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Abstract

Although the ‘affective turn’ in social sciences lead to a new understanding of the effects of emotions on society, the role of emotions in media remains scarcely researched. Purpose of this study is to shed light on emotions in global television news and the ways in which gendered and racialized power relations may shape, and may be shaped by, emotional practices and discourses. Precisely because emotions play a significant function in discourses of political conflict, focus here is the coverage of political dissent, specifically the coverage of the 2017 Unite the Right rally in the two global television channels CNN International and Al-Jazeera English. The study thus builds on literature on emotions and political struggles, and literature on emotions in the media, to apply the questions posed therein to the medium global television. Analyzing broadcast items, this study employs a mixed method approach that combines a quantitative content analysis with a qualitative analysis of broadcast items grounded in Teun A. van Dijk’s tradition of critical discourse analysis, within an analytical framework that privileges emotions. The findings reveal an unequal distribution of voice in the coverage of both channels, which in connection with emotion practices and discourses, establishes a marginalization of voice along the lines of race, class, and gender. Accordingly, the study gives an account of the representation of voice, race, and emotions in the coverage of the Unite the Right rally, and establishes the importance of studying emotions in media in relation to these concepts.
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1. Introduction

The world was watching on August 12th as the 2017 Unite the Right rally in Charlottesville, Virginia escalated into violent clashes between White supremacists, neo-Nazis, and anti-racism protesters. What would later be known as the largest White supremacist gathering in the US of the last decade was triggered by plans to remove a confederacy statue, and turned deadly as a White supremacist drove into a crowd of counter-protesters, injuring many and claiming the life of anti-racism activist Heather Hayer.

The violence of that day in August was foreshadowed by the images of the previous night that circulated through the media: hundreds of White supremacists and neo-Nazis marching on the campus of the University of Virginia in a torchlit procession chanting “You will not replace us”. They were scenes that evoked memories of marches of the Hitler Youth and the Ku Klux Klan, and while traditional views of journalism cast emotions as conflicting with objectivity and thus antithetical to journalism (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013), the scenes of the Unite the Right rally traveling through media defied this view: they exposed racial hatred, fear, and terror.

Although the ‘emotional’ or ‘affective turn’ in social sciences lead to a new understanding of the effects of emotions on society, most media and communication scholars have been reluctant to address the emotions surfacing in their research. However, despite the long-held views that wrongfully cast emotions as toxic to the rational and thus unsuitable for politics and journalism (Thompson and Hoggett 2012; Turner 2014; Wahl-Jorgensen 2013, 2016), emotions have never been fully divorced from public discourse. On the contrary, in this ‘new age of emotionality’ (Turner 2014: 179), — a time that is defined by emotionally charged patterns of violence, such as hate speech, racial and ethnic conflicts, and terrorism — emotions are not only a by-product of our social realities, but the running engine behind public discourse and political participation (Wahl-Jorgensen 2016).

Point of departure here is an understanding of emotions as a political resource, which renders the separation of public discourse and emotion both an unattainable goal and not desirable. Moreover, it highlights the significance of emotions in political struggle and dissent. Accepting the role of emotions in public discourse then means rethinking the traditional understanding of journalism, and researching media in a way that allows us to understand how emotions function in the media landscape.

1 Following a line of critical race theorists, this study capitalizes White as well as Black when referring to race.

Addressing these complexities, this study focuses on two global television news channels — CNN International (CNNI) and Al-Jazeera English (AJE) and their coverage of the 2017 Unite the Right rally. Television is understood as a medium that is particularly relevant in regard to emotions, as researchers from a variety of theoretical disciplines, inspired by Marshall McLuhan’s ideas (1964), have argued that the combination of audio and visual narratives interacts with human senses in a unique way (Cho et al 2010: 310). Yet despite a few notable exceptions (e.g. Unz 2011, Pantti 2010, Cho et al 2010, ) the role of emotions in television, and especially the role of emotions in television news, is scarcely researched.

Consequently, this study builds on literature on emotions and protest (e.g. Jasper 1998, 2014; Thompson and Hoggett 2012) and literature on emotions in the media (e.g. Wahl-Jorgensen 2013, 2017) to apply the questions posed therein to the medium global television and the Charlottesville coverage. Global media are of specific relevance in this context, as the events in Charlottesville served as a catalyst for the growing extreme-right groups across the world and must be understood against the backdrop of a recent global upsurge in racial violence (Davey and Ebner 2017).

Furthermore, as media are not only a tool for visibility, but also actors themselves in shaping those very power dynamics they are reporting on, questions of representation and voice are paramount. Considering the criticism by Black academics (e.g. Lewis 2016), who suggest that television projects a fabled era of post-racialism, the question what roles media play in covering race-related protest is particularly urgent. Acknowledging the history of news coverage of race-related protests that cast Black protesters into stereotypical roles (Gray 1997) it follows that the long-standing criticism that tv networks commonly operate under the ‘conditions of Whiteness’ (ibid.) is not only reflected in television newsroom culture — in which marginalized journalists are expected to ‘dye their voice universal’ (Trinh 1989) — but also relates to the news coverage itself, as newsroom culture and management shape the coverage of their channel. Therefore, studies that examine the content of news production are crucial to complement newsroom studies. Furthermore, as these criticisms are related to US news networks, it is necessary to broaden the scope of this research and investigate global television channels in connection to these global issues.

Following Nancy Fraser’s theory of justice in a globalizing world (Fraser 2010), representation in global media is here understood as a fundamental precondition of social equality. Consequently, AJE and CNNI are relevant cases for this study, as AJE prides itself to ‘give a voice to the voiceless’, while CNNI is local to the events and Charlottesville and thus local to the contemporary racial tension in the country.

Moreover, acknowledging that representation needs to go in tandem with ‘having a voice’, this study builds on Nick Couldry’s conceptualization of voice. Although voice has traditionally been regarded
as purely rational in scholarly discourse, this study considers emotional expression as inherent to voice. In doing so, this study employs a mixed methods approach of quantitative content analysis and a qualitative analysis of broadcast items grounded in Teun A. van Dijk's tradition of critical discourse analysis. Broadcast items are examined within an analytical framework that privileges emotions, to shed light on the role of emotions in global television news and the ways in which gendered and racialized power relations may shape, and may be shaped by, emotional practices and discourses. Specifically Karin Wahl-Jorgensen's (2013) concept of the 'strategic ritual of emotionality' — which suggests that journalism relies heavily on a regimented use of emotionality through explicit expression and elicitation of emotion — is used to explore the use of emotions in the coverage of both channels.

While Wahl-Jorgensen stresses that it is relevant to consider ‘which emotions do gain purchase in the public sphere, why and with what consequence’ (Wahl-Jorgensen 2017: 06), this study argues that these questions must be approached under the consideration of social hierarchies, and asks if the way we evaluate emotional expressions is not only dependent on the emotion itself but also on who is displaying it. Who is ‘allowed’ to show expressions of emotions, and what kind, what is palatable and what is not, are therefore signifiers of social power structures.

Finally, to explore different sides of representation, the study differentiates between three kinds of actors: speaking actors, crowd actors and crowds. Underlying this pursuit is the question if television narratives make use of crowd actors, by isolating specific individuals within the crowd through framing and giving them a representative function.

In summary, this study gives an account of the representation of voice, race and emotions of the Charlottesville coverage in the two global television channels AJE and CNNI, positioning questions of representation and voice in the context of global media. It does not only address a traditionally overlooked object of study — emotions in journalism — but centers it in connection to race. An intersection that has been largely overlooked in empirical research and under-theorized in media and communication literature.
2. Research Aim and Questions

By analyzing how expressions of dissent and tensions over racial inequality are portrayed, this study explores the role of emotions and its connection to racial power dynamics in the coverage of the 2017 Unite the Right rally of the two global television channels CNNI and AJE.

Both channels are rooted in two different newsrooms with different profiles: CNNI represents an US-American perspective while AJE, although financed by Qatar, is not known for a Qatar perspective but prides itself to ‘give a voice to the voiceless’ (Figenschou 2010). Through a comparative analysis of their coverage, the aim of this study is to shed light on the role of emotions in global television news and the ways in which gendered and racialized power relations may shape, and may be shaped by, emotional practices and discourses.

In order to contribute to the research on emotions in television news, a methodology to map the emotional expressions of tv news actors will be developed. The study addresses the following questions to achieve this aim:

RQ1: What similarities and differences can be identified in the coverage of the two channels CNNI and AJE of the 2017 Unite the Right rally regarding the actors involved and who is given a voice in the coverage?

This question is posed in order to analyze expressions of dissent and tensions over racial inequality in connection to representation and voice, while RQ2 connects to the role of emotions in the coverage.

RQ2: What part, if any, does the ‘strategic ritual of emotionality’ play in the coverage of the two channels? Who expresses emotions and what kind? How is it expressed, and what role does emotional expression play in the discourse?

It should be noted here that while this study uses the concept of ‘voice’ alongside the notion of emotional expression, it does not consider the two as separate processes, but understands emotional expression as part of ‘having a voice’. However, to explicitly address emotional expression, the concepts are used distinctly. This matter is addressed in detail in section 3.2.1.

In order to answer the first RQ a quantitative analysis of the two broadcasts will be employed.

---

3 The term global television is used to signify the global reach of the channels in focus. While the decision to use the term ‘global’ is not unproblematic (What is truly global? How to separate global outlook from global culture (Berglez 2008)? Does the term encourage a simplistic view of media under globalization that implies communicative equality?), it is informed by the argument that the notion of ‘transnational’ is insufficient because it uses the nation-state as basis for comparison, despite the significance of supranational organizations and the fact that nations are not internally homogenous (Wassermann 2011: 102). Nevertheless, the purpose here is not to discuss global spheres or to theorize the differences between global and transnational media, but to analyze their content through a lens of emotions.
In connection to this a qualitative analysis will be carried out, addressing the second RQ. The qualitative analysis is informed by ideas of critical discourse analysis, following van Dijk and situating this study in this research tradition. Given the distinct characteristics of these global television channels, one expected outcome is that AJE and CNNI will present different views of this conflict. Furthermore, a comparative study can here be expected to provide a more nuanced analysis of the use of emotion in global television news. A more detailed account of this can be found in the literature review, which is following.
3. Theoretical Frame and Literature Review

The aim of this chapter is to position this study in scholarly debate and to explore how it connects to previous research relevant to this study. The chapter is three-fold, tying together three main concepts of this study that are examined in connection to media: protest, race, and emotions. The first part ‘Media, Protest and Race’ explains the complexities of studying media representations through racial lenses and gives a short introduction of media representations of protests in general, and race-related protest in particular.

The second section argues for the relevance of emotions as an object of study, linking the concept to media and communication research and questions of power, which makes it significant to a study on representations of a race-related protest. Finally, the third part of this chapter addresses the medium of this study: global television news. This chapter provides insights into prior research on global media and highlights why global television is a compelling object of study in the context of the Unite the Right rally. In addition to this, the third section includes a brief presentation of both channels — AJE and CNNI.

3.1. Media, Race and Protests

Because the focal point of this study are global television representations of a race-related protest, the following section will first give an answer to the question of why it matters to consider racial categories in research and what this implies. Secondly, this section provides a definition to the framework of racism as a concept. Additionally, prior research on media representation of protest will be reviewed and connected with racial stereotypes in protests coverage, underscoring the significance of this field of study.

3.1.1. Studying Media through Racial Lenses

Jacque Barzun’s argues that racism starts with the use of race categories, claiming that the use of racial categories is as a form of highlighting differences (Barzun cited in Downing and Husband 2005: 04). Hereby he critiques the use of race categories in research as well as in everyday life. Objecting to Barzun, but being in agreement with John Downing and Charles Husband, I argue that it is essential to register that race categories are social categories and not science-based. However, mere disregarding of race as a social factor serves as a trapdoor. Following the thinking of Black, queer feminist, and civil rights activist Audre Lorde, it is advisable to be cautious not to mistake unity for
homogeneity. Lorde emphasizes that there are differences between humans such as their race, but that it is not the differences that lead to separation, but rather the ‘refusal to recognize those differences, and to examine the distortions which result from our misnaming them and their effects upon human behavior and expectations’ (Lorde 1984: 115).

In his influential work ‘The Racial Contract’ Charles W. Mills argues that turning a blind eye to race is ultimately built on White privilege:

Nonwhites then find that race is, paradoxically, both everywhere and nowhere, structuring their lives but not formally recognized in political/moral theory. But in racially structured polity, the only people who find it psychologically possible to deny the centrality of race are those who are racially privileged, for whom race is invisible precisely because the world is structured around them, whiteness as the grounds against which the figures of other races—those who, unlike us, are raced—appear. The fish does not see the water, and whites do not see the racial nature of a white polity because it is natural to them, the element in which they move (Mills 1999: 76).

Of course there are people of color who deny the centrality of race, like there are women who do not see the centrality of gender as a social factor. As Mari Matsuda says, ‘all forms of oppression benefit someone, and sometimes both sides of a relationship of domination will have some stake in its maintenance’ (Matsuda 1991: 1189). But the important point here is that a color-blind ideology rather reflects privilege than progress.

How does media fit into this conflict of what Michael C. Dawson calls the ‘abode of race (...) hidden in plain sight’ (Dawson 2016: 161)? Drawing on Jack Lule’s assumption, according to which media play an essential role in constructing ‘us’-and-‘them’ relation (Lule 2012: 56), I argue that it is not only necessary to examine racism in media, but that it must be done through a lens that considers racial differences, their social and historical contexts and media’s role in perpetuating them. Furthermore, it should be noted that the meaning and importance of racial categories are neither fixed nor static but continually contested and redefined (Saito 2015: 38). Drawing on Michael Omi and Howard Winant (2012) this study is set in a framework that acknowledges the ‘instability’ of race. Because understandings of race are fluid, grounding examinations of race in the sociopolitical context in which the examined racial formation occurs is absolutely essential (Omi and Winant cited in Saito 2015: 38).
3.1.2. Old Racism, New Racism, Trumpism?

In order to analyze the role of media in representing a race-related protest and more specifically, the possible reproduction of racial hierarchies, the framework of racism itself as a concept must be defined first. Martin Barker defines old racism as the racism of slavery, segregation, and apartheid, which is explicit in discourse. Whereas new racism, he argues, ‘wants to be democratic and respectable, and here first off denies that it is racism. Real racism, in this framework of thought, exists only among the Extreme Right. In the New Racism, minorities are not biologically inferior, but different’ (Barker cited in van Dijk 2000: 34). Contemporary forms of racism are however still deeply intertwined and strongly interdependent of old racism (Hall 2000: 222-24), which is grounded in the sociobiological understanding of race that argues for the segregation of racial groups and for a natural superiority of the White race (Dunn et al. citing Pettigrew and Meertens 2004: 411). In the US American context, these two broad forms of racism can be defined as the overtly operating White supremacist ideology prior to the 1960s civil rights movements and new forms of racism in the post-Jim Crow US.

Underlying this new form of racism is an ideology that critical race scholars across disciplines refer to as a ‘colorblind racial ideology’. Racial ‘colorblindness’ is based on the notion that individuals should be treated as persons whose identities or social position have not been shaped by race. Critics however argue that this ‘ideology serves to support racial inequality by undermining attempts to address institutional forms of racism’ (Satio 2015: 39).

How does this connect to the media? As van Dijk points out, ‘new racism’ operates in news and argues that discourse plays a significant role in the ‘reproduction’ of racism and racial inequalities (van Dijk 2000). He stresses that the often subtle and indirect ways of new racism are discursive, expressed and enacted by text and talk, such as in television news reports. To reveal the discursive mechanisms of the ‘role of public discourse in the reproduction of racism’, he argues, a detailed discourse analysis is needed that goes beyond superficial content analysis. While there are a multitude of ways to conduct a discourse analysis, this study borrows from van Dijk to identify the following discourse strategies: blame transfer (van Dijk 1995: 37), positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (van Dijk 2006: 373), and in addition to this, the concept of authoritarianism as source of news-making (Alo and Ajewole-Orimogunje 2013: 118) will be used. A description of these concepts and how they will be applied can be found in the methodology section.

While there has been scholarly consensus over the distinction between ‘new’ and ‘old racism’, researchers currently observe a new resurgence of explicitly pro-White rhetoric and a rise in public displays of various formations of White supremacy (e.g. Hartzell 2018), that supersede the
race-evasive discourse that is characteristic of the ‘new racism’ in the West. Is ‘new racism’ then still a suitable framework of this study? Can we still speak of a racism characterized as ‘more subtle than overt racism’ (Sonnett et. al 2015: 328), a covert racism that has been replaced by its old, overt predecessor (Dunn 2014: 410-411)?

Scholars begin to make sense of a possible shift under the name of Trumpism. Many have argued, Donald Trump’s presidential campaign, election and ultimately his presidency contributed to a shift, precisely because it was achieved on the back of a White nationalist and xenophobic platform (Narayan 2017: 07). Samira Saramo for example, reasons that the rise of ‘Trumpism’, that she defines as a social movement characterized by populism, strongman politics, and identitarianism, has ‘relied on emotional evocations of violence—fear, threats, aggression, hatred, and division’ (Saramo 2017: 01). Drawing from Tabachnick, Saramo understands Trumpism as both uniquely American and of the 21st century, as well as distinct from the European Fascism of the last century, despite the popular comparison of the two (Tabachnick cited in Saramo 2017: 04).

Contextualizing Trumpism, Kyle W. Kusz argues that Trump’s White nationalist strongman rhetoric and performances on the campaign trail ‘can only be deemed unproblematic if viewed through a White racial frame that dismisses how Trump has not only tapped into a frowning reactionary White racial anger, but has cultivated and legitimated the open expression of White supremacist qua White nationalist discourse in mainstream American media culture’ (Kusz 2017: 232).

While it seems to early to draw conclusions on whether there has been a significant cultural shift that might have shaped a new form of racism, Stephanie L. Hartzell offers new insights arguing that this new discourse is distinct from the race-evasive rhetoric characteristic of new racism: ‘Instead, these formations of pro-White rhetoric attempt to reason that open affirmations of White pride and pro-White political positions are not necessarily White supremacist but, rather, are justifiable expressions of White racial consciousness for a sociopolitical context in which the argument that race does not matter has become an increasingly unjustifiable position’ (Hartzell 2018: 24). Keeping these thoughts in mind, the following section addresses general marginalization strategies in protest coverage and forms of marginalization that are more specific to Black protesters.

3.1.3. The Protest Paradigm and the Irrational Crowd

Previous research on the media coverage of protests demonstrates that they are usually covered in adherence to the ‘protest paradigm’, defined by recurring patterns in mainstream media that typically delegitimize protesters and frame social protests as disruptive to the social order (Chan and Lee 1984; Boyle, McLeod and Armstrong, 2012; McLoud, 2007). Following Douglas M. McLeod and James K.
Hertog (1999) as well as Thomas McFarlane and Ian Hay (2003) Frank E. Dardis (2006) developed a typology of ‘marginalization devices’ of the paradigm, including framing devices such as general lawlessness (in which media focuses on violent and destructive behavior of protesters) and police confrontation (in which media stresses conflict between law enforcement and protesters) (Dardis cited in Shahin et al. 2016: 145).

Such marginalization devices are deeply tied to emotions. Stressing conflict and violent behavior then goes hand in hand with stressing that protesters’ anger is irrational or extreme. As Wahl-Jorgensen argues, public anger is not only a means of predicting participation in protest and potential for disorder and violence (Greer & MacLaughlin cited in Wahl-Jorgensen 2017: 08), but is also used to discredit protesters and social movement’s tactics (Wahl-Jorgensen 2017: 08-09).

Emotions in general were more in focus of scholarly work, when crowds and collective behavior, not social movements and collective actions, were central to studying protests. Political emotions such as anger were not only incidental characteristics but the motivation and justification of social protest (Jasper 1998: 397-98). However, the traditional image of a crowd is not characterized by justified political anger but that of an irrational one. Crowds were historically thought to turn rational individuals into irrational masses of extreme and violent emotions (Jasper and Owens 2014: 530). This notion goes back to the nineteenth century where crowds were assumed to create a kind of ‘primitive’ collective mind and group feelings shared by individuals of the crowd through hypnotic processes such as suggestion and contagion. Overwhelmed protesters were then thought to be moved beyond reason by these processes (ibid.).

A central work in crowd theory is Gustave LeBon’s ‘The Crowd’ (1960 [1895]), who characterized crowds as suggestible, irritable and credulous. In his opinion, crowds were led by unconscious motives and displayed ‘very simple and very exaggerated’ emotions: “A commencement of antipathy or disapprobation, which in the case of an isolated individual would not gain strength, becomes at once furious hatred in the case of an individual in a crowd” (LeBon cited in Goodwin et al. 2000: 66). While the crowd tradition erased individual’s agency, the Freudian tradition viewed emotions as emerging through personality conflicts, and not as a reaction to the social environment. As a result only certain people exhibiting the corresponding personality conflicts were seen as susceptible to movement appeals. As Jeff Goodwin et al. report: ‘Their emotions are inevitably negative or troubled rather than positive and joyful; they reflect a psychological problem, albeit one that might go away with maturity. Participants do not enjoy protest, they are compelled to it by their inner needs and drives’ (Goodwin et al. 2000: 69).

Both traditions did not recognize protesters as rational actors with agency. Neither moral principles, agenda setting nor positive effects of participation in mobilizations were registered. In the words of
Lyn H. Lofland, the image of the crowd was one of ‘emotional baggage of irrationally, irritability, excess, fickleness, and violence’ (Lofland cited in Jasper 1998: 408).

The notion to link emotions surfacing in collective behavior, such as anger, with irrationality still prevails today. As James M. Jasper argues, massed demonstrators either play with or against those images that frame them as angry, dangerous, and irrational, by signaling calmness and a commitment to nonviolence or by hoping ‘to appear threatening enough to be taken seriously’ (Jasper 1998: 210). While the framing of individual protesters or crowds as angry, or rather ‘too angry’, is a general marginalization technique, it has been argued to be used disproportionally against Black people. This will be further elaborated on in the next section.

3.1.4. Racial Stereotypes in Protest Coverage

Going back to the civil-rights era, media scholar Herman Gray lays out central stereotypical images of Black people in his 1997 essay ‘Remembering Civil Rights: Television, Memory, and the 60s’: ‘Black people portrayed in news coverage of the civil-rights and Black Power movements appeared either as decent but aggrieved Blacks who simply wanted to become a part of the American dream, or as threats to the very notion of citizenship and nation’ (Gray 1997). He argued, that television created an idealized figure, the ‘civil-rights subject’. He argued that this cultural trope, created by media, was presented as an ‘an exemplar of citizenship and responsibility—success, mobility, hard work, sacrifice, individualism’ (ibid.). The civil-rights subject, as Aniko Bodroghkozy argues, was then the worthy beneficiary of the civil-rights movement, in contrast to ‘the poor, disenfranchised segments of the black community who did not fit with the civil rights narrative of achieved equality’ (Bodroghkozy 2013: 04).

This polarization between worthy Blacks and Black who supposably drained public resources and created crime served a larger function. As Gray argues: ‘Within the American discourse of race, the civil-rights subject performs important cultural work since it helps construct the mythic terms through which many Americans can believe that our nation has now transcended racism’ (Gray 1997). According to which, rights are granted by White people, not taken by Blacks.

Studying political representation in television, Chuck Tryon highlights that parallels can be found in today’s media coverage of the Black Lives Matter movement. He writes referring to Gray: ‘Many similar framing narratives were at play in the cable news coverage of protests in the aftermath of the deaths of Micheal Brown and Freddie Gray, with reporters singling out some Blacks as seeking to preserve the American dream, often by finding members of the community who worked to protect or rebuild businesses that had been damaged or destroyed during the protest, and by comparing them favorably
to rioters “with nothing better to do,” a framing that was also used during the Los Angeles rebellion after the verdict in the Rodney King case’ (Tryon 2016: 61).

While it is crucial to anchor racial stereotypes of protest coverage in their history, stereotypes circulating in media coverage are not constructed in a protest-vacuum but usually tied to stereotypes found outside of protest contexts. Understanding racial stereotypes in media coverage then means understanding the larger context of racial stereotypes.

Underlying the stereotype of Black protesters as ‘threats’ or ‘rioters’ for example, is a marginalization technique found inside and outside of protests contexts that ties back to a larger racialized and gendered image of the ‘angry Black man’. According to Adia H. Wingfield, the stereotype of the angry Black man prohibits anger among Black men and in order to avoid it, it obliges them to deny race-based inequalities (Wingfield 2007, 12). Furthermore, Wingfield argues: ‘Cultural ideas about masculinity grant dominant men dispensation to display anger. Indeed, White men’s situational anger signals and shores up their control, but Black men’s anger signals their lack of control. Thus, when Black men display anger, they do not gain power, but instead lose credibility and risk institutional sanctions, including incarceration or termination, at odds with class mobility’ (Wingfield citing Collins and Ferguson 2007: 38-39). This means, that Black men who avoid displaying anger violate masculine expectations, due to the cultural association of men and anger. Consequentially, as argued above, avoiding the stereotype of the angry Black man hinders Black men to express indignation over inequalities — the core element of protest.

Journalism, or here television news, then holds the critical task of balancing the two — to give people of color the opportunity to voice political anger over the inequalities they endure, while avoiding to reduce Black anger to stereotypical tropes (such as the angry Black man), that ultimately marginalize them. Precisely because Black anger in the West is culturally not accepted to the same extent as White anger is, journalism is a place where this perception can be challenged. An optimistic conclusion here would be to argue that journalism holds the opportunity to not only give people of color a voice, but to construct news narratives that do not undermine political emotions of people suffering inequalities, and that highlight what the displayed emotions can tell us about the inequalities in which they arise. How we tell the story of this conflict determines whether it is a story about White supremacists emotions, a story about racial hatred that says — this is appalling because this hate is inescapable — or a story about the struggle of racial equality that contextualizes the political emotions of people of color that says — this is appalling because this suffering is systemic. It is not inescapable, but sustained by willful acts.

While this motivates the relevance of emotions in the representation of political dissent and how racial power dynamics inject further complexities in this object of study, the following section will
take a step back and explain: how voice is defined here, how voice connects to emotions, how emotions are being studied and more importantly, why. It will be argued here that emotions have been wrongfully neglected in media and communication research and why an analytical framework that privileges emotion is particularly valuable in connection to the scholarly debate on ideology and power. This part of the literature review mainly borrows from sociological research to bridge it with media and communication research.

3.2. Media, Voice and Emotions

3.2.1. Voice and Emotions

At the core of protesting lies the pursuit of making your voice heard. What does it mean though, to have a voice? Drawing from Couldry (2010), this study differentiates between two levels of the term: voice as process and voice as value. Voice as process refers to ‘the act of giving an account of oneself’, to provide a narrative, and ‘the immediate conditions and qualities of that process’, whilst voice as value describes ‘the act of valuing, and choosing to value, those frameworks for organizing human life and resources that themselves value voice (as process)’ (ibid). Furthermore, the act of valuing voice, according to Couldry, implies respecting the various interlinked processes of voice and sustaining them instead of undermining or denying them. Accordingly, valuing voice means to pay attention to the ways in which voice as process is effective and through which mechanisms it may be undermined or devalued. The unequal distribution of narrative resources then represents a denial of voice, and as Couldry stresses, results in a form of oppression. This form of oppression is what W. E. B. Du Bois describes as ‘double consciousness’, a ‘sense of always looking at oneself through the eyes of others’ (W. E. B. Du Bois 1994). For voice refers to the process of ‘articulating the world from a distinctive embodied position’ (Couldry 2010: 08), differences between voices, differences in how we are exposed to the world, must be recognized. If this is denied, voice is denied. The representation of different voices is therefore paramount to equality, for which one fundamental dimension of difference in how we are exposed to the world is race.

How does this connect to emotions? Voice has traditionally been regarded as purely rational, but as argued above, this study considers emotional expression as inherent to voice. To give an account of oneself at times requires the use of emotions — to express anger over injustice, joy over successes. To have a voice then involves emotional expression, but it also involves the recognition of emotion. Undermining, curtailing, diminishing or delegitimizing emotions is therefore here understood as a misrecognition of voice as a value. Does voice then claim any sort of emotional expression to any
degree in any social setting? No, but in turn, the acceptance of different degrees of emotional expression in relation to social setting can be an indicator for social power or lack thereof (see section 3.2.4).

Media then, in this train of thought, are not ‘open systems for representing our world back to us’ but instead specific ‘concentrations of narrative and other resources’ (Couldry 2010: 123), such as emotions. This concentration ultimately generates ‘hidden injuries for those who are less well placed in the distribution of symbolic power’ (ibid.).

In conclusion, being given a voice is here not only considered as the opportunity to speak, but in regard to media representation the question must be, how is this voice being ‘treated’ in the narrative. Consequently, as emotional expression is implied in voice, the question is not only who is ‘allowed’ to express emotions and what kind, but also what role does the expressed emotion play in the discourse? What are emotions then, and how can they be understood?

3.2.2. Conceptualizations of Emotions

Imperative for research on emotions is to define emotions, how they can be understood and how they are understood in this study. Most scholars conceptualize emotions as a ‘multicomponent phenomenon’ that includes cognition (e.g. the interpretation of a situation), emotional feeling (e.g. sadness), visual expression (e.g. crying), reactions of the autonomous nervous system (e.g. increasing heart rate), and action trends (e.g. preparing to run away) (Van Dam and Nizet 2015: 137).

Beyond this conceptualizations two broad schools of thought structure research on emotions: the organismic view and the interactive account. According to the organismic view — influenced by the early writings of Sigmund Freud, Charles Darwin and William James — emotions are viewed as natural sensations, ‘instincts’ or ‘impulses’, originating in the body and responding beyond the control of those experiencing them. Following this model William James compared emotions to the act of sneezing. The organismic view argues that emotions can be triggered beyond an individual’s own cognition, but does not acknowledge social factors as an influence on how emotions are actively evoked or suppressed.

The interactive account, grounded in social constructionism, believes instead that social influences permeate emotions. Following John Sabini and Maury Silver this study points out that emotions are both bodily states and social constructions at the same time (Sabini and Silver cited in Czarniawska 2015: 68). Furthermore, borrowing from Ian Burkitt, emotions are here understood as multi-dimensional ‘complexes’ (unfolding in thinking, feeling and acting), ‘which are both cultural and embodied, and arise in power relationships’ (Burkitt cited in Zembylas 2015: 181).
Therefore, emotions are seen as part of the relations and interactions between people rather than a simply individual or internal phenomenon (Zembylas 2015: 181).

Based on this understanding, this study argues to understand emotions as resources following scholars such as Arlie Hochchild (1979, 1983), Thomas Scheff (1979, 1988), Randall Collins (1975, 1990), and in particular, Jack Barbalet (1998). Emotions are in this understanding like all resources unequally distributed in a society. Furthermore, emotions are not only a result of unequal distribution of material resources, but are in themselves a valued resource. Consequently, emotions have significant effects ‘not only on people but social structure and culture at all levels of social organization’ (Turner 2014: 179).

3.2.3. The Affective Turn

What role emotions have played in the scholarly debate of social sciences depends largely on how far back into its history one reaches. In the early history of social sciences, emotions were viewed as central to humanities. Aristotle understood emotion (pathos) as a crucial element of story (mythos) (Aristotle cited in Gabriel and Ulus 2015: 36), Niccolò Machiavelli analyzed the connections between love and fear and the exercise of power, while David Hume examined moral sentiments to reason (Machiavelli and Hume cited in Thompson and Hoggett 2012: 01).

However, for much of the last century social sciences scholars’ conception of emotions that pitted emotions against reason led to a neglect of emotion in research. Political scientist’s assumption of a political subject that was essential rational ultimately constructed a theoretical understanding that split cognition from emotion and politics from passion. As Simon Thompson and Paul Hoggett have argued, ‘to some extent, what happened in political studies simply echoed what was going on elsewhere in the social sciences, where, throughout much of the period after the Second World War, the grip of positivism and behaviouralism was powerful’ (Thompson and Hoggett 2012: 01).

Nevertheless, social sciences scholars re-introduced emotions to their research in what has been referred to as the ‘discursive turn’ in the 1980s in tandem with a growing interest in language, meaning and discourse, and more recently though the ‘affective’ or ‘emotional turn’.

The renewed interest in the role of emotion in politics has been ignited by scholars researching women’s and LGBTQ movements. While women have traditionally been linked to emotions as well as irrationality, women’s and LGBTQ movements addressed this issue (Ferree 1992). While these movements made room for emotions in the public sphere, feminist scholars sought to ‘legitimate their work not by avoiding emotions, but by embracing them’. For example, Verta Taylor (1996) and Cheryl Hercus (1999) contributed to research on emotions and social movements by introducing a feminist analysis of anger suppression (Ferree; Taylor; and Hercus cited in Jasper and Owens 2014: 02).
Today, emotions are of considerable interest for social movement scholars, largely influenced by US American political sociologists Jeff Goodwin and James Jasper, who have analyzed the role of emotions in the mobilization of political and social movements (e.g. Jasper 1998, 2014; Jasper and Owens 2014, Godwin et al. 200). These scholars have typically grounded their work in sociological and anthropological accounts, viewing emotions as socially constructed by highlighting ‘framing’ activities of activists and elites. Deborah B. Gould, for example, analyzed US American queer movements during the AIDS crisis in the 1980s and the work of LGBTQ activists who reframed the shame and loss the queer community experienced into pride and anger. Gould argued that this transition enabled the community to move from being positioned as an object of fear, anxiety and contempt to an active political subject (Gould 2001, 2002).

To further understand the connection between emotions and political power, the following section introduces the concept of ‘feeling rules’.

3.2.4. Emotions and Ideology

Arlie R. Hochschild introduced the concept of ‘feeling rules’, the aspect of ideology which deals with emotions. Feeling rules are social ‘guidelines for the assessment of fits and misfits between feeling and situation’, governing what emotional displays are appropriate or inappropriate in a certain social setting (Hochschild 1979: 566). Underlying the notion of feeling rules is ‘emotion work’, the effort to adhere to feeling rules, or to ‘mange your feelings’. Emotion work can be cognitive, bodily or expressive.

Feeling rules then can makes us feel entitled to certain emotions (e.g. feeling the ‘right to be angry’) or experience a gap between felt emotion and social guidelines (e.g. ‘I shouldn't feel so guilty’). According to Hochschild rules for managing feeling are implicit in any ideological stance. Put differently, they are the ‘bottom side’ of ideology. How the connection between feeling rules and ideology plays out is perhaps best explained in one of Hochschild’s own examples:

‘(...) feeling rules in American society have differed for men and women because of the assumption that their natures differ basically. The feminist movement brings with it a new set of rules for framing the work and family life of men and women: the same balance of priorities in work and family now ideally applies to men as to women. This carries with it implications for feeling. A woman can now as legitimately (as a man) become angry (rather than simply
upset or disappointed) over abuses at work, since her heart is supposed to be in that work and she has the right to hope, as much as a man would, for advancement’ (Hochschild 1979: 567).

While Hochschild revealed connections between emotions and power, researchers examining the relationship between race and emotions suggest that feeling rules are not only gendered but also racialized, which results in more stringent emotional standards for Black people (Wingfield 2010, Wilkins 2012). As Michael Schwalbe et al. argue, ‘sustaining a system of inequality, one that generates destabilizing feelings of anger, resentment, sympathy, and despair, requires that emotions be managed’ (Schwalbe et al. 2000: 434). Furthermore, scholars of this field suggest that inequalities are enforced through ‘emotional otherness’ (Wilkins and Pace 2014: 402), and argue that there is a racial form of ‘emotional segregation’ (Beeman 2007). While this research stems from sociology scholars, media and communication research that centre the connection between race and emotions is scarce. Media’s role in these processes thus remains largely unexplored in empirical research, and under-theorized in media and communication literature.

Nevertheless, the connection between emotions and ideology matters greatly in the context of this study, because it gives a theoretical framework for the emotional underpinnings of the marginalization strategies that have been described earlier. It follows that the marginalization strategy that frames protesters as ‘too angry’, that deny voice, targets particularly Black people because it operates under feeling rules that hold Black people to more stringent emotional standards. These racialized feeling rules then contribute to a system of White domination, as they inhibit Black people from voicing anger over injustices and being heard. The concept of ‘being heard’ connects here back to the object of study — media. In order to understand what role emotions play in media, the following section outlines how the connection between emotions and journalism has traditionally been understood.

### 3.2.5. Emotions and Journalism

What place do emotions have in journalism? Some argue that ‘the very idea of emotionalized public discourse runs counter to received wisdom about journalism’ (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013: 131). The traditional understanding of emotions as antithetical to reason is enshrined in the conception of journalism, because the binary of reason and emotion ultimately casts emotions as incompatible with the dominant vision of journalism as ‘fact-centered’ (Chalaby, 1998).

The profession, that guards the notion of objectivity as a core principle of journalism, thus cultivated an institutionalized resistance to the idea of emotion in journalism. Accuracy, fairness, balance and impartiality, in this framework of thought, are protected when emotions are shunned.
Emotion in journalism has traditionally not been taken seriously, neither by scholars nor practitioners, despite evidence of its prominence (Pantti, 2010; Peters, 2011). For example, ‘the sensationalized journalism of tabloid media is often denigrated in public and scholarly discourses precisely because the sensational is perceived to involve emotion in such a way as to preclude rationality and hence serious quality journalism’ (Sparks cited in Wahl-Jorgensen 2013: 131). However, the place of emotions in journalism is not restricted to one branch of the profession and as recent research suggest, journalism is profoundly emotional (e.g. Wahl-Jorgensen 2013, Cho et al. 2003).

While some have argued that in modern cultures, emotions are learned through media such as print, television and the internet (Wirth and Schramm 2005), research on how emotions operate in media in general and news journalism in particular is still underdeveloped. Scholars who make a foray into the research on emotions however, present findings that underscore the significance of the field. For example Jaeho Cho et al. (2003) argues for the need to examine the role of emotional responses as a consequence of political communication processes. Comparing differences in the emotional tone of coverage between the print and television news coverage concerning the September 11 terrorist attacks, Cho et al. found that television news was consistently more emotional than print news. While Cho et al. analysis treated television news in the same manner as they would print news, conducting a content analysis using television transcripts, not including the visual and audio components of the material, Dagmar C. Unz (2011) highlighted the connection between emotions and camera work as well as editing practices in television news journalism. Television therefore exhibits emotional practices that are particular to the medium, and underscore the significance of this study. As said in the introduction, this study builds on Wahl-Jorgensen’s strategic ritual of emotionality (2013) to explore what role emotions play in the coverage of the Unite the Right rally. A description of this analytical framework follows.

3.2.6. The Strategic Ritual of Emotionality

Analyzing the role of emotions in journalistic story telling Wahl-Jorgensen proposes that there is an ‘institutionalized and systematic practice of journalists infusing their reporting with emotion’. Taking Gaye Tuchman’s (1972) notion of the strategic ritual of objectivity as a vantage point — which understands objectivity as a well-established dictum for a formed set of professional practices to protect journalists from the risks of their trade — Wahl-Jorgensen argues that the strategic ritual of emotionality draws on practices of objectivity and at other times operates in tension with them. This contradiction arises precisely because notions of journalistic professionalism and objectivity are at
odds with the use of emotions practiced in journalism. This strategic ritual of emotionality manifests itself in the use of expressions of affect, personalized story-telling and anecdotal leads. It does not instruct journalists to express their own emotions, on the contrary, emotional expressions of journalists are heavily policed and disciplined. Rather, journalists rely on emotional labour that they ‘outsource’ to non-journalists — ‘the story protagonists and other sources, who are (a) authorized to express emotions in public, and (b) whose emotions journalists can authoritatively describe without implicating themselves’ (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013: 130). In conclusion, emotional expression in journalism is ‘carefully policed, but extensive, systematic and routinized (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013: 141).

This study has argued for an analytical approach that privileges the emotions. Why global television is as a medium has a distinct connection to emotions in journalism, as well as a special relevance to racial conflicts such as the one in Charlottesville, will be shown in the following section.

3.3. Television in a Globalizing World

3.3.1. Representation in the Global Public Sphere as a Matter of Justice

This study has so far established an understanding of voice as a precondition for social equality in which emotion is inherent. Ultimately, as suggested above, the question of voice is also a question of representation, which is where this concept connects to media — but why study specifically global media?

Fraser’s theory of justice in a globalizing world (Fraser 2010) provides insights into this question. In her work Fraser expanded her two-dimensional perspective (of recognition and redistribution) of social justice to a three dimensional perspective that includes representation. Fraser’s notion of representation that is envisioned in a postwestphalian political space concerns social belonging: who counts as a member of the community, and consequently who is entitled to justice claims? This understanding of representation serves as groundwork to theorize representation in the global sphere here. Although issues of representation and diversity have long interested scholars (e.g. Entman and Rojecki 2000, Newkirk 2000, Campbell 2012, Rivas-Rodriguez 2004), and minorities and women still remain underrepresented in the newsroom (Beam and Du Cicco 2010, Drew 2011, Rivas-Rodriguez et al. 2004, Meyers and Gayle 2015), little attention has been paid to the issue of representation in global newsrooms. This raises the question whose voice is represented in the global public sphere?
Moreover, drawing on Fraser, who is included and who is excluded in an imagined global community, and how can an equal distribution of voice and recognition be ensured on a global level? In light of a recent upsurge of racism, so called ‘right-wing populism’, and increasing worldwide migration patterns, these questions are of great importance and affirm that representation cannot only be addressed on a national level but must be considered in a global scope — for which global television is arguably a suitable medium.

In summary, this study builds on an understanding of representation in global media as a fundamental precondition of social equality that lays the groundwork for voice to which emotional expression is inherent. As such it is seen as a site of contemporary injustice and social struggle accelerated in the globalized age that unfolds along the lines of race and gender.

3.3.2. Global Television as a Medium and as a Site of Representation

As part of legacy media, television is a medium that predominated prior to the digital age. Put differently, it is considered to be an ‘old medium’ in a new media ecology that is shaped by the technological developments in the globalizing public sphere.

However, its significance is ongoing — the processes of globalization and digitalizations enabled ‘the convergence of television and broadband’ and opened up new opportunities for the flow of media content (Thussu 2007: 13). Television is today not only consumed through a television set but additionally accessed via various digital platforms in form of streams as well as shared clips of newscasts. The growth of digital platform and social media networks thus did not supersede television but gave television the possibility to diversify the means of reaching its audience. As a result of this, particularly global television channels such as AJE and CNNI ‘have survived and in some cases even flourished’ (Robertson 2015: 11).

Analyzing the events in Charlottesville which have a global scope and significance — as they must be understood against the backdrop of a global resurge of racism and a rising global movement of the extreme-right (Davey and Ebner 2017) — is particularly compelling through a global medium, such as global television. As Simon Cottle and Mugdha Rai argue, ‘how global news mediate conflicts and communities to wider audiences’ across the globe is crucial for an evaluation of how television news is ‘implicated in reproducing structures of dominance or enhancing democracy and its contribution to ‘global civil society’ (Cottle and Rai 2008: 158). This in turn is a relevant question in the context of this study: Does the coverage challenge racial inequality and racial division, contributing to democracy, and if so how?

Attentiveness to how opposing views and voices are presented in the circulating forms and representations of global news is thus crucial (Cottle 2008: 165). In the light of racial conflicts — that
incorporates not only opposing views and voices, but specifically on one side a White supremacist ideology and on the other side the notion of anti-racism — democracy is played out in the global public spheres not as ‘genteel conversation’ but rather as a ‘series of embattled fields contention, insurgency and reflexivity’ (Dryzek 2006). Amidst this conflict, ‘protesters raise their voices not only to challenge their own governments’ — hence challenging the state of their own country — ‘but also to speak to a global audience’ (Robertson 2012). This means that global news media make room for wider mobilization and validation that broaden the scope of this conflict (Gamson and Wolfsfeld 1993), as news discourses, along with visualized narratives and emotive testimonies, contribute to ‘processes of recognition and understanding of competing world outlooks’ (Cottle 2006: 167–184). Because it has been argued that global television news can promote a form of global solidarity and broadened collective compassion (Cottle 2014), it carries a specific relevance to the study of emotions and journalism. Bringing the suffering or the anger of a geographically distant other close, global news media has been said to contribute to both ‘cosmopolitan moments’ and ‘the globalization of emotions’ (Beck, 2006: 5–6). The flip side of this process can be summarized in Ulrich Beck’s words: ‘violence in one corner of the globe incites the readiness to resort to violence in many others’ (Beck 2006: 6). While its beyond the scope of this study to explore the notion of ‘cosmopolitan empathy’ and how mediated emotions may or may not contribute to it, previous research on global media and cosmopolitanism underscore the significance of global news in the research of journalism and conflict, as well as journalism and emotions.

Why a comparative analysis is especially valuable when analyzing global media in general, and global television news in particular, is elaborated after a brief introduction of the two channels in question: AJE and CNNI.

### 3.3.3. CNN International

CNNI is a prominent channel in global television research and not surprisingly so: with its reach in audiences that includes ‘almost 354 million households around the world’⁴, it is undoubtably a force in the global media landscape. CNNI launched under the slogan ‘Go Beyond Borders’, emphasizing the global perspective of the network, which mostly broadcasts from studios outside the US, in London, Mumbai, Hong Kong and Abu Dhabi. But CNNI is not only a relevant choice for this study because of its reach in audience members, or its global ‘mission’, but because the US-based newscast is local in relation to the conflict in Charlottesville. The question of how global television might cover events that are local to it for a global audience is arguably interesting. Furthermore, an analysis of the
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channel’s coverage is compelling in the context of this study because of its conflicting relationship with President Trump, who dubbed CNN as ‘fake news’ and stated that CNNI misrepresents the US to its global audience. While CNNI can be expected to provide an Anglo-American outlook, its view is not un-competed. Taking note of AJE’s rising significance in the global television market, CNN launched a competing production center in 2009: CNN Abu Dhabi, based in the United Arab Emirates, targeting specifically AJE’s Arab audiences. So, who is Al-Jazeera English?

3.3.4. Al-Jazeera English

AJE, the first English-language satellite news channel broadcasting globally from the Middle East, is part of a larger television network that gained global momentum due to Al-Jazeera Arabic’s controversial coverage of the US ‘war on terror’ under the Bush administration (Robertson 2015). It follows that AJE traditionally stands in contrast with US American channels such as CNNI: while CNNI provides an Anglo-American outlook, AJE positions itself as the global television channel that covers ‘the other opinion in international news, those diverging, oppositional, controversial views and voices’ (Figenschou 2010: 86). As a result of this, AJE is considered to be a contra-flow news organization (Figenschou 2010, Robertson 2015), which makes the channel an important case for a comparative analysis of global television channels. Moreover, the news actors’ own conception of their channel — that it aims to be ‘truly global’ and serving a ‘genuinely global audience’ (Robertson 2015) — as well as their reputation of promoting diversity, make the channel suitable for this study.

In conclusion, this study is comparing two global television broadcasts that along their global reach share two significant characteristics: both channels broadcast within the same few hours to the same global audience in the same language (English) and claim to uphold shared values, norms and principles of journalistic professionalism and objectivity (Robertson: 2015).

To account for the differences that exist in global television newsrooms and to avoid monolithicizing the media (Lewis 2016), a comparative analysis is paramount. The dominant characteristic that global television news share — its global reach to a global audience — do not necessarily presume


homogeneity in global television news discourses or how different channels operate in the global public sphere. A detailed description of the material and sampling, and how this comparison is conducted, can be found in the following section.

4. Materials

The material of this study consist of the evening news broadcast items of the 2017 Unite the Right rally of the two tv channels AJE and CNNI. The Unite the Right rally is of relevance to this study, because it is considered the largest White supremacist gathering in the US in a decade\(^8\), and therefore plays a key role in contemporary race-related protests.

It should be noted here that the present study was carried out in collaboration with the Screening Protest Project\(^9\). While this study was conducted independently, the aim of the Screening Protest project — to compare representations of dissent between global television channels — also served as a framework here. Furthermore, the project provided the broadcast recordings for this study.

Broadcast items of the Charlottesville coverage were identified by their topic. Meaning that each entire evening newscast of each day of the coverage was considered: if the Charlottesville protests\(^10\) were mentioned, the item in question was included in the sampling. Table 1 shows the distribution of the Charlottesville coverage between the two channels AJE and CNNI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Days of Coverage</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>% of total broadcast time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>6 (12.- 16.08.17 + 19.08.17)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>~30mins (n=192 min)</td>
<td>16 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>6 (12.- 16.08.17 + 19.08.17)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>~2h 30mins (n=299 mins)</td>
<td>51 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of items devoted to Charlottesville coverage in relation to the total broadcast time of the evening newscasts.

---


\(^9\) The Screening Protest Project (financed by the Swedish Research Council) is conducted by Alexa Robertson at Stockholm University’s department of Media and Communication studies.

\(^10\) The term ‘Charlottesville protests’ is used to include counter-protests of the Unite the Right rally.
The AJE coverage considered in this sampling is broadcast live from London at 19.00, London time. In CNNI’s case the sampling includes the evening news reaching European audiences at 21.00: this includes the program News Now as well as The World Right Now (depending on the day). The only exception being the 19th of August, where the sample includes the newscast Newsroom at 19.00. A more detailed breakdown of the news bulletins can be found in appendix A.

The sampling of the channels is motivated in regard to their audience numbers and moreover because they represent a diverse media landscape. Furthermore, both channels are chosen for a comparative analysis in order to explore similarities and differences in the reporting: CNNI is a relevant choice for studying the protest in Charlottesville, not only because the channel is based in the US and identifies as the news organization which domestically reaches ‘more individuals (...) than any other cable tv news organization in the United States’, but also because the channel has a significant international reach, which includes ‘almost 354 million households around the world’\(^\text{11}\). While CNNI provides an US-American outlook, AJE has been described as a contra-flow news organization which prides itself in having a culturally diverse staff (e.g. Figenschou 2010, Robertson 2015). Both channels are also a relevant choice in regard to the larger context of racial tension and representation issues. CNNI, among other US American tv channels, have been criticized in the past for reproducing racial stereotypes and the marginalization of African Americans in their coverage (Campbell 1995; Campbell et al 2012). Whereas AJE, as the first English-language satellite news channel broadcasting globally from the Middle East, defines itself as a channel that gives ‘voice to untold stories (...) and challenges established perceptions’ (Corporate profile, English.Aljazeera.net). As Figenschou observes, ‘the channel intends to cover the other opinion in international news, those diverging, oppositional, controversial views and voices that are rarely invited onto mainstream news media programs’ under the premise to give a voice to the voiceless (Figenschou 2010: 86).

In summary, choosing two media channels rooted in different systems allows for a more nuanced analysis, because it sensitizes to variation and to similarity. As Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini argue, it ‘denaturalizes’ the media system that is familiar, rendering ‘taking for granted’ aspects visible to the researcher and forces her to conceptualize those aspects that require explantation (Hallin and Mancini 2004: 02).

5. Methodology

The methodology of this study consists of a two step analysis, using a mixed method approach. In a first step a quantitative content analysis will be conducted, followed by a qualitative analysis. The combination of the two methods is meant to compliment each other. As David Silverman (2004) argues, qualitative methods are more flexible, subjective and speculative, while quantitative methods are objective and based on well-determined variables (Silverman 2004: 42). Thus, employing a mixed methods approach helps to overcome limitations that are specific to each method — while content analysis uncovers patterns through concrete data, qualitative analysis, which is based on interpretation instead, offers a holistic image over social processes.

In the context of this study, a mixed method approach is valuable as the quantitative analysis provides groundwork to address the representation of voices in the coverage and to make an informed comparison between the channels that is rooted in a factual basis, while the qualitative analysis can address the conjunction of emotions and discourses in a way that a numeric analysis cannot grasp. The coding is then operationalized through the following code questions: What are the roles of the speaking actors? What is the race and gender of the speaking/crowd actors? What kind of emotions are the speaking/crowd actors displaying?

Taken together, these questions not only show through which voices the coverage is presented, but also through which actors emotions surface in the reporting and what kind. Furthermore these findings will be connected to the different discourses of the study, exploring how discourses operate through the use of emotions.

In conjunction, the quantitative and the qualitative analysis addresses both research questions:

**RQ1:** *What similarities and differences can be identified in the coverage of the two channels CNNI and AJE of the 2017 Unite the Right rally regarding the actors involved and who is given a voice in the coverage?*

**RQ2:** *What part, if any, does the ‘strategic ritual of emotionality’ play in the coverage of the two channels? Who expresses emotion and what kind? How is it expressed, and what role does emotional expression play in the discourse?*

Because television is a medium that marries the visual with the textual, it should be noted that this study does not only consider the text, but acknowledges the interplay between word and image. Some parts of the analysis will give more attention to the image — the image is for example elemental in the depiction of crowds and one source of the display of emotions. Other parts will instead focus more on
the textual side and how discourses are constructed through it. However, the analysis will always be informed by both the image and the text.

5.1. Quantitative Analysis

As argued above, this study differentiates between three kinds of actors: speaking actors, crowd actors and crowds, and accordingly three different sides of emotional display which unfold in the emotional expressions of those mentioned actors. While the people who are given a voice in the coverage ultimately shape the discourse of the coverage, and crowds naturally play a significant role in the television coverage of protest reporting, the study asks whether or not television narratives make use of crowd actors who are given a representative function within the crowd through visual framing (for a definition see appendix E).

Consequently, categories of the quantitative analysis are designed to grasp the role (e.g. protester, expert), race, gender, and focal emotions of speaking/crowd actors and to count for their occurrence (for definitions see appendix E). Secondly, the occurrence of moving images of crowds are counted along with the focal emotion of the crowd and their character (e.g. White supremacists, mixed crowd of White supremacists and anti-racism activists).

Code questions and instructions were tested in form of a pilot study in which four different coders were involved coding a random sample of both channels. The coders were all media and communication masters students, and hence experienced in methodological research and coding procedures. However, this also meant that coding was not tested on coders outside of this field and in a broader sense, outside of academia. In general, coders were unfamiliar with the coverage prior to the pilot study while half of the group had previously coded for the Screening Protest project, the other half was not familiar with the project prior to coding. The group of coders was racially homogeneous, a limitation of this study (because the coding involves racial classification), but the group was diverse on the grounds of nationality. Based on a concluding discussion with the coders changes to the codebook were made to clarify the coding process.

It should be noted that racial categories were designed based on the understanding that colorblind disregarding of racial categories does not solve racial segregation (see section 3.1.1.). Therefore, actors are classified under their perceived races to analyze racial representation of speaking actors. The word ‘perceived’ is added here to emphasize that a racialized classification that is not based on self-identification will always be flawed, and that it cannot claim to assess the race of another person, but is rooted in the subjectivity of the coder, who is classifying the actor based on her perceptions. Furthermore it is noted here again that racial categories are not scientifically based but a social
construct. As Don Heider argues, the assigning of a person to a racial group ‘is a historically situated, symbolic, socially constructed process, ultimately decentered and one that changes not only from local to local, but even within locals depending on circumstances and contexts’ and is thus a highly politicized process (Heider 2014: 06).

5.2. Qualitative Analysis

The qualitative part of this study revolves around the question of what role emotions in general and the strategic ritual of emotionality in particular play in the coverage of the two channels. The analysis is informed by van Dijk’s conception of critical discourse analysis (CDA) as a field that is primarily concerned with studying and analyzing written and spoken texts to reveal ‘the way social power abuse, dominance, and inequality are enacted, reproduced’ (van Dijk, 2004: 352) in social and political context. In that manner, this analysis is situated in the tradition of this field, that according to van Dijk aims not only to understand but to expose and ultimately resist social inequality (van Dijk 2015: 353). In order to understand the role of the news media and their message, as van Dijk (1995) argues, attention needs to be paid to the structures and strategies of discourses and the ways they relate to institutional arrangement.

For the feasibility of this study, this study does not conduct CDA at length but, borrowing from van Dijk, the objective of the qualitative study is to identify specific strategies relating to the news coverage. In doing so, this study focuses on discourse patterns making use of van Dijk’s concept of blame transfer (van Dijk 1995: 37), the strategy of positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation (van Dijk 2006: 373) as well as authoritarianism as source of news-making (Alo and Ajewole-Orimogunje 2013: 118).

Blame transfer, according to van Dijk is a discourse strategy that has been created and propagated by politicians and the media to shift blame on others and avoid responsibility (van Dijk 1995: 37). Similarly, through ‘positive self-presentation and negative other-presentation’ actors present a typically biased account of facts in favor of the actor’s own interests, while blaming negative situations and events on others (van Dijk 2006: 373). Lastly, drawing on Denis McQuail’s (1987) observation that ‘elites are both key sources and key subjects of news’ and that reports of what elites say about events often not only contribute to an event but may constitute the event itself, Moses Alo and Christiana O. Ajewole-Orimogunje introduced the discourse strategy ‘authoritarianism as source of news-making’ (McQuail cited in Alo and Ajewole-Orimogunje 2013: 118).
Furthermore, Wahl-Jorgensen’s (2013) account of strategic emotionality (see section 3.2.6) is used as an analytical framework to explore the use of emotions in the coverage of both channels. In doing so, the second research question is addressed, asking what part, if any, the strategic ritual of emotionality plays in the Charlottesville coverage.

In order to examine the use of emotions of anchors and journalist more in depth, this analysis differentiates between referential use of emotions (or emotion referral) and emotion cueing. Emotion referral is here understood as the practice of referring to an emotion and grounding it in evidence. A journalist might for example claim ‘the people on the streets are angry’ and back this claim up by providing images of people shouting and fighting each other, or providing a statement from a protester that makes this emotion evident (e.g. by discussing it). While emotion cueing is inviting the audience to feel a specific way regardless of evidence (e.g. ‘theses are scary scenes’).

Using the results of the quantitative content analysis, the qualitative analysis then addresses the following questions: **Who expresses emotions and what kind? How are they expressed, and what role does emotional expression play in the discourse?**

### 6. Results and Analysis

This section is divided into two main parts. The first one presents the quantitative analysis, addressing the first research question: What similarities and differences can be identified in the coverage of the two channels CNNI and AJE of the 2017 Unite the Right rally regarding the actors involved and who is given a voice in the coverage?

The second part presents the qualitative analysis, answering to the second research question: **What part, if any, does the ‘strategic ritual of emotionality’ play in the coverage of the two channels? Who expresses emotion and what kind? How is it expressed, and what role does emotional expression play in the discourse?**

### 6.1. Quantitative Analysis

#### 6.1.1. CNNI and Representation

*CNNI*’s coverage of Charlottesville shows a clear overrepresentation of White voices. Out of a total of 96 speaking actors, 73 speaking actors were White (76%). The distribution of voices was similarly unequal in regard to race as it was to gender. Out of a total of 96 speaking actors only 27 were women.
Put differently, 72% of all speaking actors were male. While men dominated the coverage, Black women were particularly marginalized: only 6% of all speaking actors were Black and female.

Overall, the most prominent voice in the coverage was a White male head of government – Donald Trump was coded as a speaking actor in 13.5% of all cases. On second place 12.5% of all speaking actors were White male politicians (head of government not included). Taken together, these numbers show that CNNI promoted the voices of White male political elites most prominently.

It should be noted that Trump’s dominant presence in the coverage had an impact on the evaluation of racial and gender representation. But even excluding him completely from the sample would still amount to an overrepresentation of White people with 69.7% of all speaking actors being White, as well as an overrepresentation of male voices, with 66.3% of all voices being male.

All non-White and Black voices that were present in the coverage belonged to elite actors (experts, politicians, economic elites and media actors), with the exception of one Black man who was coded under the ‘ordinary person’ category. Furthermore, the majority of CNNI’s Black and non-White speaking actors were affiliated with the channel: they were either employed as journalists and anchors, or as CNNI experts. On one hand, this resulted in a racially balanced representation of CNNI’s staff: out of 19 speaking actors coded as CNNI employed, 10 were White. On the other hand, sources that were not affiliated with CNNI were dominantly White, out of 62 speaking actors who are not employed by CNNI, only 8 were Black or non-White.

While elite actors were dominating the coverage, the coverage included three activists (all White), one protestor (White), one witness (White) and six ordinary persons (five White, one Black) out of 96 speaking actors. Notably, all activists and protesters given a voice in the coverage were affiliated with Antifa12. Activists and protesters were present in one item of the last day of the coverage, the 19th of August. While the item was linked to the Charlottesville protests, the coverage included a collage of images from different protests in different cities. The one protestor interviewed in all of CNNI’s coverage of Charlottesville was then paradoxically an Antifa protestor at a May Day protest in New York City.

---

12 The Antifa movement is a decentralized, militant anti-fascist network. The roots of the movement go back to the 1930s where social democrats, communists and others formed the ‘Antifaschistische Aktion’ as an alliance to engage in self-defense against Nazi paramilitaries (Rosenhaft 1983: 81).
6.1.2. AJE and Representation

First off, when analyzing AJE’s results in general, and in particular in comparison with CNNI, it should be noted that AJE did not devote as much time to the Charlottesville protest in their news coverage than CNNI did. This resulted in a much smaller AJE sample than CNNI (see table 1). Keeping this in mind, the overrepresentation of White speaking actors was even more stark in AJE’s coverage, which included 25 White speaking actors out of a total 28, resulting in 89% of all speaking actors being White. When it comes to gender representation, AJE’s coverage was made up of 60.1% of male speaking actors compared to CNNI’s 72%.

The interaction between both categories, race and gender, can be observed in CNNI as well as in AJE. The fact that women and Black people were underrepresented ultimately added up and resulted in Black women being underrepresented. In fact, Black female voices were entirely absent in AJE’s coverage.

Overall, the most prominent voice in AJE’s Charlottesville coverage is the voice of a White female anchor (21.5%). The second place is shared by Trump, White male politicians (head of government not included) and White male in-House journalists, each of which at 10.7%.

The notion that Black people and people of color were only given a voice in elite roles was not reflected in this sample. However, given that only one Black man and two non-White people were among the speaking actors, it was generally not possible to make this observation based on these marginal numbers.

What can be said nonetheless is that, while elites outnumber non-elites, 21.4% of all speaking actors were either witnesses or ordinary persons. Charlottesville’s protesters and activists were in AJE’s coverage.

What is striking in AJE’s coverage is that 39.3% of all speaking actors were either in-house anchors or in-house journalists. This is an unusual result for the channel, which is known for giving a voice to sources outside of their staff. For comparison, CNNI’s coverage included 15.6% speaking actors which were in-house anchors and in-house journalists.

This difference may be due to the difference in sample size — more airtime allows for more sources to speak besides anchors and journalists covering the news. Nonetheless, it is evident that AJE told the news of the Charlottesville protests in large part through media actors.

For an overview of the complete breakdown of speaking actors of both channels see fig. 1 on the following page for comparison.
Fig 1, distribution of speaking actors of both channels in percentages.
6.1.3. Crowds and Crowd Actors

The use of crowds and crowd actors was analyzed in five items of each channel, over the first two days of the coverage. This timeframe was used for two reasons: because the first days of coverage revolve around the specific events of protests (as opposed to the aftermath of the protest), and are thus significant when it comes to the use of crowds and crowd actors, and secondly in order to limit the sampling to a considerable material that stays within the scope of this study.

The crowd scenes of both channels were sources for emotions, with the most dominant one across both channels being anger. The two channels painted slightly different pictures of the protests however: in AJE the focus lay on White supremacists, while CNNI focused on both groups confronting each other.

6.1.4. CNNI, Crowds and Crowd Actors as a Source of Emotions

CNNI used 35 scenes of crowds or crowd actors across the five items of the sampling. In 64.5% of all crowd scenes, a crowd of White supremacists and anti-racism protesters (Mixed Crowd) was shown. These were usually scenes in which both sides were physically fighting with each other.

Consequently, the most prevalent emotion displayed by a crowd was anger, with 58%. 21% of all crowd scenes coded for emotions were coded as 'cannot be identified'. This category included scenes in which the faces of people in the crowd were not visible and emotional expression could not clearly be identified otherwise (for example through people physically fighting and screaming, which would indicate anger). In large part these were scenes in which people were running or moving quickly, and the camera did not catch a clear image of them, and/or people were filmed from behind. Additionally scenes in which people were masked and did not display behavior that could indicate emotional expression fell into this category.

In 14.3% of all crowd and crowd actors scenes a crowd actor was used. Here images of the same Black man was used repeatedly. Fig. 2 shows a comparison of the distribution of emotions displayed in crowds in both channels:
6.1.5. AJE, Crowd and Crowd Actors as a Source of Emotions

While CNNI used 35 scenes of crowds or crowd actors across the five items of the sampling, AJE included 22 scenes. This divergence might be due to the fact that CNNI devoted more time to Charlottesville per item. AJE’s coverage showed a majority of White supremacist crowds (42.1%). With 41% the dominating emotion displayed by crowds was anger, a result that parallels CNNI’s. However, in AJE’s coverage fear was the second most prevailing emotion, with 29%.

Interestingly, AJE did not only use the images of crowd actors to a similar extent as CNNI (13.6%), but did also partly use the same footage and thus the same Black man served as a crowd actor in the coverage. In addition to this actor, AJE’s coverage included a second Black male crowd actor.

Because CNNI showed more scenes in which White supremacists and anti-racism counter-protesters were confronting each other, viewers watching CNNI’s coverage were more exposed to scenes in which people were physically fighting and in rage. This notion of rage was then amplified by blurry scenes, leaving an impression of chaos. AJE’s scenes of crowds did contain very similar images of raging crowds, but in addition crowd scenes contained images in which crowds displayed fear.

Fig 2: distribution of emotions displayed in crowds in CNNI and AJE
Additionally, both channels used Black male crowd actors who displayed anger. Strikingly *AJE* and *CNNI* used the same footage of one crowd actor repeatedly. In *AJE*’s case however an additional second crowd actor occurred in the coverage. A more detailed account of both crowd actors is given in the qualitative section.

6.2. Qualitative Analysis

6.2.1. The Strategic Ritual of Emotionality in CNNI and AJE

*What part, if any, does the ‘strategic ritual of emotionality’ play in the coverage of the two channels?*

Despite long-held views that constructed news journalism as antithetical to emotions, emotions were present throughout the whole coverage of both channels. Besides the ones displayed in crowd scenes, emotions surfaced in the material through the text, or through open displays of emotional expressions, such as crying or shouting out of anger. A comprehensive overview of ‘emotion text’ of speaking actors divided by role, race and gender can be found in appendix C.

Open displays of emotional expressions that go beyond a textual level are not found among journalists and anchors. This is very likely due to the fact that the emotional expression of journalists is heavily policed and disciplined under the notion of professionalism.

Contrary to Wahl-Jorgensen’s findings, which suggest that journalists never discuss their own emotions, a *CNNI* anchor described her own emotions in one instance, but this finding was an outlier and could not be found in *AJE*’s coverage.

Nevertheless, journalists and anchors of both channels described the emotions of others: ‘she said she was out here, she was a little scared but she wanted to be here in solidarity, (…) but she was a little afraid’ (*CNNI*, journalist in ‘Heather Hayer’s Virgil’); ‘Opponents fear that supremacists will show up’ (*AJE*, anchor in ‘Boston Protests’).

This is in line with Wahl-Jorgensen’s argument, who concluded that journalists describe emotions of protagonists, individuals and groups and collectives. Moreover, anchors and journalists of both channels referred to events, situations, scenes, or images by using emotional descriptions. A finding which would indicate that emotions tied to the journalists and anchors surfaced in the text largely through a referral use of emotions.

The use of either emotion referral or emotion cueing was found in both channels (see appendix B). Furthermore journalists described the emotions of others by using a combination of emotion referral and cueing for emotions. Blurry lines between the cueing for emotions and emotion referral occurred
when descriptions of emotions were not based on evidence in form of quotes or by descriptions of behavior that would signal the described emotions (e.g. people were crying, they were sad). For example in statements such as ‘there is no question that the initial statement was disappointing to many’ (AJE, journalist in ‘U.S. President Criticized by Both Parties’), emotions were used to evaluate a situation, but were neither connected to a specific group, nor based on evidence. Furthermore, emotions were used without being connected to an entity: ‘(It’s) chilling to see the torches there’ (CNNI, anchor in ‘Division In The Nation’). In these cases it was not clear if anchors and journalists spoke about their own reactions, or made assumptions on behalf of others.

Two additional observations were made corresponding with Wahl-Jørgensen’s study. First, sources discussed emotions, including their own. In this instance, for example, a witness discussed on the events by reflecting her feelings about it in AJE’s news: ‘It made me feel like this has been bubbling for a long time, and people had these opinions for a long time…I’m not glad that this happened but it’s time that we are facing them…and I’m glad that we’re facing them’ (AJE, witness in ‘Virginia Tensions’).

Secondly, journalists deployed discourses that juxtapose normalcy with a dramatic event to create tension and emotional engagement. In one item, for example, CNNI’s journalist closes by saying ‘very graphic images today, Anna, of violence of this otherwise quiet college town’, framing Charlottesville as a quiet college town, an image that is juxtaposed with the images of the clashes.

Finally, in addition to Wahl-Jørgensen’s findings, whose study is based on print journalism, the reporting was infused with emotions communicated through images, especially those of crowds (as argued above). Hence, the strategic ritual of emotionality could be observed in the Charlottesville coverage of CNNI and AJE, in which the journalistic reporting included emotions on the side of the image and the text.
6.2.2. Crowd Actors in Focus (CNNI and AJE)

### Fig. 3: Man in chain costume (Crowd Actor 1)

*Left: AJE, crowd actor in ‘Violence at Rally in Virginia’; right: CNNI, crowd actor in ‘Cornel West On Protests: They Held Us Hostage’*

Interesting similarities between both channels could be found in their use of crowd actors. As mentioned above, both channels used Black male crowd actors who displayed anger and in the case of crowd actor one (fig 3), AJE and CNNI used the same footage. Notably, both channels edited the audio track out, so that the voices of crowd actors were absent.

Crowd Actor 1 recalls images of the roots of America’s racist history. Reminiscent of slavery, the Black man is wearing ‘costume chains’. He is shouting, but what he is saying is not audible to the viewer. Visible though is that he is clearly expressing anger. In addition to this actor, AJE’s coverage included a second Black crowd actor: a Black man holding a portrait of former President Barack Obama and First Lady Michelle Obama over his head. Like the first crowd actor, he is shouting, again not audible to the viewer.

### Fig. 4: Man holding a portrait of Barack and Michelle Obama (Crowd Actor 2)

*Left and right: AJE, crowd actor in ‘Violence at Rally in Virginia’*
He holds a very intimate portrait of Barack and Michelle Obama. It is an older portrait, that captures a tender moment between the then young couple. It is almost bizarre to see this romantic, loving image between all the scenes of racial hatred. So while the crowd actor in chain costume triggers memories of the times of slavery, and reminds us of the roots and history of racial hatred in the US, the second crowd actor not only reminds us of the Obama era, but of Black love. In literal terms, as well as metaphorically speaking, he is holding up an image of love amid hatred.

6.2.3. Charlottesville through CNNI's eyes — ‘I was chilled just watching it on tv’

Fig. 5: CNNI Anchor, Ana Cabrera introduces Wes Bellamy in ‘Interview with Charlottesville’s Vice Mayor’

‘Welcome back, we are continuing to follow the breaking news out of Charlottesville, Virginia at this hour, where there were protests — violent protests — in the streets there. White nationalists clashing with counter-protesters around the statue of a confederate general’, CNNI’s anchor Ana Cabrera summarizes before introducing the Charlottesville’s vice mayor Wes Bellamy for a phone interview. The split-screen shows Cabrera on one side and on the other side video footage of protesters of both groups attacking each other — in the midst of the clashes the bright red and blue colors of confederacy flags flash on screen. ‘To say that I am disappointed would be an understatement’, Bellamy, says. As he points out, he is the only African American on Charlottesville’s city council. While he calls for the community to stand together, the whole screen fills with the images of the fighting crowds. As the interview goes on, Cabrera reads statements from Republican politicians condemning the violence and discusses Trump’s reaction with Bellamy. ‘What more do you need to see, in order for us to be able to stand together?’, Bellamy asks, ‘You see those images of a car, driving into a crowd of
people — what more do you need to see? (...) It’s 2017, if you can’t come together and rise with us and stand united with us...I don’t know what else to say to you’. In that moment CNNI’s anchor takes over: ‘Vice Mayor Wes Bellamy, I can hear the passion and emotion in your voice’, she says. In the next moment she breaks the news, ‘We have now confirmed from Charlottesville Mayor Michael Signer that one person has died in fact today during the violence in the city’. Again Bellamy urges people to come together and stand united. It is the closing message of the interview, before Cabrera ends the call.

This item is typical for CNNI’s Charlottesville coverage in its construction: the anchor conducts a live interview — in this case with a politician — which is accompanied by a stream of video footage of the clashes and in addition to an analysis of the events. The item includes an analysis of politicians’ reactions to the events. It illustrates the presence as well as the complex dynamics of emotions in the coverage.

Bellamy’s first reaction is to say that he has been ‘disappointed’ by what he has seen in his city — evidently, to react to an event also means to share your emotional reaction. Moreover, Bellamy’s emotions were foregrounded again at the end of the item by Cabrera saying, ‘I can hear the passion and emotion in your voice’. Why would an anchor highlight that her interviewee is passionate when he, as a Black man, speaks about racism? What does this interaction convey? As demonstrated in the literature review, we all operate under feeling rules that reflect our social position and social environment — in this case the news environment. Suggesting that someone is passionate or emotional — particularly in a Western professional setting in which displays of emotional expressions operate under distinct feeling rules — can serve as a reminder of these rules. Rules that do not allow emotional expression for Black people to the same extent as they do for Whites, especially in regard to displays of anger by Black men.

Positive Self-representation and Negative Other Representation

In reaction to the racial hatred displayed in Charlottesville, White speaking actors in CNNI’s coverage of the Unite the Right rally condemned racist and antisemitic behavior. One discourse that could be observed was a discourse of positive self-representation and negative other-representation used by White speaking actors (see appendix D). While anchors asked ‘Did you anticipate anything like this could happen in a beautiful community like Charlottesville Virginia, home of the Universtiy of Virginia?’ (CNNI, anchor in ‘Witness Describes Unrest’), their sources highlighted that Charlottesville was otherwise a ‘quiet college town’ shifting the blame to people who were ‘coming from out of town’ (CNNI, politician in ‘Violent Clashes’).

Furthermore, White actors distanced themselves from the events in form of emotion-stance taking, by describing the events as ‘horrible’, ‘disturbing’, ‘horrifying’, ‘harrowing’, or by describing neo-Nazis
and White supremacists as ‘disgusting’ or ‘vile’. Politicians, for example, addressed White supremacists directly: ‘We deplore your hatred, your bigotry, and shame on you!’ (CNNI, politician in ‘Division In The Nation’).

By marking us-them relations or othering White supremacists, White speaking actors distanced themselves from White supremacists. In connection to the overrepresentation of White speaking actors, this discourse constructed an us — consisting of White people who condone racist behavior— and them — consisting of White nationalists and neo-Nazis who overtly display racial hatred and violence.

**Authoritarianism as Source of News-making**

As mentioned in the quantitative part of this analysis, CNNI centered the voices of political elites in its coverage. Statements from Republican politicians appeared in the coverage as a source of news-making: political elites were cited condemning the violence of White supremacists and neo-Nazis in Charlottesville or reacted live to each other’s statements.

Here, for example, a White, male politician argues in favor of Trump's statement: ‘He called for ideally Americans to love one another’ (CNNI, anchor in ‘Trump Blasted For Failure To Condemn White Supremacists’). Giving Republican politicians the chance to denounce racial hatred, or giving voice to the first Lady who calls for ‘communicat[ing] without hate in our hearts’ (CNNI, ‘Trump Without Regret’), gave political elites the opportunity to distance themselves from White supremacists and their actions.

Although Trump’s reactions to the protest was heavily criticized in CNNI, this scrutiny did not extend to other politicians. By giving voice to politicians to condemn racial division, CNNI’s coverage constructed a discourse that supports the status quo and cleans the political ranks from potential connections to the events. Republicans proclaimed that the people on the streets do not represent the
Republican party, and framed the protesters of the *Unite the Right* rally as outliers of society. This discourse ultimately constructed racial divisions as an abnormality as opposed to a systemic issue.

This connects with yet another finding of this study, which shows that a large amount of ‘emotion text’ in the CNNI coverage was tied to Trump. Either contributed by Trump himself who is addressing emotions — ‘no citizen should ever fear for their safety’ (*CNNI, head of government in ‘President Trump Urges Unity, Condemns Hate’*) — which were then discussed by others — ‘he suggested that there was too much hate and violence on both sides’ (*CNNI, expert in ‘Trump Again Blames Both Sides’*) — and their authenticity challenged — ‘that delay seemed so revealing of what was truly in his heart’ (ibid.). Furthermore, speaking actors discussed emotions triggered (or not triggered) by Trump: ‘he has facilitated fellow citizens to hate in public’, ‘the core support of Donald Trump is perhaps not quite as outraged morally about what the president said’ (*CNNI, expert in ‘Cornel West: They Held Us Hostage’*).

While Trump’s influence can be considered a limitation of this study (because him dominating the coverage distorts results in a way), it can be argued that the finding that emotions present in the coverage are frequently tied to him contributes to research on Trump’s role in the media. Furthermore, the finding is significant in light of the question which emotions gain purchase in the public sphere.

**Absences**

Noticeable in their absence were the voices of anti-racism protesters, of the people who took to the streets to confront White supremacy and antisemitism, as well as the voices of ordinary Black people, for whom this debate neither begins nor ends within the span of a news item. However, talking about the absences of voices certainly also concerns the absence of White supremacist protesters, which will be addressed in detail in the ‘Results and Discussion’ chapter.
6.2.4 Charlottesville through AJE’s eyes - ‘A city were hatred was laid bare’

Fig. 7: AJE journalist, Gabriel Elizondo holding a newspaper with the headline ‘A Day of Death’
AJE, ‘Virginia Tensions’

It is Sunday the 13th of August, a day after the Unite the Right rally. AJE’s evening news open with the scene of Charlottesville’s car attack: a driver plowing his car into a crowd of counter protesters before reversing rapidly, people screaming, running after the car. Felicity Barr, AJE’s anchor, gives a brief overview of the events of the day before, adding that ‘President Trump is under fire for not doing more to condemn the violence in Charlottesville’ before handing over to Gabriel Elizondo, who is reporting from Charlottesville. Images we saw just a while ago are repeated. The car plows through the crowd, we know now that a person died somewhere in that scene, even though it is not visible here. Then there is a cut and witness Nick McCarthy gives his account on what happened. Clearly disturbed by what he saw he keeps repeating himself: ‘There was a girl that was trying to (…) there was a girl that was trying to get up, there was a girl that was trying to get up —’ , then he turns silent (Witness Nick McCarthy, AJE, 13th of August 2017: ‘Virginia Tensions’).

Fig. 8: AJE, Witness Nick McCarthy in ‘Virginia Tensions’
Elizondo takes over, and we see the images of White supremacists and anti-racism counter-protesters attacking each other. Among several crowd scenes, we see a Black male crowd actor in a chain-costume screaming. Shortly after that scene a police officer announces that the assembly has been declared unlawful. In the following moment AJE takes us back to the events of Friday night, the torch-lit rally, explaining that the protesters plan was to protest against the impending removal of a confederate statue. Then, Elizondo, who before narrated the item, appears on screen for the first time. Walking towards the camera he says: ‘Twenty-four hours after all the violence occurred everything is calm here now (...) Residents of this town [were] waking up to this headline in the local newspaper’, he holds up the paper, ‘A day of death — it’s a headline nobody wanted to see’. The accounts of two other White speaking actors follow. They seem concerned, yet one of them concludes: ‘I’m not glad that this happened but it’s time that we face these real thoughts that people have about other human beings and I’m glad that we’re facing them’. Elizondo closes, ‘normally a quiet college town, this is a city were hatred was laid bare, transformed into racial violence for the world to see’.

As the last sentence highlights, AJE’s coverage is polyvalent. On one hand Charlottesville is presented as a ‘normally quiet college town’, on the other hand as a ‘city were hatred was laid bare’. The first discourse conveying that Charlottesville is otherwise spared from this form of hatred and the latter indicating that the events were a symptom of a larger racial conflict.

It is a typical item for AJE’s Charlottesville coverage, in which this dissonance is played out. Alternating between a narrative about a city that is ‘surrounded in the deep South by a terrible history of racism and slavery and the Confederacy’ (AJE, journalist in ‘Charlottesville Vigil’), and thus rooted in racial division, and a city which fell victim to racists and in which authorities were ‘trying to restore order’ (AJE, journalist ‘Violence at Rally in Virginia’) that was usually kept.

As demonstrated in the quantitative analysis, this item is also typical in giving White speaking actors a voice. As this item illustrates, White speaking actors were here again conveying the message of anti-racism.

**Emotion Text**

One source of emotion text in AJE’s coverage were White ordinary persons (see appendix C). Citizens reported that they were ‘glad’ that the events forced people to confront racism, or that they were ‘worried’ (AJE, ordinary person in ‘Virginia Tensions’) that these forms of violence would reoccur, informing about their own emotions.

Interestingly, although Trump was prominently featured in AJE’s coverage as well as in CNNI, and both channels covered the same press conference, CNNI’s material featured several statements which
were emotion-laden, while *AJE* excluded them and covered only statements from the press coverage in which no emotions were present. While *CNNI*'s Trump argued that ‘the hate and the division must stop’, ‘no citizen should ever fear for their safety, (...) and no child should ever be afraid’, that people ‘have to come together as Americans with love’ and that the events in Charlottesville were ‘very, very sad’ (*CNNI, head of government in ‘President Trump Urges Unity, Condemns Hate’*) to him, *AJE*’s Trump was edited emotion-free.

**Authoritarianism as Source of News-making**

Similarly to *CNNI*'s coverage, *AJE* included Republican voices that responded to the events. What was typical for *CNNI*'s coverage, to quote statements politicians issued via Twitter, could also be found in *AJE*’s coverage. In these cases Twitter posts were also visually displayed. In addition to this, statements from political elites were quoted without any further references: ‘George W. and H. W. Bush issued a statement (...) talking about how America must always reject racial bigotry, antisemitism and hatred in all forms’ (*AJE, anchor in ‘Trump Condemnation’*). Like in *CNNI*’s coverage, Republicans condemned racial violence, while a larger contextualization of their statements was absent. The following table shows examples of these discourses in both channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>CNNI</strong></th>
<th><strong>AJE</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some top Republicans aren’t holding back in their condemnation of yesterday’s very violent attacks here in the United States. The housekeeper Paul Ryan, the senate majority leader Mitch McCannel and Senator Marco Rubio and Rob Portman, they are all speaking out against bigotry and hatred. <em>CNNI, anchor in ‘Trump Blasted For Failure To Condemn White Supremacists’</em></td>
<td>President Trump is under fire for not doing more to condemn the violence in Charlottesville, Virginia on Saturday (...) The US Attorney General Jeff Sessions has denounced the attack, saying 'the violence and deaths in Charlottesville strike at the heart of American law and justice. <em>AJE, anchor in ‘Virginia Tensions’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We have heard from the president’s daughter, Ivanka Trump, several hours ago now. Earlier this morning on Twitter, she put out this statement. She said, ‘There should be no place in society for racism, white supremacy and neo-nazis. We must all come together as Americans - and be one country united’. <em>CNNI, journalist in ‘White House Issues Statement’</em></td>
<td>And that is what has been disappointing to so many on both the left and on the right — that it took the president three days to make this statement. (...) He is the leader, and people in the United States look to the president at times in division for a unifying message. <em>AJE, Journalist in ‘Trump Condemnation’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A couple of hours after that tweet we also heard from an unnamed white house official, that goes further, and is more explicit than what we heard from the president yesterday. here is what that statement says (...)<em>CNNI, journalist in ‘White House Issues Statement’</em></td>
<td>Do you think what he said today can really pull back his image? Of course he is not just criticized by other politicians including Republicans, but he even got into a spat with a top pharmaceutical boss. <em>AJE, anchor in ‘Trump Condemnation’</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2: examples of authoritarianism as source of news-making in CNNI and AJE

Positive Self-representation and Negative Other Representation

Although the coverage highlighted the need ‘to heal those painful divisions that exist in the United States over race’ (AJE, journalist in ‘Trump Condemnation’), discourses such as blame transfer and positive self-representation and negative other-representation could also be found in AJE’s coverage (see appendix D).

Here for example, a journalist argues that the groups who were violent were mainly not local residents: ‘(...) when the White nationalists, the White supremacists, the Nazis came to this town’ (AJE journalist in ‘Charlottesville Vigil’).

Furthermore, discourses made use of a strategic ritual of emotionality, by creating dramatic tension through juxtaposition: as shown above journalists highlighted that Charlottesville was a ‘quiet college town’, now a city ‘transformed into racial violence’ (AJE journalist in ‘Virginia Tensions’). Similar findings surfaced in CNNI’s coverage (see appendix D).

In addition to this, a discourse of blame transfer could be found in which blame was posed on an unidentified group of people outside of Charlottesville, by emphasizing that people came from outside the city to protest. Likewise, positive self-representation was employed by framing Charlottesville as ‘otherwise quiet’ and spared from ‘hatred’, shifting the blame to an unidentified other.

Overall, AJE’s coverage was broad, ranging from a whole item devoted to the mother of the man who killed Heather Hayer by driving his car into a crowd of anti-racism protesters, to an item covering the memorial service of Hayer. In doing so, AJE told the story through a diverse range of standpoints, including political and economic actors. However, as argued above, the voice of protesters was absent in AJE’s coverage as well.
7. Discussion and Conclusion

This section is divided in three main parts. The first part discusses the findings of this study in connection to the theory, the second part addresses the operationalization of the methodology, while the last part draws conclusions for further research and acknowledges limitations.

7.1. The Findings

7.1.1. The Strategic Ritual of Emotionality & The Role of Emotions

The strategic ritual of emotionality could be observed in the Charlottesville coverage of CNNI and AJE, comprised by practices that included:

- Journalists making use of emotion referral and emotion cueing in their reporting
- Journalists making use of an ambitious combination of emotion referral and cueing
- Journalists describing emotions of individuals, groups, and collectives
- Journalists describing events or situations through emotions
- Journalists using juxtapositions of normalcy with a dramatic event, creating emotional tension
- Sources speaking about their own emotions, the emotions of others or using general emotion descriptions to discuss their reaction to events, or to evaluate situations
- Visual editing and framing choices: using the images of crowd scenes and crowd actors as sources of emotions

It should be noted here that Wahl-Jorgensen did not include the use of emotion cueing or emotion referral in her analysis. However, the two notions and their distinction proved to be a helpful tool to analyze the journalists’ use of emotions. Strikingly, it was often difficult to differentiate if a journalist was using emotions in a referential way — describing emotions of others, or situations — or was cueing emotions — inviting us to feel a certain way (as argued above). By blurring the line between emotion referral and emotion cueing journalists indicated how the situation should be read and what to feel about it, while describing emotions in the reporting.

In accordance to Wahl-Jorgensen’s observation that sources frequently spoke about their own emotions (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013), this study found that sources discussed their own emotions and thus provided what could be called ‘emotion context’ to viewers. In AJE’s coverage, for example, ordinary persons reported about their reactions to events by reflecting on their feelings about what happened.
Sources could provide emotion context by sharing their own emotional reaction because the institutional constraints of journalism did not apply to them. This is especially the case for ordinary persons or witnesses, who do not have to oblige to professional constraints, as elite or expert sources do. The news reports therefore did not only provide viewers with information about the events, but also informed them on how others felt about them — emotions ultimately played a central part in the evaluation of the events in Charlottesville and the aftermath of the protests.

The question of why emotion context in journalistic reporting matters to audiences goes beyond the limitations of this study, but how people who were affected by the events feel about what happened is presumably essential for viewers to evaluate the news. How others emotionally react — what emotions are displayed and in what intensity — ultimately signals to us how to process and evaluate how we ourselves feel about what has been reported.

This is why representation is crucial, because it tells us through which eyes we understand the news, which voices we hear, and whose emotional context is involved in our evaluation of the news.

### 7.1.2. Representation

The most prominent voice in CNNI’s coverage of the Unite the Right Rally was Trump, the most prominent voice in AJE was a female anchor. While Trump’s dominance might not be a surprising finding, the distribution of voices in AJE’s broadcast runs counter its reputation to provide a diverse range of sources (Robertson 2015). Furthermore, both channels included accounts of speaking actors they clearly introduced as witnesses, but did not give a voice to the protesters of Charlottesville in their coverage. According to the protest paradigm the marginalization of protesters was to be expected (Chan and Lee 1984; Boyle, McLeod and Armstrong, 2012; McLoud, 2007). Nonetheless it may come as a surprise that neither anti-racist protesters nor White supremacists and neo-Nazis were among the speaking actors. While it is unclear why both channels were not interviewing anti-racism protesters, one hypothesis could be that CNNI and AJE avoided interviewing supremacists and neo-Nazis to avoid serving as a mouthpiece to racist and antisemitic views, and pushing the Overton window. In CNNI’s case however, the coverage included a statement from White supremacists and former KKK leader David Duke, which would negate this hypothesis.

### 7.1.3. White Speaking Actors and the Message of Anti-Racism

One of the findings that emerged through the qualitative analysis is that both channels presented White speaking actors conveying the message of anti-racism. Does it matter then that Whites are overrepresented and people of color underrepresented?
Generally speaking it arguably matters whether Black people are underrepresented in a public debate about racial conflict, because they are the group being targeted by racism and thus the most affected by it. Moreover, the underrepresentation of Black people in both channels reflect the denial of voice in Couldry’s (2010) understanding of the term. Both channels however included Black people as speaking actors, therefore the question might then be what is ‘enough’ representation? The answer to this question might not lie in absolute numbers but rather an understanding of representation that acknowledges the intersections of identities and accounts for voice as it recognizes differences between voices and differences in how we are exposed to the world.

The underrepresentation of women and the underrepresentation of Black people, for example, ultimately resulted in Black women being particularly marginalized in the coverage of both channels. and in AJE’s case, Black female voices were completely absent.

Furthermore, in CNN’s coverage all non-White and Black voices that were present in the coverage belonged to elite actors, with the exception of one Black man who was coded under the ‘ordinary person’ category. This result underscores the dynamics between the intersection of race and class that marginalize the voices of non-elite People of Color. Some even argue that the high visibility of Black elites — which is perceived as an index of progress — obscures the persistence of systemic racism (Rickford 2016:37). In either way, in AJE’s case these findings neither match with the network’s reputation of ‘giving a voice to the voiceless’, given that the voice of protesters and activists were absent here as well.

One group of White speaking actors who conveyed the message of anti-racism were politicians. While Trump was the most prominently covered under politicians in both channels, both channels also gave voice to other White Republican politicians. Although Trump’s denunciation of the violence in Charlottesville was questioned, the statements of other Republicans such as Vice President Mike Pence’s and Attorney General Jeff Sessions’s were not contextualized, although their relation to White supremacist groups are contentious.

Sessions, for example, has faced race-related questions throughout his career. In 1986, his nomination for a federal judgeship was denied by the Senate Judicial Committee for, among other things, claiming that the NAACP (the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People) was ‘un-American’ and joking that the KKK were ‘ok guys’. In office, Sessions’s policies were criticized by Blacks and low-income Americans, as he amended an Obama-era ‘mandatory minimum’ policy to the effect that expert say disproportionately affect Black people and Latinx defendants. Similarly,

---

questions on Pence’s stance on race relations have been raised during the primary campaign of the 2016 US presidential election. Trump was asked by a journalist whether he would disavow the support of former KKK leader David Duke and White supremacist groups in general. Trump answered the question by claiming ‘I know nothing about David Duke. I know nothing about White supremacists’\textsuperscript{14}. When Pence was asked in return whether support by racists should be rejected he refused to comment.

It matters that Sessions’s and Pence’s statements were not put into this larger context in the Charlottesville coverage, because their track record raises the question of whether their condemnation of racial violence extended to the underlying ideology of White supremacy.

Seeking to quarantine racism to limited precincts, ultimately constructs a climate in which it is socially acceptable to condone extreme forms of racial violence, but not to challenge the ideology in which Whites are the beneficiaries of racial oppression. Arguably, their condemnation operated under the rules of ‘new racism’: because new racism denies that it is racism and only understands racism to exist among the extreme right (Barker cited in van Dijk 2000: 34), politicians were able to condemn the violence at the rally without being challenged on the meaning of their condemnation beyond the events in Charlottesville.

It is a form of distancing practiced in the coverage by White speaking actors (whether it be politicians, journalists or experts) that shies away from acknowledging racism as institutional in the US, and ignores the deep historic roots of White supremacy, in which Charlottesville is no exemption. Furthermore, it connects with emotions, because this distancing is practiced through emotional expression. Underlying the discourse of positive self-representation and negative-other representation is an expression of shock, or surprise.

However, the backstory of the Unite the Right rally reveals that Charlottesville, while being a ‘quiet college town’ and a ‘liberal enclave’ in the South (\textit{AJE,} journalist in \textit{‘Charlottesville Vigil’}), was struggling to reckon with its own past of White supremacy for years before the Unite the Right rally escalated. The debate of the removal of the confederacy statue reaches back to 2002 when city councilor Kristin Szakos asked in a talk if the city should consider removing confederacy statues. The debate of the removal of the confederacy statue reaches back to 2002 when city councilor Szakos asked in a talk if the city should consider removing confederacy statues, becoming later the target of death threats for her proposal. The thread of violence was also present in public debates to which people brought guns along with Confederate flags, until the Charlottesville city council voted 3:2 to remove the statue.

Again it matters if these details are absent in news stories, because it is ultimately how we present this conflict of the Unite the Right rally. It becomes part of the fabric of how the history of racial dominance and oppression becomes written and unwritten by the context we give, the details we highlight and the details that go untold — revealing the continuity of racial violence and struggle over racial equality, or obscuring it.

7.1.3. Crowds and Crowd Actors

This study introduced the concept of the ‘crowd actor’ to protest studies. While previous research explored the nature of crowds and their representations in media, scholars traditionally understand crowds as masses, instead of collectives of individual actors. This study has shown how global television in particular makes use of individual crowd actors. Furthermore, the sampling of this study showcased an interesting use of crowd actors in which the distinct images of the same crowd actor travelled between both channels and further infused the reporting with emotions. This underscores the hypothesis that crowd actors play a significant role in representing the crowd and political struggle at large. In this case, exclusively Black male crowd actors who displayed anger were used in scenes that were contrasted with images of White supremacists. It can be argued then that their anger was used to illustrate the racial conflict of the events in Charlottesville, while the erasure of their voice was emblematic for the absent voices of Black non-elite actors. Taken together, this study advocates for the inclusion of the concept of crowd actors into the research field of protest studies. As illustrated in this study, the concept adds more nuances to the representation of protests and provides new insights into how visual and narrative editing shapes our understanding of crowds.

7.2. Methodology

A mixed method approach of quantitative content analysis and qualitative analysis that is grounded in the tradition of CDA has been proven to be fruitful in providing a holistic account, especially in combination with an analytical approach that privileges emotions. The quantitative content analysis provided an understanding of which social groups were over- or underrepresented in the coverage. However, a larger sample would be needed to be able to make more general conclusions, and to test tendencies that surfaced in this sampling — such as the marginalization of Black female voices. Combining quantitative content analysis with a qualitative analysis made it possible to address the representation of voices in a numeric manner as well as to investigate ‘voice’ and the discourses they contributed through a lens of emotions.
It has been argued that the ‘emotional’ or ‘affective turn’ has in large part been unaccompanied by explicit methodological debates (Kleres 2015: xvii). This lack of methodological guidance from media and communication research has equally been challenging and creatively inspiring. Furthermore, this study faced a gap in methodological instruction in regard to the medium of the study: because the existing body of literature that addresses the connection between emotion and journalism is in large part based on print media, the methodological debate on researching emotions in television is especially scarce. Nevertheless, the findings of this study are arguably encouraging to engage in research that addresses emotions in journalism. The attempt to capture emotions on a quantitative level revealed to be most beneficial when analyzing emotions displayed in crowd scenes. Crowds often displayed emotions openly and in most cases emotions could be classified and coded without ambiguity. However, arguably due to the institutional constraints that govern emotional expressions in journalistic settings, speaking actors’ emotional expressions were usually ‘hidden’ in the text. As Wahl-Jorgensen argues: ‘because emotional intention, expression and reactions are both socially constructed and profoundly embedded in language, it is challenging to identify exactly how emotion operates in the narrative and scholars have grappled with this empirical problem for decades’ (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013: 135). While the quantitative analysis of emotions could not fully grasp the emotions expressed of all speaking actors, the qualitative analysis provided valuable results in this regard. Furthermore, Wahl-Jorgensen’s strategic ritual of emotionality proved to be a beneficial tool in the investigation of the use in global television news, despite the fact that it is originally introduced in the context of print media. Implications for further research will be addressed alongside limitations of this study in the following section.

7.3. Limitations and Further Research

The primary limitation of this study is linked to the racial classification. As it has been argued above, racial classification that is not based on self-identification will always be flawed. Consequently, quantitative research on racial representation in television presents a methodological dilemma. However, an analysis of the coverage of the Unite the Right rally that does not address race would certainly misconstrue the underlying issue. Moreover, it has been proven by this study that racial representation is a significant issue in the coverage of both channels. Does the end justify the means then? There is no simple answer to this question, but rather the answer depends on the reader’s own stance towards racial categorization. Nevertheless, precisely because most studies that address racial representation do not discuss their methodology in regard to classification, it is advocated here to address this issue and to do so in a way that is transparent and gives room to problematize this issue.
Moreover, further research on racial and gender representation in global television coverage would certainly be a valuable addition to research on global media and diversity. Furthermore, it should be noted here that this study put a focus on African Americans, not least because the protest revolved around the removal of a confederate statue. However, the events in Charlottesville revealed a more complex picture of the contemporary White supremacy movement characterized by intersections of racial hatred and antisemitism, that this study could not address. In the current political climate of racial division, antisemitism and xenophobic hatred, further research on what role emotions play in political discourses and media representations is particularly urgent.

7.4. Conclusion

Aim of this study was to shed light on the role of emotions in global television news and the ways in which gendered and racialized power relations may shape, and may be shaped by, emotional practices and discourses. Specifically, by analyzing how expressions of dissent and tensions over racial inequality are portrayed, this study explored the role of emotions and its connection to racial power dynamics in the coverage of the 2017 Unite the Right rally of the two global television channels CNNI and AJE.

In doing so, the present study gives an account of media representation of voice, race, and emotions in the Charlottesville coverage of both channels out of which several conclusions can be made. Remarkably, there has been a greater difference between the representation of White and Black people than between the coverage of both channels in general. In both channels, White people dominated the coverage, while Black people were underrepresented, especially in roles outside of elite professions and along the lines of gender: Black women were marginalized in CNNI and completely absent in AJE. Similarly the voices of the protesters of the Unite the Right rally were entirely absent in both channels. This matters greatly because it is accompanied by a denial of voice on two levels: voice as process — the act of giving an account of oneself — and voice as value — respecting the various interlinked processes of voice and sustaining them instead of undermining or denying them (Couldry 2010).

Furthermore, the analysis revealed that the coverage of both channels relied heavily on the ‘strategic ritual of emotionality’ (Wahl-Jorgensen 2013): the coverage was profoundly emotional but due to long-standing practices of objectivity, built on particular parameters for the expression of emotion. Accordingly, emotional expression was carefully policed: generally speaking, anchors and journalists did not express their own emotions and outsourced emotional expressions. However, journalists and anchors made use of emotion referral and emotion cueing, as well as an ambiguous combinations of
the two, indicating how the situation should be read and what to feel about it through emotional description.

In line with the strategic ritual of emotionality sources described their own emotions — or in the case of crowds and crowd actors visually displayed emotions — and thus provided ‘emotional context’, which was a fundamental part of the evaluation of events. This underscores the ongoing relevance of representation and/or voice (in this train of thought the two cannot be separated from each other), because it determines through which eyes we understand the news, which voices we hear, and whose emotional context is involved in our evaluation of the news. Following Fraser’s theory of justice in a globalizing world (Fraser 2010) and her understanding of representation in global media as a fundamental precondition of social equality, the distribution of voices in the coverage of both channels reflects unequal power relations between White and Black people in global television media. This inequality, in which Black people were suppressed, was disguised (whether consciously or unconsciously) through discourse strategies such as ‘positive self-representation and negative other-representation’, ‘blame transfer’ and ‘authoritarianism as a source of newsmaking’. Through these strategies White speaking actors of the Charlottesville coverage distanced themselves from White supremacy and constructed racism as an abnormality of society instead of contextualizing the events and acknowledging the systemic nature of racism. In light of these subtle ways in which racist structures operated — as it is emblematic for ‘new racism’ (van Dijk 2000) — and in light of the recent upsurge of a global White supremacist movement, the findings of this study stress to acknowledge race as social factor in and outside of research and underscore its continued significance. Moreover, the findings showcase the need to analyze voice and representation through an analytical framework that acknowledges intersecting identities and, following Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991), recognizes the tension between assertions of multiple identities and ‘the way power has clustered around certain categories and is exercised against others’ (Crenshaw 1991: 1297).

Finally, through the analysis of expressions of dissent, this study highlighted how emotions must be understood as a political resource. In doing so, it is argued here that emotions are a valuable and relevant object of study in media and communication research that has been neglected for too long — especially in regard to studies on political dissent and political struggle where political anger (among other emotions) needs to be valued. As Lorde argues, ‘anger is a grief of distortions between peers, and its object is change’ (Lorde 2012).
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## Appendix A (List of Items)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 2</strong></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CNN</strong></td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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</tr>
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<td>Item 6</td>
</tr>
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<td>Item 7</td>
</tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
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</tr>
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</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B (Use of Emotions by Anchors and Journalists)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Filename/ Itemname</th>
<th>Emotion Cueing</th>
<th>Emotion Referral</th>
<th>Combination of Referral and Cueing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>U.S. White Nationalists</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Violence at Rally in Virginia</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170813</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Virginia Tensions</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Samantha Bloom</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>U.S. President Criticized by Both Parties</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Trump Condemnation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Suspect In Car Ramming Denied Bail</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>U.S. Racism Row</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Filename/ Itemname</td>
<td>Emotion Cueing</td>
<td>Emotion Referral</td>
<td>Combination of Referral and Cueing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170816</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Charlottesville Attack</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Charlottesville Vigil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>President Trump Facing Criticism (CEOs)</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170819</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Boston Protests</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Car Plows Into Crowd</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Violent Clashes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>President Trump Urges Unity, Condemns Hate</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Interview with Charlottesville's Vice Mayor</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>1 Dead in White Nationalist Clashes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Trump Speaks Amid Violence in Charlottesville</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Division In The Nation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170813</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Man Confronts White Supremacist Rally Organizer</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Suspect's Former Teacher Says He was &quot;Infatuated&quot; With Nazis</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Woman Killed In Crash Identified As 32-Year-Old Heather Heyer</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Trump Blasted For Failure To Condemn White Supremacists</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>White House Issues Statement</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Jewish Leaders To Trump: Condemn White Supremacist Violence</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Witness Describes Unrest</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170814</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Trump Calls Out Racists</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Filename/ Itemname</td>
<td>Emotion Cueing</td>
<td>Emotion Referral</td>
<td>Combination of Referral and Cueing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Trump Speaks For Second Time</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Suspect Appears in Court</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Teacher: Suspect Was Infatuated with Nazis</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Race and Reconciliation</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>VP Pence: No Tolerance For Hate &amp; Violence</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Cornel West On Protests: They Held Us Hostage</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170815</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Fourth Executive Quits Trump's Manufacturing Council</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Survivor Recalls Car Attack</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Trump Without Regret</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Trump Again Blames Both Sides</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>World Leaders React to Trump</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>Tensions Flare Over Fate of Confederate Monuments</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>Heather Hayer's Virgil</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>Amazing Grace</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>Friedens, Family Honor Legacy of Heather Hayer</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNNI</td>
<td>CNN_kl19_20170819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>Bosten Counter-Protest</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>Demonstrators March Against 'Free Speech Rally'</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>Antifa Groups Seeking Peace Through Violence</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix C (Emotion Text)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Text CNNI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anchors, White, female</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- they’re <strong>not happy</strong> about it (White supremacists, about taking the confederate statue down)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- we know that David Duke was at this protest and he <strong>felt emboldened</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- are you <strong>surprised</strong> people are doing what they are doing in such a ‘in-your-face’ way?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a <strong>horrifying</strong> scene, we warn you, this video is very graphic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>scary</strong> images on the streets there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- what is actually disturbing though (nazis marching on the streets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the <strong>hate-filled</strong> rally and violence in Charlottesville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- you saw torches during that protest, which must have sent a shiver down the spines of many, many Americans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- this is a guy who just <strong>hates</strong> to give in to his critics (Trump)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- you have a <strong>chilling</strong> tweet here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- turn the corner into <strong>hateful</strong> violence and speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- chilling to see the torches there</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- certainly Heather Heyer did not want <strong>despair</strong> to have the last word</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- she went there in <strong>hope</strong> and faith (Heyer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- then he wouldn’t have caused so much <strong>consternation</strong> in the country about the events (Trump/Charlottesville)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- it’s <strong>disturbing</strong> (the events)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- continuing to cause a lot of <strong>confusion</strong> inside and outside the White House, violence and <strong>hate</strong> and unrest (Trump)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- One of the reasons that Trump supporters <strong>like</strong> him is they believe he says in public, on Twitter, exactly what he thinks and <strong>feels</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- This sounds and feels very familiar.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Very <strong>disturbing</strong> pictures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- There were many women who were <strong>disgusted</strong> after that (access hollywood tape)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A lot of what Michaela is talking about is what is <strong>in the hearts</strong> of many Americans, it does not seem to be in the heart of this president</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- (quoting heather hayer:) ‘if you’re not <strong>outraged</strong>, you’re not paying attention’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- I was <strong>chilled</strong> just watching it on tv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- tell us what the <strong>mood</strong> has been like in there (memorial service)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Their message (protesters) is one of tolerance and <strong>love</strong> over extremism and <strong>hate</strong> and racism (Boston anti-racism protesters)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- give us an idea of the <strong>mood</strong> on the ground there in Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- the protests in Boston have been <strong>peaceful</strong> so far</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Anchors, White, male |
| - that **horrific** car assault |
| - they are all speaking out against bigotry and **hatred** |

| In-House Journalists, White, female |
| - tensions have been incredibly high |
| - tensions remain high |
| - the **disturbing, sad** images have been going on since last night |
| - they (Antifa) wanted to meet us very early in the morning because they were **concerned** about a lot of people being around |
| In-House Journalists, White, male | - that was a pretty **harrowing** scene there  
- Weimer had some fairly **disturbing** things to say...take a look  
- this appeared to be a grudging appearance, it was something that Trump needed to do (...) rather than necessarily **his real feelings** and a **desire** to correct a wrong  
- there will be some new controversies, some new **outrage**  
- the reactions of some republicans who have condemned Trump's sentiments without necessarily condemning him personally shows that that core support of Donald Trump is perhaps not quite as **outraged** morally about what the president said on Tuesday, as the cooperate world, the media world and the sort of the rest of the world appears  
- the performance of the president yesterday wasn't the kind of performance that amounts to a show of morally leadership that creates space for these questions to be debated in a way that doesn’t **aflame** passion  |
| In-House Journalists, non-White, female | - she said she was out here, she was a little **scared** but she wanted to be here in solidarity, (...) but she was a little afraid (person deciding to join the protest)  
- **hearts are heavy** for her (Heyer)  
- there was a lot of **emotion**, there was a lot of **pain** (memorial service)  
- you see this one message here that says ‘for truth, for justice, for **love**’, that’s what she represented (Heyer)  |
| In-House Journalists, Black, female | - the president has been **passionate** and vocal on twitter  
- (there is) a different **mood** in different places (Boston March)  
- (quotes chant) ‘**no hate, no fear**, immigrants are welcome here’  
- it is a very **peaceful** crowd  |
| In-House Experts, White, male | - there was a **hope** that there wouldn't be violence the way it has been  
- the goal of the driver was to **terrorize**  
- I think there is a lot of ** Hate** from different groups  
- David Duke is a **vile, disgusting** human being  |
| In-House Experts, non-White, female | - because he has this strong ** grudge** with the media (Trump)  |
| In-House Experts, Black, male | - to speak to the **hate**, the bigotry  
- the words don't explicitly address the **hate** in our midst that has been exacerbated and intensifed by the president’s actions and inactions  
- it is a **shame**, it is abandon-able, it is **reprehensible**  
- David Duke is simply expressing the **sad, disturbing, distressing** thoughts and racial impulses of many people  
- he suggested that there was too much **hate** and violence on both sides (Trump)  
- the presidents remarks were morally frustrating and **disappointing**  
- I am **embarrassed** by it, this is very **shameful** (events in Charlottesville and Trumps reaction)  
- if you **feel emboldened** (refers to Nazis)  
- there is research that suggests, that you have just as much dislike and **hatred** towards those who are part of different parties  |
| Experts, White, female | - Scaramucci felt **burned** by his (..) experience in the White House  
- that delay seemed so revealing of what was truly in his heart (Trump)  
- Trumps gut seems to be more with those more populist, nationalist, even White identity politics, forces of within his base, ..., that is something that is very **disturbing** to a lot of people  |
| Experts, Black, female | - we have to take a step back and look at this incident for what is was, which was a sort of moment of **terror**  
- the idea here was to **terrorize** this community  
- African Americans who have a long history of being **terrorized** by groups like the KKK  
- There are jewish Americans, who survived the Holocaust, there are refugees from the South who survived Jim Crow, who are triggered right now, who are **in pain**.  |
| Experts, Black, male | - he has facilitated fellow citizens to hate in public  
- we are just trying to bare witness to love and justice  
- talking about loving each other regardless of color, sexual orientation, nationality and religion  
- it is not coming from his heart (Trump's condemnation)  
- it's a very sad commentary on the level of hatred, I have never seen this kind of hatred in my life  
- this is not a surprise  
- most of human history is a history of hatred in the resentment, domination and oppression and the best we can do is to break that circle. how do you break that circle? love, justice, courage, sacrifice...  
- the hatred (is) coming back and getting recast  
- I'm not a leader of anybody, I try to be a lover, and justice is what love looks like in public  
- to be a hope in your acts, (to) keep a vision of love  
- not to allow despair to have the last word, but anybody who's not in despair in some sense is not sensitive to the realities of today. |
|---------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Head of Government, White, male | - we condemn in the strongest possible terms this egregious display of hatred, bigotry and violence on many sides  
- no citizen should ever fear for their safety, (...) and no child should ever be afraid  
- the hate and the division must stop  
- we have to come together as Americans with love for our nation and (...) true affection for each other  
- When I watch Charlottesville, to me it’s very, very sad  
- we love our country, we love our flag, we’re proud of our country, we’re proud of who we are  
- we must love each other, respect each other (...) we have to respect each other, ideally we have to love each other  
- the KKK, neonazis, White supremacists and other hate groups, that are repugnant to everything we hold dear as Americans |
| Politician, White, female | - lets communicate without hate in our hearts  
- I think the fact that right-wing governments and right-wing politicians stand next to each other should actually worry us  
- opposing these disgusting expressions of nazism  
- I think the fact that these leaders (...) keep their mouths silent about the the clear nazism and racism should be worrying here in Israel, the US and all over |
| Politician, White, male | - The views fueling the spectacle in Charlottesville are repugnant  
- we deplore your hatred, your bigotry, and shame on you!  
- he called for ideally Americans to love one another, for all god's children to love one another  
- this is an exercise of hate that leads to hateful action  
- the president (...) condemned (...) hatred  
- we have no tolerance for hate  
- they expect the leader of our party, Donald Trump, to be equally forceful in denouncing that sort of hate  
- (...) after this horrific event in Charlottesville  
- The outrage was right.  
- Whoever trivializes violence and hate betrays Western values. |
| Politician, non-White, female | - They (White supremacists) represent hate and evil. Anyone who believes in the human spirit must stand against them without fear. |
| Politician, Black, male | - to say that I am disappointed would be an understatement  
- I hope that the president hears this message  
- I hope people decided now, after seeing this, (...) that we can finally come together  
- obviously it’s a horrific incident  
- to reject the notions of hate |
| Witness, White, male | - You could see the level of hate, you could feel in the air the tension  
- you had tension building  
- we anticipated something horrible but we didn't think it would be a car  
- this is a very foreign, intimidating and disconcerting thing to see - it was a rhetoric of hate  
- it was obviously distressing |
| Ordinary Citizen, White, male | - we have to have a conversation without all the **hatred** and the violence  
- I think that’s what the lord would want us to do, just to stop, just **love** one another |
| Economic Elite, White, male | - Mr Trump missed a critical opportunity to bring our country together by unequivocally rejecting the appalling actions of White supremacists. |
| Economic Elite, Black, male | - rejecting expressions of **hatred**, bigotry and group supremacy |
| Rep. of an NGO/INGO, White, male | - Holocaust survivors are **crying**.  
- People who have endured Nazi Germany are **in tears**. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion Text AJE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Anchors, White, female | - a day of racial tension  
- Trump condemned far right groups calling them repugnant  
- opponents **fear** that supremacists will show up (at the Boston rally) |
| In-House Journalists, White, female | - and that is what has been **disappointing** to so many (Trump not denouncing groups of White supremacists by name earlier)  
- a very strong condemnation (... of any form of **hate**, racism and bigotry  
- there continues to be that **feeling** that the president has harmed those efforts to heal those painful devisions that exist in the United States over race  
- not showing the leadership one would **like** (Trump)  
- he had condemned **hate** and violence and bigotry  
- there is no question that the initial statement was **disappointing** to many  
- there was this effort by the White House to sort of massage the response to what many had **hoped** it would be (Trump’s statement)  
- George W and H W Bush issued a statement (...) talking about how America must always reject racial bigotry, antisemitism and **hatred** in all forms  
- thanked the president for his remarks, he (former leader of the KKK) said he (Trump) was **courageous** and honest |
| In-House Journalists, non-White, female | - the president, in his denunciation of **hatred** and bigotry |
| In-House Journalists, non-White, male | - it is surrounded in the deep South by a **terrible** history of racism and slavery and the Confederacy (Charlottesville)  
- it was an interesting mixture of that **emotional reminisce** you expect from an memorial service but defiance, **admiration** for Heather Hayer  
- there was great **admiration** (for Hayer)  
- ugly scenes  
- really, really terrible scenes  
- very tense scenes  
- normally a quite college town, this is a city were **hatred** was laid bare  
- here its legacy and the passions over the monuments to it linger (Confederacy)  
- what many people here find **offensive** (Confederate statues)  
- if the the next domino falls here, many Kentuckians **hope** it doesn't fall violently |
| Politician, White, male | - violence and deaths...strike at the heart of American law and justice |
### Ordinary Citizen, White, female

- It made me feel like this is been bubbling for a long time, and people had these opinions for a long time...I'm not glad that this happened but it's time that we are facing...and I'm glad that we're facing them

### Ordinary Citizen, White, male

- I am worried about the response, after Charlotte I am extremely worried (if Confederate statues would come down)

### Ordinary Citizen, Black, male

- it actually is offensive to a lot of people (Confederate statues)

---

### Appendix D (Discourse Strategies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Positive Self-Representation and Negative Other-Representation/ Blame Transfer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 01</td>
<td>'what brought these violent groups to Charlottesville is a statue'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 02</td>
<td>'very graphic images today Anna, of violence of this otherwise quite college town of Charlottesville, Virginia'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 02</td>
<td>'I've heard verbal altercations between locals here shouting at, whether it'd be protesters or counter-protesters, to go back home, to leave this town be'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'this city, the one that I love (...) is better than the display we're seeing from these racists cowards that are coming from out of town.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'these people do not dictate who we are as a city'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'they are not going to take our city. This is still our city.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'why do you think they're coming to your city specifically?'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'they want to take back what they think is quote on quote theirs. This city, that I know, is better than the images you see on the television screen'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170812 - 04</td>
<td>'we are not going to allow to let these White supremacists to take over our city and let the nation think that this defines us'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CNN_kl21_20170813 - 02</td>
<td>'just the kind of hatred a university town almost never sees'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Positive Self-Representation and Negative Other-Representation/ Blame Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN_kl22_20170813-07</td>
<td>'did you anticipate anything like this could happen in a beautiful community like Charlottesville Virginia, home of the University of Virginia?'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJE</td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170813 - 01</td>
<td>'everything is calm here now, this is where all the violence took place.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170813 - 01</td>
<td>'normally a quiet college town'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170813 - 01</td>
<td>'this is a city where hatred was laid bare, transformed into racial violence for the world to see'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170816-02</td>
<td>'Charlottesville seems to become almost a symbol of tolerance and anti-racism'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170816-02</td>
<td>'it [Charlottesville] is surrounded in the deep South by a terrible history of slavery...It's a small liberal enclave.'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170816-02</td>
<td>'when the White nationalists, the White supremacists, the Nazis came to this town'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E (Codebook)

Codebook

The study differentiates between speaking actors, crowd actors and crowds:

**Speaking Actors** are defined as individuals who are given a voice in the coverage, verbally or in form of written statement (e.g. a tweet, [or parts of] a speech). Hence, when a person is given the opportunity to express his or her thoughts and opinions freely through his or her choice of words, he or she is considered a speaking actor.

**Crowds** are defined as a large group of people gathering. Oftentimes crowds are shown in scenes that are constructed like ‘collages’, showing many short clips of crowds consecutively. If there is a cut and another clip of a crowd is being shown, it is coded as a distinct, or second crowd.

**Crowd Actors** are defined as single actors in a crowd who have a representative function and therefore play a significant role in the narrative of the news story. Significant here is that the crowd actor becomes visible in the midst of other people, e.g. the face of the crowd actor must be clearly shown. Usually a crowd actor is singled out through visual framing (e.g. when the camera centers one actor in the frame). Additionally the crowd actor can be identified through symbolic actions that he or she displays, e.g. speaking into a microphone. Sometimes two people are shown side by side who fit the criteria of a crowd actor. In this case code for two separate crowd actors. The category does not apply for more than two people in one scene.

*For speaking actors, crowds and crowd actors the categories below are coded to answer the following coding questions:*

1. What is the name of the item?
2. What are the roles of the speaking actors?
3. What is the race, gender of the speaking actors?
4. What kind of emotion are the speaking actors displaying?
5. If crowds are present in the coverage, what kind of crowds are being shown?
6. What kind of emotions are the crowds displaying?
7. If crowd actors are present in the coverage, what is the race, gender, age of the crowd actors?
8. What kind of emotions are the crowd actors displaying?
1. Item

Broadcast items are used to distinguish different segments in one broadcast. A news story, covering one overarching topic in one broadcast, can consist of a single item or several. Items are therefore not only defined by their topic but in conjunction with the nature of the report. For example, one item can consist of a journalist interviewing people on the street, while in the next item shows a panel of experts debating the same issue in the studio. A lead-in from the anchor (where the anchor gives a short introduction into the issue and then hands over to a correspondent) is not counted separately, but counted as part of the item that is being introduced. However, an item can also consist solely of a report or statement presented by the anchor if the report stands alone. The beginning and end of an item are usually signaled by the anchor or a journalist through an introduction and a sign-off (e.g. ‘Fahmida Miller, with the latest there, reporting live from Nairobi, thank you’).

The item label corresponds to the filename of the broadcast (e.g. Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170812), but an item-ending is added to differentiate different items in one broadcast. The items are counted chronologically (e.g. Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170812 - 01, Al_Jazeera_kl19_20170812 - 02).

2. Channel

Identify the television channel (e.g. Al-Jazeera)

3. Perceived Race

(this category does not apply for crowds)

Race categories are assigned on the basis of what can be deducted by an average viewer from features such as appearances (e.g. skin color, or hair), and other contextual cues. If the actor is named, further information on the background of the actor (e.g. personal racial identification, region of origin, origin of biological parents) is sought out for classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaking Actor — Race</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black (or African American)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-White (e.g. Asian, Arab, Native American, Latinx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Role

Speaking actors are coded for the role they perform in the item. Cues for identification can be found in the introduction of the anchor or journalist or on the displayed banner at the bottom of the screen. Please note that anchors are only coded once per broadcast as a speaking actor. See categories under ‘actor role’.
5. Comment
The following should be noted in the comment section:

1. **For Speaking Actors:** name of the actor if its given; otherwise note ‘unnamed’. Add a short description if actor role does not sufficiently describe the actor (e.g. ‘Samantha Bloom, mother of suspect’)

2. **For Crowds:** brief description of what is happening in the crowd (e.g. ‘people fighting, violence’; or ‘crowd in front of confederate statue’)

6. **For Crowd Actors:** short description (e.g. ‘unnamed, woman with microphone’)

7. **Emotion Fixed**
   - choose from five different categories: anger, fear, sadness, happiness, neutral (see instructions under ‘coding for emotions’)
   - coder can code for up to two different emotions in the two categories emotions fixed 1&2

8. **Emotion Comment**
   note here emotion cues: visual, acoustical, discursive etc.
   Be particularly attentive when it comes to discursively embedded emotions used by anchors and journalists (e.g. journalist: ‘very ugly scenes, really, really terrible scenes, tense scenes’; or ‘some people were almost at a loss of words’).
### Actor Role

#### Speaking Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actor Role</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protester</td>
<td>a person who appears in a news broadcast in their capacity as someone who is demonstrating against a policy or problem, typically by taking part in a protest, march or rally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist</td>
<td>identified as activist when introduced by anchor or in banner; a person who works ‘regularly’ to promote a certain cause, as opposed to a person who might take part in a one-off or occasional demonstration (see ‘protester’); supports but does not necessarily represent Amnesty, Greenpeace etc (see ‘member/rep of NGO’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremist</td>
<td>e.g. right-wing extremists must be self-identified as an extremist by the actor or by the journalist Note name of organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Victim                        | a person who suffered from or was harmed as a result of an external action; it could be either an accident or an action carried on purpose by a person or a group of persons  
                                 |   e.g. victim of a car accident/terrorist attack/police brutality victim                                                                                                                                   |
| Member of minority            | a person who appears in a news broadcast in their capacity as someone who belongs to an under-represented social group (e.g. as an representative of the LGBT+ community)                               |
| Ordinary person               | citizen, consumer, bereaved, bystander, patient, shopkeeper, ‘man in the street’; survivor, relatives of victims, bereaved or relatives of criminals should be coded here                                                                 |
| Witness                       | actor who witnesses an action he or she was not part in, self-identified or identified as witness by the journalist                                                                                                                                                  |
| Member or representative of an NGO or INGO | eg spokesperson or General Secretary of Oxfam, Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Wikileaks, etc                                                                                                               |
Coding For Emotions - Instructions

The coder identifies the focal emotion of one actor or a crowd, defined as the most important emotion the actor appeared to be experiencing in that scene, based on:

1. facial expression
2. tone of voice
3. posture
4. gestures
5. evoking situation
6. other contextual cues

In order to identify the focal emotion, the coder is encouraged to note every emotion that he/or she is witnessing as a viewer and then to determine the focal emotion evaluation the following factors:

1. relevance to the scene
   The relevance to the scene can be determined through the context of the report as well as the context the actor itself is situated in. How does the emotion relate to the scene? Is an argument amplified through an emotion? Does it alter the course the discourse? How are other actors reacting to the displayed emotion, if they are reacting at all? The display of a focal emotion is often acknowledged by other witnessing actors in some way, for example through verbal or facial modes of expressions (e.g. ‘I understand your anger’).

2. intensity
   prosodic features (such as loudness, emphasis, variations of pitch and tempo), paralinguistic features (such as laughing, gaps, pauses) and non-verbal communication (kinesics, such as as nodding, facial expressions and hand movements) can signal the intensity of an emotion

3. duration (relative to other emotions displayed in the item)

Focal emotions are coded regardless of how long the emotion indicator lasted, following Martin’s (2017) approach: ‘Hence, if a character was shown smiling consistently for 30 seconds, it would be counted as one indicator of happiness. An additional emotional code would not occur unless the charter changed emotions’ (Martin 2017: 505).

If one actor expresses several focal emotions in one item, focal emotions are coded separately.
For Crowds:

Just as with single actors, the coder aims to identify the focal emotion of a crowd. Hence, when there are a couple of actors within a crowd who display for example a neutral or happy emotion among a majority of actors who express anger, only anger will be coded.