover, the phrase "*mass immigration*" establishes a quantitative "*excess*" or surplus, suggesting an influx of people perceived to be uncontrollable. The term "*bringing*" enables any incidents of disease or harm to be attributed directly to the agency of immigration, suggesting that disease is not incidental to the refugee presence but has now become an inherent consequence of the act of immigration. The most ideologically laden phrase is "*will probably claim more British lives than any terrorist act.*" The use of hyperbole is employed to amplify the threat without regard for factuality, and the comparative forms also participate in the act of creating an erroneous equivalency between refugees and terrorisms.

Moreover, the conceptual metaphor of immigration as a contagion prevalent in the expression of "*imported plagues*" (from the title of the article), dehumanizes

the representations, to render a figure that identifies the refugee as simply as a contaminator of disease. Such metaphors draw on the semantic field of health crises, tapping into visceral fears of infection and death. This lexical framing not only strips refugees of individuality and context but also aligns with broader nationalist discourses that portray the British population as victims of governmental negligence in the face of foreign intrusion. The editorial deploys fear-based language and metaphorical framing to reconstitute the refugee subject as an existential threat to national integrity. By appealing to affective and evaluative language: terms associated with danger, illness, and death, this discourse reproduces a hierarchy of belonging in which the refugee is cast as both ethnically alien and biologically hazardous. Such constructions normalize exclusionary attitudes and policies by embedding xenophobic ideology within seemingly rational public health concerns.

Western media coverage has relied on racialized and cultural framings when reporting on refugees, particularly those originating from Muslim-majority countries such as Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, and Sudan. These individuals are frequently portrayed through essentialist stereotypes that associate their ethnic and religious backgrounds with danger, backwardness or extremism. This depiction extends beyond simplistic "*terrorist*" labels and often includes broader assumptions of cultural incompatibility. For example, media narratives regularly present Muslim refugees as resistant to liberal democratic norms, especially in relation to gender equality, secularism and human rights. Such portrayals are rooted in the widely circulated "*clash of civilizations*" framework proposed by Samuel Huntington [22], which posits a fundamental opposition between Islamic and Western values. Consequently, Middle Eastern and North African refugees are constructed not only as security threats but also as symbolic threats to Western cultural identity. This discourse legitimizes exclusionary immigration policies and

shapes public perception by reinforcing fears of cultural erosion. *"In this new world the most pervasive, important, and dangerous conflicts will not be between social classes, rich and poor, or other economically defined groups, but between peoples belonging to different cultural entities"* [22]. It is stated that cultural identity, not economics or class, is the main source of future conflict. This is a justificatory argument that supports a "clash of civilizations" perspective. Rhetorical tools like contrast, prediction and certainty (*"will not be... but between..."*) are used to structure the argument persuasively and delineate some future conflicts. **Predication and intensification strategies** are applied because conflicts between cultures are framed as *"pervasive," "important"* and *"dangerous"*, these adjectives intensify the emotional weight of the statement and negatively attribute threat and instability to cultural diversity. The phrase *"peoples belonging to different cultural entities"* categorizes individuals by cultural identity, reinforcing a group-based division of the world (e.g., Western vs. non-Western, Christian vs. Muslim, etc.). This contributes to the in-group vs. out-group dichotomy by encapsulating the idea that these groups are fundamentally differentiated by deep-seated cultural characteristics, which include language, religion, and historical experiences. Furthermore, the term *"peoples"* is utilized in its plural form to emphasize the collective identities of distinct cultural groups, suggesting that these conflicts transcend individual or national disputes and are rooted in broader civilizational identities.

*"It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural"* [22]. This statement underscores Huntington's belief that cultural identities that are rooted in history, language, tradition and religion, are more prone to conflict than political or economic differences. By framing future global tensions along civilizational lines,

Huntington introduces a paradigm where cultural affiliations become the primary lens through which international relations and conflicts are understood. Huntington employs definitive and assertive language, using phrases like "*fundamental source of conflict*" and "*dominating source*," which serve to emphasize the centrality of culture in global affairs. The repetition of "*source of conflict*" reinforces the idea that cultural differences are not peripheral but are at the heart of international discord. Such diction not only conveys the gravity of his thesis but also influences readers to perceive cultural divisions as inevitable and deeply entrenched. In the context of media representations of refugees, Huntington's framework has been instrumental in shaping narratives that portray refugees, especially from Muslim-majority countries, as cultural "others" who may pose a threat to Western values and social cohesion. This perspective can legitimize exclusionary policies and foster public apprehension towards refugee populations, as cultural incompatibility is perceived as a source of potential conflict.

Ethnic stereotypes often differ according to ethnicity because historical and colonial relationships have shaped how certain ethnic groups are perceived. Media portrayals of refugees from regions such as Sub-Saharan Africa, the Middle East and parts of Asia often perpetuate colonial-era stereotypes, depicting them as "uncivilized," "barbaric" or incapable of assimilation. These representations are not merely descriptive but serve to reinforce existing power structures and justify exclusionary policies.

The media often employ discursive strategies such as repetition, vivid imagery, emotional intensification and dehumanizing language to construct and reinforce ethnic stereotypes. Through linguistic tools refugees can be portrayed as either victims of chaos or agents of violence, depending on the context. For instance, The Guardian reports: "*Like many other similar prisons across Libya,*

*Triq al-Sikka is a place of hunger, disease, beatings, rape, torture and death. Death by starvation, death by beatings, death by execution. And death by suicide"* [78]. The repetition of "death by..." emphasizes the brutal conditions faced by migrants, implicitly associating their origin with chaos. This linguistic framing dehumanizes the subjects and aligns with the stereotype of refugees from certain regions as inherently violent or uncivilized. Similarly, in another report, The Guardian highlights the abuse of migrants by Tunisian authorities: "*Moussa, a migrant from Guinea, explains: 'There was a pregnant woman and they beat her until blood started coming from between her legs. She passed out'*" [58]. This vivid account underscores the inhumane treatment of migrants, reinforcing that refugees are victims of barbaric practices. The graphic description serves to elicit an emotional response but also perpetuates the image of certain regions as lawless and brutal. These examples illustrate how the media employ specific discursive strategies to reinforce stereotypes about refugees from particular regions.

Religion plays a significant role in ethnic stereotyping, particularly when refugees come from regions that differ religiously from the host nation. This is especially true in Western countries where the majority of the population may be Christian, secular or hold Western values. Muslim refugees were frequently depicted as potential terrorists or threats to national security. Such representation reinforced the stereotype that Muslims are associated with violence and extremism. This stereotype is largely shaped by the media's tendency to link Islam with terrorism.

For instance, in 2015, U.S. presidential candidate Ben Carson likened Syrian refugees to dangerous animals, stating: "*If there's a rabid dog running around in your neighborhood, you're probably not going to assume something good about that dog... It doesn't mean that you hate all dogs... but you're putting your intellect into motion*" [70]. This metaphor equates refugees with "rabid dogs," invoking

fear and justifying exclusionary policies. The use of "*rabid*" implies uncontrollable aggression, while "*dog*" dehumanizes individuals, reducing them to animals. Such language shifts the focus from the refugees' circumstances to their perceived threat, influencing public perception and policy.

Similarly, in a 2016 speech, Donald Trump emphasized the need for "*extreme vetting*" of immigrants from Muslim-majority countries: "*We have no idea who they are, where they come from. There's no documentation. There's no paperwork. It's going to end badly folks. It's going to end very, very badly*" [50].

This discourse constructs refugees as unknown and potentially dangerous, emphasizing uncertainty and risk. The repetition of phrases like "*no idea*" and "*no documentation*" underscores fear and the need for stringent control.

In the UK, media narratives have also linked Muslim refugees to security threats. A British Labour politician stated: "*Criminal trafficking gangs are getting stronger, extremists are able to exploit the crisis, and the disorder of an unmanaged response threatens community cohesion and stability*" [69]. This statement frames the refugee situation as a security crisis, using terms like "*criminal*," "*extremists*" and "*threatens*" to suggest danger. The language implies that refugees are not only victims but also potential perpetrators, necessitating control and surveillance.

Refugees from predominantly Christian countries, such as those from Eastern Europe or certain parts of Africa, are more often seen as culturally similar to the host country. This often leads to more positive or sympathetic portrayals in the media. Media narratives about Christian refugees may focus on their suffering and position them as victims. For instance, during the early stages of the Russian invasion of Ukraine, correspondent Kelly Cobiella remarked: "*To put it bluntly, these are not refugees from Syria, these are refugees from neighbouring Ukraine... They're Christians, they're white. They're very similar to people who live in*

*Poland*" [50]. This statement underscores a perceived cultural and religious affinity between Ukrainian refugees and the host populations in Europe, suggesting that such similarities make it easier for host countries to accept and empathize with these refugees. Such media narratives employ inclusive language and emphasize commonalities when discussing Christian refugees, using terms like *"our relatives"* or highlighting shared values and traditions. Such framing fosters a sense of unity and moral obligation to assist. *"This is a relatively civilised, relatively European city where you wouldn't expect that or hope that it's going to happen"* [50] The adjectives *"civilised"* and *"European"* are central to the ideological framing of the utterance. Both are positively marked terms that implicitly carry connotations of order, modernity and moral superiority. The intensifier *"relatively"* suggests comparison, indicating that the speaker views this city as closer to a cultural norm that is *"like us,"*: Western, stable and developed. These adjectives are laden with historical and colonial assumptions that construct *"civilised"* as the opposite of *"barbaric"* or *"chaotic,"* often associated with non-Western spaces. The clause *"where you wouldn't expect that"* carries a strong presupposition — that violence or war is expected in places that are not *"civilised"* or *"European."* The structure encodes normative assumptions about where suffering *"should"* occur. The verb *"expect"* implies a pre-existing cognitive framework about where conflict is likely or justifiable. The utterance implicitly contrasts *"civilised/European"* with *"uncivilised/non-European,"* thus relying on binary oppositions. This not only spatializes conflict but also racializes it by suggesting that war and suffering are endemic to non-Western, non-white societies. Such language, even when casually spoken by journalists or commentators, normalizes a hierarchy of empathy, where media coverage and public concern are unevenly distributed based on perceived cultural or racial proximity.

Media portrayals of African refugees often employ language and imagery that, while not always explicitly referencing skin color, implicitly convey negative stereotypes associated with Blackness. British newspapers have utilized images to perpetuate colonial tropes about refugees. Black African and Middle Eastern men are frequently depicted in contexts that criminalize them, such as being photographed during “illegal” border crossings or in detention centers.

In the context of the Ukrainian refugee crisis, reports have emerged of Black refugees facing discriminatory treatment. For instance, a Nigerian medical student Jessica Orakpo recounted being told by Ukrainian officials, “*If you are Black, you should walk,*” [65] while white Ukrainians were assisted onto transportation. She described how Ukrainian officials denied her and other Black refugees access to transportation, instructing them to walk instead. Such incidents underscore how skin color can influence the treatment of refugees, with Black individuals often facing additional hurdles.

So, the analysis of British and American media discourse reveals the persistent use of discursive strategies like predication, intensification, argumentation, nomination and justification that sustain and reproduce ethnic stereotypes about refugees. Through nominalizations, metaphorical language, hyperbole and lexical items from the semantic field of threat (e.g., “*plague,*” “*terrorist,*” “*chaos,*” “*invasion*”) refugees are frequently portrayed as dangerous, unmanageable and culturally alien.

According to their ethnic and religious identity, refugees are treated differently: Muslim refugees are often depicted as potential extremists, while African refugees are framed as impoverished and burdensome, reinforcing colonial-era stereotypes. In contrast, refugees from predominantly Christian and culturally proximate regions (such as Ukraine) are described using inclusive and sympathetic language, marked by positively connoted adjectives like “*civilized,*”

“*European*” or “*like us.*” Such lexical choices serve to normalize empathy for certain refugee groups while legitimizing exclusion and suspicion towards others.

### 2.3 Negative stereotyping of refugees in British and American mass media

One of the most persistent negative stereotypes in British and American media is the portrayal of refugees as economic burdens. Media outlets often highlight the cost of refugee resettlement, framing refugees as a drain on social services. This stereotype is particularly prevalent in the context of public debates around government spending and austerity measures.

Media often employs specific discursive strategies to construct a narrative that portrays refugees and immigrants, particularly from developing countries, as health threats to the UK. In the 2003 article by Anthony Browne in *The Spectator*, it was said: “*It is not through letting in terrorists that the government's policy of mass immigration — especially from the Third World — will claim the most lives. It is through letting in too many germs” [55]. The discursive strategy of **predication** is applied here because the statement assigns **negative attributes** to immigrants, not only associating them with terrorism but more strongly with disease. This portrays immigrants as a biological threat, framing them as harmful to public health. According to the **referential/nomination strategy** refugees are regarded as an out-group, highlighting ethnic and geographic otherness: “*mass immigration from the Third World*”. The term “*mass*” in the phrase “*mass immigration*” carries connotations of excess and uncontrollability, presenting immigration as an overwhelming force. The label “*Third World*” carries a colonial, inferiorizing tone, emphasizing distance and cultural incompatibility. Moreover, it evokes images of underdevelopment and disease. The quote justifies anti-immigration sentiment by appealing to public health and safety. It creates a pseudo-logical argument: immigration brings germs, germs cause death, therefore*

immigration is deadly. This moral and rational framing is an **argumentation strategy** to legitimize discriminatory attitudes. The speaker **foregrounds** the supposed health risk, while **backgrounding** any discussion of the immigrants as individuals with needs, rights or humanity. Immigrants are dehumanized through metaphor — not described as people but as “*germs*”. This reinforces the image of contamination, infection and danger. The idea that immigration will “*claim the most lives*” exaggerates the perceived danger, aiming to alarm readers. The use of the modal verb “*will*” expresses certainty, presenting the negative outcome as inevitable. The construction “*Not through... but through...*” emphasizes the contrast between terrorism and disease suggesting that the latter is a more significant threat due to immigration. The phrase “*letting in too many germs*” uses a passive construction that obscures agency, making it unclear who is responsible for this action. Analyzing this excerpt we can see how use of dehumanizing metaphors, alarmist language and grammatical structures that obscure agency contribute to a discourse that fosters fear and justifies exclusionary policies.

Another popular British media The Times in a commentary titled “*Bravo Labour, you've made both migrant and housing crises worse*” (2025) states: “*Rising numbers of illegal migrant arrivals — 9,885 so far this year — are placing additional pressure on housing resources*” [46]. The phrase “*Illegal migrant arrivals*” categorizes individuals using a legalistic and stigmatizing label. This positions them as outsiders and lawbreakers, reinforcing the “**out-group**” identity. The term “*illegal*” in this phrase criminalizes the act of seeking asylum, despite international law recognizing the right to seek refuge. This choice of words frames migrants as lawbreakers rather than individuals fleeing hardship. The phrase “*placing additional pressure on housing resources*” has a negative consequence directly to migrants, framing them as problematic and responsible for worsening existing issues. The use of precise figures: “*9,885 so far this year*” means that

**quantification strategy** is also applied. It highlights the scale of migration, potentially inciting alarm. The combination of large numbers and crisis-related language (“*placing additional pressure,*” “*worse*”) increases emotional impact and dramatizes the situation. The sentence structure creates a direct causal link between migrant arrivals and housing pressure, implying that one leads to the other without considering other contributing factors. Although the sentence uses an active grammatical structure, it discursively applies **passivation** by reducing migrants to numbers (“*rising numbers of arrivals*”), which shifts attention from individual agency to abstract forces and contributes to a depersonalized portrayal.

British media depict not only Muslim refugees negatively. For example, one article described Romania as “*one of the most corrupt countries in the EU*” and highlighted that “*Romanians were the third-largest group of foreign prisoners to be jailed in Britain in 2014. They also account for almost half of all foreigners recorded by British police as having been convicted of a sexual offence abroad*” [88]. Romanians are categorized as a national out-group, marked by the label “*one of the most corrupt countries in the EU.*” This contributes to **othering**, positioning them outside the legal norms associated with the UK or the EU more broadly. This strategy fosters social division and justifies exclusionary attitudes. Negative attributes such as “*corrupt,*” “*foreign prisoners*” and “*convicted of a sexual offence*” **stigmatize** the group and reinforce negative perceptions. The article generalizes the actions of some individuals to the entire group, implying that all Romanians fit these criminal profiles. This is a form of **aggregation**, a sub-strategy of assimilation, where people are grouped together and stripped of individuality.

Another famous British newspaper Daily Mail discusses the increase in criminal notifications involving EU migrants in the UK, highlighting concerns about the implications of the EU's freedom of movement policy. A great example is the article titled “*Criminal notifications for EU migrants leap by 40% in five*

years: now there are 700 every week in the UK but less than 20,000 foreign criminals have been deported” [48]. The **quantification strategy** is applied. The use of specific statistics here underscores the perceived severity of the issue. The juxtaposition of the high number of criminal notifications with the low number of deportations functions as an **implicit argument**: that the government is failing to deal with foreign criminals effectively. The criminal aspect is **foregrounded**, while migrants’ contributions are **backgrounded** or omitted entirely.

In phrases from the same article [48]: “Poles and Romanians the worst offenders, fuelling fears over EU impact,” “But the statistics show that only 19,227 foreign crooks have been deported” terms like “foreign crooks” and “worst offenders” reinforces a clear “**us vs. them**” distinction. Moreover, emphasizing that Poles and Romanians are the “worst offenders” presents them not just as lawbreakers, but as the most problematic among migrants. This depicts the stigmatization of specific groups, framing the issue as not just about crime but about particular nationalities. **Intensification** appears in emotionally loaded phrases like “worst offenders” and “fuelling fears”, which elevate the seriousness of the situation. The focus is entirely on criminality and fear, while migrant contributions, legal status or broader context are omitted.

This article contains several quotes from considerable figures. For example David Green, director of think-tank Civitas, said: “When we consider if immigration is a bad thing or a good thing we have got to remember that a lot of people who arrive here are criminals.” The clause “a lot of people who arrive here are criminals” [48] has an **overgeneralization** and subtly implies that criminality is common among immigrants, although the indigenous inhabitants of the country also commit many crimes. Jack Montgomery, spokesman for Eurosceptic group *Leave.EU* added: “The public are being endangered and the law-abiding majority of immigrants are being given a bad name, which worsens

*tensions*” [48]. The phrase “*The public are being endangered*” makes a claim of immediate threat and plays on fear-based rhetoric, suggesting that immigration poses a direct risk to ordinary citizens. “*The law-abiding majority of immigrants*” means that most immigrants are not criminals, but the actions of a minority are damaging the reputation of the whole group.

In American media discourse, refugees are also frequently depicted through frames of hostility, often emphasizing social tensions and public resistance to their presence. One example appears in a report by the Los Angeles Times, which cites a local resident’s reaction to asylum seekers: “*There are people driving by pretty constantly in big pickup trucks telling them to go back to your country*” [74]. The phrase “*pretty constantly*” suggests a sustained and normalized pattern of harassment, implying that such behavior is not isolated but recurrent and perhaps socially sanctioned. The lexical choice of “*big pickup trucks*” functions symbolically; these vehicles are often culturally associated with rural American identity and masculinity. This invokes a sense of power, intimidation and territorial dominance. Their mention contributes to an implied power imbalance between the local population and the refugee newcomers.

The direct speech “*go back to your country*” constructs a division between those perceived as belonging (“**us**”) and outsiders (“**them**”), reinforcing exclusionary boundaries. Migrants or ethnic minorities are implicitly characterized as outsiders, without any direct naming, through the command to leave. Syntactically, the imperative mood creates a command, devoid of negotiation or empathy, which linguistically erases the legitimacy of the refugee’s presence. The pronoun “*your*” establishes a clear **in-group/out-group** binary, othering the refugees and reinforcing the notion that they do not and cannot belong. Stylistically, the quote operates through the use of deictic expressions (“*your country*”) that construct spatial and national distance. This deictic distancing aligns with

discursive practices that frame refugees not as individuals seeking protection, but as intruders or outsiders, whose mere presence provokes local defensiveness.

The statements made by Mohamed, a 19-year-old asylum seeker from Mauritania, reveal not only the psychological and material struggles of relocation but also the socio-discursive conditions shaping refugee experiences in the United States. His reflections: “*It’s better in New York City,*” [74] and “*There, no one cursed at you and said, ‘Go back to your country.’*” [74] contrast urban anonymity and tolerance with rural hostility and exclusion. Linguistically, these utterances **foreground** a spatial dichotomy that links geography with social acceptance: “*New York City*” becomes a symbolic space of relative safety and dignity, while the unnamed rural location (Newburgh, N.Y.) embodies rejection and isolation. By using “*your country*”, the speaker linguistically classifies the subject as foreign, thus applying a **referential/nomination strategy** to reinforce group boundaries (in-group vs. out-group). Mohamed’s additional statement: “*It’s like the desert... There’s nothing here for us*” is rich with metaphor and socio-political meaning. The simile “*like the desert*” evokes both physical and existential desolation, underscoring not only the geographic barrenness but also the social and economic abandonment experienced by relocated asylum seekers. The phrase “*There’s nothing here for us*” creates a sense of alienation, implying that resources and opportunities are unavailable to the speaker’s group. Here the plural pronoun “*us*” implicitly includes other asylum seekers, suggesting a shared condition of marginalization.

One more example of negative portrayal of refugees and immigrants in American political discourse is Donald Trump's statement during a campaign rally in New Hampshire on December 16, 2023: “*They’re poisoning the blood of our country. That’s what they’ve done. They poison — mental institutions and prisons*

*all over the world. Not just in South America. Not just the three or four countries that we think about. But all over the world they're coming into our country — from Africa, from Asia, all over the world”* [70]. Phrases like “*They're poisoning the blood of our country*” use metaphorical and biologically charged language to dehumanize immigrants, portraying them as toxic or dangerous. This reflects **predication**, where negative traits (poisonous, criminal) are assigned to a group. **Aggregation** is used to create fear and general suspicion: “*mental institutions and prisons all over the world,*” This suggests that immigrants are largely criminals or mentally unstable. The repetition of “*all over the world*” and the escalation in scope (from South America to Africa and Asia) uses **intensification** to heighten the perceived threat and emotional impact. The use of the present continuous tense in “*They're poisoning*” implies an ongoing and active process, reinforcing the idea of a continuous threat.

American media often portray refugees as a faceless mass — groups defined more by their numbers than by individual identity. This impersonal framing can strip refugees of their individuality and reduce them to symbols of burden or victimhood. However, many of them actively push back against such narratives. As Liliana Esther, a 36-year-old woman from Valledupar, Colombia, said in an interview with The Washington Post: “*We don't want to be a drain on society, but rather an integral part of it. We want people to know us by our names; not our immigration status”* [88]. This statement reflects a strong desire to be recognized not merely as refugees, but as full, contributing members of society — a shift from **impersonalization** to **personalization**. This girl makes an attempt to focus on the identity of individuals, encouraging recognition beyond the label of “immigrant.” By stating “*We don't want to be a drain on society,*” the speaker rejects negative stereotypes, using the **referential strategy** of **self-categorization** to present herself as a valuable contributor to society.

She also added: *“This is how we want to be seen. Not just as “refugees”, but as Liliana, Fabian, Dalyn and Cely. Not as “asylum seekers” but as human beings with human stories, lives and aspirations”* [88]. The repetition of first names: *“Liliana, Fabian, Dalyn, and Cely”* is a clear example of **personalization**, where refugees are identified by their names, making them more relatable and humanizing them in contrast to the general label of "refugees." It is an attempt of **individualization**, where people want to be seen as distinct, with their own stories and identities. The phrase *“human beings with human stories”* employs repetition and parallelism to reinforce the idea of shared humanity, while the inclusion of *“lives and aspirations”* evokes emotional resonance and suggests future-oriented agency.

Media representations of refugees often use various discursive strategies to shape public perception. Common strategies include **polarized language** (creating an “us vs. them” divide), **overgeneralization** (labeling refugees broadly as criminals or burdens), and **emphasizing threats** (framing refugees as security or health risks). Media also utilize **referential nomination** (categorizing refugees into fixed labels like “illegal immigrants”), **predication** (assigning negative or victimized qualities), and **intensification** (using emotive language to heighten the emotional impact). These strategies often work to reinforce negative stereotypes and foster exclusionary attitudes.

So, media discourse in both the UK and the US often relies on specific discursive strategies to negatively stereotype refugees. Almost all articles contain **polarized language** to create an “us vs. them” divide. **Overgeneralization**, **emphasizing threats**, **referential nomination**, **predication**, **intensification**, **argumentation**, **foregrounding and backgrounding** are combined together to reinforce negative perception of refugees.

Lexical choices such as "*illegal migrants*," "*foreign crooks*" and "*worst offenders*" and metaphors like "*poisoning the blood*" or "*germs*" dehumanize and criminalize asylum seekers, reducing them to abstract problems rather than people in need. The use of passive voice, absence of agency, and imperatives like "*go back to your country*" reinforce exclusion and hostility. Deictic expressions and generalizations further establish an "us vs. them" dichotomy. This fosters fear and perpetuates public resistance to refugee integration.

#### **2.4 Positive statements in the stereotyping of refugees in British and American mass media**

While much of the discourse around refugees in British and American mass media tends to emphasize negative or victimizing stereotypes, there are also positive statements that highlight refugee contribution and potential. One of the most powerful positive stereotypes of refugees is their resilience and strength in overcoming the challenges they face. Media outlets often highlight the incredible fortitude and determination of refugees who, despite suffering trauma, war and displacement, manage to rebuild their lives. These stories go beyond the notion of refugees as passive victims, instead framing them as active agents in their own survival and recovery.

British media often portray asylum seekers as skilled individuals eager to contribute to their new community. A great example of affirmative refugee representation can be found in Positive News, a media outlet that specializes in constructive journalism. In its coverage of the Compass Project, which supports asylum seekers in accessing higher education, the article features Bada Yusuf, an Egyptian refugee living in the UK. He states: "*Through the Compass Project, which helps asylum seekers go to university, I have nearly completed a masters in finance at Birkbeck University*" [71]. The strategy of **individualization** is applied

– rather than generalizing about refugees as a group, the quote highlights a specific person’s success with active verb constructions such as “*I have nearly completed*” framing the speaker as competent and self-determined. The inclusion of institutional names (Birkbeck University, Compass Project) lends credibility and concreteness to the refugee’s achievements, moving away from abstract victimhood toward tangible contribution. The reference to the master’s degree in finance represents the speaker’s skills, showing potential contribution to society — **functionalization strategy**. This framing contests dominant stereotypes of refugees as dependent or burdensome by **foregrounding** their educational integration and socio-economic potential. Furthermore, the narrative aligns with a broader discursive shift in some segments of the British media, which aim to humanize refugees through success stories rather than fear-based or deficit-focused rhetoric.

Asylum seekers are frequently depicted not as burdens but as individuals possessing agency, resilience and the capacity to enrich the local economy and the social fabric of the societies in which they settle. In December 2024 The Guardian showed how the Irish seaside town of Courtown made a proactive approach to integrating approximately 200 male asylum seekers, including professionals such as doctors, veterinarians, and multilingual engineers: “*Local initiatives include integrating asylum seekers into the community by providing employment, involving them in volunteer activities, and educating them about local culture and customs*” [67]. The language centers on community **integration**, emphasizing that asylum seekers are being welcomed and supported in ways that benefit both them and the host society. Refugees are presented in terms of productive societal functions: employment and volunteering. This shows them as contributors rather than dependents. The use of terms like “*integrating,*” “*providing employment,*” “*volunteer activities*” and “*educating*” conveys active participation and mutual

engagement, emphasizing the community's commitment to inclusion and countering narratives that depict them as passive or unwilling to assimilate. The phrase “*local culture and customs*” suggests a two-way exchange, where asylum seekers are not only learning about their new environment but are also being welcomed into it, fostering a sense of belonging.

US media often portrays refugees as active economic agents who are very hardworking, sometimes even more than native citizens and bring skills, resilience and entrepreneurial spirit to the United States. One such example is the Washington Post article with the title “*The economy is roaring. Immigration is a key reason*” [49]. Even from this title we can see a cause-effect relationship, arguing that immigration is not just neutral but a *key driver* of prosperity. The article uses comparative forms and metaphors of strength and motion to recast refugees as a powerful force behind national recovery: “*Immigration has propelled the U.S. job market further than just about anyone expected, helping cement the country’s economic rebound from the pandemic as the most robust in the world*” [49]. Asylum seekers are shown as active contributors rather than passive recipients, reinforcing agency and involvement in societal progress — **activation strategy**. The use of the verb “*propelled*” metaphorically represents immigration as a driving engine behind job market growth. The comparative structure “*Further than just about anyone expected*” suggests that the outcome exceeded all reasonable forecasts. The phrase “*Helping cement the country’s economic rebound*” emphasizes immigration's ongoing supportive role with the verb “*cement*” portraying immigration as foundational to recovery.

Pia Orrenius, vice president and senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas added that relying solely on the native-born workforce is insufficient for sustaining growth: “*And that’s been instrumental. You can’t grow like this with just the native workforce. It’s not possible*” [49]. The repetition of the

modal phrase “*You can’t...*” followed by “*It’s not possible*” creates a **parallel structure** that reinforces the impossibility of economic growth without immigrants.

In The Washington Post in the article titled “*It’s time for some red states to do the right thing and accept refugees*” [60] Catherine Rampell also positively depicts refugees. She writes that, despite initial challenges, refugees become net contributors to the economy over time: “*Study after study — including one commissioned and then buried by the Trump administration — has found that refugees are an economic and fiscal net-positive. That is, they ultimately contribute more in taxes than they receive in public services. Sure, many refugees arrive destitute and initially require substantial help. But over time, their high levels of employment and entrepreneurship allow them to move up the economic ladder” [60]. **Argumentation strategy** is applied because the quote builds a logical case by referencing multiple studies to argue that refugees are fiscally beneficial. It uses evidence to legitimize the claim that refugees contribute more to society than they take. The contrast between “*arrive destitute*” and “*move up the economic ladder*” emphasizes economic progress over time, with language choices that highlight transformation and improvement. The terms like “*economic and fiscal net-positive,*” “*high levels of employment*” and “*entrepreneurship*” frame refugees not as burdens but as assets to the economy. The quote “*they ultimately contribute more in taxes than they receive in public services*” rebuts a common stereotype: that refugees drain public resources. Phrases like “*over time*” and “*ultimately*” highlight the long-term benefits of refugee resettlement and suggest that while initial investments are necessary, they yield positive returns in the future. In general, in this article refugees are portrayed as valuable, productive members of society.*

“*Afghan refugees are not a threat — they are people in need of support” — this phrase was written in American magazine Teen Vogue in 2021 and illustrates*

how U.S. media can present refugees, including Muslim refugees, in a compassionate and supportive light [67]. Calling refugees “*people in need of support*” humanizes them, moving away from bureaucratic or dehumanized labels like “*asylum seekers*” or “*migrants*”. It makes them relatable human individuals, not anonymous masses. The use of the term “*Afghan refugees*” provides a specific category. This can function as a **referential act**, grouping people based on nationality and status, but here it is done positively — to clarify who they are, rather than to exclude them. The structure of the sentence creates a contrast between two identities — “*not a threat*” versus “*in need of support*”. This shifts the emotional framing toward empathy. The needs and humanity of refugees are brought to the **foreground**, while any association with threat or illegality is excluded.

US media also frequently emphasizes success stories — individuals who have turned tragedy into opportunity. Refugees who become teachers, business owners or prominent sportsmen are spotlighted not only for their personal achievements but also for how they inspire others. For example Masomah Ali Zada, an Afghan athlete and head of mission for the Refugee Team at the Paris 2024 Olympics shows great resilience. Having fled Afghanistan, she now leads a team of 37 athletes from 11 nations, of course she provides support and fosters a sense of community. Moreover, she describes her team as an “*example of hope*” and “*a symbol of unity.*” She said: “*I want to be useful to the athletes and represent them with dignity during the Olympics... Some of them still have delicate situations to deal with and to support them, they have access to a psychologist who is part of the team. We make sure that all the athletes don't feel physically or mentally tired” [66]. We can see that Ali Zada actively shapes the emotional and logistical environment for her team and reinforces the image of leadership. Words and phrases such as “*example of hope,*” “*symbol of unity,*” “*represent them with**

*dignity*” and “*support*” evoke admiration and human warmth. This frames the refugee experience not as one of pity but of empowerment and contribution. The use of “*we*” and “*all the athletes*” promotes a sense of solidarity and shared experience and shifts the discourse from individual resilience to collective support and community. By juxtaposing past trauma (fleeing Afghanistan) with present leadership and care for others, the excerpt depicts a compelling success story.

Visual storytelling also plays a role in positive framing. Humanitarian-focused reporting often includes images of refugees helping others (Appendix 2). The Boundless Kitchen describes how “*food can be used as a social tool — to create a forum where people from different cultural backgrounds can meet on common ground. We offer refugees internships and courses. Young people from Somalia, Eritrea, Syria, and Greenland come several times a week and take part in the daily cooking” [45]. This quote not only presents that refugees are active participants in society but also frames them as contributors to multicultural dialogue. By naming specific countries (e.g., *Somalia, Eritrea, Syria and Greenland*) and highlighting participation by young people, the text **personalizes and individualizes** refugees. The expression “*common ground*” underscores the integrative and inclusive nature of the initiative. The mention of internships and regular participation further emphasizes continuity and structure, countering the stereotype of the refugee as transient or marginal.*

Moreover, that excerpt continues by: “*the new citizens have the chance to develop their language and social skills; they can take ownership by presenting their food traditions and sharing them with Danish people — with pride. Our experience is that mixing cultures creates a room with dynamic diversity and humility” [45]. The quote assigns **positive qualities** such as “*pride,*” “*ownership,*” and “*social skill development*” to “*new citizens,*” which are **inclusive, and forward-looking**. Replacing “*refugees*” with “*new citizens*” is a **deliberate***

**nomination strategy** that redefines identity positively and signals integration into the community. The phrase “*take ownership*” suggests agency and autonomy, which contributes to a discourse of empowerment. Sharing food “*with pride*” highlights emotional confidence and self-worth, while the concluding phrase “*dynamic diversity and humility*” employs positive evaluative adjectives that frame cultural exchange as not just tolerable but desirable and enriching.

Both quotes depict refugees as not only rehabilitated survivors but also people who enrich the host society.

### CONCLUSION to Part II.

In conclusion, media representations of refugees in Britain and the United States are shaped by historical, socio-cultural and political contexts, resulting in the discursive privileging of some groups and the marginalization of others. Several discursive strategies are used. **Referential strategies** that construct refugees as an “out-group” or “in-group”, **predication** that assigns negative or positive traits and **argumentation** that assigns particular qualities are employed to frame refugees in a particular light.

Linguistic tools such as **metaphorical language, categorization and passivation** are used to dramatize perceived threats and depersonalize refugees. Using them the media legitimize exclusion, control and marginalization. However, other linguistic means, like **metaphors, nominalization and activation** humanize refugees, highlight their resilience and frame them as active contributors to society.

Ethnic stereotypes also shape how refugees are portrayed in mass media. These representations rely on racialized cultural and religious frames that dehumanize refugees and present them as threats to national security. Muslim refugees are constructed as potential security threats, while refugees from

predominantly Christian, white and culturally proximate regions are represented as “deserving”, relatable and “like us.”

Refugees are more often portrayed negatively than in a positive light in British and American mass media. Through the use of dehumanizing metaphors, such as “germs” or “poisoning the blood” and stigmatizing labels like “illegal migrants” or “foreign crooks,” the media fosters fear and moral panic. The use of impersonal statistics, overgeneralizations and lexical items from semantic fields of crime, disease and burden activates **impersonalization**, **assimilation** and **intensification**, stripping refugees of individuality and framing them as a homogenous threat rather than as human beings with diverse experiences and aspirations. Grammatical structures, such as passive voice, modal verbs indicating certainty, and imperative commands reinforce these discursive strategies by removing nuance and suggesting inevitability or urgency. Refugees from specific regions, particularly Muslim-majority and Eastern European countries, are more likely to be criminalized or associated with cultural incompatibility, while their personal stories and agency are neglected.

Despite the prevalence of negative and victimizing stereotypes in the UK and US media, there are many positive representations that portray refugees as capable and valuable members of society. **Activation** strategies are used to shift the focus from refugees as passive victims to individuals with agency, strength and the potential to contribute meaningfully to their host countries. Their achievements and resilience are **foregrounded**. Through examples from Positive News, The Guardian, The Washington Post, Teen Vogue and others, refugees are depicted as professionals, community leaders and cultural ambassadors. **Intensification** reinforces positive portrayals through emotionally engaging language that evokes admiration and respect.

## PART III. STEREOTYPICAL PORTRAYAL OF UKRAINIAN REFUGEES IN MASS MEDIA OF ENGLISH-SPEAKING COUNTRIES

### 3.1. Portrayal of Ukrainian refugees in the US mass media

Unlike refugees fleeing active warzones or political persecution, many of the Ukrainians migrated not primarily to escape violence but to seek better opportunities and improved living conditions. Ukrainians often cite issues like corruption, poor wages and lack of opportunity, rather than immediate danger or trauma. That’s why many Ukrainians in this context resemble economic migrants more than traditional refugees, further complicating their categorization. Yet, under U.S. immigration law and historical ties with former Soviet states, they have easier access to resettlement programs — a privilege not extended to many other displaced populations. This framing contrasts with how refugees from Muslim-majority or African countries are depicted.

When Russia launched its full-scale invasion of Ukraine, European countries, particularly Ukraine’s neighbors, responded with unprecedented speed and scale in accepting refugees. Never before had such large numbers of displaced people been received. According to The Washington Post: *“Poland was hesitant to accept refugees during the last crisis, but has already welcomed 1.18 million people who left Ukraine. Germany, one of the most receptive countries last time, has received 780,000 refugees from Ukraine so far, 40 percent of the number of refugees and asylum seekers it received in 2015 and 2016 combined”* [57]. The mentioning of numerical data “1.18 million people” and “780,000 refugees” adds concrete weight to the abstract notion of hospitality and underscores the enormity of the refugee intake.

The New Republic writes: *“The flow of Ukrainian refugees into Europe — which the United Nations already pegs at over two million in the last week, mostly into Poland — differs in several key ways from the largely Middle Eastern and*

*Asian refugee flows that have shaped European domestic politics in the last few years. European countries seem much more comfortable with, and enthusiastic about, the prospect of integrating fellow Europeans*” [73]. The phrase “Ukrainian refugees” versus “largely Middle Eastern and Asian refugee flows” categorizes individuals based on geographical and ethnic identity. It distinguishes between the “in-group” (Europeans) and the “out-group” (non-Europeans). The text assigns more favorable qualities to Ukrainian refugees: “fellow Europeans”. The phrase “already pegs at over two million in the last week” applies **intensification and quantification** strategies and emphasizes the urgency. The adjectives “comfortable” and “enthusiastic” show a warm attitude toward Ukrainians, unlike Middle Eastern or Asian arrivals who are often considered a threat. This highlights a racial and cultural hierarchy in migration discourse.

Further, the article notes that: “*The Polish government and volunteers (are) setting up welcome centers and literally rebuilding train tracks to ferry Ukrainian refugees into the country at the same time as border guards are empowered to violate international law and immediately expel other migrants*” [73]. In this excerpt Ukrainian refugees are portrayed as “deserving” and culturally aligned because “volunteers (are) setting up welcome centers and literally rebuilding train tracks,” while others are framed as disposable or legally undesirable: “border guards are empowered to violate international law and immediately expel other migrants.”

The article also states: “*Even now, in the Ukrainian refugee outflows, there are plenty of reports of discrimination against African and Indian students and workers caught up in the crowds fleeing the violence of the invasion.*” African and Indian individuals are brought to the forefront, drawing attention to intra-refugee group disparities that might otherwise be overlooked in media coverage focused solely on Ukrainian nationals. Here, the noun “discrimination” and the phrase

“*caught up in the crowds*” evoke passivity and injustice, revealing the racialized layers within the refugee experience. The sentence implies that the protection afforded to Ukrainians is not extended equally to all, reinforcing an unequal humanitarianism. The article from The Washington Post proves it saying: “*The country has been a key destination for African students for decades. Now, students are reporting racism at the border as they flee*” [44]. The students are described as victims of racism, which indicates that the **predication** strategy is applied. The attention is primarily driven to racism at the border, highlighting this injustice while **backgrounding** other aspects of the refugee experience. That is, even if the refugees were also fleeing from Russia's full-scale invasion of Ukraine, because they studied in Ukraine but were not native Ukrainians, the attitude towards them could be different.

Saakshi Ijantkar, an Indian medical student in her fourth year, recounted her difficult experience in a phone interview with CNN on Monday from the city of Lviv: “*There are three checkpoints we need to go through to get to the border. A lot of people are stranded there. They don't allow Indians to go through...They allow 30 Indians only after 500 Ukrainians get in. To get to this border you need to walk 4 to 5 kilometers from the first checkpoint to the second one. Ukrainians are given taxis and buses to travel, all other nationalities have to walk. They were very racist to Indians and other nationalities*” [94]. Saying this Saakshi Ijantkar depicts both the physical hardship and emotional toll faced by many of the non-Ukrainian refugees during the 2022 war in Ukraine. The phrase “*They allow 30 Indians only after 500 Ukrainians get in*” conveys **unequal treatment** by presenting numbers as evidence: “*Ukrainians*” (the in-group) and “*Indians*” (the out-group). Moreover, the parallel structure “*Ukrainians are given taxis and buses... all other nationalities have to walk*” contrasts entitlement with deprivation. The quote uses

a **personal perspective**: “we,” “*they don’t allow Indians*”, which emphasizes lived experience.

Many other international students from various nationalities reported facing similar discrimination at the Ukrainian border. For instance, Nneka Abigail, a 23-year-old medical student from Nigeria, described: “Foreigners are being denied. The border guards are acting very racist toward us. They keep saying that Ukrainian citizens must go first, while foreigners are told to wait behind” [94]. The phrase “*Ukrainian citizens must go first, while foreigners are told to wait behind*” shows a clear contrast based on nationality. This parallelism highlights the **inequality**: one group is actively prioritized, the other passively excluded.

Ukrainians also benefit from certain legal privileges. For instance, for several years now, they have been allowed to travel to EU countries without a visa, so now, fleeing from war, they can go to countries where they already have relatives or acquaintances. According to the American magazine *The New Republic*: “The EU has relaxed certain border controls, allowing Ukrainians to enter even without a passport, and is now set to enact a never-before-used provision known as a Temporary Protection Directive, which would grant Ukrainians residency permits for up to three years.” [73]. This excerpt reflects the EU’s will to support Ukrainians offering not only immediate safety but also access to work, healthcare and education across member states. In the early days of the invasion in 2022, many Ukrainians fled their homes in panic — often without having time to gather belongings or official documents. This was not a typical migratory movement; it was a sudden, unplanned exodus and the EU’s policy adaptation reflects that reality: “*allowing Ukrainians to enter even without a passport.*”

Moreover, Ukrainian refugees received the Temporary Protection Directive that offered many benefits: residency permits for up to three years, immediate

access to the labor market, access to education for children, healthcare and social welfare rights, while other asylum seekers often wait months or years for such status clarification and are barred from employment during that time. The phrase “*never-before-used provision*” **justifies** the exceptional policy shift, potentially reinforcing the idea that the situation with Ukrainian refugees is unique.

As Margaritis Schinas, the European Commission’s vice president noted, it is “*a very generous offer, far beyond the classical asylum protections. I would say it’s Europe at its best*” [60]. The phrase “*very generous offer*” meant a willingness to provide more than what is legally or politically required. Such a generous act enabled Ukrainians to rebuild their lives easier. “*Europe at its best*” is a superlative national and cultural affirmation, suggesting that this time Europe provided really notable assistance to refugees. He also described many of the Ukrainian refugees as “*highly educated and skilled people*” who “*can immediately incorporate into our systems,*” [60] portraying Ukrainian refugees as ideal migrants: educated, skilled, and quickly integrable. Individuals are represented based on their **function** — in this case, as workers or contributors who can integrate into existing systems. Overall the statement **justifies** accepting these individuals by framing them as economically useful.

The welcome extended to Ukrainians sharply differs from Europe’s general treatment of asylum seekers from other nationalities. The crisis triggered by the Syrian war in 2015 caused lasting political tensions within the European Union, as member states disagreed over how to distribute responsibility for the incoming refugees. At the same time, the arrival of large numbers of non-White, non-Christian migrants fueled the rise of nationalist and far-right movements across the continent.

As Marwa El-Shinawy wrote: “*The Russian-Ukrainian war revealed the ugly face of Europe. It showed their racism against Arab and African immigrants*

*despite all the human rights slogans*” [60]. The contrast between “*Arab and African immigrants*” and “*Europe*” depicts a clear **in-group/out-group** distinction. The phrase “*revealed the ugly face of Europe*” personifies Europe and labels it as “ugly” because it has a hidden or discriminatory reality that has now been exposed. It means that the Russian-Ukrainian war has uncovered a previously concealed reality — the unequal treatment of refugees based on their origin, ethnicity, or religion. While Ukrainian refugees, who are predominantly white and Christian, have been widely welcomed and granted immediate access to rights, refugees from Arab, African or Muslim backgrounds have often faced stricter border controls and slower asylum procedures. **Emotionally loaded expressions** like “*ugly face*” and “*despite all the human rights slogans*” heighten the moral condemnation and emphasize the speaker’s disapproval.

Andreas Kluth, former editor in chief of Handelsblatt Global confirmed this by saying that in 2015, “*the refugees were dark-skinned Muslims, and Warsaw slammed its borders shut... Now they’re fellow Christians and Slavs, and Poland has warmly welcomed more than half of the 6.7 million Ukrainians who’ve fled abroad*” [60]. This quote contrasts **two refugee crises** (2015 vs. post-2022) and invites the reader to compare past rejection with present acceptance. Two distinct groups: “*dark-skinned Muslims*” and “*fellow Christians and Slavs*” highlight racial, religious and ethnic **othering**. “*Dark-skinned Muslims*” constructs the first group as foreign and culturally distant, while “*fellow Christians and Slavs*” invokes shared identity and belonging. The **predication** strategy is applied: negative and positive attributes are assigned depending on group identity. Muslim refugees are framed as less acceptable and threatening: “Warsaw slammed its borders shut”, while Ukrainian refugees are portrayed positively as “*fellow*” Europeans who are “*warmly welcomed.*”

The ongoing war in Ukraine has triggered a massive wave of displacement, with hundreds of thousands of refugees fleeing to neighboring European countries. And unlike in some previous refugee crises, this time many countries did not hesitate to accept Ukrainian refugees. On the contrary, they actively mobilized resources and policies to offer support, demonstrating a broad-based political and societal willingness to provide humanitarian assistance. As it is written in The Washington Post: *“Nations in Europe are opening the door to a historic wave of refugees fleeing the war in Ukraine, breaking with the continent’s past resistance to asylum seekers from the Muslim world and Africa and embracing hundreds of thousands of new arrivals whom some leaders are hailing as culturally and ethnically European”* [76]. In this excerpt we can see selective humanitarianism because the treatment of Ukrainian refugees differs from that of refugees from Muslim-majority countries and Africa. This creates a clear **in-group/out-group distinction**, framing Ukrainians as more acceptable or familiar. The quote **foregrounds** the welcoming of Ukrainian refugees while **backgrounding** the struggles of non-Europeans, minimizing their significance in the discourse.

Some journalists and public figures have made comparisons that many see as biased or racially insensitive, highlighting the perceived “normalcy” or “Europeanness” of Ukrainian refugees in contrast to those from non-European countries. In the statement by Bulgarian Prime Minister Kiril Petkov, as reported by the Associated Press, there is a stark dichotomy in the characterization of Ukrainian refugees versus those from Muslim countries: *“These are not the refugees we are used to... These people are Europeans. These people are intelligent. They are educated people. ... This is not the refugee wave we have been used to, people we were not sure about their identity, people with unclear pasts, who could have been even terrorists”* [96]. The speaker differentiates **“these people”** (Ukrainians) from **“the refugees we are used to”** (implicitly Middle

Eastern, African or Muslim refugees). The use of **evaluative language** legitimizes unequal treatment and fosters **implicit bias**. Petkov refers to Ukrainians as “*Europeans,*” “*intelligent*” and “*educated people,*” deploying positively connoted descriptors that emphasize cultural familiarity. In contrast, he evokes prior refugee groups using **suspicion language**: “*people we were not sure about their identity,*” “*people with unclear pasts*” and “*who could have been even terrorists.*” This comparison shows trust and worthiness to Ukrainians, while casting Muslim or Middle Eastern refugees as potentially dangerous and culturally alien. The use of terms like “*not sure about their identity*” and “*unclear pasts*” associates non-European refugees with risk and instability. He added: “*In other words, there is not a single European country now which is afraid of the current wave of refugees*”[96]. The absence of fear in this quote implies not only acceptance, but comfort and trust toward the current ukrainians.

In US media Ukrainian refugees are regarded as “deserving” of aid: “*They are very vulnerable citizens. It would be ideal to see the U.K. open its doors*” [76]. The phrase “*very vulnerable citizens*” shows that Ukrainian refugees are in need of protection. The use of “*citizens*” rather than “*refugees*” or “*migrants*” adds some dignity and avoids dehumanizing labels often applied to displaced persons. The second sentence (“*It would be ideal to see the U.K. open its doors*”) presents a **normative statement** that implies what should happen, appealing to humanitarian values. This strategy draws on the **topos of humanitarianism** (i.e., since they are vulnerable, the moral action is to help them).

American media portrayed Ukrainian refugees not only through language but also through **visual representation**. Images of people dragging suitcases (Appendix 3), walking along highways (Appendix 4) or standing in traffic jams (Appendix 5) visually represent both movement and endurance and evoke both suffering and dignity. As CNN stated: “*almost all of those who have crossed the*

*border are women and children. They make up a staggering 90% of Ukraine's refugees*" [80]. That is why photos in the media often center on mothers holding children, elderly women crossing borders or young children with backpacks or stuffed animals. This visual framing emphasizes vulnerability and familial bonds. Moreover, close-up images showing tears, exhaustion or quiet determination humanize refugees, countering stereotypes of migrants as threatening or anonymous masses (Appendix 6).

Media often gives a compassionate, human-centered portrayal of Ukrainian refugees and underscores the deep involvement of American communities in helping displaced individuals start new lives in the U.S. Stories of particular individuals help individualize the refugee experience. Narratives focus on personal stories, emotions and challenges, such as cultural differences and language barriers, which makes the refugee experience relatable and human. A great example is a story about Yana Miroschnyenko, a thirty-four-year-old Ukrainian, who took her five-year-old son and came to Brooklyn. There she has been met with unexpected kindness from American strangers: "*Not everyone knew where Ukraine was, but everyone in America was friendly,*" "*The only reason I exist is because of the generosity of strangers*" [52].

Despite the kindness she had received, Yana, like many other Ukrainians struggled emotionally with separation from her husband and the trauma of being uprooted. Her words, "*I have to be strong for my son, but often I want to cry,*" [52] reveal the need to project resilience for her children while quietly enduring psychological exhaustion. Yana's quote, "*I don't want to be a refugee,*" rejects the label, not out of shame, but because it symbolizes a life she did not choose.

A notable motif in U.S. media coverage of Ukrainian refugees is the emphasis on their presumed desire to return home once the conflict ends. Yana's phrase "*As soon as I can, I want to go home*" [52] expresses a deep desire to come

back to her previous country. She, like many other Ukrainians, deeply misses her homeland and hopes to return as soon as possible. This reinforces the fact that most Ukrainians fled not by choice, but out of fear for their lives or because their homes had already been destroyed. In truth, a lot of Ukrainians still remain strongly connected to their country and hope to return once it is safe to do so. In general, Yana's story highlights both the vulnerability and the strength of Ukrainian refugees, as well as the compassion of the American communities that have welcomed them.

On the whole, while the largely positive coverage of Ukrainian refugees has helped generate support and foster integration, it simultaneously exposes the unequal valuation of human suffering based on origin and identity.

### **3.2. Stereotypical representations of Ukrainian refugees in the UK mass media**

At the end of February 2022, Europe faced a refugee crisis triggered by Russia's invasion of Ukraine. By May 3, approximately 8 million individuals had been displaced within Ukraine, while around 6.7 million Ukrainian refugees moved to Europe. If talking about the UK, there were 82,100 of Ukrainian refugees by the end of June 2022. Since that time, UK headlines have depicted the influx of Ukrainians entering the country. Many discursive strategies used in the British media to report on Ukrainian refugees were analyzed.

When Russia's full-scale invasion started, a lot of Ukrainian refugees fled their homes and families because they were afraid of their safety and that of their relatives and friends. The Russian invasion began so suddenly that civilians had no time to make decisions and they had to escape danger immediately. Most people firstly sought refuge in neighboring countries due to geographic proximity and the availability of direct train routes: *“At least 100,000 people have already fled their homes, while several thousand have crossed into neighbouring countries including*

*Moldova, Romania and Poland.*” [86] The mention of “*at least 100,000 people*” and “*several thousand*” uses numbers to convey the scale of displacement, creating a sense of urgency and legitimizing concern. As Sky News reports, “*The train station is where you'll find most of the refugees. They arrive on platform five on the daily trains from Lviv in Ukraine*” [87]. Such details about where and how refugees arrived focus on the logistical aspects of their movement, drawing attention to the visible reality of the crisis.

Many refugees were women traveling with children or elderly parents, as Ukrainian men of conscription age were not permitted to leave the country under martial law. Often women evacuated their families to safe places and then returned to Ukraine to their husbands or communities: “*Valentina Puzanova only came to Poland to bring her elderly mum and young son to safety. Now she will head back to be with her husband. 'It's my home...'*” [87]. This quote depicts strong emotional ties to home and family. Despite the danger, Valentina’s decision to “*head back to be with her husband*” because it’s “*her home*” underscores how important the concept of home is — it is not merely a physical place but an anchor of identity and belonging. But the safety of her loved ones was in the first place: “*came to Poland to bring her elderly mum and young son to safety,*” which reflects the protective role many women took on during fleeing from the war. Her return to Ukraine, likely to a city where there still was a conflict, demonstrates personal courage and a refusal to fully separate from her homeland and husband.

Another quote from this article states: “*The Bilechenko family — mum, dad and four children — arrived in Poland two weeks ago. It provided them some sense of safety. But now, the draw to be back home outweighs the considerable risk they know they will face*” [87]. This highlights how people who have to move to other countries, even when necessary, often feel uncomfortable there. The phrase “*the draw to be back home outweighs the considerable risk*” shows that they

decided it not naively, but they are fully aware of the danger and want to return. Such quotes depict refugees not only as victims of war but also as **emotionally complex individuals** making difficult, brave decisions. They challenge the stereotype of refugees as helpless, instead portraying them as deeply rooted, loyal to their country and guided by love for their families and homeland.

In the beginning of the full-scale Russian invasion, the government decided to take real action. This statement proves: *"The government should now respond with a well-resourced initiative working with councils across the country, to welcome Ukrainians who need sanctuary"* [86]. This appeal highlights that the British government not only opens its doors but also provides support. It shows that there was awareness among politicians that offering sanctuary required coordination at both national and local levels. Ukrainian refugees are referred to in terms of their situation: *"who need sanctuary"*, which **justifies support** based on their **social function** as people in crisis. Labour deputy leader Angela Rayner said: *"They are in need, and we should be responding to that need"* [86]. This message reveals a moral duty to stand with people fleeing war and offer them help out of basic human empathy. And then she added: *"I'm incredibly proud of the Ukrainians and I'm proud of what our country is doing to support their freedom and their right to exist"* [86]. This means that she admires and respects Ukrainians, portraying them not just as victims of war but as individuals worthy of praise.

The UK had such a strong national will to help Ukrainians that Boris Johnson *"doubled the number of the refugees fleeing the Russian invasion that the UK will take from the 100,000 announced just 24 hours earlier by Priti Patel, the Home Secretary"* [47]. Boris Johnson is depicted as the **active agent** who made the decision, emphasizing political leadership and initiative. The UK abandoned restrictive quotas in favour of a more humanitarian approach: *"There will be no numerical limit on this scheme and we'll welcome as many Ukrainians that wish to*

*come and have match sponsors*" [47]. Moreover, Patel added: "*Making a success of it will require a national effort from the entire country and our country will rise to that challenge*" [47]. This highlights the solidarity shown by communities, councils and individuals across the UK, who all came together to offer support, shelter, and dignity to Ukrainians in need.

Many countries consider Ukrainians as an investment in the country's future. As another article states: "*Ukrainian refugees will turbocharge the economy of any country wise enough to accept them,*" [85] underscoring the idea that Ukrainian refugees are an economic asset. The **argumentation strategy** is applied because the statement **justifies** accepting refugees by appealing to economic benefit, suggesting that hosting them is not only moral but economically strategic. The tone of the sentence is optimistic and the structure expresses high certainty about a future outcome.

Further it is added: "*If we're smart, we will open our borders to highly skilled and well-educated Ukrainians*" [85]. Moreover, Ukrainians "*are ready and able to integrate and contribute to British society.*" This means that they bring valuable skills, ambition, and youth — qualities that many Western economies, including the UK, need due workforce shortages. Saying "*Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic, all with demographic challenges to cope with, will benefit hugely from all the refugees fleeing the war – and if the UK was smart, we would be opening our borders to those who want to make a new life in this country as well*" [85] means that other countries are already reaping the long-term benefits of supporting Ukrainians, and the UK should not fall behind. The phrase "*Those who want to make a new life*" humanizes refugees, portraying them as hopeful and proactive, **not passive victims**.

Ukrainians are portrayed as intelligent and well-educated individuals: "*Ukraine had six universities in the top 1,000 globally, an impressive number for a*

*small, relatively poor country. Its graduates are the equal of any in the world*" [85]. Ukrainians are described using **positively evaluated characteristics** such as "intelligent," "well-educated," and "equal of any in the world," which assigns them high intellectual value. The phrase "*an impressive number for a small, relatively poor country*" highlights how Ukraine exceeds expectations. By stating "*Its graduates are the equal of any in the world*," the text emphasizes that Ukrainian graduates possess knowledge and skills on par with those from top global institutions and they are worthy of respect and support. Ukrainians are referred to collectively through their academic achievements, **highlighting a national identity** associated with excellence and capability.

Moreover, they are among the youngest refugee groups: "*they are mostly young. Ukraine has a similar age profile to the rest of Europe but right now it is the younger people that are fleeing. Many of the countries they are arriving in already face a looming demographic crisis*" [85]. The statement "*they are mostly young*" and the clarification that "*right now it is the younger people that are fleeing*" suggest that those leaving Ukraine are of working age or younger, which contrasts with the aging populations in many European host countries. Such young refugees are very important because they can help solve big problems that many European countries are facing, like not having enough workers and having more older people than young ones.

In British media discourse, particularly in response to the Ukrainian refugee crisis, there have been many **positively framed narratives**, which contrast with the often securitized or racialized depictions of refugees from other regions. A notable example can be found in The Guardian article titled "*This was their home too*": *Frankie Mills's intimate portraits of Ukrainian refugees in the UK.*' The article describes the photographic project in terms that **foreground** the humanity and resilience of the displaced individuals: "*The project underscores the universal*

*longing for belonging and purpose, highlighting the resilience and adaptability of the refugees amidst their challenges*” [81]. The use of abstract nouns such as “*longing*,” “*belonging*,” and “*purpose*” evokes a shared human condition, positioning refugees not as “others” or outsiders but as individuals with universally relatable emotions and aspirations. The words “*resilience*” and “*adaptability*” emphasize agency and strength, challenging dominant narratives that often reduce refugees to passive victims. Moreover, the inclusive phrasing “*universal longing*” bridges the divide between refugees and host communities. It frames displacement as an experience that can be empathized with rather than feared. From a discourse analytical standpoint, this representation contributes to a **counter-discourse** that resists the “threat” framing typical of securitized media language. Instead, it promotes **solidarity and moral responsibility**, fostering a more humane perception of refugee identity within the UK’s public sphere.

The event in Canterbury exemplifies how refugees maintain cultural identity and national pride even while in exile. In August 2022, around 100 people marched through Canterbury to celebrate Ukrainian Independence Day, marking 31 years since Ukraine separated from the Soviet Union. The event also came six months after the Russian invasion began. Notably, more than 200 families, mostly women and children, had relocated to the city, and many host families joined the march in solidarity. One host, Kim Pye, said: “*It’s what we can do, because we feel very proud to do what we’re doing, and to give them a home is one of the most basic human needs*” [83]. Direct quotes and personal testimonies humanize the refugees, giving them voice and agency. Phrases like “*to give them a home is one of the most basic human needs*” emphasize shared humanity and moral responsibility. The use of inclusive language: “*we feel very proud*” fosters a sense of community and shared values between the British hosts and Ukrainian guests.

The quote from Denys Nizalov, chair of Canterbury for Ukraine “*We see overwhelming support from local residents, from local businesses,*” [75] further reinforces the positive portrayal of Ukrainian refugees in British media coverage. The adjective “*overwhelming*” conveys an **emotionally intense** and widespread level of support, suggesting that the local community not only accepts but actively embraces the Ukrainian refugee presence. The repetition of the prepositional phrase “*from local...*” emphasizes the breadth of the support, spanning both individuals and institutions. The declarative sentence in the present simple tense (“*We see...*”) creates a sense of immediacy and ongoing reality, reinforcing that this solidarity is not a singular gesture but a sustained, observable pattern. The use of the first-person plural pronoun “*we*” constructs a **collective identity**, aligning the speaker with the refugee community and asserting their visibility and agency. This framing constructs a narrative of unity and mutual support. Rather than depicting refugees as isolated or marginal figures, the sentence situates them within a network of **active**, caring relationships with the host society. This contributes to a counter-discourse against the stereotypical portrayal of refugees as societal burdens.

Reports about refugees in Ukraine have been accompanied by gentle headlines and significant support, which may not have been observed during other refugee crises outside of Europe. This has raised questions about possible **double standards** and differences in the treatment of refugees from various countries, as well as how they are portrayed in the media. A government spokesman stated that councils had “*a duty to ensure families are not left without a roof over their heads. The majority of sponsors want to continue hosting for longer than six months*” [99]. This suggests that many British citizens are not only willing but eager to support Ukrainian families over extended periods of time. While asylum seekers from the Middle East or North Africa have often faced suspicion and cultural

incompatibility, Ukrainian refugees have largely been portrayed as victims of unjust war, evoking sympathy.

Iryna Savchuk’s story is a great example of how British families warmly welcomed Ukrainian refugees. She said: *“It was like a fairy tale. From the war we found ourselves in paradise. We were welcomed very warmly: our own bed with pajamas, our pictures everywhere, plenty of food in the kitchen”* [99]. The use of **metaphorical language**: *“like a fairy tale,” “paradise”* depicts the contrast between the safety of a British home and life in bomb shelters. The attention to small details like *“our own bed with pajamas, our pictures everywhere, plenty of food in the kitchen”* reinforces the individual identity and dignity of refugees and reflects the desire of Britons to make the refugees feel at home and cared for.

Images from UK media often depict Ukrainian refugees participating in community events, such as marches or cultural celebrations, which highlight their resilience and integration into local communities. These photographs typically show refugees engaging with local residents, displaying Ukrainian flags, and wearing traditional attire, symbolizing their cultural pride and solidarity. (Appendix 6). Ukrainian refugees are also frequently shown with their pets, such as cats, dogs, or parrots, emphasizing the emotional bonds they preserved during displacement. Fleeing the war, many did not leave behind their beloved animals, bringing them across borders alongside family members. This underscores not only their attachment to home but also their deep sense of responsibility, reinforcing their humanity and evoking empathy from host communities.

The article from the British media The Telegraph states: *“Ukrainian refugees took over 2,000 pets to the UK this year. No family member — be it a cat, dog, or even a degu — would be left behind”* [54]. This quote highlights Ukrainians’ strong emotional bonds not only with human relatives but also with their pets, treating animals as full members of the family. They are **family-**

**oriented people** and treat pets not just as animals, but as family members: "*When you own a pet, regardless of the type of pet you have, it becomes your friend and it becomes a member of the family,*" "I would not care whether it's a rodent, a turtle or rabbit or parrot, *it's still your friend and member of your family, so I completely understand people who wanted to bring them,*" "*It's a piece of home, and it's like having your relatives here with you as our dog is our member of the family*" [54].

Moreover, during the full-scale Russian invasion, pets became a vital source of emotional strength. For many, animals are not just companions but lifelines. They help Ukrainian refugees find purpose and maintain mental strength when facing war, displacement, and loneliness: "*Coming through war twice, being alone, it's really a nightmare; it's just because of those pets that I try to be strong and fight for survival*" [98]. In all these quotes animals are regarded as “family members”, suggesting deep emotional attachment and **personification**. The enumeration of animals (“rodent, turtle, rabbit, parrot”) shows that each type of pet, regardless of its size, is significant. “*Piece of home*” conveys that they are not just animals, but a living connection to the past and to home.

British media like The Guardian do not only cover refugees in general terms, they also share personal, individual stories: “*From law firm to farm: five Ukrainian refugees describe the wrench of adjusting to new lives in strange corners of Europe, as well as the opportunities and generosity they encountered*” [79]. The phrase “*the wrench of adjusting to new lives*” metaphorically represents the difficulty of adapting to a new country and culture. In general the story of Olha, a Ukrainian refugee and former business lawyer, is a powerful example of how resilience and determination can help rebuild a life in a new country — and even make long-held dreams come true.

When the war in Ukraine forced her to flee Kyiv, Olha didn't just seek safety, she made a promise to herself to pursue her dream of becoming a farmer: “I

*made a promise to myself: if I survive, I will change something in my life and get closer to my dream*” [79]. The strategy of **activation** is used here to portray Olha as an active participant in shaping her future. Despite having no contacts in Switzerland, no farming background, and limited knowledge of German, Olha wrote to the Swiss Farmers’ Union. She believed their strong agricultural tradition could help her start a new life. Olha didn’t give up. Olga secured an internship, packed a small bag, and moved to a place where she didn’t know anybody: *“I didn’t know a single person. Initially, I cried every other day, then once a week, then once a month. Well, now I’m not crying any more, I’m just learning”* [79]. The **personalization strategy** applied in these quotes emphasize her individuality, making her a human figure rather than just a representative of a group of refugees. The use of her name and the focus on her emotions and aspirations adds personal depth to the narrative. Direct quotes from Olha allow the audience to see the story from **her perspective**, making her experience more personal. Her words: *“I made a promise to myself...,” “I didn’t know a single person...,”* invite empathy and allow readers to connect with her emotionally. Olha’s story is very inspiring, and it is just one among many similar success stories of Ukrainian refugees who, despite the trauma of war and displacement, have managed to build meaningful new lives abroad.

Despite the warm welcome and positive portrayal of Ukrainians in British media, Ukrainian refugees have faced **challenges with the visa system**. The biggest problem has been the delay in renewing visas, which affects their ability to maintain stable employment and plan for the future: *“Ukrainian refugees in the UK are losing their jobs because their visas cannot be renewed until the month before they run out”* [84]. As Yana Ihorivna Pronina, an English teacher said: *“I secured a permanent contract, but it was annulled after two months due to my visa officially expiring in June 2025. Currently, I am on a fixed-term contract”* [84].

Her experience shows how bureaucratic limitations create instability, even for those who are integrated, employed and contributing to society. Although she was able to obtain a permanent position, the rigidity of the visa process forced her into a more precarious fixed-term role. In short, while British hospitality is generally positive, administrative obstacles continue to create uncertainty for refugees striving for long-term stability.

The analysis of the material leads to the conclusion that in the British press, Ukrainian war refugees are depicted not only as victims suffering from the consequences of military actions in their home country, but more often as heroes who risk their lives in the pursuit of safety. The hosting countries are shown to face challenges related to the influx of newcomers, either because they are entering foreign nationals or because they require assistance from governments and local communities.

Using discourse strategies such as personalization, nomination, predication, argumentation, perspectivization and activation journalists construct narratives that highlight resilience, integration and moral worth. Linguistic tools such as evaluative adjectives ("*brave*," "*highly skilled*"), metaphor ("*turbocharge the economy*") and emotionally charged quotations reinforce these representations. Content analysis demonstrates Ukrainian refugees as active, educated and family-oriented individuals whose presence benefits host societies. This stands in contrast to representations of other refugee groups.

### **3.3. Creolization of Ukrainian refugees stereotypes in the media texts in British and American mass media**

Stereotyping, particularly in mass media, serves as a mechanism for simplifying complex realities. Refugees are frequently depicted through reductive lenses: the victim, the threat, the burden or the hero. These figures are often

racialized and politicized. The representation of refugees demonstrates how such stereotypes can be reconfigured through creolized narratives that merge humanitarian, racial, geopolitical and economic logics.

In the US media it was stated: *"NATO was founded to protect 'civilized' people. That means White"* [63]. This statement draws attention to how the concept of "civilization" is often racially coded. As further noted in commentary, *"Race has never been denoted solely by skin color but has always been defined in ways relying on a wide range of physical characteristics... It has always relied on cultural markers... to mark one group as distinct and inferior or superior to another"* [63]. Such framing positions "Western civilization" as inherently tied to whiteness and liberal ideals, constructing an exclusive cultural identity.

**Visual media strongly reinforces** this racial bias. While both Black and white refugees fled the same full-scale Russian invasion of Ukraine, the portrayal differs significantly. Black and non-European refugees are often depicted through a fear-based lens — shown in despair, in crowded spaces, overwhelmed, powerless, and sometimes evoking suspicion or unease (Appendix 7). In contrast, Ukrainian refugees are typically portrayed in a more individualized and sympathetic light — particularly women with children, holding pets, waving flags or carrying symbolic belongings (Appendix 6), (Appendix 8). These visuals humanize them and align them with Western viewers, reinforcing a sense of shared identity. By employing such imagery and language, the media more clearly highlights the difference between depiction of Muslim or African refugees as the "other" and Ukrainians as *"like us."* This creolized narrative, combining verbal and visual modes, amplifies the unequal treatment of refugees based on racial and cultural proximity to the West.

The article from The Telegraph discusses the challenges faced by Ukrainian refugees in the UK due to the restrictive conditions surrounding their visa

extensions: *“Ukrainian refugees in the UK are losing their jobs because their visas cannot be renewed until the month before they run out... The restriction has led to Ukrainians being forced out of employment contracts or not offered job interviews amid the uncertainty created by the system”* [84]. This text highlights the instability that Ukrainian refugees experienced. Phrases such as *“losing their jobs”* and *“forced out of employment contracts”* create an image of vulnerability and helplessness.

This article contains a photo of the crowd holding **blue and yellow flags** and **posters**. These colours symbolize Ukraine and evoke a strong connection to the ongoing crisis caused by Russia’s invasion, serving as a visual reminder of the refugees' vulnerable position. The crowd holding signs emphasizes the **collective action** aspect of the visual. The people in the image are shown as advocating for a more **inclusive and supportive** approach to refugee treatment. This not only portrays public sentiment but also emphasizes the importance of **social movements**. From one of the posters it can be read: *“Welcome all refugees”* (Appendix 9). This represents public solidarity with Ukrainian refugees, framing them as **deserving** of a warm reception and humanitarian support. It is an overt visual call for **compassion** and **action**, contrasting with the bureaucratic obstacles faced by the refugees.

In general, the text from this article frames Ukrainian refugees as victims of an unjust system. It highlights their struggles due to the bureaucratic delays surrounding their visa renewals. In contrast, the image projects a message of **hope**, solidarity and support.

The article from The Washington Post states: *“Japan has accepted dozens of people fleeing Ukraine — a remarkable move by a country that historically has been unwelcoming to refugees and a decision that reflects Tokyo’s increasingly assertive response to the Russian invasion”* [57]. This example, both in text and

image (Appendix 10) is a powerful instance of **multimodal representation**, where written news content and visual elements work together to construct a narrative about Japan's rare openness toward refugees, specifically Ukrainians. The phrase "*unwelcoming to refugees*" alludes to Japan's strict immigration policies, highlighting how the Ukrainian case stands out — potentially due to shared political values or public sympathy for European victims. Images of Japanese citizens holding **blue-and-yellow Ukrainian flags**, signs with phrases "*Stand for Ukraine*" and "*No war*" (*in different languages*) signals emotional solidarity. The idea to write in different languages indicates that this support transcends language barriers, representing a global or international form of solidarity. The **color scheme** (blue and yellow) dominates, making the Ukrainian identity visible and instantly recognizable. Through this representation, Japanese society responds to the Ukrainian crisis not only diplomatically, but also emotionally and symbolically. Ukrainians are positioned as exceptional refugees: worthy of empathy, visually supported, and politically aligned with democratic values.

The combined visual and textual elements frame Ukrainians not only as victims but as deserving of empathy, rooted in shared democratic values. The consistent use of Ukrainian national symbols in the image aligns with the textual narrative that frames Ukrainians as "exceptional refugees," worthy of both political and emotional support.

### CONCLUSION to Part III

American and British media not only reflects how the United States treat Ukrainian refugees, but also comments on the responses of other countries. U.S. mass media texts employ different discursive strategies. **Nomination strategy** was used to categorize individuals into distinct social groups, such as Ukrainians, Indians, or Muslim refugees to establish group identities and boundaries. Ukrainians were positioned as the in-group —“fellow Europeans” and “ideal

migrants”. **Predication strategy** depicted Ukrainians as “highly educated,” “skilled,” and “quickly integrable,” whereas other refugees — as threatening. **Argumentation strategy** was employed to justify the unequal treatment of refugees: (Temporary Protection Directive and the “never-before-used provision” for Ukrainians). **Perspectivization** through phrases like “we” conveyed a personal and emotionally engaging viewpoint. **Intensification strategy** heightened the emotional tone and emphasized the discrimination faced by non-European refugees. Together, these strategies legitimized preferential treatment of some groups while criticizing the mistreatment of others.

Linguistic means like **evaluative adjectives** (“*comfortable*,” “*enthusiastic*,” “*deserving*”) and stark **statistical comparisons** (“*30 Indians after 500 Ukrainians*”) were used to highlight disparities in refugee treatment. **Euphemism** (“*displacement*” instead of “*deportation*”) and **appeals to shared values** (e.g., democracy, Christianity, whiteness) were used to promote the acceptability of Ukrainian refugees.

The media highlight how displacement is experienced not only as a crisis but also as an opportunity for community and humanitarian action. Ukrainians are portrayed as educated, young, and economically beneficial. This positions them as an investment rather than a challenge. At the same time, those from the Middle East or North Africa are often framed as a social burden. This raises questions about possible double standards in the treatment and representation of refugees based on their origin.

The creolization of Ukrainian refugee stereotypes in US and UK mass media combines verbal discourse (journalistic language) and visual codes (images, colors, national symbols) to create a layered, emotionally resonant representation. The **semiotic choices in imagery** (e.g., Ukrainian women with children, pets or flags) **individualize and humanize** Ukrainian refugees, while non-European refugees are

often shown in crowds or in chaotic conditions, invoking fear or pity rather than identification. This **multimodal strategy works to legitimize selective empathy** based on racial, cultural, and geopolitical familiarity.

Overall, the analysis of British and American media texts from 2022–2025 demonstrates that refugee representation is ideologically charged. Through creolized discourse, Ukrainian refugees are constructed as exceptional: deserving and compatible.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

The research examines the formation and evolution of cross-cultural stereotypes by exploring the studies of linguist scholars. It was found out that stereotyping is regarded as a social act associated with identity and culture. Preconceptions develop during the child's earliest years influenced by family, media exposure and societal norms. This shapes their perception of other cultures and social groups.

It was revealed that socio-cultural and political factors significantly influence the stereotypical portrayal of refugees. Socially, prevailing attitudes, collective historical experiences and dominant cultural narratives shape how refugee groups are perceived — often reinforcing in-group vs. out-group dynamics. Political agendas often emphasize economic utility, security threats or humanitarian responsibility to foster different stereotypical representations.

We analyzed both US and UK media to examine how refugees are portrayed. It was found that migrants are typically portrayed in a negative light, often represented as a potential threat to national security. Such depictions frequently rely on generalized assumptions and reinforce existing prejudices. In contrast, Ukrainian refugees are portrayed positively more often than non-Western refugees. They are depicted as individuals who contribute to the economic development of the host country and who do not pose a threat. They are often framed as educated, skilled and capable of quick integration into society. This contrast reflects a clear distinction between “in-group” and “out-group”.

To uncover these patterns, discursive strategies were applied, revealing how language and representation construct and reinforce such divisions in media and public discourse. Referential/nomination strategy was used to refer to Ukrainians as to “fellow Europeans” who need help while African, Indian or Muslim refugees are presented as “non-deserving” and “the mass responsible for migrant crisis”.

Predication strategy was applied to describe Ukrainians with positive traits, suggesting that they will contribute economically. Meanwhile, other groups are either described negatively or framed as passive recipients. Argumentation strategy was used to justify preferential treatment or criticize discrimination. For instance, the activation of the Temporary Protection Directive for Ukrainians is explained with reference to their perceived usefulness and integrability — an economic and humanitarian justification. Meanwhile, the lack of similar protection for non-European refugees is left unjustified. This imbalance reflects unequal refugee policies, using logic, data (e.g., numbers of admitted refugees), or references to laws and rights to frame certain actions as appropriate. Perspectivization mentioned personal voices or quotes to create the reader’s empathy or distance. First-person accounts like “we” highlight lived experiences of exclusion, allowing marginalized voices to be heard. This strategy helps readers emotionally engage with one group while remaining detached from another, reinforcing the asymmetry in representation. Through emotionally charged expressions the intensification strategy was used to amplify injustice or approval. It creates a strong emotional appeal to support one group while downplaying the needs of others.

We identified which linguistic means were used to realize these discursive strategies. The **referential/nomination strategy** was implemented through the use of nouns denoting nationality or religion (e.g., “*Ukrainians*,” “*Muslims*”), generic labels such as “*migrants*” or “*refugees*”, and depersonalizing mass metaphors like “*a flood*” or “*a wave*.” Such expressions establish a binary between the “in-group” and the “out-group.” The **predication strategy** relied on adjectives (e.g., “*skilled*,” “*dangerous*”), evaluative participles (“*excluded*,” “*welcomed*”), and metaphorical language (“*imported plagues*”) to assign specific attributes to social actors. The **argumentation strategy** was realized through causal connectors (“*because*,” “*therefore*,” “*as a result*”), statistical references and legal citations

(e.g., “*under EU law,*” “*according to the directive*”). Direct and indirect speech, personal pronouns (“*we,*” “*they*”), and source references were used in the **perspectivization strategy** to evoke empathy or distance. Emotionally loaded vocabulary (“*ugly face,*” “*heartbreaking*”), intensifiers (“*deeply,*” “*shockingly*”), contrastive structures (“*despite all the human rights slogans*”) and repetition (“*death by starvation, death by beatings, death by execution*”) were used to amplify or tone down the emotional and rhetorical impact of the discourse. Together, these linguistic tools function in combination and are often used in English media to humanize or dehumanize refugees.

Conducting the multimodal discourse analysis we explored not only textual depiction of refugees but also visual elements that were used to enhance their positive or negative image. Ukrainians more often are represented as optimistic, shown on photos with their relatives or even pets, while “non-European” refugees are almost always pictured as dirty, in crowds and chaos.

Overall, analyzing positive and negative portrayals of refugees and how they are socio-culturally and politically influenced, this research highlights the powerful role that media plays in shaping attitudes toward refugees through both linguistic and visual representation. It is important to understand this for promoting more ethical media depiction, as well as fostering a more informed and compassionate public discourse surrounding displacement and migration.

## SUMMARY

Магістерська робота присвячена аналізу стереотипного зображення біженців. У роботі здійснено ґрунтовний аналіз дискурсивних стратегій, які використовуються для формування ставлення аудиторії до іммігрантів, а також розглянуто лінгвістичні засоби, які їх реалізують.

В основі роботи лежить комплексний підхід із застосуванням різних методів дослідження. За допомогою контент-аналізу досліджено частотність використання певних лексичних одиниць, тем і візуальних елементів у медіатекстах, що стосуються зображення біженців, а також загальні тенденції у способах їх подання. Завдяки критичному дискурс-аналізу, який слугує теоретичною основою дослідження, було проаналізовано, як мова функціонує в соціальних контекстах для виявлення прихованих владних відносин, нерівності та ідеологічних установок. Метод мультимодального дискурс-аналізу дозволив дослідити взаємодію між текстовим і візуальним контентом у медіа, зосереджуючись на тому, як різні семіотичні ресурси (зображення, заголовки, підписи тощо) спільно формують значення та впливають на сприйняття аудиторії. Міждисциплінарний підхід, який поєднує напрацювання лінгвістики, медіазнавства, соціології та культурології, дозволив розглядати мову як форму соціальної практики, що відображає і формує суспільні уявлення про біженців.

Магістерська робота починається з міждисциплінарного вивчення стереотипів, їх зародження та розвитку. Розглянуто їхню класифікацію та етнічну вербалізацію. Визначено які є стратегії дискурсивного аналізу та з'ясовано хто їх запровадив. Аналіз зосереджується на таких поняттях: “стереотипи”, “біженці”, “засоби масової комунікації”.

Докладні практичні розділи присвячено вивченню Британських та Американських статей про біженців. В першому розділі розглянуто

стереотипізацію всіх біженців, в другому лише українців. В дослідженні проведено комплексний аналіз термінів, які вживаються для опису біженців.

Отримані дані свідчать про використання епітетів, паралелізмів, повторів, метафоризації та перебільшення як характерних лексичних засобів, що активно застосовуються у процесі стереотипізації.

У дослідженні стверджується, що в англomовних засобах масової комунікації існують терміни, які вживають для опису “європейських” біженців, таких як українці, та “неєвропейських” біженців, наприклад таких як африканці. Дуже популярною є поляризована мова (“ми” проти “вони”), де українці здебільшого за допомогою епітетів зображуються позитивно, тоді як інші біженці — негативно та сприймаються як “загроза для суспільства”, що спричиняє формування образу “іншого”. Для зображення українців часто використовуються активні конструкції, що підкреслюють їхні дії як корисні для суспільства. Натомість в описі інших біженців зустрічаються пасивні конструкції, що створюють образ бездіяльних осіб, які лише отримують допомогу.

Як показав аналіз мовного матеріалу, стереотипне зображення біженців відбувається за рахунок різних засобів, зокрема застосування морфологічних і синтаксичних прийомів, а також зображень, які підсилюють позитивні чи негативні характеристики певних груп біженців залежно від їх національності або походження.

## REFERENCES

1. Алексенко С. Ф. Політична коректність в англomовному медійному дискурсі як засіб реалізації кооперативної комунікативної стратегії / С. Ф. Алексенко. – Київ : Науковий вісник кафедри ЮНЕСКО КНЛУ, 2018. – Вип. 36. – С. 52–56.
2. Дацишин Х. Мовна толерантність у назвах осіб старшого віку: можливості медіа у формуванні й руйнуванні стереотипів / Х. Дацишин. – Львів : Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка», 2002. – Вип. 2 (4). – С. 87–94.
3. Медвідь О. В. Використання міжтекстових зв'язків у сучасній українській прозі / О. В. Медвідь. – Чернівці : Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича, 2021. – С. 85–94.
4. Тарасенко, В. В. Гендерні стереотипи у медіа // Гендер і культура : зб. наук. праць / за ред. Н. А. Костенко. – Харків : Основа, 2017. – С. 45–58.
5. Allan, K., & Burrige, K. Forbidden Words: Taboo and the Censoring of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2006. P. 90–111.
6. Aronson, J., Steele, C. M. Stereotypes and the fragility of human competence, motivation, and self-concept. // Handbook of competence & motivation / Eds. C. Dweck, E. Elliot. – New York: Guilford, 2005. – P. 436–456.
7. Bayton J. A., McAlister L., Hamer J. Race-Class Stereotypes. The Journal of Negro Education. 1956. Vol. 25, No. 1. P. 75–78.
8. Baxter, J. Resolving a gender and language problem in women's leadership: consultancy research in workplace discourse. *Discourse and Communication*. 2017. Vol. 11, no. 2. P. 141–159.

9. Bernam, N., and White, A. Refusing the stereotype: Decoding negative gender imagery through a school-based digital media literacy program. *Youth Studies Australia* [Online]. 2013. Vol. 32, no. 4. P. 38–47.
10. Buchtel, E. E. Cultural sensitivity or cultural stereotyping? Positive and negative effects of a cultural psychology class. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2014. Vol. 39. P. 40–52.
11. Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'Brien, L. Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002. Vol. 82, no. 3. P. 359–378.
12. Carnaghi, A., & Yzerbyt, V. Y. Subtyping and social consensus: The role of the audience in the maintenance of stereotypic beliefs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2007. Vol. 37, no. 5. P. 902–922.
13. De Genova, N. The "Crisis" of the European Border Regime: Towards a Marxist Theory of Borders. *International Socialism*. 2016. No. 150. P. 31–54.
14. Diebels K. J., Czopp A. M. Complaining about a compliment?: Evaluating attributions of positive outcomes to discrimination. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*. 2011. Vol. 14. P. 217–223.
15. Fiske S. T., Cuddy A. J. C., Glick P., Xu J. A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002. Vol. 82, No. 6. P. 878–902.
16. Gerbner G., Gross L., Morgan M., Signorielli N. The “mainstreaming” of America: Violence profile no. 11. *Journal of Communication*. 1980. Vol. 30, No. 3. P. 10–29.

17. Glăveanu V. P. Stereotypes revised – Theoretical models, taxonomy and the role of stereotypes // *Europe's Journal of Psychology*. 2007. Vol. 3, No. 3. P. 1–16.
18. Glick P., Fiske S. T. The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating Hostile and Benevolent Sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 1996. Vol. 70, No. 3. P. 491–512.
19. Goffman E. *Frame analysis: An essay on the organization of experience*. New York : Harper & Row, 1974. – 586 p.
20. Hagan, J. The political economy of refugee migration: The case of Cuban migration to the United States. *Social Forces*. 2008. Vol. 87, no. 1. P. 67–84.
21. Hofstadter, R. *Social Darwinism in American Thought, 1860–1915*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 1944. P. 1–243.
22. Huntington, S. P. *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1993. P.368.
23. Karasawa, M., Asai, N., & Tanabe, Y. Stereotypes as shared beliefs: Effects of group identity on dyadic conversations. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2007. Vol. 10, no. 4. P. 515–532.
24. KhosraviNik M. The representation of refugees, asylum seekers and immigrants in British newspapers during the Balkan conflict (1999) and the British general election (2005). *Discourse & Society*. 2009. Vol. 20, No. 4. P. 477–498.
25. King, T. *The inconvenient Indian illustrated: A curious account of native people in North America*. Doubleday Canada. 2017.
26. Lee M., McCauley C., Jussim L. Stereotypes and stereotyping: A social psychological perspective // *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2013. Vol. 4, No. 3. P. 292–299.

27. Lippi K., McKay F. H., McKenzie H. J. Representations of refugees and asylum seekers during the 2013 federal election. *Journalism*. 2020. Vol. 21, No. 11. P. 1611–1629.
28. Malkki, L. Speechless emissaries: Refugees, humanitarianism, and dehistoricization. *Cultural Anthropology*. 1996. Vol. 11, no. 3. P. 377–404.
29. Moore, K., Gross, B., & Threadgold, T. Migrations and the Media. *COMPAS, The Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford*. 2012. P. 41–80.
30. Nguyen, M., & Fung, C. Refugee humanism: Race, humanitarianism, and the affective politics of sanctuary. In: Nguyen, M., & Fung, C. (eds.). *Refugee Cultures: Forty Years of Vietnamese Refugee Representation*. Springer. 2022. P. 1–24.
31. Polybius. *The Rise of the Roman Empire*. 1889. Book 6, chapter 4, P. 41–45.
32. Said E. W. *Orientalism*. New York : Pantheon Books, 1978. – 368 p.
33. Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., and Hamilton, H. (eds.). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell. 2001. P. 273, 416.
34. Stephens, K. Cultural stereotyping and intercultural communication: Working with students from the People’s Republic of China in the UK. *Language and Education*. 1997. Vol. 11, no. 2. P. 113–124.
35. Teo P. Racism in the News: A Critical Discourse Analysis of News Reporting in Two Australian Newspapers. *Discourse and Society*. 2000. Vol. 11, No. 1. P. 7–49.
36. van Dijk, T. A. *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. London: SAGE. 1998. P. 374.
37. van Dijk, T. A. New(s) Racism: A Discourse Analytical Approach. In: Cottle, S. (ed.). *Ethnic Minorities and the Media*. Philadelphia: Open University Press. 2000. P. 33–49.

- 38.van Dijk, T. A. Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*. 1993. Vol. 4, no. 2. P. 249–283.
- 39.van Dijk, T. *Racism and the Press*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. 1991. P. 92.
- 40.van Leeuwen T. *Discourse and Practice: New Tools for Critical Discourse Analysis*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 2008. – 288 p.
- 41.van Leeuwen T. The Representation of Social Actors. In: Caldas-Coulthard C. R., Coulthard M. (eds.). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London : Routledge, 1996. P. 32–70.
- 42.Wodak R. *Feminist Critical Discourse Analysis: New Perspectives for Interdisciplinary Gender Studies*. Symposium on CDA: Feminist CDA and Interdisciplinary; Rightwing Populism Local Answers to Global Issues, Athens, 2005. – 25 p.

#### ELECTRONIC SOURCES

- 43.134,200 Ukrainian refugees have arrived in the UK – now what? *The Telegraph*. 2022. URL:  
<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/10/11/council-said-had-make-homeless-what-next-ukrainian-refugees/>
- 44.Anti-Black racism is upending easy narratives about the historic exodus from Ukraine. *The Washington Post*. 2022. URL:  
<https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2022/03/03/anti-black-racism-is-upending-easy-narratives-about-historic-exodus-ukraine/>

45. At Denmark's 'Boundless Kitchen,' Refugees Cook Food from Their Home Country. *Condé Nast Traveler*. URL: <https://www.cntraveler.com/story/at-denmarks-boundless-kitchen-refugees-cook-food-from-their-home-country>
46. Bravo Labour, you've just made two crises worse. *The Times*. 2025. URL: <https://www.thetimes.com/comment/columnists/article/bravo-labour-youve-just-made-two-crises-worse-rggqcrdhs>
47. "Britain to allow more than 200,000 Ukrainian refugees to come to the UK." *The Telegraph*. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/world-news/2022/03/01/britain-allow-200000-ukrainian-refugees-come-uk/>
48. Criminal convictions for EU migrants leap by 40% in five years: 700 found guilty every week in the UK. *Daily Mail*. URL: <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3450323/Criminal-convictions-EU-migrants-leap-40-five-years-700-guilty-week-UK-20-000-foreign-criminals-deported.html>
49. Economy needs immigrants, but border politics get in the way. *The Washington Post*. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2024/02/27/economy-immigration-border-biden/>
50. Europe's contrasting responses to Ukraine refugee crisis prompt criticism. *The Independent*. 2022. URL: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/ukraine-refugees-response-europe-racist-b2024840.html>
51. Europe's immigration crisis: A clash of civilizations. *The Trumpet*. URL: <https://www.thetrumpet.com/13089-europes-immigration-crisis-a-clash-of-civilizations>

52. Fleeing the War, a Ukrainian Comes to Brooklyn. *The New Yorker*. URL: <https://www.newyorker.com/news/news-desk/fleeing-the-war-a-ukrainian-comes-to-brooklyn>
53. Foreign students fleeing Ukraine say they face segregation, racism at border. *CNN*. 2022. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/02/28/europe/students-allege-racism-ukraine-cmd-intl/index.html>
54. Hedgehogs to parrots: Ukrainian refugees brought over 2,000 pets to the UK this year. *The Telegraph*. 2022. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2022/12/27/hedgehogs-parrots-ukrainian-refugees-took-2000-pets-uk-year/>
55. How the government endangers British lives. *The Spectator*. 2003. URL: <https://archive.spectator.co.uk/article/25th-january-2003/12/how-the-government-endangers-british-lives>
56. Iron Man *sweet.tv*. 2025. URL: <https://sweet.tv/movie/17015-zalizna-lyudina>
57. Japan opens its doors to Ukrainians. *The Washington Post*. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/03/19/japan-ukraine-refugees/>
58. Labour once sought an ethical foreign policy. That should be the guiding star in tackling the refugee crisis. *The Guardian*. 2024. URL: <https://amp.theguardian.com/global-development/2024/sep/21/labour-ethical-foreign-policy-migration-refugee-crisis-italy-keir-starmer>
59. Labour's asylum policy demonises male migrants, but women and children pay the price. *The Guardian*. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/article/2024/jul/31/labour-britain-asylum-policy-demonisation-male-migrants-women-children>
60. Millions of Ukrainian refugees may stay in E.U., top official says. *The Washington Post*. 2022. URL:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/06/06/ukrainian-refugees-european-union-eu/>

61. Migrant children face 'intimidation and racism' in UK schools. *BBC News*.

URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/av/uk-28860092>

62. Mystery of the imported plagues. *Mail on Sunday*. URL:

<https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1125209/>

63. "NATO was founded to protect 'civilized' people. That means White." *The Washington Post*. URL:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/11/nato-ukraine-refugees-whiteness/>

64. Nearly 800 illegal immigrants arrested in massive Florida ICE raid. *The New York Post*. URL:

<https://nypost.com/2025/04/26/us-news/nearly-800-illegal-immigrants-arrested-in-massive-florida-ice-raid/>

65. Nigerian student in Ukraine: 'They said black people should walk'. *BBC News*. 2022. URL:

<https://www.bbc.com/news/av/world-africa-60573719>

66. Paris 2024: 'Resistance' is the shared history of refugee athletes. *Le Monde*.

URL: [https://www.lemonde.fr/en/sports/article/2024/07/23/paris-2024-resistance-is-the-shared-history-of-refugee-athletes\\_6695497\\_9.html](https://www.lemonde.fr/en/sports/article/2024/07/23/paris-2024-resistance-is-the-shared-history-of-refugee-athletes_6695497_9.html)

67. 'People are very welcoming': asylum seekers find support in Irish town – photo essay. *The Guardian*. 2024. URL:

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2024/dec/02/asylum-seekers-refugees-courtown-ireland-photo-essay>

68. People of colour fleeing Ukraine attacked by Polish nationalists. *The Guardian*. URL:

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2022/mar/02/people-of-colour-fleeing-ukraine-attacked-by-polish-nationalists>

69. People-smuggling gangs ‘trying to exploit’ Keir Starmer’s global summit. *The Guardian*. 2025. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/mar/31/people-smuggling-gangs-keir-starmer-global-summit>
70. ‘Poisoning the blood’: Trump’s ugliest moments on immigrants. *The Washington Post*. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2023/12/18/poisoning-blood-trumps-ugliest-moments-immigrants/>
71. Portraits challenge negative stereotypes around refugees. *Positive News*. URL: <https://www.positive.news/society/portraits-challenge-negative-stereotypes-around-refugees/>
72. Refugees from Ukraine and Afghanistan treated differently, charity warns. *BBC News*. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-wiltshire-62334985>
73. Resettling Ukrainian Refugees: The Challenge for Europe and The United States. *The New Republic*. URL: <https://newrepublic.com/article/165670/ukraine-refugee-resettlement-us-immigration>
74. Seeking asylum and work, migrants bused from N.Y. find hostility. *Los Angeles Times*. URL: <https://www.latimes.com/world-nation/story/2023-05-24/seeking-asylum-and-work-migrants-bused-out-of-nyc-find-hostility>
75. Shades of ‘whiteness’: immigration and the role of British newspapers before the EU referendum. *openDemocracy*. 2018. URL: <https://www.opendemocracy.net/en/shades-of-whiteness-immigration-and-role-of-british-newspapers-before-eu-referendu/>
76. Suddenly welcoming, Europe opens the door to refugees fleeing Ukraine. *The Washington Post*. 2022. URL:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/02/28/ukraine-refugees-europe/>

77. Suella Braverman warns illegal migrants they're not welcome in Britain as she joins Greek coastguards on front line. *The Sun*. URL:

<https://www.thesun.co.uk/news/20281500/suella-braverman-invasion-coast-illegal-migrants/>

78. The EU pays Africa's brutal militias to lock up migrants. Britain wants to follow suit. *The Guardian*. 2023. URL:

<https://amp.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2023/jun/04/eu-pays-africas-brutal-militias-to-lock-up-migrants-britain-wants-to-follow-suit>

79. "The farmer, the dishwasher and the performance artist: how war forced career changes on Ukrainian refugees." *The Guardian*. URL:

<https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2023/dec/29/ukraine-war-refugees-forced-career-changes>

80. They fled Ukraine to protect their children. Now these mothers are returning home. *CNN*. 2022. URL:

<https://edition.cnn.com/2022/04/30/europe/ukraine-lviv-women-children-refugees-return-home-cmd-intl/index.html>

81. "This was their home too": Frankie Mills's intimate portraits of Ukrainian refugees in the UK. *The Guardian*. URL:

<https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2024/mar/03/frankie-mills-portraits-ukrainian-refugees-in-uk-good-evening-we-are-from-ukraine>

82. UK's £3.5bn bill on public services for migrants on benefits. *The Times*.

URL: <https://www.thetimes.com/uk/politics/article/uks-35bn-bill-on-public-services-for-migrants-on-benefits-9jnmbxg95>

83. Ukraine war: Refugees in Canterbury mark independence day. *BBC News*.

2022. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-kent-62664619>

84. Ukrainian refugees face losing jobs over visa rules. *The Telegraph*. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/01/15/ukrainian-refugees-face-losing-jobs-over-visa-rules/>
85. Ukrainian refugees will turbocharge the economy of any country wise enough to accept them. *CEPR*. URL: <https://cepr.org/voxeu/columns/how-ukrainian-migrants-affect-economies-european-countries>
86. Ukraine invasion: Charities urge UK to welcome thousands of refugees. *BBC News*. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-60518801>
87. "Ukraine war: Not every refugee at the Polish border is ready to find a new home – some already want to go back." *Sky News*. URL: <https://news.sky.com/story/ukraine-war-refugees-at-polish-border-weigh-up-returning-to-devastated-homes-after-leaving-family-behind-12570296>
88. We are more than refugees. We are human beings with human stories. *The Washington Post*. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/gender-identity/we-are-more-than-refugees-we-are-human-beings-with-human-stories/>
89. Why do some people hate the EU? *BBC News*. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/blogs-eu-34091417>

### **Dictionaries**

90. Бусел В.Т. Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови. Київ; Ірпінь : Перун, 2005. VIII, 1728 с.
91. Гром'як Р.Т., Ковалів Ю.І. Літературознавчий словник-довідник Київ : «Академія», 2006. 752 с.

- 92.Словник української мови : в 11 тт. / редкол. : І. К. Білодід (голова) та ін.– К. : Наукова думка, 1970-1980. – Т. I-XI. 58. Українська радянська енциклопедія / гол. ред.appendi
- 93.Collins Online Dictionary. URL: <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/>
- 94.Concise Cambridge Dictionary. URL: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/>

## APPENDICES

Appendix 1. A protestor in Los Angeles on Friday. Multiple brands have incorporated “#BlackLivesMatter” into their social media accounts. *The New York Times* URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/31/business/media/companies-marketing-black-lives-matter-george-floyd.html>



Appendix 2. At Denmark's "boundless kitchen" refugees cook food from their home country. URL: <https://www.cntraveler.com/story/at-denmarks-boundless-kitchen-refugees-cook-food-from-their-home-country>



Appendix 3 Ukrainians wait to enter Poland, which has accepted 1.18 million refugees. *The Washington Post*. URL:

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr\\_7\\_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr_7_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a)





Appendix 4. Ukrainians are fleeing Ukraine as a full-scale Russian invasion begins. *The Washington Post*. URL:

[https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr\\_7\\_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr_7_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a)



Appendix 5. Ukrainians wait in a miles-long line at a border crossing in Shehyni en route to Medyka, Poland, on Feb. 25. *The Washington Post*. URL: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr\\_7\\_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/interactive/2022/ukraine-refugees-european-union/?itid=sr_7_ad88a576-1c54-43d1-9a7f-ad34ff9b820a)





Appendix 6. Liudmyla Sobchenko, 28, and her son Nazar, 3. CNN. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2022/04/30/europe/ukraine-lviv-women-children-refugees-return-home-cmd-intl/index.html>



Appendix 7. African residents in Ukraine wait on a platform inside Lviv railway station on Feb. 27, 2022. The Washington Post. URL: <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2022/04/11/nato-ukraine-refugees-whiteness/>



Appendix 8. Ukraine war: Refugees in Canterbury mark independence day.  
BBC News. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-england-kent-62664619>



Appendix 9. Ukrainian refugees face losing their jobs over visa rules. The crowd holding signs emphasizes the collective action aspect. *The Telegraph*. URL: <https://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/2025/01/15/ukrainian-refugees-face-losing-jobs-over-visa-rules/>



Appendix 10. Demonstrators protesting the Russian invasion of Ukraine march. *The Washington Post*. URL:

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/2022/03/19/japan-ukraine-refugees/>

