Security, media and multicultural citizenship: a collaborative ethnography

Gillespie, Marie

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:
Gillespie, M. (2007). Security, media and multicultural citizenship: a collaborative ethnography. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *10*(3), 275-293. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549407080731

EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF cultural studies

Vol 10(3) 275–293; 1367-5494
DOI: 10.1177/1367549407080731
www.sagepublications.com

Security, media and multicultural citizenship

A collaborative ethnography

Marie Gillespie
Open University

ABSTRACT This special issue reports on a collaborative UK research project which examined how new security challenges are constituted in the intersecting relationships between political and military actors, news producers, news representations and discourses, and news audiences. This article introduces the ethnographic reports which follow, and describes the theoretical premises and methodological strategies of the research. It outlines an innovative, multi-disciplinary methodology – 'Integrated Multidisciplinary Media Analysis' – which integrates Collaborative Media Ethnography (a novel method in itself) with institutional and textual analysis. This combination of mutually informing approaches affords unique insights into social and cultural processes. The research process began with explorations of how public knowledge and understanding of security issues relate to and are shaped by everyday cultures of media practice, the subject of the following reports. Combined with the findings of researchers investigating the perceptions and working practices of security-policy and media professionals, and others working on the textual analysis of salient news broadcasts, our study reaches three main conclusions. First, that ritualized interactions between policymakers, journalists and 'citizen audiences' constitute the media–security nexus as a 'battlespace' of mutual disrespect and suspicion. Second, that this exacerbates the marginalization and racialization of many ethnic minority groups but in particular British Muslims, who face declining prospects for multicultural citizenship. Third, that security policymakers must struggle to find public legitimacy in view of the growing scepticism and hostility of national and diasporic news media and audiences.

KEYWORDS *citizenship, collaborative ethnography, Iraq War 2003, multiculturalism, news media cultures, racialization, security, 'War on Terror'*

Introduction

Our research project 'Shifting Securities: News Cultures before and after the Iraq War 2003' formed part of a research programme funded by the UK's Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC) on the theme

New Challenges to Security (ESRC award number 223–25–0063. Full project details can be found at www.mediatingsecurity.com.) The 'Shifting Securities' project built upon previous analysis of news coverage of the 11 September 2001 attacks in the USA, and reception of the coverage among transnational audiences in the UK in the three months following these events (Gillespie, 2006a; OFCOM, 2002). That snapshot study was extended in this project, which tracked 'shifting securities' among diverse audience groups over 35 months (April 2004 to March 2007) while investigating textual and institutional dimensions of media production.

This article introduces selected reports by ethnographic researchers on the articulations of security issues, media uses and perceptions, and related social, cultural and political concerns among diverse audiences in the UK, particularly minority ethnic and religious groups. The focus of this article is on the methodological and theoretical underpinnings of the research.

A key aim of the study was to pioneer Integrated Multidisciplinary Media Analysis (IMMA) as an empirical approach to the study of mediated political and policy communication, using an integrated methodological design which articulates analyses of media production, media texts and media reception. The events and issues addressed here – the intersections of national, international, local and global security policy and its impacts; questions of political authority and legitimacy, citizenship, social cohesion, cultural diversity and integration – are of great and wide interest. For us as researchers, however, the theoretical and practical integration of a multidisciplinary method, applicable in principle to any topic of politics and public affairs, has been of paramount significance. How research is conducted must be connected to what the research finds.

Three research teams ('Strands') worked to a co-ordinated timetable, regularly updating one another on research findings and re-calibrating approaches to maximize consistency and mutual illumination. *Strand A* developed the methodology of 'collaborative media ethnography' pioneered in the 11 September project. A mix of interviews and participant observation enabled us to examine diverse groups' cultures of news media practice in depth and detail, over time and across places. The initial aim was to analyse the impact of the Iraq War 2003 on concepts and perceptions of security in UK civil society, in the context of the increasing diversity of national and transnational news sources and audiences, and growing concerns about social cohesion and multicultural citizenship. Ethnography (as distinct from interview methods) lets us track differences between what people say and what they do, and gives clues as to why they might speak and act as they do. The majority of interviewees were known to interviewers from previous qualitative social research projects and/or other social relations; researchers deployed a variety of methods to elicit spontaneous, self-revealing speech and to observe everyday media practices. Between September 2004 and March 2007, semi-structured (individual and group) interviews, of up to two hours, were carried out with 239 people in cities

across the UK and the Republic of Ireland. We gathered much comparative data across time – many people were interviewed several times, e.g. both before and after the London bombings of 7 July 2005 – as well as across different places and social spaces. Interviews were mainly conducted in English but sometimes in two or even three languages (Arabic, Urdu, Punjabi, Hindi, Sylheti, Bengali, French). Interview data was supplemented with co-viewing and observational data (see reports and preliminary analyses on website). At several points in the course of the research, images (still and moving) were used to prompt responses and to test hypotheses about the relative significance of images over verbal or written narratives of events in shaping responses. These images were selected on the basis of input from Strands B and C.

Strand B conducted textual and discourse analysis of news programmes. It examined the content of mainstream (English-language) television and internet news coverage of selected, 'security-salient' news events, and analysed patterns in the framing of post-Cold War discourses of national and international as well as social and environmental security (Hoskins and O'Loughlin, 2007).

Strand C conducted interviews and focus groups with security and media professionals, in order to draw out their understandings of their roles in the development, execution, media management and reporting of security policy; hence, to examine the actual and perceived influence of security practitioners (including military personnel as well as diverse 'experts') on the content of news programmes and on the securing of public legitimacy for security policy; and, as it emerged, their perceptions of the danger to the lives of military personnel ensuing from negative reporting (Michalski and Gow, 2007).

Findings from each of the three strands of research fed into the others on an ongoing, co-ordinated basis via virtual and 'real-life' project meetings, website postings and emails. When Strand A researchers noted that 'citizen audience' groups were disturbed by a certain feature of coverage, or when Strand C researchers noted that security professionals were concerned that certain images carried messages which threatened the legitimacy of their policies, other researchers were asked to explore these points. Likewise Strand B researchers asked the ethnographers to test hypotheses concerning relations between news presentation formats and perceptions of security issues. An example of such mutual agenda-shaping is presented in the 'Integrated Multidisciplinary Media Analysis: case study' subsection below.

This special issue of *EJCS* presents reports from Strand A. The majority of Strand A interviewees are members of ethnic minorities in the UK, and most are Muslims. However, the study was events-led, not structured around ethnicity. Ethnicity, politics, security, culture and citizenship were not treated as *a priori* concepts. Rather, the aim was to see how particular events activated and mobilized these categories and to assess their dynamic interplay in people's talk.

The second part of this introduction ('Theoretical framings') presents theoretical issues. It argues that legitimacy is the crucial concept for understanding and assessing the mediated relationships between policymakers and publics, and the health or otherwise of democratic processes of deliberation and participatory citizenship in multicultural societies. 'Top-down', governmentality and security policy-oriented approaches can and should be combined with 'bottom-up', socially based, culturally informed, constructionist approaches to the everyday politics of security. Anthropological and Cultural Studies approaches have much to offer Security Studies in Politics and International Relations. Some of the most general findings of the project are also outlined here. The third part ('Methodology: collaborative media ethnography within IMMA') addresses methodological issues in more detail, in particular, issues relating to our sample and the social profile of our interlocutors. The fourth part ('The articles') introduces the individual articles which follow.

Theoretical framings

Security, democracy and citizenship: a governmentality perspective

The decision by the USA and UK governments to go to war on Iraq in 2003 created deep rifts in public opinion across the world. In the UK it ruptured long-established relationships between politicians, journalists and publics. One million protesters in London on 15 February 2003 – one of the biggest demonstrations ever to take place in the UK – did not dissuade Prime Minister Blair and President Bush from their chosen course. The implications of our findings for political legitimacy are discussed in detail elsewhere (Gillespie, 2006b).

Governments depend on public trust, but for the UK government trust is in increasingly short supply, not least because of the way it presented the case for war and the disastrous consequences since for the people of Iraq and for global security (Gow, 2005; Power Commission, 2006). The fragile legitimacy of the Iraq War has exposed some of the inherent weaknesses of security policies generated by the USA/UK-declared 'global war on terror' following 9/11. Contrary to widespread assumptions, 9/11 did not radically change the rationale of security policy but accelerated the adoption of a new, preventative paradigm which had been emerging during the 1990s. Transnational security threats such as terrorism, pandemics and environmental catastrophe, alongside patterns of global migration, had triggered new paradigms of governance based on attempts to regulate risky flows – flows of migrants, microbes, (dirty) money and (nuclear) materials (Bauman, 2000, 2006; Cooper, 2006; Sassen, 2006). This altered the calculus of risk for governments: from a measurable, probabilistic conception of risk to notions of catastrophic risk in which unknown threats emerge in unforeseeable ways. In the face of global

warming, terrorism, health pandemics and financial contagion, a new generation of policies was adopted, based on principles of prevention, precaution and pre-emption.

This new conception of risk and an ever-expanding conception of security have served the interests of governments and media, though their disadvantages have by now become apparent. Governments increasingly 'sell' security as a virtual commodity to citizens, although in the UK at least this strategy has only led to growing scepticism and cynicism. Likewise, the 24/7 media industry requires constantly renewed threats, risks and insecurities to sustain itself. But its credibility is equally in doubt as sensational images appear to drive the news agenda, immediacy rules over content, 'breaking rumour' and speculation replace facts and evidence, and the F3 formula prevails: 'first, fastest but flawed' (Gowing, 2003).

It would be a mistake to dismiss the seriousness of real threats and risks. Governments have to respond to them: their first duty is to ensure the security of their citizens. The mounting concern about unpredictable, unquantifiable and potentially catastrophic risks is well known (Beck, 1992, 1999, 2002; Taylor-Gooby and Zinn, 2005). Environmental, economic, terrorist and other risks are both interconnected and also forever 'emergent', requiring a state of alertness and vigilance from politicians, media and publics. National, political, social and economic infrastructures are recognized to be too complex and fragile to be protected in the face of unexpected disruption. The result is a permanent 'war against contingency' (Dillon, 2007: 14).

Wars today must play much more by the rules of politics, markets and media: 'warmaking must *capitalize* on market relations, *exploit* democratic political forms, and *manage* independent media. [...] The best way of characterizing the new mode of war as a whole is therefore *global surveillance warfare*' (Shaw, 2005: 55–6 [original emphasis]). As this global surveillance turns war and terrorism into media spectacle, and audiences into spectators of mass civilian deaths, what becomes of informed citizen participation in deliberative democratic communicative processes?

Governmentality perspectives are useful in highlighting the operations of political power and shifts in the strategic goals of security policy. Our IMMA research approach demonstrates how news media reinforce this new calculus of risk and threat. The discourse and textual analysis strand of our project (Strand B) found two kinds of logic within media production which reflect the new logic of security, and of emergence and catastrophic risk. First, what Hoskins and O'Loughlin (2007) call the 'modulation of terror' contains fear and amplifies threats. Breaking news stories are accommodated into pre-existing narratives by deploying media 'templates' from past events: for example, reporting of the July 7 London bombings repeatedly invoked the 'spirit of the Blitz' – the legendary courage of Londoners during German bombardment in the Second World War. Such templates frame sudden, unexpected events to render them intelligible

for journalists and audiences alike. Yet if this contains fears, television news also amplifies threats, for instance through the televisual qualities of rolling 24/7 news broadcasts. The split screens, juxtaposition of multiple stories, scrolling headlines and rapid cuts produce a sense of a world of interconnected insecurities. The contradictory dynamic of this 'modulation of terror' by news producers is matched by Strand A's findings about how audiences manage anxieties, often triggered by news media, that feed into a sense of proliferating insecurities. Crucially, audiences modulate their own news viewing by turning off and disengaging, then turning on and re-engaging. Contrary to much current comment and research, the citizens and audiences we worked with are far from disengaged from the political process. But the psychic and social demands of managing insecurity mean their engagements are fluid, fluctuating and contingent.

A second media logic amplifying notions of emergence and catastrophic risk is the interacting logic of *re*mediation and *pre*mediation (Grusin, 2004). Remediation involves reproducing and re-appropriating news materials from diverse news sources to create a report. A salient example is the increasing use of Al Jazeera footage or web images on European news media. Most European news viewers have never watched this Arabic channel, but the remediation of its images of terrorism and the words of terrorists sustains the sense of prevailing threat and effectively associates it as a channel 'for' terrorism. Premediation, in contrast, does not repeat but anticipates and speculates about future risks and threats before they have happened. In this way, today's 24/7 news media are constantly vigilant, keeping public fears alive. Speculative discursive chains connect the 'threats' of migration and diversity, terrorism, terrorists and 'their' media. This chain of associations simplifies issues and polarizes people. In particular, it reinforces a sense of a 'clash of civilizations' and presents a Muslim/non-Muslim division as a threat to the nation, to 'Europe' and to 'the West'. It projects an unending future of insecurities, sustaining the governmental logic of precautionary pre-emption. However, useful as it is, such a top-down analysis from a governmentality perspective needs to be accompanied by empirically-based analysis from a constructionist perspective, that emphasizes processes of securitization.

Mediation, securitization, racialization: a constructivist perspective

The 'Shifting Securities' project attempts to research news audiences *as* publics: that is, to examine whether and how citizens' media practices, and responses to mediated political discourses, enable or impede political participation, democratic debate, and inclusive and respectful multicultural citizenship. Our focus is on the inter-subjective and dialogic processes of mediated communication through which the everyday politics of fear and insecurity are negotiated, contested and enacted by citizens. Ethnographic and constructivist approaches afford people (as audiences and publics,

viewers and citizens) agency with capacities, competences and capabilities – crucially with 'voice' – in ways that governmentality approaches do not. And voice and viewpoint, inclusion and exclusion, are fundamental to the deliberative and legitimating processes that take place via the media.

News 'audiences' are not identical with 'publics' but they do overlap. The terms are associated with different orientations (entertainment or distraction for an audience; information and education for a public), and they have different disciplinary homes (sociology versus politics). They are equally slippery concepts and hard to pin down empirically, especially as media technologies, texts, contexts of reception, and patterns of media use multiply and diversify. News audiences are increasingly hard to define and study, while the concept of a public can connote anything from a shared understanding of the world or a common identity, to a claim to inclusiveness or a consensus about collective interests (Livingstone, 2005). In researching 'news cultures' and media practices we hope to bridge the divide. News cultures and political cultures are mutually constitutive: they interact in symbiotic fashion. It is very rarely possible to disentangle 'effects' of news media from prior convictions – even if many people do claim that certain news stories 'opened their eyes' or politicized them. Through using news media, people may experience membership of a public or of multiple (national and transnational) publics, if only temporarily. But they may not. Audiences are not always part of a public, for reasons which include censorship, lack of cultural or educational capital or personal preference.

The increasing array of transnational media, and growing use of the internet, makes it much harder for governments to get their policy messages across and so secure legitimacy (see Gillespie, 2006b). Conversely it is getting much easier for news audiences to forge 'micro public spheres', in which one hears and sees only what conforms to, and confirms, a pre-existing world view. Ritualistic uses of media are embedded within the 'ontological security' management strategies of audiences. This can lead to insular, rigid forms of thinking which augment an often fragile, though emphatically asserted sense of certainty and security (Aksoy, 2006). But we find also that many minority ethnic UK citizens, especially those with multilingual cultural capital, use transnational media to support highly engaged forms of political participation. Some seek out and use alternative sources of news and information, displaying highly flexible modes of reasoning and participating in multiple national and transnational public spaces of communication and socio-political action – negotiating plural forms of authority and bases of legitimacy. I refer to these multilingual, global news user-producers as 'critical cosmopolitans'. Comparing and contrasting different news sources, they construct their own narratives, which may not conform to those of politicians and journalists, PRs and 'spin' merchants, in any one country. Critical cosmopolitans participate in, and translate across multiple national, global and diasporic public spheres,

displaying intellectual curiosity, flexibility and 'world openness'. They are motivated by a concern with social justice and political change. They use news media critically, mobilising cosmopolitan cultural capital and transcultural competences to engage in collaborative political and moral judgements aimed at effecting change. In contrast, among insular parochials and passive cynics, news avoidance, social insecurity, and rigid and dogmatic modes of reasoning are more common (Gillespie, 2006a). These are but two, albeit strong, tendencies across a widely variable spectrum of response to mediated politics in our study.

As mentioned, the project was 'events-led'. The salience of security news depends on the nature of responses to 'critical events'. This is a term used by Veena Das (1995) to refer to events involving state terror and political violence that propagate social trauma and suffering, inequality and exclusion especially among marginalized minorities. Our variable and shifting senses of proximity or distance (physical, cultural and affective) to those events define their security salience. Proximity and distance to events are created (by media), imposed (by states) and negotiated (by audiences). They are not opposite ends of a spectrum but work together, creating tension and ambivalence (see Qureshi's article). Modulating complementary opposites, 'distant proximities' define our relationship to mediations of security threats (Rosenau, 2003).

The term mediation, in this context, refers to the multiple, interacting sets of relationships between news media production and consumption, within the framework of political debates, policy formation processes, and other dimensions of 'public affairs' which may or may not be 'visible' in media texts. (It is for this reason that Strand C of our project involved off-the-record interviews with personnel in the UK and US military, security services and governments.) Using the term in this way avoids thinking of given moments in the political communication process as separate and separable research domains. Mediation is an irreducibly political process: cultural and symbolic power, and the capacity to control, manage and change images and narratives, is unevenly distributed. It is notably denied to racialized minorities and those without elite educational capital. But dominant images and narratives are often resisted, re-appropriated or challenged by alternative media practices, productions and representations (Silverstone and Georgiou, 2005: 433–4). Media in multicultural polities have great power to include and exclude, marginalize or magnify, glorify or reify. Through and in media, identities are claimed, framed or denied, and securities sought or undermined. Media are crucial to public debates on questions of difference, competing rights and duties, visibility, racism, inclusion and exclusion, respect and recognition. Researching mediations of security policy and publics in multi-ethnic polities requires an integrated research design if we are to understand the subtleties and changing nature of these relationships and to judge the health and state of multicultural democracy. This is a

point to which we will soon return, and one on which all the following reports comment.

Our research suggests that 'security news' has especially high salience for racialized minorities, precisely because it implicates them as threats to security. The term 'racialized' is used to emphasize that 'race' is not a useful analytical term: it cannot explain social or cultural differences. Rather it is a social process, a way of ascribing inferior status to a group, on the basis of physical differences, resulting in discrimination, segregation and marginalization (Murji and Solomos, 2005). Since 9/11, processes of racialization and securitization (how threats are identified, constructed and treated as security issues) work hand in hand (Huysmans and Buonfino, 2005). They are bolstered by mediations: how threats are prioritized, framed and represented by the media and interpreted by audiences.

How do our interlocutors discuss and respond to these perceived dynamics? Two strong patterns of response are apparent across all our interviews, and characterize the news cultures and practices of British Muslims and other racialized minority interviewees. First, interviewees perceive the British government as 'obsessed' (a frequently used term) with maintaining high levels of public fear about the likelihood of a terrorist attack. As they see it, the UK media serve the government in this regard. Second, the media are seen as systematically demonizing Muslims, associating Islam with violence and terrorism, and representing Muslims as the 'enemy within'. This triggers deep emotional and political responses: anger, alienation, despair, a sense of hopelessness and powerlessness in local, national, transnational and global contexts. The Iraq War has deepened the sense of outrage, injury, insult and victimization that has come to define Muslim sensibilities, despite all efforts to escape this ascribed role. Facing and dealing with implicit and or explicit accusations of terrorism has become an everyday task, many interviewees explained. This quandary motivates new, politicized assertions of Muslim identity. Yet many comment that the pervasiveness and the totalizing quality of the racialization, securitization and mediation faced by Muslims in the UK trap them in a 'game' of identity politics which they can neither escape from nor win.

The second widespread pattern of response combines scepticism towards state and media discourses of threat with genuine fear. Interviewees of both dominant and minority ethnicities are highly conscious of the manipulation of the terrorist threat but they still fear that an attack might occur. Some use a minimizing template strategy, relating the current terrorist threat to previous or more immediate or proximate threats, be it IRA terror threats of the 1970s and after throughout the UK (see especially Herbert's article) or the Madrid bombings, or, most typically, such relatively 'commonplace' fears as unemployment, poverty and paedophilia (a UK-wide source of local and sometimes national panic). Most refuse to allow any fear of terrorism to impinge on their daily lives. Some younger

interviewees, however, nurse a millenarian sense of a disastrous fate awaiting the world, forge connections between global threats (the Asian tsunami, the war in Iraq, advanced military technologies) and local threats (racism, crime and poverty in the East End), and absorb terrorism into this narrative of imminent apocalypse (see Al-Ghabban's article). Such views and visions cannot be generalized, but they indicate how a paradoxical sense of threats as both constructed and real can engender responses both of powerlessness ('there's nothing we can do about it') and of pragmatism ('we've got to get on with our lives').

Most interviewees feel that they have become more insecure in recent years, and most are more afraid of the *consequences* of security policy than of terrorism. These include 'casual', everyday racism, state surveillance, arrest and detention, creeping militarism and threats to civil rights and traditions of democracy and the rule of law. With the July 7 bombing, interviewees reported, fears of terrorism intensified, only to dissipate soon after. A large proportion of racialized minorities base their fears on personal experience of stop and search, identity checks and temporary detention. Muslim women in particular report very high levels of direct, 'casual' racist aggression (name-calling, spitting, attempts to remove their hijab: see Sadaf Rivzi's article). Nearly all interviewees can recount several stories of racist abuse told by a friend or relative. Others claim indirect knowledge of racism ('heard stories'). One of our major findings is that all Muslims and most other ethnic minorities report fears of expressing themselves in public, and in the workplace, due to possible aggressive or violent response. This has led to massive self censorship, and a diminishing sense of participation in public life and of national and local belonging. This is perhaps the reason so many interviewees appreciated the opportunity to have their views taken into account.

It is not hard to see how such sentiments are linked to political and news media discourses and representations. In order to legitimate the 'war on terror', the term 'security' has come to be used in an increasingly wide set of senses and contexts, blurring many social categories and distinctions. An associative chain links minorities, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers, criminals, terrorists and enemies within. Racism and racialization flourish when threats from inside and outside are conflated. The seemingly limitless polysemy of the term 'security' reduces its analytical usefulness for researchers, but for many interviewees the connotations of insecurity, militarism, terrorism and racism have a message that rings loud and clear.

Many report a diminishing sense of security exacerbated by a feeling that the boundaries are blurring between different contexts of security: inside and outside national boundaries, public and private spaces, physical and virtual spaces, corporate and political spaces, and so on. The 'state of exception' (Agamben, 2005) brings national security policy into everyday life as a threat to personal security. One interviewee (retired,

white, middle-class male) speaks of living in a state of continual and increasing uncertainty, of 'a thousand pin-pricks of insecurity' in daily life, as long-standing, taken-for-granted assumptions are challenged by social, cultural and political changes (Gillespie, 2006b: 485). For racialized minorities living in metropolitan centres, the consequences of security policies are far reaching and unpredictable: as most of the reports show, many feel their UK citizenship and the promise of multiculturalism is fundamentally called into question by current security policy, which raises troubling questions for the future chances of living in a peaceful multicultural state.

Methodology: collaborative media ethnography within IMMA

A summary table of interviewees' social background details is provided in the appendix. The project website offers more detailed tables (see www.mediatingsecurity.com). This very broad sociological sketch must be read with caution. In due course we will analyse the quantitative alongside the qualitative data but for the purposes of this special issue this is a qualitative empirical study. Our understanding of the dynamics of identities and identifications is based on qualitative data and premised on the assumption that all social beings have multiple, overlapping axes of identifications. Particular forms of identifications may be accentuated in some contexts but recede in others. Identifications are shifting but not infinitely fluid. They are strategically mobilized in different contexts and in response to different events. No one social category (for example, ethnicity or religion) defines a person's social identity. The identification of religion as a cultural category in the context of a project on security could be highly problematic if used in a culturally deterministic way. Here, it is intended only as a very broad classification and should not be read as either determining or dominating. Some of our interviewees of white English ethnicity describe themselves as having a Christian education or background but not as 'Christian' per se. In the same way, some describe themselves as Muslim but seek to qualify that categorization in a host of ways. Some describe themselves as 'secular' or 'non-practising' and would insist that this is more of a cultural and social identification than a religious one. Others made the point, quite strongly, that their first identification is not as Muslim but, rather, they are, and would want to be known as, Bangladeshi or Somali or English or British.

Although 69 percent of our 239 interlocutors were of Muslim background, we chose not to give priority to this fact, in order to avoid deterministic and reductionist analyses. Instead we have aimed to analyse under what circumstances and in relation to which events Muslim identity came to the fore. Any exclusive focus on an individual's identity as 'Muslim' misrepresents the views of self identity expressed by our interviewees. Media representations of 'Muslims', as if this identity subsumed all others, were

a frequent source of consternation and distress. The label 'Muslim' must be read alongside other forms of identification such as age, gender, place of birth, nationality, residence and occupation, as well as in the context of huge variations in beliefs and practices.

Class is another highly problematic category. The interplay of economic, social and cultural capital is dynamic. We have documented the professional and class self-identifications of respondents, but we are reluctant to attempt to aggregate statistics where respondents have categorized themselves in diverse ways. Access to economic, educational and cultural capital may shape modes of engagement with news, but it does not determine them. The mobilization of cosmopolitan cultural capital is reflected in the ability to translate across different linguistic and cultural contexts, and to act as cultural mediators and brokers in ways which enhance communication and understanding between diverse groups.

The tables in the appendix and on our project website document interviewees' main news sources. Often these are clusters of sources with interviewees naming no outstanding trusted source. Nevertheless we have been surprised by the frequency with which UK mainstream sources (the BBC, Sky and Channel 4) recur, despite the availability of multilingual and transnational news sources. This suggests a strong desire on the part of minority ethnic and British Muslim groups to participate in public and national debate even if fear of speaking out and powerful exclusionary forces combine to encourage self-censorship and the seeking out of alternative news sources.

Each interview was recorded and transcribed, and an interview report and preliminary analysis submitted to the project website. Using a qualitative data analysis software programme (NVivo 2), all interview data was coded and categorized. The NVivo database was made available to all researchers on the project, as well as to several others. Ethnographers accessed it to compare and contrast the findings of their domestic and local studies against wider patterns and trends emerging across the study. Thus while some samples may appear to be very small, and the analyses may seem to magnify everyday micro-processes of political talk, researchers have been able to discuss and situate their findings in the wider context of the overall project. An e-discussion group enabled ongoing sharing and re-evaluation of emergent findings, as did our numerous project meetings. This kind of collaborative media ethnography remains methodologically unique, and an essential part of the kind of integrated research design (IMMA) that enables mediations, publics, policies and politics to be studied as aspects of the same complex process.

Integrated Multidisciplinary Media Analysis: case study

One example may serve to illustrate how the integrated research approach worked in practice. A Strand C focus group interview identified television presentation of a specific news story as a source of concern among UK

security and military policymakers. The story was based on images of a US marine who appeared to be shooting an Iraqi civilian in a mosque in Fallujah, filmed by NBC journalist Kevin Sites, in November 2004. The policymakers were worried that no context was given in news reports as to the type of operation or the rules of engagement. They feared that this depiction of 'cold-blooded murder' would add to the mounting negative reporting of military operations in Iraq.

Six television news presentations of the footage were then analysed by Strand B researchers. They found that all were to some extent 'sanitized', typical of war coverage in mainstream English-language media. There was indeed little contextualization of the kind sought by military policymakers. However, there was much more variation in the way the footage was presented than had been presumed by the policymakers. The images of the shooting were not simply or uniformly represented as murder.

Six clips from the footage were then shown to diverse groups of interviewees by Strand A researchers. Several interviewees expressed surprise that they had not registered this particular incident at the time of its occurrence. They agreed that this was probably because it fitted a dominant narrative news pattern of US abuse and atrocity ('we have heard so much of what goes on in Iraq of this nature'). But some found the footage shocking; even 'too graphic'. Interviewees were divided over whether it had been necessary to show the shooting but, after discussion, most judged that it was 'in the public interest' to show the whole sequence.

Strand A interviewees recognized that various 'sanitizing devices' had been used in presenting the footage, such as black screens and cutting the sound track at the moment of death. However, rather than sanitize the event, these devices were seen to dramatize consciousness of it. This perception correlated with respondents' more general views on the use of other kinds of routine sanitizing devices, such as editing out the moment of execution from terrorist beheading videos. These, too, were considered to exacerbate rather than assuage feelings of repulsion and disgust. Interviewees reported vividly imagining the scenes of violence and death underlying the blanked out screens and silences.

Some interviewees judged the incident to be an act of 'murder', based on how it was anchored, what they saw and what they thought it meant. Others problematized any easy equation between seeing and knowing and argued that contextual information might have been omitted from the report: for example, the marine's action might be justifiable because 'the guy was just about to explode a grenade'. Both representation and interpretation of events can be more varied and more critical than the military interviewees supposed. Audiences are often more reflective than professionals assume. The value of integrated research is shown here by the way in which an iterative and reflexive approach can lay the foundations for a more rounded analysis.

The articles

Karen Qureshi's article establishes themes which recur in many of our reports. She addresses questions of 'citizenship as belonging' by comparing the memories, hopes and concerns of two families living in Edinburgh: a 'white' Christian family and a Pakistani Muslim family, with similar class positions, educational and economic capital, but radically different in terms of freedom of movement and feelings of human security, as well as political awareness. 'There was a time I would have been prepared to die for this country – this is a country that has given me everything. But the way – there have been a few incidents have happened….' Masood (in his 40s) goes on to describe how an encounter with airport customs, where he was singled out and harassed, left him feeling diminished. His feelings of attachment to Britain have changed. He feels his status as a British citizen is under attack. He and his family no longer feel safe in their home. Media representations linking Muslims with terror make him ask: 'Will there come a time when we'll get sent back to Pakistan?' For the 'white' Edinburgh family up the road, however, life proceeds as normal, despite diffuse concerns about 'Britishness' being eroded by 'multiculturalism', and about the purported power of Muslims to change the Christian ethos of the country. Politically indifferent most of the time, the family feels engaged and insecure only once during the research process: when the father's workplace is temporarily besieged by anti-globalization protestors. Qureshi's article describes alarming polarizations as two similar 'quiet wee families' experience shifts in global–local power relations in vastly different ways.

Ammar Al-Ghabban, a teacher in Tower Hamlets in the East End of London, investigates how young people, mainly young women, feel about the news that comes at them from all angles in multiple languages. They come across as interested in accessing the truth, but preferring to have it transmitted to their mobile phones in bite-sized chunks. One group of young women speak of the news as apocalyptic, heralding the end of the world. Others just put bad news out of their minds. Some of the young Bangladeshi women interviewed take the threat of terror attacks much more seriously than 'white' British women with a similar class and local background. Most teenagers combine a revolted fascination with images of torture, and cynicism about what (if anything) is to be believed. Yet cynicism can feed into dogmatic thinking and beliefs and to a form of conspiracy paranoia which ignores the state (its non-legitimacy taken for granted) and focuses on the venal deceptions of media corporations.

Sadaf Rivzi's article shows how important it is to open up communicative spaces for Muslim women marginalized in political debate. The groups of women who congregated in each other's houses and chatted with Sadaf were mainly Urdu- and Punjabi-speaking housewives, spanning a wide age-range, with very different life-stories. Sadaf uses concepts provided by

her informants as analytical terms – especially the notion of *apna*, which roughly translates as 'belonging to people like us'. In this revealing and at times poignant article, the women heroically resist the researcher's well-intentioned efforts to coax them to express their views independently of those of their sons, husbands and other male relatives, to whom Rizvi is constantly being referred.

David Herbert's article shows how attitudes towards terror in Northern Ireland have been de-romanticized by the events of 9/11 and its aftermath. He emphasizes the cross-cutting legitimacy of the BBC, seen as the only reasonably reliable source of news in the UK, but also the extent to which news of terrorist events in Northern Ireland is now kept out of the UK media because it no longer suits the new security policy agenda of the British government.

Zahbia Yousuf's article, based on interviews with people in Indian households in London and Northern Ireland, makes important comparative points about plural identifications, overlapping and sometimes conflicting, between Britishness and other forms of belonging. She examines how multilayered identifications shape understandings and feelings of and towards Britishness, belonging and citizenship, and impact on judgements and perceptions of the legitimacy of state security policy.

The last two articles reflect our concern with testing experimental methodologies. Habiba Noor uses a media production simulation exercise with young Muslim women in London and New York in order to explore perceptions of international news media and local audiences, or as Noor puts it, how these young women situate themselves in relation to 'a trans-historical discourse of Muslim representation'. This forms part of Noor's larger project in which diverse research subjects constructed their own sequences of video images and scripted voiceovers regarding the Iraq war. Videos can be viewed on the project website (www.mediatingsecurity.com).

Akil Awan's report is unique in not being based on interviews. He attempts a 'virtual ethnography' of 'jihadist' sites. Many such sites, as well as their visitors, designers and servers, have been harassed as part of the war on terror. Any site which survives for a long time is deemed by virtual jihadists to be CIA-funded and thus part of a conspiracy to present radical Muslims as the main enemies of Western democracy. Awan argues that understandable feelings of frustration, fear, rage and upset regarding the sufferings of Islamic communities worldwide cannot simply be 'shut down'. Other, more violent forms of expression may become more attractive if the virtual jihadist movement is blocked. Acts of internet communication are not violent in themselves, though jihadist visual and textual contents may be. Awan doubts whether exposure to jihadist sites could ever 'turn anyone into a terrorist', but when state violence is condoned, some will deem retaliatory violence by non-state actors legitimate – violence breeds violence.

Finally, three pieces by European scholars respond to the research reports. The aim is to expand the political and intellectual resonances of this volume beyond the UK. Helen Hintjens, writing from The Hague, expresses dismay at the 'besieged' situation of minorities and the exclusionary forms of citizenship in the 'brave new Europe' as its fortress walls are drawn not just around but everywhere within. She views the articles as suggesting that citizens are increasingly objects and targets of propaganda rather than informed by news media and that declining state legitimacy cannot easily be restored.

Arnd-Michael Nohl, writing from Hamburg from a media education perspective, addresses the issue of what constitutes learning from news and the relationship between news media audiences, and the deliberative practices of publics and citizens. The study of mediated democratic engagement requires an analysis of informal as well as formal processes of deliberation and their impact. He argues that the concept of 'cultures of media practice' and of 'media-*bildung*' are useful if we are to grasp the creative and transformative potential of informal learning from news.

Finally, Werner Schiffauer, writing from Berlin, points to the troubling convergence of exclusionary state practices and policies directed at European Muslims, despite sharp distinctions in approaches to multiculturalism in the UK and Germany. This convergence, he argues, aims at an exclusionary European identity premised on a polarization between Muslims and non-Muslims. He, too, sees the reports as reflecting the increasingly precarious and provisional quality of the citizenship status of racialized minorities. Is a retreat into defensive identities and a reluctance to enter into public debate surprising in this context? No. And does this not undermine the very idea of multicultural democracy and citizenship? Sadly, our research gives us reason to think that this is the case. Yet the passion with which the new politics of security is contested offers a measure of hope for the future.

Acknowledgements

Special thanks to Dr Tom Cheesman for his editorial assistance throughout this special issue. The section on how the integrated research design worked in practice is taken directly from the final project report to the ESRC authored jointly by Marie Gillespie, James Gow and Andrew Hoskins, with assistance from Ben O'Loughlin and Ivan Zverzhanovski, to all of whom go many thanks.

Special thanks are due to Dr Ben O Loughlin for his contributions to the ethnographic strand of the project and to this article. Thanks, too, to Dr Andrew Hill and to Dr Dorle Drackle for their comments on early drafts. I would also like to thank Dr Helen M. Hintjens and Professors Arnd Michael Nohl and Werner Schiffauer for their contributions. Needless to say, this special issue would not have been possible without the commitment and energy of the researchers who conducted the research. It has not been possible to publish all their work so I would

like to thank Somnath Batabyal, Noureddine Miladi and Atif Imtiaz for their work on the project. But most of all, warm thanks to all those who participated in the study, and offered us insights into their private and public lives. It is to them that we dedicate this special issue.

References

Agamben, G. (2005) *State of Exception* (translated by K. Attell). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Aksoy, A. (2006) 'Transnational Virtues and Cool Loyalties: Responses of Turkish Speaking Migrants in London to September 11', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32(6): 923–46.

Bauman, Z. (2000) *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bauman, Z. (2006) *Liquid Fear*. Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, U. (1992) *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. London: Sage.

Beck, U. (1999) *World Risk Society*. Cambridge: Polity.

Beck, U. (2002) 'The Terrorist Threat: World Risk Society Revisited', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(4): 39–55.

Cooper, M. (2006) 'Pre-Empting Emergence: The Biological Turn in the War on Terror', *Theory, Culture and Society* 23(4): 113–35.

Das, V. (1995) *Critical Events: Anthropological Approaches to Contemporary India*. London and New Delhi: Routledge.

Dillon, M. (2007) 'Governing Terror: The State of Emergency of Biopolitical Emergence', *International Political Sociology* 1: 7–28.

Gillespie, M. (2006a) 'Transnational Television Audiences after September 11 2001', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 32(6): 903–21.

Gillespie, M. (2006b) 'Security, Media, Legitimacy: Multi-Ethnic Media Publics and the Iraq War 2003', *International Relations* 20(4): 467–86.

Gow, J. (2005) *Defending the West*. Cambridge: Polity.

Gowing, N. (2003) 'Tyranny in Real Time'. Presentation at the 8th Forum on Global Issues, Federal Foreign Office, Berlin, Germany, 20–21 February. [Accessed 16 April 2007: http://www.uni-stuttgart.de/soz/kvv/index.php?act=Attach&type=post&id=2549]

Grusin, R. (2004) 'Remediation', *Criticism* 46(1): 17–39.

Hoskins, A. and O'Loughlin, B. (2007) *Television and Terror: Conflicting Times and the Crisis of News Discourse*. London: Palgrave.

Huysmans, J. and Buonfino, A. (2005) 'The Politics of Exception and Unease: Immigration, Asylum and Insecurity in Parliamentary Debates on Terrorism in the UK'. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the British International Studies Association, University of St Andrews, 21–23 December.

Livingstone, S. (ed.) (2005) *Audiences and Publics: When Cultural Engagement Matters for the Public Sphere*. Bristol: Intellect Books.

Michalski, M. and Gow, J. (2007) *War, Image and Legitimacy: Viewing Contemporary Conflict*. London: Routledge.

Murji, K. and Solomos, J. (2005) *Racialisation: Studies in Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

OFCOM (2002) *After September 11: TV News and Transnational Audiences* (Gillespie, M. and Cheesman, T. 'Part Two: Audience Research Report')

Broadcasting Standards Commission and Independent Television Commission [now OFCOM]. [http://www.bsc.org.uk/pdfs/research/911.pdf]
Power Commission (2006) *Power to the People: The Report of Power, an Independent Report on British Democracy*. York: York Publishers. [http://www.parliament.uk/commons/lib/research/notes/snpc-03948.pdf]
Rosenau, J.N. (2003) *Distant Proximities: Dynamics Beyond Globalisation*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Sassen, S. (2006) *Territory, Authority, Rights: From Medieval to Global Assemblages*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
Shaw, M. (2005) *The New Western Way of War*. Cambridge: Polity.
Silverstone, R. and Georgiou, M. (2005) 'Editorial Introduction: Media and Minorities in Multicultural Europe', *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 31(3): 433–41.
Taylor-Gooby, P. and Zinn, J. (2005) 'Current Directions in Risk Research: Reinvigorating the Social?', *Social Contexts and Responses to Risk* (SCARR) Working Paper 2005/8. [Accessed 18 April 2007: http://www.kent.ac.uk/scarr/papers/taylor-goby&Zinn%20Wk%20Paper8.05.pdf]

Appendix

Table 1 Summary of demographic information

Total: 239 respondents

Gender	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Male	100	41.8
Female	139	58.2
Age	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
0–17	44	18.4
18–24	44	18.4
25–34	58	24.3
35–44	38	15.9
45–54	27	11.3
55–64	18	7.5
65+	10	2.4
Religion	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
Christian	36	15.1
Muslim	166	69.5
Hindu	17	7.1
Jewish	2	0.8
No religion	11	4.6
Unknown	7	2.9

(continued)

Table 1 (continued)

Place of birth if not UK	*Frequency*	*Percentage*
South Asia	57	23.8
East Asia	2	0.8
Middle East*	17	7.1
North Africa	11	4.6
Other Africa	9	3.8
Europe	6	2.5
Caribbean	1	0.4
North America	6	2.5
Northern Ireland	10	2.4
Republic of Ireland	9	3.8

*Includes Afghanistan and Turkey

Biographical note

Marie Gillespie is Professor of Sociology at the Open University. Her recent Open University teaching texts include an edited volume *Media Audiences* (2005) and a co-edited volume (with Jason Toynbee) *Analysing Media Texts* (2006). She is media research convenor at the ESRC Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (www.cresc.ac.uk/research/theme2/index.html). Recent research projects include a collaborative ethnography of the reception of media coverage of the attacks of 9/11/2001 among transnational audiences (http://afterseptember11.tv) and a multidisciplinary project (reported on here) on transnational news cultures and the politics of security (www.mediatingsecurity.com). Her most recent research is an AHRC funded project 'Tuning In: Diasporic Contact Zones at BBC World Service' (http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/diasporas/). Her publications include a monograph entitled *Television, Ethnicity and Cultural Change* (Routledge, 1995). ADDRESS: Faculty of Social Sciences, The Open University, Walton Hall, Milton Keynes MK7 6AA, UK. [email: m.gillespie@open.ac.uk]