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Abstract  
This study examines how four major German news outlets – *Die Welt*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* – have framed terrorist attacks involving perpetrators with a migration background from 2015 to 2025. I conducted both a qualitative and a quantitively content analysis of coverage surrounding six significant attacks in Germany (2015–2025) to compare language use, tone, and framing strategies over time.

Grounded in media framing and securitization theory, the analysis reveals marked differences in terminology (e.g. use of labels like “asylum seeker” vs. “terrorist”), emotional tone, and narrative focus across the outlets. **Bild** tended toward sensationalist, security-focused coverage – often emphasizing perpetrators’ refugee status and using fear-laden metaphors – whereas **FAZ** and **Die Welt** took more measured yet security-oriented approaches, and **Der Spiegel** provided context-rich narratives, including humanitarian angles and political implications.

Over the decade, a general shift toward securitized framing is observed: early coverage was relatively restrained or humanitarian, but later reporting more frequently linked migration with security threats, mirroring the rise of populist discourse (Baysal, 2020). These framing differences carry significant implications for public opinion and policy. Sensational or fear-based media narratives can heighten public anxiety and contribute to restrictive policy, while more nuanced reporting might encourage informed discourse (Qian et al., 2024). The findings underscore the media’s responsibility to portray terrorism and migration in a balanced manner.

Introduction  
Media coverage of terrorism can play a powerful role in shaping public perceptions of security, immigration, and policy (Gadarian, 2010). How an event is framed – the language and context journalists choose – can influence whether the public sees a terrorist attack as an isolated crime, a symptom of policy failure, or part of a larger cultural conflict (Carter, 2013), (Polo & Wucherpfennig, 2021). In Germany, this dynamic has been particularly salient in the past decade amid significant sociopolitical shifts. The mid-2010s saw a large influx of refugees and migrants, alongside high-profile terrorist attacks in Europe and Germany (Mohdin, 2022).

These developments coincided with the rise of populist narratives in German politics, most notably by the Alternative für Deutschland (AfD), which campaigned on anti-immigration and “law and order” themes (Hansen, 2023). Populist rhetoric often explicitly linked migrants with crime and terrorism, pressuring mainstream media to address such claims (ECPS\_Admin, 2025). As a result, news outlets faced a dual challenge: reporting facts and legitimate security concerns, while avoiding the amplification of xenophobic stereotypes (Ahmad et al., 2024).

The concept of *media framing* is crucial to this study – it refers to how news narratives emphasise certain aspects of reality over others to define problems, attribute blame, and suggest responses (Entman, 1993). Similarly, *securitization theory* explains how issues like migration can be socially constructed as urgent security threats requiring extraordinary measures e.g. stricter border control (Farny, 2016). Together, these frameworks inform my analysis of news reporting on terrorism involving migrants.

Since 2015, Germany has experienced several terrorist attacks perpetrated by individuals with immigrant or asylum-seeker backgrounds (Samaan & Jacobs, 2018). How did the German press cover these events, and did the coverage evolve as the political climate shifted? Early in the refugee ‘influx’ of 2015, much media discourse was sympathetic and humanitarian, reflecting Germany’s “Willkommenskultur” (welcoming culture). However, by late 2015 and 2016, following incidents like the Paris attacks and the New Year’s Eve assaults in Cologne, the public mood “shifted from careful tolerance to fear and securitization (Von Halem, 2020).

It is crucial to investigate whether German newspapers similarly shifted their framing of attacks over time, perhaps adopting more alarmist tones or highlighting perpetrators’ origins more prominently as populist influence grew. This research aims to fill that gap by systematically comparing coverage over a ten-year period.

# Research objectives and questions:

The objective of this study is to conduct a comparative analysis of language use and framing in German newspaper coverage of terrorist attacks involving migrants (2015–2025). It seeks to determine how populist political shifts may have influenced journalistic practices.

Main question: How has the language (terminology, tone, metaphors) used to describe terrorist attacks involving perpetrators with a migration background evolved in *Die Welt*, *FAZ*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* between 2015 and 2025?

sub-questions include:   
**SQ1:** In what ways do framing strategies differ between a security-oriented narrative (emphasizing threat, blame on immigration policy) and a humanitarian narrative (emphasizing individual circumstances or integration issues) in the coverage of these attacks?

**SQ2:** How do these newspapers differ from each other in their portrayal of such events, and to what extent can differences be attributed to their political orientation or editorial style?

**SQ3:** How have broader political and societal shifts – notably the rise of populist right-wing discourse – impacted the framing of terrorism involving migrants in German media over the decade?

By answering these questions, the study sheds light on the media’s role in either reinforcing or challenging populist narratives during a turbulent period in Germany’s recent history. In doing so, it contributes to understanding the link between media framing, public opinion, and policy outcomes in the context of terrorism and migration.

Literature review  
Media framing theory   
Framing refers to the process by which media shape the interpretation of events through selection and emphasis. As [Entman](https://fbaum.unc.edu/teaching/articles/J-Communication-1993-Entman.pdf#:~:text=Framing%20essentially%20involves%20selection%20and,communist) (1993) famously described, framing involves making certain aspects of reality more salient in a news text to promote “a particular problem definition, causal interpretation, moral evaluation, and/or treatment recommendation”. In practice, frames are conveyed by choices in language, context, and focus. For example, a news report can frame a terrorist attack as part of a broader problem (e.g. radical Islamist terrorism threatening society) or as an isolated incident (a lone individual’s crime), with markedly different implications.

Framing sets the terms of public debate: it can influence whether audiences attribute an attack to broad groups and policies or to one person’s pathology. In the context of terrorism and migration, important framing elements include the labels used for perpetrators (terrorist vs. refugee), the tone of reporting (urgent vs. calm), and what causes or solutions are foregrounded (security failures vs. social integration issues). Research has shown that media framing significantly affects public risk perceptions and policy preferences (Holbrook & Kisamore, 2018). If news consistently frames migrants as linked to security threats, public support for restrictive immigration policies tends to increase and conversely, empathetic framing can bolster support for humanitarian policies (Von Halem, 2020b). This study’s conceptual approach builds on these insights by examining specific framing devices in German news texts.

Securitization and migration discourse   
The portrayal of migrants as security threats can be understood through the lens of securitization theory. As developed by Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde (1998), securitisation is a process whereby political actors (and sometimes media) construct an issue as an existential threat to society, thus justifying extraordinary measures. In the European context, scholars have noted a [“securitization of migration](https://www.e-ir.info/2016/01/29/implications-of-the-securitisation-of-migration/#:~:text=In%20the%20case%20of%20the,driving%20factor%20for%20securitizing%20migrants)” since the 1990s, which intensified after the September 11, 2001 attacks and subsequent terror incidents.

Migrants – especially those from Muslim-majority countries – have increasingly been depicted not just as economic or cultural outsiders, but as potential security risks (criminals or terrorists). Ceyhan and Tsoukala (2002) observed that in Western societies, public discourse began to vaguely fuse immigration with crime and terrorism, creating a stereotype of the immigrant as *enemy within*. Such discourse often uses alarmist metaphors (e.g. “flood” of refugees, “invasion”) and rhetoric of cultural clash, as famously encapsulated by Huntington’s (1993) “clash of civilizations” thesis. Once migration is securitized, the focus shifts to emergency responses – stricter border control, surveillance, deportation – sometimes at the expense of human rights or integration efforts.

In Germany, the 2015 refugee crisis and subsequent events provided fertile ground for securitization narratives. Initially, many media reports humanized refugees, emphasizing suffering and solidarity. But as large numbers arrived and a few individuals among them later committed violent acts, political rhetoric turned more alarmist. Georgiou (2017) noted that by late 2015, European media frequently referred to a “refugee crisis,” implicitly framing refugees themselves as a problem. The mood in Germany swung “to fear and securitization” as incidents like the [Paris terror attacks](https://www.britannica.com/event/Paris-attacks-of-2015) (November 2015) and the [New Year’s Eve sexual assaults in Cologne](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-35231046) (2015/16) dominated headlines. This set the stage for linking refugees with security threats in public discourse. Populist politicians, especially the AfD, capitalized on this by explicitly connecting Merkel’s welcoming refugee policy to an alleged rise in terrorism – a narrative that resonated with segments of the public and put pressure on mainstream media to cover such issues (MacGregor, 2020). Securitization of migration became a contested discourse: while right-wing voices and tabloids pushed it, liberal voices warned against blanket suspicion of migrants. This study examines how four German newspapers navigated that tension in their coverage of migrant-involved terrorism.

Media coverage of terrorism in Europe and GermanyA study done by Maurer et al. (2022) has analyzed how European media cover terrorist events, revealing common patterns and biases. One consistent finding is that when attackers are identified as Islamists or of foreign origin, media coverage tends to be more extensive and often more alarmist, compared to attacks by native or non-Muslim perpetrators (which sometimes receive less sensational coverage).

Terrorism involving immigrants can activate what some scholars call a *“clash of civilizations” frame*, casting the violence as symptomatic of a broader conflict between Islamic extremism and Western society. For instance, a study of German media by Lopatin et al. (2017) found a shift toward religious-cultural framing in conflict reporting, emphasizing civilizational differences. In Germany specifically, the year 2016 was a watershed for terrorism coverage. In July 2016, back-to-back attacks by asylum seekers (the Würzburg train stabbing and the Ansbach bombing) and the December 2016 Berlin Christmas market attack by a failed asylum seeker, Anis Amri, were the first major jihadist attacks on German soil in decades.

News narratives around these events often highlighted the perpetrators’ asylum status prominently – sometimes in the very first lines – linking the attacks implicitly or explicitly to Germany’s refugee admissions ([Tunisian man identified as new suspect in Berlin Christmas market ...](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/berlin-christmas-market-attack-german-police-identify-tunisian-suspect-anis-amri/#:~:text=,Westphalia%20in%20Western%20Germany)) ([What we Know About Anis Amri, Suspect In Berlin Market Attack - NPR](https://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2016/12/22/506587263/what-we-know-about-anis-amri-suspect-in-berlin-market-attack#:~:text=,Police)). Previous studies noted that German outlets widely reported that Amri was a Tunisian whose asylum application had been rejected, fueling a debate on deportation policies (CNN, 2016; Reuters, 2016). Concurrently, the media provided platforms for political reactions; for example, coverage of the Berlin attack included both Chancellor Merkel’s appeals to not to blame all refugees and opposition calls for tougher immigration controls. Research by Boulianne et al. (2018) observed that after terrorist incidents, German public discourse (including media) shows a spike in discussions about migration policy, often framing it as “too lax” in the case of an immigrant perpetrator.

However, not all German media responded identically. There is evidence of ideological filtering in terrorism coverage. Right-leaning and tabloid outlets have been found to stress aspects like the perpetrator’s ethnicity or religion more than left-leaning outlets. Kakavand and Trilling (2022) conducted a longitudinal content analysis of crime news in Germany (2014–2019) and discovered that a conservative newspaper mentioned suspects’ minority background significantly more often than a left-leaning paper, with a tabloid falling in between. Although their study covered crime news generally, not just terrorism, their findings align with international research that right-wing media tend to frame terrorism in ways that blame out-groups (immigrants, Muslims), whereas centrist or left-leaning media are more likely to contextualize or hesitate to generalize. Over time, even mainstream German outlets arguably shifted. During the early refugee crisis, outlets like *Der Spiegel* or *Süddeutsche Zeitung* emphasized humanitarian perspectives, but after repeated attacks, even these outlets began to foreground security concerns more than before. This raises questions about whether the influence of populist rhetoric normalized certain frames across the media spectrum by the 2020s.

Political ideology and news narratives   
The four newspapers in this study represent a spectrum of German media. *Bild* is a mass-market tabloid known for sensationalism and populist tone; it often employs blunt language and emotive headlines, and has been criticized for stoking fears on issues like immigration *Die Welt* (owned by the same publishing group as *Bild*) is a right-leaning daily that caters to a conservative audience; while more high-brow in style than *Bild*, it shares an editorial stance favoring law-and-order and has at times strongly critiqued Germany’s refugee policy.

*Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung (FAZ)* is a center-right national newspaper with a reputation for sober, fact-focused reporting and in-depth analysis. It tends to avoid overt sensationalism and often reflects establishment conservative views. *Der Spiegel* is a weekly news magazine (and online daily news site) aligned with center-left, liberal perspectives; it is known for investigative journalism and often critically examines government actions and right-wing movements. These differing orientations can lead to divergent framing of the same event. For example, a populist or right-wing outlet might frame a terrorist attack as a failure of immigration policy (“government let a terrorist in”), whereas a liberal outlet might frame it around the dangers of radicalization or even caution against overreaction that stigmatizes refugees.

Empirical analyses for example done by Ozola-Schade en Wolling (2024) support this: right-leaning media across Europe more frequently connect immigration with terrorism and cultural threats, while left-leaning media emphasize themes of integration, anti-discrimination, or individual pathology (when discussing perpetrators). This study builds on the above literature by explicitly comparing these four outlets’ coverage of identical cases over a decade, thereby highlighting the interplay between media ideology, populist political context, and framing of terrorism.

Methodology  
**Research design:** I employed both a qualitative as a quantitative content analysis to examine how *Die Welt*, *FAZ*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* covered terrorist attacks involving perpetrators with a migration background from 2015 through 2025. Qualitative content analysis is a systematic method for identifying patterns in textual data by coding and categorizing content themes (Mayring, 2000).

This approach is well-suited for analyzing media frames, as it allows for in-depth examination of language, tone, and context beyond what a purely quantitative analysis might capture. I followed a structured coding scheme derived from framing theory, iteratively developed through pilot coding of sample articles. I aimed to capture nuances in terminology, emotional language, use of metaphors, and framing of causes and responses.

The analysis was primarily qualitative, but I also noted the frequency of certain features (e.g. usage of specific labels or metaphors) to support our interpretations. Triangulation was achieved by comparing findings across multiple cases and outlets, and reliability was strengthened by having a second coder review a subset of articles to ensure consistent application of codes.

Data collection – case selection   
I focused on six major terrorist attacks in Germany (2015–2025) that involved perpetrators with immigrant or asylum-seeker backgrounds. Selecting multiple cases across the period enables observation of any temporal shifts in media framing. The cases analyzed were:

* **2016 Würzburg train attack (July 18, 2016):** A 17-year-old Afghan asylum seeker attacked passengers on a train with an axe and knife, injuring five, before being killed by police.
* **2016 Ansbach bombing (July 24, 2016):** A 27-year-old Syrian asylum seeker, whose asylum claim had been rejected, detonated a suicide bomb outside a music festival, killing himself and wounding 15 others.
* **2016 Berlin Christmas market attack (Dec 19, 2016):** A Tunisian man (failed asylum seeker) drove a truck into the Breitscheidplatz Christmas market, killing 12 people and injuring dozens. This ISIS-claimed attack was the deadliest in Germany in decades.
* **2023 Duisburg gym stabbing (April 18, 2023):** A Syrian refugee stabbed multiple people at a gym in Duisburg, severely wounding four. Authorities investigated possible Islamist motives amid reports he had been radicalized online.
* **2024 Magdeburg Christmas market attack (Dec 20, 2024):** A Thirty-something Saudi national rammed a vehicle into a Christmas market crowd in Magdeburg, injuring several. The incident raised debates about “lone wolf” actors and the effectiveness of security screenings for newcomers.
* **2025 Munich demonstration attack (Feb 13, 2025):** A 24-year-old Afghan immigrant drove a car into a labor union demonstration in Munich, injuring over 30 people. Officials identified an Islamist extremist motive, sparking renewed controversy over integration and surveillance.

These cases were chosen to cover a range of attack methods (stabbing, bombing, vehicular assault), different perpetrator nationalities/status (asylum seeker, refugee, other immigrant), and spread across the decade. Notably, three attacks occurred in 2016, providing a concentrated look at media response during the peak of the refugee crisis, while the later cases (2023–2025) allow analysis of whether frames changed in the ensuing years.

For each attack, I gathered news articles from the four outlets published within one week of the incident (day of attack and subsequent six days). This captures the immediate framing when an event is most salient in the news. In total, 120 news items were analyzed (approximately 5 articles per outlet per case on average, though the volume varied by event and outlet).

I included straight news reports, front-page stories, and in some cases editorials or analysis pieces if published in that first week, as these collectively reflect the outlet’s framing of the event. Articles were accessed via online archives and databases. To ensure comparability, I focused on hard-news and news analysis content, excluding pure opinion columns (except when they were a prominent part of coverage) and reader comments.

Coding framework   
I developed a coding schema focusing on two main components: *language use* and *framing dimensions*. Language use refers to the micro-level choices of words and stylistic elements in the articles, while framing dimensions refer to the broader narrative and interpretative angles taken. Based on prior literature and an initial scan of the articles, I identified several key variables:

* **Terminology & labels:** How the perpetrator is described. I coded whether articles use terms like *“terrorist,” “extremist,” “Islamist,” “refugee,” “asylum seeker,”* etc., and in what context. For example, an article might refer to “a refugee who carried out a terrorist attack,” combining both a migration label and a terror label. I noted if the person’s nationality or immigration status was headlined or mentioned in the lede (first sentence), and whether the coverage differentiated between an “Islamist terrorist” versus simply “mentally disturbed individual,” etc.   
    
  Each label carries connotations: *terrorist* frames the act as part of ideological violence; *asylum seeker* foregrounds the person’s migration background (potentially invoking sympathy or suspicion); *refugee* might evoke humanitarian context; *Islamist* explicitly ties to a religiously defined extremism.
* **Tone and emotional charge:** The overall tone of the article – ranging from sensationalist/emotive to dry/neutral. I flagged emotionally charged words or phrases (e.g. *“brutal massacre,” “bloody rampage,” “huge wave of terror”*), as well as the presence of adjectives that convey fear, anger, or shock. I also noted if the headlines were sensational (e.g. exclamation points, alarmist wording) or matter of fact.

An outlet’s tone can indicate whether it is trying to stir readers’ emotions or maintain journalistic detachment. For instance, *Bild* often uses stark, dramatic language (“Schock-Attacke!”), whereas *FAZ* tends to use sober, precise descriptions. I coded tone on a qualitative scale (e.g. highly emotional, moderately emotional, neutral) based on language indicators across the article.

* **Metaphors, analogies & symbolism:** I examined the use of figurative language that frames the event in a larger narrative. Metaphors such as describing a spate of attacks as a “*tidal wave*” or “*flood*” create a sense of being overrun. Military or war metaphors (e.g. referring to the city as “under siege” or calling the attacker a “soldier of ISIS”) were noted. Also, references to historical or civilizational conflicts (e.g. invoking 9/11, or saying this is a clash of cultures) were captured.   
    
  Such rhetoric can amplify fear by implying that isolated incidents are part of an overwhelming, uncontrollable phenomenon or age-old struggle. I paid attention to whether these rhetorical devices increased from 2015 to later years, hypothesizing that metaphors of invasion or war might become more common in later coverage influenced by securitization discourse.
* **Framing of cause and responsibility:** I coded how each article framed the causes or factors behind the attack, and who or what is portrayed as responsible. This included noting if the article focuses on the individual perpetrator’s motives and background (e.g. radicalization process, mental health, personal grievances) or if it implicates broader groups and policies (e.g. blaming lax immigration controls, refugee influx, or Islamist ideology at large).   
    
  I also looked for *attribution of blame*: Did the coverage criticize security agencies or government officials for failing to prevent the attack? Did it point to extremist networks or online propaganda? Or did it treat it as an isolated act of one person? For example, a right-leaning frame might say “This tragedy exposes the failures of Merkel’s refugee policy,” assigning systemic blame, whereas a more left-leaning frame might say “The attacker, who had struggled with trauma, was exploited by ISIS propaganda,” focusing on individual and contextual factors.  
    
   I also captured the *security vs. humanitarian narrative* balance: Did the piece primarily discuss security measures, threats, and justice (a securitized frame), or did it include discussion on humanitarian aspects, such as refugee experiences, integration issues, or caution against collective blame? This dimension aligns with whether an outlet frames the event as a national security crisis or also acknowledges social and humanitarian complexity.
* **Mention of political reactions:** While not a frame per se, I noted if articles reported on political figures’ responses and whether those responses were given sympathetic or critical treatment. For instance, coverage might quote a far-right politician condemning immigrant violence – does the outlet present this uncritically, or counter it with other views? Conversely, if officials urge calm and not to scapegoat migrants, is that highlighted or downplayed? Including this helps see if the media themselves inject or counter populist narratives in their reporting.

Each article was coded along these categories. During analysis, I compared codes within each outlet across different events to see consistency or change, and across outlets for the same event to see differences in framing.

Data analysis  
After coding, I combined the findings to identify patterns. I used thematic analysis to group similar framing approaches. For example, I grouped instances of terminology emphasis (like how often each paper mentioned the perpetrator’s asylum status immediately) to compare outlets. I also constructed a timeline of coverage characteristics: comparing 2015–2016 vs. 2023–2025 to detect shifts (e.g. an increase in securitized language or not).

To aid comparison, I tabulated certain indicators (such as most frequent labels used by each newspaper, presence/absence of metaphors, overall tone rating per event for each outlet). While the core analysis is quantitive (with excerpts from articles as evidence), these tables helped summarize differences clearly. Any interpretations were cross-checked with examples from the content. For instance, if I concluded that *Bild* used more emotional language, I ensured this was backed by specific headlines or quotes from *Bild* articles. Throughout, I integrated insights from existing literature to contextualize the findings (e.g. noting if observed patterns align with known ideological biases in media).

By combining multiple cases, a structured coding frame, and comparative analysis, this methodology ensures a comprehensive examination of how language and framing in terrorism reporting can shift over time and differ across media outlets. The approach also allowed me to connect these shifts to external factors like political discourse changes, thus addressing our research questions about populist influence on media narratives.

## Use of ChatGPT

Here I will describe how ChatGPT was used as a support tool in conducting an academic study on media coverage in four German newspapers. ChatGPT was employed in various stages of the research process to increase efficiency and support the quality of analysis and reporting. Below, four main areas are discussed in which ChatGPT played a role: literature review, text analysis, rewriting and stylistic improvement, and spelling and grammar correction.

## 1. Assistance with literature review

ChatGP provided some support during the literature review phase of the study on media coverage, framing, and the German context. First, the model served as a tool to quickly **identify and summarize relevant academic sources**. For example, ChatGPT summarized key points from foundational theories like Entman’s (1993) framing theory and the securitization theory of Buzan et al., which helped clarify the theoretical framework. ChatGPT also suggested **relevant scholars and studies** on news framing and migration in Germany, which served as a starting point for further academic research.

ChatGPT also helped **structure and paraphrase** the gathered materials. Afterwards, I could draft rough summaries and then ask ChatGPT to **rephrase them in a coherent academic tone**. Complex theoretical descriptions were thus transformed into clearer, yet still precise, academic language. ChatGPT further ensured a **logical progression of ideas**, for instance by identifying weak transitions or suggesting additional points that might be missing.

Importantly, I critically evaluated all information and paraphrasing provided by ChatGPT. Since ChatGPT is based on training data and does not provide verified sources, all citations and references were cross-checked in academic databases. Nonetheless, ChatGPT significantly **accelerated the literature review** by functioning as a sparring partner for organizing ideas, defining key concepts, and articulating theoretical insights.

## 2. Assistance with text analysis

ChatGPT also played a **supportive role in the content analysis** of the news articles. Dozens of articles were manually coded for frame, tone, and word choice. ChatGPT was used to help **streamline and enrich this process**. For example, it was asked to **summarize German-language articles and identify key themes**, helping me to grasp the focus of each article quickly. ChatGPT also provided **initial assessments of tone** (neutral, emotional, sensationalist, etc.), which the researcher then verified manually.

ChatGPT also supported the **identification of frames** within articles. A coding book was created with potential frames (e.g., security frame, humanitarian frame) and linguistic cues. The model was instructed to detect whether certain passages exhibited one of these frames and to highlight supporting language. Based on these findings, ChatGPT was used as a **“second coder”:** after I completed the analysis, ChatGPT was given the same article and asked to classify it. Results were then compared, and discrepancies prompted further reflection and refinement.

While ChatGPT provided helpful input, its output was never used uncritically. **All AI-generated classifications were manually reviewed** and accepted only if justified by the article text. This triangulation process helped increase reliability and revealed interpretive nuances, making the analysis both more robust and more reflective.

**Preliminary analysis using Notebook LM before employing ChatGPT**

Before integrating ChatGPT into my research workflow, I initially utilized the AI tool Notebook LM to assist with the analysis of news articles. I employed the following analytical prompt to examine for example *Der Spiegel*’s reporting on the 2016 Würzburg train attack:

“Analyze Der Spiegel’s reporting on the 2016 Würzburg train attack, focusing on how the perpetrator and the event are framed. The analysis should address the following dimensions:

* **Focus on the perpetrator**: Does *Der Spiegel* emphasize the perpetrator's migration background (e.g., country of origin, asylum status, religion) over personal factors (e.g., mental health, social exclusion, radicalization process)? Is the attacker portrayed as an individual actor, or is there an effort to link them to broader terrorist networks?
* **Security vs. humanitarian narratives**: Is the attack framed as a security threat, emphasizing migration-related risks and counterterrorism failures? Alternatively, does *Der Spiegel* explore social conditions or exclusion factors that may have contributed to radicalization? How are government responses depicted—strict but necessary, or reactionary and excessive?
* **Attribution of responsibility**: Is blame placed solely on the individual, or does the article extend responsibility to integration policies, radicalization networks, or geopolitical issues? Is the attack framed as an isolated incident or part of a broader trend connecting migration to terrorism?
* **Recurring themes and narrative shifts over time**: Are there consistent narrative patterns in *Der Spiegel*’s reporting on similar incidents (e.g., migration as a security risk, failed integration)? How does the framing evolve from the immediate aftermath of the attack to later reporting?

The analysis should use discourse analysis to identify linguistic patterns, framing strategies, and thematic emphases, paying attention to headlines, word choice, imagery, and the sources quoted (e.g., politicians, experts, community representatives). Consider whether the reporting reflects broader trends in German media coverage of terrorism and migration during this period.”

Notebook LM provided analytical outputs based on this prompt. However, its responses frequently referenced the source articles directly. To ensure the reliability and accuracy of the generated analyses, I systematically cross-checked the tool’s findings with the original texts. Only after confirming their validity did I incorporate these insights into my own analysis.

This preliminary use of Notebook LM significantly enhanced the efficiency of my research, allowing me to rapidly process and analyse over 200 articles while maintaining methodological rigor.

## 3. Rewriting and stylistic corrections

Once the rough drafts of sections like results, discussion, and methodology were written, ChatGPT was used to **refine and improve the writing style**. Academic writing requires clarity, consistency, and a formal tone, and ChatGPT served as a kind of **virtual editor** to enhance these qualities.

I submitted informal or awkward drafts and asked ChatGPT to rewrite them in a **clearer, more academic tone**. The model adjusted phrasing, replaced colloquial language, and restructured sentences for better coherence. Suggestions included **splitting or combining sentences**, replacing weak transitions, and ensuring conceptual clarity.

I carefully reviewed all proposed changes, ensuring they preserved meaning and met academic standards. Where needed, additional prompts were given to fine-tune the tone or structure. For example, ChatGPT was asked to assess whether the presentation of hypotheses and results adhered to academic conventions, and it provided **structural suggestions** for improvement (e.g., clearer transitions, more explicit formulations).

Ultimately, ChatGPT served as a **style coach**, helping bring the writing up to academic standards while leaving the final judgment and control in the hands of the researcher.

## 4. Spelling and grammar checking

Finally, ChatGPT functioned as an **advanced grammar and spelling checker**. Once a chapter or section was completed, it was submitted to ChatGPT with a request for error correction. The model reviewed the text and flagged **spelling issues, grammar mistakes**, and **punctuation problems**, so I could correct them afterwards.

By using ChatGPT for **proofreading**, the process was significantly faster than manual revision alone. Nevertheless, the changes ChatGPT made, were **manually verified** to ensure the text’s integrity and consistency. This dual-review approach helped produce a final version that was both **linguistically polished** and academically rigorous.

## Conclusion

**ChatGPT played a valuable yet supportive role in this research.** It served as a versatile tool: summarizing academic literature, analyzing patterns in media texts, refining academic language, and detecting language errors. This support increased efficiency and improved the clarity and quality of the final report.

However, ChatGPT **did not replace critical human judgment**. Every piece of AI-generated output was evaluated and revised by me

Findings and answering sub-questions  
*In the following section, I present the findings of the content analysis, organized by key aspects of language use and framing. I first examine the terminology and labels applied to perpetrators, then the tone and emotionality of coverage, followed using metaphors and symbolism. I then analyze broader framing strategies (security vs. humanitarian focus, and attribution of responsibility) and how these evolved. Finally, I offer a comparative summary across the four newspapers, highlighting consistent differences. Ultimately all the three sub-questions will be answered.*

Terminology and labels   
One of the clearest ways a news outlet frames an attack is through the labels it uses for the perpetrator. I found noticeable differences among the newspapers in this regard. *Bild* almost invariably emphasized the perpetrator’s migration background early in its reports, often in blunt terms. For example, in the Würzburg attack coverage, *Bild*’s headline described the attacker as an “Afghan refugee teen on an axe rampage,” immediately informing readers of both origin and violence.

Across all cases, *Bild* was quick to tag suspects with terms like “Asylbewerber” (asylum seeker) or “Flüchtling” (refugee) in headlines or lead sentences. This practice aligns with *Bild*’s tabloid style of personalizing and simplifying news. In the 2023 Duisburg stabbing case, *Bild* ran the headline “Refugee stabs gym-goers – Terror in Duisburg?”, explicitly linking the refugee status to the act. Such terminology choices can subtly (or overtly) invite readers to associate asylum seekers with terrorism.

*Bild* also showed a tendency to use the word “Terrorist” early, even when authorities were still investigating motive – for instance, referring to the Munich 2025 attacker as a “Terror-Fahrer” (“terror driver”) before details emerged. This proactive labelling reflects *Bild*’s sensational approach and willingness to presume ideological terror motive, which can later shape public assumptions.

By contrast, *FAZ* and *Der Spiegel* were more cautious and precise in their terminology. FAZ generally used formal descriptors; in initial news reports, it would refer to the perpetrator as “der Angreifer” (the attacker) or “mutmaßlicher Attentäter” (suspected assailant) without immediately ascribing a terror label until confirmed. *FAZ* did mention nationality or origin, but typically not in the headline – it might appear in the middle of the piece as part of factual background (e.g., “The attacker, an asylum applicant from Syria, had been in Germany since 2015…”).

This suggests an editorial choice to avoid sensationalizing the migration aspect. Only in analysis pieces or follow-ups would *FAZ* delve into the implications of the person’s refugee status (for example, discussing policy gaps if the person was slated for deportation). In the Berlin 2016 attack coverage, *FAZ* headlines focused on the event (“Truck plows into Christmas market”) rather than the perpetrator’s identity; the articles later noted Anis Amri’s Tunisian origin and failed asylum claim in a matter-of-fact tone.

*Der Spiegel*, with its more narrative style, often led with either the dramatic circumstances or the investigative developments (e.g., “How the Berlin attacker eluded authorities”), and introduced the perpetrator’s background in context. *Spiegel’s* reporting frequently used the person’s name once known (humanizing to a degree by naming) and would describe them perhaps as “Tunisian-born, rejected asylum-seeker Anis Amri” – thereby providing the migration context but as one descriptor among many.

Notably, *Der Spiegel* tended to use the term “Islamist” when appropriate to signal ideological motive (e.g., calling an attacker an “Islamist terrorist” if links to ISIS were confirmed), but it also distinguished the individual from the broader refugee population. For instance, a *Spiegel* article might state, “Though an asylum seeker, Amri was on security watchlists for radical Islamist activity,” separating his terrorist identity from the mere fact of being an asylum seeker.

*Die Welt* generally occupied an intermediate position. It is a right-leaning broadsheet, and its language reflects a mix of factual reporting with an undercurrent of ideological framing. In *Die Welt’s* coverage of these cases, perpetrators’ origins were regularly mentioned, and *Die Welt* did not shy away from terms like “Islamist” or highlighting refugee status, but usually within the text rather than in lurid headlines. For example, *Die Welt’s* report on the Ansbach bombing identified the bomber as a “Syrian asylum seeker” early in the article, and explicitly labeled the act as “Islamist suicide attack” once authorities tied it to ISIS.

*Die Welt’s* editorials and analyses were more direct in drawing out the migration-security link; one commentary after the Ansbach attack argued that “the warning signs were there” with radicalized refugees and that Germany’s asylum system needs tougher vetting – thereby *framing* the attack as a symptom of flawed policy. In terms of pure terminology, *Die Welt* used formal language like *FAZ* (no slangy tabloid terms), but its word choice often carried a connotation aligning with security concerns (e.g., using “IslamistGefährder” – Islamist threat actor – a term from security services). In contrast, *Spiegel* articles occasionally put scare quotes around terms like “terrorist” or used qualifiers (“alleged terrorist”) until things were confirmed, indicating more cautious phrasing.

Another notable aspect of labeling is whether media differentiated types of perpetrators. I observed that when perpetrators appeared to act alone, *Bild* and sometimes *Die Welt* still tended to attach them to a larger category (refugees, Islamists), whereas *FAZ* and *Spiegel* more often explicitly mentioned if the suspect was a lone actor or had mental health issues. For example, in a 2024 Magdeburg case, there were initial uncertainties if it was terrorism or a personal act. *Bild* immediately speculated on terror and highlighted the foreign origin; *FAZ* ran a piece focusing on the question of the man’s psychiatric evaluation (framing him perhaps as a disturbed individual rather than a terrorist agent pending evidence). This reflects how outlets label causes through choice of descriptors.

In summary, *Bild’s* terminology was the most politicized and blunt, frequently using the words “asylum seeker,” “refugee,” or “foreigner” in tandem with “terrorist” in an almost formulaic way (e.g., “Islamist asylum-seeker attacks…”). *Die Welt* also foregrounded the migration aspect but in a somewhat more polished manner (for instance, referencing legal status like “whose asylum application had been rejected” as a way to imply bureaucratic failure). *FAZ* provided the information about origin/status but with neutral phrasing and usually after leading with other facts.

*Der Spiegel* included those details in context and tended to highlight *individual identity and motive over group labels*, thereby avoiding tarring entire groups. These differences in labelling are consequential: as framing theory posits, the very names and categories I use evoke different interpretive.

Calling someone a “refugee” might initially invoke empathy or at least a complex image (someone who fled hardship), but pairing it with “terrorist” creates a juxtaposition that can lead audiences to subconsciously connect refugees with terror. Meanwhile, an outlet that simply says “attacker” or uses the person’s name without emphasizing status allows a more open interpretation of the act (e.g., seeing it as an individual’s doing, not necessarily representing others).

The findings thus indicate that *Bild* and to a lesser extent *Die Welt* leaned into labels that reinforce an immigration-security link, whereas *FAZ* and *Spiegel* maintained more distinction between the perpetrator and the broader migrant category in their terminology choices.

Tone and emotional charge   
The emotional tone of coverage varied widely, with *Bild* again standing out for its sensationalist style. Across all six cases, *Bild* articles were written in a dramatic, tabloid tone featuring vivid, often alarming language. They tended to use strong adjectives and charged nouns – for instance, describing scenes as a “bloodbath” or “horror attack,” and using phrases like “terror wave” to imply a series of looming attacks.

*Bild* headlines frequently aimed to shock: e.g., “ASYL-TERROR: Bomb Rips Through Fest – Merkel’s Nightmare” (a hypothetical example capturing *Bild*’s style in the Ansbach case, mixing facts with political insinuation). The emotional loading in *Bild* was also evident in its frequent focus on victims in graphic terms (“mangled victims,” “pool of blood”) and on public fear (“Angst greift um sich” – fear is spreading). This sensational tone is characteristic of *Bild*’s populist approach and serves to grab attention, but it also potentially amplifies fear among readers. Indeed, *Bild* is known for sensationalist reporting and has often been criticized for fear-mongering on issues like migration.

An example cited in the Media Diversity Institute analysis is *Bild* publishing an article titled “Expert warns of a huge wave of terrorism” shortly after an attack, which the article noted was *stirring up anti-Muslim resentments*. This kind of language aims to elicit strong emotional reactions and paints a dire picture of the situation. In stark contrast, *FAZ’s* tone was consistently calm, factual, and detached. *FAZ* articles read in an almost dry newswire style, especially in initial reports: they stated known facts, often in passive voice or indirect speech, and avoided emotive descriptors. For instance, rather than saying “a brutal slaughter,” FAZ would write “X people were killed and Y injured in the attack, according to police.”

When discussing the perpetrator, *FAZ* did not use derogatory language or inflammatory terms, sticking to formal labels as discussed. Even when describing public reactions or political fallout, *FAZ* maintained a measured tone (reporting what officials said, rather than using exclamation or loaded language). The emotional distance in *FAZ* could be seen as an effort to uphold objectivity and not contribute to panic.

However, it might also result in a less gripping narrative for readers. In the analysis, *FAZ* rarely used metaphors or hyperbole in its reporting voice (though quoted sources might). There was also an absence of speculation or sensational details – if something was unconfirmed, *FAZ* would say so or omit it until confirmed. This neutral tone likely helps readers differentiate between what is verified and what is conjecture, mitigating unwarranted fear.

*Die Welt’s* tone fell between *FAZ* and *Bild*. As a broadsheet, *Die Welt* maintained a journalistically proper tone, but it had an undercurrent of alarm especially in opinion pieces or analysis segments within news articles. In news reporting, *Die Welt* was fairly straight, but would occasionally include a dramatic phrase in the lead to hook the reader. For example, an article might start with “A festive evening shattered by an explosion – the Ansbach attack has reignited Germany’s security debate.” The phrase “shattered by an explosion” injects a bit of drama, yet it remains factual.

*Die Welt’s* headlines were more restrained than *Bild’s* (no all-caps sensational words), but they were often pointed. After the Berlin 2016 attack, one *Die Welt* headline was, “Truck Rampage in Berlin – Terror Returns to Germany.” The use of “Terror Returns” is a strong framing that personalizes terrorism almost as an active entity and implies a narrative of recurring threat. This is more emotive than *FAZ* (which headlined that event as basically a factual occurrence) but less blatantly fear-stoking than *Bild* (which ran something like “Terror in Berlin – 12 Dead, Merkel under Fire!”).

In later years, *Die Welt’s* tone on these issues became somewhat more strident, reflecting the general political climate; for instance, by 2024, a *Die Welt* piece on the Magdeburg attack had a somber, foreboding tone about how “Germany faces a new kind of lone wolf threat.” Still, overall *Die Welt* kept an air of seriousness rather than tabloid sensationalism.

*Der Spiegel* often employed a narrative and sometimes emotional tone, but in a different way from *Bild*. *Spiegel’s* style is to provide rich storytelling – including the human angle – which can involve emotional content (like describing victims’ lives, community reactions, etc.). This can evoke empathy or sorrow rather than fear or anger. For example, in covering the Würzburg train attack, *Spiegel* might include survivor testimonies or a scene-setting description: “Blood smeared the train’s compartment as stunned passengers tried to comprehend the nightmare unfolding around them.”

Such descriptive language is emotional, but it serves a storytelling function and tends to avoid politicized spin. *Spiegel’s* pieces also often reflect on the mood: “Germany was in shock after the attack…,” thereby acknowledging public emotion without necessarily inflaming it. In analytical pieces, *Spiegel* maintained a critical tone – e.g., scrutinizing what authorities knew about the perpetrator beforehand – but even its criticism was couched in relatively formal language (for instance, “This incident raises serious questions about surveillance of known extremists” – critical but not a rant).

Notably, *Der Spiegel* covers the *political emotions* around an event (like public outrage, grief, fear) but usually through quotes or reported reactions, rather than adopting a hysterical tone itself. One exception is perhaps the use of irony or sharp language in some *Spiegel* commentaries to underscore a point, but generally, the news reporting was measured.

Quantitatively, if I categorize tone, *Bild* consistently rated “highly emotional/sensational,” *Die Welt* “moderately emotional” (in mixing urgency with facts), *FAZ* “neutral/factual,” and *Spiegel* “neutral to moderate, with moments of emotional depth (particularly empathy).” During the immediate aftermath of the attacks, all outlets understandably conveyed urgency, but how they did so differed.

For instance, when news first broke of the Berlin truck attack, initial online headlines within the first hours across outlets all indicated a possible terror attack with many casualties –urgency was inherent. But by the next day, *Bild’s* tone was pushing fear (“Are I safe at our markets?”), *Die Welt* and *FAZ* were solemn but focused on facts (“Manhunt ongoing for Tunisian suspect”), and *Spiegel’s* tone was analytic (“Security gaps allow attacker to flee – an analysis”). These tonal differences can shape the audience’s emotional response: *Bild* likely heightened readers’ anxiety and anger (possibly against authorities or migrants), whereas *FAZ* might leave readers saddened but not panicked, and *Spiegel* could even channel some anger towards systemic issues (like government missteps) rather than a nebulous fear of “the other.”

To illustrate with evidence, consider [*Bild*’s coverage](https://www.media-diversity.org/german-media-reporting-on-the-attack-in-solingen/#:~:text=republic%20Germany%E2%80%9D%20%28%E2%80%9CMesser) of the Solingen knife attack in 2024, where a Syrian refugee was the suspect. *Bild* not only labelled it with charged terms (“Asyl-Terrorist” in one piece) but also used an aggressive tone towards those deemed responsible: they ran a story headlined “Asylum lawyer: Did she help the Solingen terrorist avoid deportation?” effectively blaming a specific person with emotive undertones. The wording “Asyl-Akte der Schande” (“asylum file of shame”) in *Bild* conveys a highly emotional and judgmental tone, suggesting betrayal and scandal.

Meanwhile, *Der Spiegel*’s headline for the same event was, “How could this happen, Herr Scholz?” – a direct, but calmer question to the Chancellor, implying concern and a search for answers rather than sheer outrage. *Spiegel’s* tone here, while pressing the Chancellor, is institutional and policy-focused (“mistake in asylum policy” is mentioned rather than viscerally fear-inducing. This comparison encapsulates the tonal divergence: *Bild* shouts and sensationally points fingers; *Spiegel* probes and critiques within a rational tone.

In conclusion, *Bild’s* reporting was the most emotionally charged, often outright sensational. It utilized fear-arousing and anger-arousing language, aligning with criticism that it can be *“fear-mongering”* in its approach. *FAZ* maintained a restrained, almost dispassionate tone, reflecting traditional high journalism values of objectivity and calm. *Die Welt* combined factual reporting with a sense of urgency and concern, at times leaning toward alarm in subtle ways but staying within the bounds of broadsheet decorum.

*Der Spiegel* managed a middle ground by injecting human emotion and depth into stories without using it as propaganda – its emotional content tended to foster understanding (empathy or questioning) rather than panic. These tonal differences are significant because they affect how readers emotionally process the news: whether they feel scared, angry, reassured, informed, or thoughtful. Tone, as an element of framing, thereby influences the public climate after an attack, either cooling it with rationality or heating it with sensationalism.

Metaphors and symbolism   
The use of metaphors and symbolic language in coverage further distinguished the outlets’ framing styles. Metaphors can powerfully frame an event by linking it to familiar images or narratives. In the analysis, I found that *Bild* and some opinion pieces in *Die Welt* were more prone to using dramatic metaphors, whereas *FAZ* largely avoided them in straight reporting, and *Der Spiegel* used them selectively as part of storytelling or analysis.

A prominent metaphorical frame observed was the notion of a “wave” or “flood” of terror. This was particularly evident in tabloid and populist discourse. *Bild* at times described the 2016 spate of attacks as a “Terror-Welle” (terror wave) hitting Germany. This metaphor conjures an image of an onrushing, natural force – implicitly suggesting that Germany is being *inundated* by terrorism, and by extension potentially by dangerous foreigners, given the context.

Similarly, in the aftermath of those attacks, Bild articles spoke of “Germany under siege” or “the country in a state of war-like fear,” language that metaphorically compares the situation to war or invasion. These choices reinforce a securitized frame by suggesting the nation is facing an onslaught (as opposed to isolated incidents). Another example from *Bild*: after the Solingen knife attack, media critics noted that *Bild* framed it as part of a pattern of “dangerous Muslim men” threatening German culture. While not a single metaphorical phrase, this broad framing employs the symbolic narrative of a culture under threat from an Other – effectively a *clash of civilizations* trope in simpler terms.

*Die Welt* also occasionally employed metaphors, especially in commentary. For instance, a Die Welt column in 2016 referred to Germany’s “*open-door policy*” on refugees as “letting in Trojan Horses,” explicitly invoking the Trojan Horse metaphor (a symbol of a hidden threat brought inside one’s gates). Such metaphors frame refugees as a conduit for danger (terrorists hiding among them) without having to state it in literal language.

I noticed *Die Welt* and *FAZ* both using the term “*Tickende Zeitbombe*” (ticking time bomb) in some contexts – for example, describing a known radicalized individual as a “ticking time bomb that authorities failed to defuse.” This metaphor suggests the inevitability of an explosion if action isn’t taken, emphasizing urgency in security measures. It was more common in *Die Welt*’s lexicon; *FAZ* might quote someone using it but less likely to use it in its own voice.

On the other hand, *FAZ’s* own writing was sparse in metaphors. *FAZ* leaned towards literal, precise descriptions. If others described an “invasion” of migrants or an “onslaught” of terror, *FAZ* would more neutrally say “the high number of refugees” or “series of attacks.” This avoidance of colorful language is part of *FAZ’s* factual framing. I did not find instances of *FAZ* referring to a “clash of civilizations” or similar grandiose frames in its news reporting. Even in opinion pieces, *FAZ* writers (often intellectual conservatives) tended to argue in analytical terms (“the integration debate,” “constitutional state’s duty to protect”) rather than emotive metaphors. This kept symbolic framing minimal from *FAZ*, which likely helps prevent turning news into an existential narrative.

*Der Spiegel* used metaphors and symbolic references in a more analytical or investigative context. For example, a *Spiegel* feature on jihadist radicalization in Germany might open with a metaphor like “a hydra of terror networks growing in the shadows” – a classical reference to a multi-headed beast, symbolizing that when one terrorist cell is cut down, others spring up.

This kind of metaphor frames the fight against terrorism as a herculean task, but it’s used within a detailed piece rather than as a catchphrase in headlines. *Spiegel* also, at times, referenced broader symbolic narratives to provide context: after the Berlin attack, one Spiegel essay discussed whether this was a “German 9/11 moment” or not – invoking 9/11 as a symbol/metaphor for epochal terror impact (ultimately arguing that Germany should avoid reacting in panic as the U.S. did). So, Spiegel’s metaphoric references often serve to *debunk or discuss frames*, not simply to assert them.

An interesting finding was that *Spiegel* explicitly discussed and often criticized the *“clash of civilizations”* narrative. In one 2017 piece, *Spiegel* writers noted that framing these incidents as Islam vs. West is overly simplistic and plays into ISIS’s own propaganda. Thus, *Spiegel* sometimes *meta-frames* the metaphors themselves, which is a level of analysis absent in the other outlets.

Another symbolic framing element was the choice of imagery and historical analogy. While this study focused on text, the articles often referenced symbols. *Bild* and *Die Welt* would occasionally draw on historical conflicts, e.g., mentioning the Crusades or the Ottoman Empire in op-eds decrying Islamist terrorism (implying a long-standing civilizational clash).

This was not mainstream in reporting but shows up in the opinion discourse around the news. *Der Spiegel* might reference Germany’s own history with far-right terrorism (like comparing reactions to these jihadist attacks with how society responded to neo-Nazi terrorism) – thus using historical analogy to give perspective, a different kind of symbolic framing that can *diffuse* the notion that only foreigners commit terror by reminding readers that terrorism has other forms (like far-right extremism). *FAZ* largely stayed away from any such analogies in straight coverage, sticking to the immediate context.

Metaphors of natural disasters (flood, wave, tidal wave) were indeed present mostly in *Bild* and occasionally *Die Welt*. Metaphors of war/battle (e.g., “frontlines,” “fifth column,” “battle at home”) also appeared in *Die Welt’s* commentary. For example, *Die Welt* wrote about an “internal front” opening in Germany (metaphorically describing domestic terrorism as opening a battlefront within the country). These war metaphors contribute to securitization by implying that extraordinary defensive actions (like war-like measures) are needed.

In contrast, humanitarian metaphors (which could frame refugees positively) were seldom used in the context of these terror reports – understandably, since once an attack happened, the focus was on security. However, in some *Spiegel* coverage and left-leaning commentary elsewhere, refugees were occasionally described with metaphors of vulnerability (e.g., “people seeking a safe harbor”) to remind readers that the majority are not threats. In the four outlets, *Spiegel* was the one where such counter-metaphors might appear, but even *Spiegel* mostly reserved that for separate refugee coverage, not the immediate terror news.

One striking symbolic phrase came from *Focus* magazine (not one of the four analyzed, but indicative of a media response): calling Germany a “schutzlose Republik” (“defenseless republic”) on a cover. While not *Spiege*l, it shows the potent symbolism used by media to characterize the situation after repeated attacks – in this case, portraying the nation as unprotected prey.

*Der Spiegel*’s own cover after the Berlin attack was reportedly “Der Anschlag” (The attack) with an image of the devastation, which is straightforward. But in the text, *Spiegel* did use the metaphor of Germany’s “innocence” being lost after these events – a common metaphor in discourse (the idea that Germany had been relatively safe and now the ‘age of innocence’ was over).

In summary, metaphorical framing was most evident in the more populist-leaning coverage, reinforcing narratives of crisis or conflict (waves of terror, cultural threats). *Bild* notably fed the notion of a threatening wave of migrant-linked terror, effectively merging the refugee influx metaphor (often described as a “wave” or “flood” in migration debates) with terrorism – a powerful combo that supports anti-immigrant sentiment. Right-leaning commentary (*Die Welt*) also utilized metaphors like Trojan Horse or battlefronts, which dramatize the perceived threat.

Centrist and left-leaning reporting (*FAZ, Spiegel*) were more literal, though *Spiegel* engaged with metaphors analytically. Identifying these rhetorical strategies is important because metaphors can entrench certain biases or worldviews. As one study notes, metaphors in refugee discourse can strip people of their humanity by portraying them as natural disasters or invaders.

In the context of these findings, when media describe terror incidents with metaphors of inundation or invasion, they may similarly strip away the individuality of perpetrators and cast all refugees or Muslims as part of a monolithic threat. On the other hand, by avoiding or critically examining such metaphors, outlets like *FAZ* and *Spiegel* may help prevent an oversimplified “us vs. them” narrative from taking hold in the public discourse.

Framing strategies: security vs. humanitarian, and attribution of responsibility   
Beyond language details, the overarching framing of *why* the attacks happened and *what should be done* differed across the outlets. I distilled two broad framing perspectives in the coverage: a security-centric frame and a contextual/humanitarian frame, though in practice, most coverage mixes elements of both to varying degrees.

In the security frame, the attack is portrayed primarily as a threat to public safety and a possible failure of security or immigration policy. This frame emphasizes law enforcement actions, intelligence lapses, the need for policy changes, and often generalizes the event to a wider security issue. In the humanitarian or contextual frame, the coverage gives weight to the background of the perpetrator (including potential personal struggles or societal factors) and warns against broad-brush responses that could harm innocent migrants or civil liberties. The analysis found that *Bild*and *Die Welt* strongly leaned toward a security frame, *FAZ* took a security frame but in a measured policy-focused way, and *Der Spiegel* incorporated more contextual framing elements than the others (though still covering security aspects).

Specifically, *Bild’s*framing across cases was that these attacks signalled a dangerous security problem linked to migration. *Bild* stories often implied or outright stated that the influx of refugees had made Germany less safe. For example, *Bild’s* follow-up reporting on the 2016 attacks included pieces with framing like “Were warnings ignored? Refugee terrorist was known to authorities” – stressing state failure.

*Bild* editorials and loaded news pieces frequently advocated or supported tougher measures: calling for faster deportations of criminals, more surveillance of asylum seekers, and political accountability (blaming Merkel’s government). The underlying narrative was that lenient migration policies had opened the door to terrorism, thus the solution lay in securitizing immigration (closing borders, stricter vetting). Even human-interest angles in *Bild* quickly pivoted to security; a sympathetic story of a victim would be followed by “This could have been prevented if…” framing.

In terms of attribution, *Bild* tended to assign responsibility broadly: not just the individual perpetrator, but the “system” that allowed him in or allowed him to become radicalized. They also occasionally insinuated collective blame – for instance, talking about certain refugee groups being prone to violence (a generalization that feeds stereotype). This securitized framing by *Bild* mirrors what scholars describe as a media-driven securitization where migrants are collectively framed as an existential security issue.

*Die Welt’s* framing was also security-oriented but with a more intellectual bend. *Die Welt’s* reports and op-eds often framed the attacks as a call for policy response. They questioned integration efforts and the asylum system: e.g., “Did lax enforcement contribute to this tragedy?” After the Berlin attack, *Die Welt* ran analyses on how bureaucratic hurdles prevented Amri’s deportation despite known extremism – framing it as a ‘state failure’ that must be fixed via policy (tightening asylum law, better information-sharing). This assigns systemic responsibility to government and policies.

*Die Welt*, being a conservative outlet, frequently discussed the need to balance humanitarian ideals with security needs, usually concluding that security should be prioritized in such times. For example, an article might highlight that “Germany’s generosity was exploited,” framing compassion as leading to vulnerability. Simultaneously, *Die Welt* did separate individual from group in some cases – it acknowledged not all refugees are terrorists, but its framing still treated these incidents as symptomatic of broader issues with migration and security. The attribution of blame in *Die Welt* was thus two-fold: the individual perpetrator (often labeled as an Islamist extremist making a rational choice to attack Western society), and the authorities (for not preventing it). Unlike *Bild*, *Die Welt* did not directly blame “all refugees,” but it did highlight connections between refugee flows and terror risks as a policy problem.

*FAZ’s* framing also ultimately leaned security-centric, but in a more nuanced way. *FAZ* editorials recognized the horror of the attacks and often supported strengthening security measures (*FAZ’s* editorial line is traditionally law-and-order friendly). However, *FAZ* also warned against hasty generalizations in several instances. For example, after Würzburg and Ansbach, a *FAZ* commentary cautioned that while asylum procedures need reviewing, “I must not turn our backs on those genuinely in need due to fear of a few.”

This indicates *FAZ* maintained a somewhat balanced stance: acknowledging security lapses (and calling for improvement) yet not fully embracing the populist narrative that refugees equal terrorists. In framing cause, *FAZ* put considerable emphasis on individual responsibility – describing the perpetrators as people who made choices to embrace violence, often influenced by jihadist propaganda.

They framed radical Islamism (the ideology) as the culprit more than the fact of migration. For instance, *FAZ* might frame Ansbach as “an example of how ISIS’s hateful ideology can poison a vulnerable mind,” putting the stress on the terror network influence. In doing so, *FAZ* attributed responsibility primarily to the terrorist and his ideological motivators, and secondarily to any security oversight. Importantly, *FAZ* articles frequently included statements from officials like “This should not lead to suspicion of all refugees” as part of the coverage, thereby inserting a bit of a mitigating frame (though one could argue simply quoting officials).

*Der Spiegel’s* framing introduced more humanitarian and societal context than others. *Spiegel* articles often explored ‘why’ the person might have radicalized or what social conditions played a role. In the Duisburg stabbing, for example, *Spiegel* investigated the perpetrator’s life: how his asylum process stagnated, possible mental health issues, isolation, and online radical influences.

This doesn’t excuse the act, but by framing these as factors, *Spiegel* implicitly distributes some responsibility to phenomena like failed integration or the spread of online extremism, not solely the individual’s immigrant identity. *Spiegel* was also more likely to mention counter-narratives, such as positive examples of refugees or the concern of refugee communities about backlashes. In terms of attribution, *Spiegel* firmly placed ‘individual responsibility’ on the attacker for the crime (never suggesting a “collective guilt”), but it also scrutinized institutional responsibility: e.g., did intelligence agencies miss signals? did politicians ignore warnings or conversely, hype the threat? *Spiegel’s* framing sometimes shifted the focus toward political responsibility for managing extremist threats rather than making it about refugees per se. A hallmark of *Spiegel’s* coverage was also including reactions of migrants or Muslim community leaders condemning the attacks – this not only humanizes the broader group but frames the issue as combating extremism together rather than “us vs them.” For the security vs. humanitarian contrast, *Spiegel* tried to straddle both: it discussed security measures (and often critically examined their effectiveness).

Still, it simultaneously reminded readers of humanitarian values and the complexity of each case. For example, a *Spiegel* piece on the Würzburg attacker noted his young age and trauma from Afghanistan before stating he was nevertheless responsible for a heinous ISIS-inspired act. This dual framing presents him as both a product of tragic circumstances and a culpable terrorist – a nuance often missing in other outlets.

Across time, I observed that immediately after an attack, all outlets leaned into the security frame to report on manhunts, threats, and official responses. The humanitarian frame (like discussing root causes or cautioning against xenophobia) tended to appear slightly later or in analysis. For instance, on Day 1 coverage, even *Spiegel* and *FAZ* mostly reported the facts of violence and quotes from security officials. By Day 3 or 4, *Spiegel* might publish a feature on the perpetrator’s background (context frame) and *FAZ* an editorial on policy. *Bild*, however, even in later days, rarely shifted to a humanitarian angle – it stayed focused on outrage, victims, and security/political demands.

Regarding blame attribution: *Bild* often externalized blame – pointing to the government or refugees as a whole (“Politics has failed us,” “These people I welcomed are attacking us”). *Die Welt* blamed policy and radical ideology. *FAZ* blamed the individual and extremist networks (and to a degree the inefficiencies in bureaucracy).

*Spiegel* examined distributed blame – including questioning societal failures (like “did our integration system let this individual slip through the cracks?”) which is a more complex framing than others. Notably, *Spiegel* and sometimes *FAZ* also framed the far-right response as part of the story: after attacks, there would be mention of AfD or Pegida exploiting the event. This meta-framing serves to attribute some responsibility for social tension to those actors, counterbalancing the blame on refugees. For example, *Spiegel* wrote about how the AfD held a rally after one attack, implicitly framing the AfD’s reaction as an important part of the narrative (and hinting that overreaction could be as dangerous as the attack’s immediate effects). This contrasts with *Die Welt*, which gave far-right reactions less critical coverage (often aligning with some of the critiques of government).

In summary, *Bild* and *Die Welt* predominantly framed the attacks through a security lens – highlighting threats, failures in security policy, and advocating tougher measures. *Bild* did so in a sensational way, sometimes casting blame widely (which can stigmatize entire groups), whereas *Die Welt* did so in a more policy-focused way (blaming governmental oversight, and advocating reforms).

*FAZ* also leaned security frame, but with careful, responsible language – it did not demonize migrants as a group, though it supported the need for strong security. *Der Spiegel* provided the most multi-faceted framing, balancing the acknowledgement of an extremist threat with reminders of humanitarian perspective and caution against knee-jerk policy or scapegoating. *Spiegel’s* frame often extended beyond immediate security to ask, “how do I prevent either terrorism or an overreaction to it?” – essentially a frame of maintaining democratic values while combating terror.

This divergence in framing strategies means that readers of different outlets could come away with very different interpretations of the same event. A *Bild* reader might conclude “I are under attack because of lenient immigration – I need crackdowns now,” a *FAZ* reader “There was a security failure by authorities – they must do better, but let’s not panic,” and a *Spiegel* reader “This is a complex tragedy involving extremism and integration issues – I need to address security without losing our principles.” These interpretations can significantly influence public discourse and policy support, which I discuss further below.

Changes over time (2015–2025)   
The analysis reveals several notable shifts in media framing from 2015 to 2025. The period began with the tail of the 2015 refugee crisis and a generally cautious or sympathetic tone in many media when discussing refugees, and it progressed to a more security-driven narrative by the mid-to-late 2010s, which then somewhat stabilized in the 2020s with the new normal of heightened security awareness.

In 2015, before any major Islamist attack occurred in Germany, coverage of migration and potential security issues was largely speculative and often separated (i.e., discussions of refugee crisis vs. discussions of terrorism abroad). Many outlets, including *Die Welt* and *Spiegel*, lauded Germany’s humanitarian response while also noting challenges. Terrorism was mostly discussed in context of ISIS in Syria/Iraq or attacks in France (like Charlie Hebdo in January 2015, Paris November 2015).

When covering those foreign attacks, there was some linking to the refugee topic (e.g., questions like “could ISIS fighters be hiding among refugees?” came up in *Die Welt* late 2015), but generally German media did not yet have a domestic case to frame. The tone in 2015 regarding refugees was comparatively positive or neutral in mainstream media, and securitized frames were present mostly in fringe or populist outlets.

However, 2016 was a turning point. The cluster of attacks in July and December created a media narrative that Germany was facing a new threat from within. I observed that after mid-2016, all newspapers – even *Spiegel* and *FAZ* – started mentioning the migration background of suspects more promptly and prominently than they might have earlier. This likely reflects both editorial judgment (deemed newsworthy due to public interest and relevance to policy debates) and perhaps a response to criticism that media might be “covering up” such details.

It’s worth noting that German media in 2016 faced accusations from the right of being “Lügenpresse” (lying press) if they didn’t report nationality of suspects. So by then, even liberal outlets became more transparent about such facts to maintain credibility. For instance, in 2016 *Spiegel Online* quickly reported that the Ansbach bomber was a rejected asylum seeker, whereas a few years prior, they might have waited for more context. This indicates a shift toward more direct reporting on perpetrator origin across the board.

Accompanying that, the framing tone shifted toward securitization in 2016-17. Looking at *FAZ* and *Spiegel* editorials in 2017, a more frequent discussion of internal security can be seen, the need to screen refugees, and the acknowledgement that Islamist extremism had a foothold. This doesn’t mean they adopted xenophobic framing, but they gave more weight to security concerns than in 2015.

At the same time, because the political atmosphere was charged (2017 was an election year where AfD entered Parliament, partly on the platform that Merkel’s refugee policy endangered Germany), mainstream media also had to clarify their stance. Many centrist editorials tried to strike a balance: reaffirming that most refugees are peaceful but also insisting that security agencies must adapt to the terror threat. The mere fact that humanitarian disclaimers were repeatedly needed (“I must not demonize all migrants, but…”) shows how much the discourse had tilted toward linking migrants and security by then. If that link hadn’t become mainstream, such caveats wouldn’t be so frequent.

From 2018 to 2020, the frequency of jihadist terror attacks in Germany decreased (with notable exceptions of far-right terror which is outside the scope). The selected cases jump to 2023, but looking at the media in interim years: coverage of migration still often referenced the 2015–2016 events as lessons. The frames introduced in 2016 – especially by conservative media – persisted. However, some normalization occurred.

Data suggests that after the initial shock, outlets like *FAZ* and *Spiegel* slightly dialed back the alarm and refocused on other issues. By 2018–2019, more critical reflection pieces about whether Germany overreacted or how to integrate refugees to prevent radicalization can be found. For example, a 2019 *Spiegel* article examined how refugee communities were doing, implicitly countering the singular focus on security by reminding readers of integration successes and failures beyond terror incidents.

The late 2020–2025 period saw new events the cases in 2023–25) that again tested media frames. I found that by the 2020s, German media had a somewhat standardized approach to incidents involving refugee-background perpetrators: quick factual reporting including origin, followed by political reaction coverage, then analysis focusing either on radicalization or policy implications. The language in 2023–2025 articles appears a bit less sensational than 2016, even in *Bild*. It’s as if the media (and public) had become more accustomed to the possibility of such attacks, and the framing settled into familiar patterns.

For example, the Duisburg 2023 stabbing – while frightening – was not hyped as a national crisis to the same degree as the 2016 events, partly because authorities framed it as an isolated case under investigation. *Bild* still sensationalized it (“Knife Terror in Gym!”), but the story did not dominate the national narrative for weeks as Berlin 2016 did. This suggests either fatigue or a calibrated response. Similarly, the 2024 Magdeburg case and 2025 Munich case, although serious, were framed by most outlets as part of the ongoing security challenge rather than something completely new. The coverage often referenced prior cases (e.g., “echoes of the 2016 attack…”), which itself frames them as a continuation of an existing threat that Germany has been dealing with.

One change over time is how explicitly populist narratives were embraced or countered. In 2016–2017, some mainstream outlets flirted with populist talking points (like heavy emphasis on Merkel’s blame). By 2025, there’s a bit more nuance. For instance, *Die Welt* by 2025 still strongly critiques immigration policy after an attack, but it also acknowledges complexities, possibly because after nearly a decade, the discourse matured. On the flip side, *Der Spiegel* in the 2020s was more openly critical of far-right exploitation of these incidents. In 2016 *Spiegel* was cautious not to appear siding with either extreme, but by 2024 *Spiegel* had pieces explicitly condemning the AfD’s rhetoric after attacks, perhaps indicating a shift to more actively contest the populist framing rather than just neutrally reporting on it.

In terms of public mood framing, early on media depicted a country largely united in grief and resolve (e.g., after Berlin 2016 there were images of memorials and calls for unity). Over time, media began to depict a more divided public response (some calling for harsh measures, others for calm), mirroring the polarized political climate. By the mid-2020s, it was common for articles to note both the outcry from the right and the appeals for tolerance from others, framing the societal reaction as part of the story. This more meta approach in later years shows the media’s adaptation to the idea that these attacks have political ramifications that need coverage themselves.

In summary, the evolution from 2015 to 2025 can be characterized as: initial caution -> heightened securitization and sensationalism around 2016-2017 -> gradual normalization and balanced caution by 2025, albeit within a generally securitized context compared to 2015. All outlets moved somewhat in the direction of acknowledging the migration-security link more explicitly after 2015, but by 2025 there was also a firmer push by some (especially left-liberal media) to contextualize and resist over-securitizing. The result is that differences between outlets persisted but were not as stark as they might have been if, say*, Spiegel* had remained as it was in early 2015.

## Overview of the answered questions

### Main Question

**How has the language (terminology, tone, metaphors) used to describe terrorist attacks involving perpetrators with a migration background evolved in Die Welt, FAZ, Bild, and Der Spiegel between 2015 and 2025?**

The analysis reveals significant evolution in the language used by the four newspapers over the decade:

* **Terminology**:
  + **Bild**: Frequently used sensationalist terms like “refugee terrorist,” emphasizing the migration background of perpetrators.
  + **FAZ and Der Spiegel**: Used more measured and contextual labels, often avoiding sensational terms.
  + **Die Welt**: Balanced factual reporting with a security-oriented narrative.
* **Tone**:
  + **Bild**: Highly emotional and fear-inducing.
  + **FAZ**: Maintained a calm and factual tone.
  + **Die Welt**: Combined urgency with journalistic restraint.
  + **Der Spiegel**: Balanced factual reporting with empathetic storytelling.
* **Metaphors**:
  + **Bild and Die Welt**: Used dramatic metaphors like “terror wave” and “Trojan horse.”
  + **FAZ**: Avoided such metaphors.
  + **Der Spiegel**: Used metaphors analytically to provide context.

By 2025, the coverage had stabilized, with nuanced reporting balancing security and humanitarian concerns. Populist narratives influenced media framing, but outlets like Der Spiegel actively countered xenophobic rhetoric.

## Sub-Question 1

**In what ways do framing strategies differ between a security-oriented narrative and a humanitarian narrative in the coverage of these attacks?**  
The framing strategies of the newspapers varied significantly:

* **Security-oriented narrative**:
  + **Bild**: Emphasized the migration background of perpetrators, using terms like “refugee terrorist” and focusing on the threat posed by migrants. For example, in the Würzburg attack coverage, Bild’s headline described the attacker as an “Afghan refugee teen on an axe rampage,” immediately informing readers of both origin and violence. This framing suggests that migration is a security threat and calls for stricter policies.
  + **Die Welt**: Also foregrounded the migration aspect but in a more formal context, often to critique policy. It linked attacks to broader security concerns and advocated for tougher measures. For instance, Die Welt’s report on the Ansbach bombing identified the bomber as a “Syrian asylum seeker” early in the article, and explicitly labeled the act as “Islamist suicide attack” once authorities tied it to ISIS.
  + **FAZ**: Focused on individual responsibility and systemic improvements without sensationalizing the migration aspect. FAZ generally used formal descriptors; in initial news reports, it would refer to the perpetrator as “der Angreifer” (the attacker) or “mutmaßlicher Attentäter” (suspected assailant) without immediately ascribing a terror label until confirmed. FAZ did mention nationality or origin, but typically not in the headline – it might appear in the middle of the piece as part of factual background.
* **Humanitarian Narrative**:
  + **Der Spiegel**: Provided context about the perpetrators’ backgrounds, including personal struggles and societal factors, and cautioned against broad-brush responses that could harm innocent migrants or civil liberties. Spiegel’s reporting frequently used the person’s name once known (humanizing to a degree by naming) and would describe them perhaps as “Tunisian-born, rejected asylum-seeker Anis Amri” – thereby providing the migration context but as one descriptor among many. Der Spiegel tended to use the term “Islamist” when appropriate to signal ideological motive, but it also distinguished the individual from the broader refugee population.

These differences reflect the newspapers' editorial stances and their approach to balancing security and humanitarian concerns.

### Sub-Question 2

**How do these newspapers differ from each other in their portrayal of such events, and to what extent can differences be attributed to their political orientation or editorial style?**

The newspapers differed significantly in their portrayal of terrorist attacks:

* **Bild**: Used sensationalist language and emphasized the migration background of perpetrators, aligning with its populist right-leaning editorial style. Bild headlines frequently aimed to shock, such as “ASYL-TERROR: Bomb Rips Through Fest – Merkel’s Nightmare.” This sensational tone is characteristic of Bild’s populist approach and serves to grab attention, but it also potentially amplifies fear among readers.
* **Die Welt**: Balanced factual reporting with a security-oriented narrative, reflecting its conservative audience and editorial stance favoring law-and-order. Die Welt’s headlines were more restrained than Bild’s, but they were often pointed. For example, after the Berlin 2016 attack, one Die Welt headline was, “Truck Rampage in Berlin – Terror Returns to Germany.” The use of “Terror Returns” is a strong framing that personalizes terrorism almost as an active entity and implies a narrative of recurring threat.
* **FAZ**: Maintained a calm and factual tone, focusing on individual responsibility and systemic improvements, aligning with its establishment conservative views. FAZ articles read in an almost dry newswire style, especially in initial reports: they stated known facts, often in passive voice or indirect speech, and avoided emotive descriptors. For instance, rather than saying “a brutal slaughter,” FAZ would write “X people were killed and Y injured in the attack, according to police.”
* **Der Spiegel**: Balanced factual reporting with empathetic storytelling, providing context about the perpetrators’ backgrounds, reflecting its liberal/progressive editorial stance. Spiegel’s style is to provide rich storytelling – including the human angle – which can involve emotional content (like describing victims’ lives, community reactions, etc.). This can evoke empathy or sorrow rather than fear or anger.

These differences highlight how political orientation and editorial style influence media framing of terrorist attacks.

### Sub-Question 3

**How have broader political and societal shifts – notably the rise of populist right-wing discourse – impacted the framing of terrorism involving migrants in German media over the decade?**

Broader political and societal shifts have significantly impacted media framing:

* **2015-2016**: Initial coverage was relatively humanitarian, reflecting Germany’s “Willkommenskultur.” The 2016 attacks marked a shift towards securitized framing. For example, after mid-2016, all newspapers – even Spiegel and FAZ – started mentioning the migration background of suspects more promptly and prominently than they might have earlier. This likely reflects both editorial judgment and a response to criticism that media might be “covering up” such details.
* **2017-2020**: Media narratives became more standardized, with a focus on security and policy implications. Sensationalism decreased slightly, but the securitized context persisted. For instance, by 2018–2019, more critical reflection pieces about whether Germany overreacted or how to integrate refugees to prevent radicalization can be found.
* **2021-2025**: Coverage stabilized, with nuanced reporting balancing security and humanitarian concerns. Populist narratives influenced media framing, but outlets like Der Spiegel actively countered xenophobic rhetoric. For example, Der Spiegel in the 2020s was more openly critical of far-right exploitation of these incidents, explicitly condemning the AfD’s rhetoric after attacks.

The rise of populist right-wing discourse, particularly by the AfD, pressured mainstream media to address claims linking migration to terrorism, leading to more explicit reporting on perpetrators’ backgrounds and a shift towards securitized framing.

Discussion  
The above findings have several important implications for the media’s role in shaping public opinion and policy in Germany. First, they confirm that media framing of terrorist attacks can significantly influence public perception of both immigrants and security. When newspapers emphasize an attacker’s asylum seeker status and use alarmist tones, it can reinforce the public’s association between refugees and danger.

Social psychology research as referred to in the literature, analysis supports this: repetitive negative media portrayals of a minority group tend to increase public prejudice and fear. In this case, the heavy use of terms like “refugee terrorist” or metaphors of “waves” of attacks by *Bild* and others likely contributed to heightened anxiety about refugees during peak years. Indeed, the rise of the AfD in 2017 (when they entered the Bundestag as the third-largest party) and the latest elections in Germany (2025) correlates with the period of intense media focus on crimes by refugees.

It’s plausible that media coverage created a feedback loop with public sentiment: populist politicians pushed the narrative that refugees bring terror, media (especially tabloids) amplified aspects of that narrative in coverage, and the public, exposed to these frames, shifted attitudes in ways that benefited populists – a classic agenda-setting and framing effect.

At the same time, this analysis shows that not all media succumbed equally to populist framing. Outlets like *Der Spiegel* and *FAZ*, while addressing security issues, strived for more nuance and caution. This likely helped mitigate blanket scapegoating of migrants to some extent among their readership. For example, by highlighting that the vast majority of refugees were law-abiding or by including refugee voices, these outlets provided counter-narratives to the fear-based framing.

This is important because a monolithic media narrative can lead to moral panic, whereas pluralistic narratives allow for public debate. Germany’s media landscape, through these differences, thus offered the public multiple lenses to interpret events – which is healthy for a democracy, but it also meant public opinion could become polarized depending on media consumption. It raises the question: did media simply reflect existing polarization, or deepen it by choosing divergent frames? Likely both.

Another implication is on policy discourse. Media framing arguably influenced policy debates on immigration and security in Germany between 2015 and 2025. For instance, after the 2016 attacks, there were concrete policy changes (Germany tightened some asylum rules, increased surveillance, and created a new federal police unit). Politicians often cite media coverage to justify measures. If newspapers like *Die Welt* and *Bild* were strongly campaigning through their framing for stricter laws (and indeed they were publishing many opinion pieces to that effect), they could create a climate where politicians feel public pressure to act.

On the other hand, the media also have the power to question and hold authorities accountable in these situations. Findings of the analysis show *Der Spiegel* asking, “How could this happen, Herr Scholz?” in the context of an attack. This indicates that media not only push for harder policies but also for explanations and potentially different solutions (e.g., better integration efforts, improved intelligence). Balanced framing – considering both security and humanitarian angles – can lead to more comprehensive policy responses that address root causes (like integration, and deradicalization) rather than purely punitive measures. In contrast, a purely securitized frame might result in quick fixes that treat all migrants with suspicion, which has ethical and practical downsides (e.g., alienating communities, and infringing rights).

The role of political shifts, particularly populism, was a driving factor in our study. I observed that as the AfD and similar voices gained prominence, their narratives seeped into mainstream media to varying degrees. This illustrates the concept of political parallelism (where media content reflects political divisions). In Germany, while public broadcasters and many mainstream outlets tried to maintain impartiality, the loudness of populist rhetoric forced issues like migrant crime onto the agenda. Even when media aimed to debunk or contextualize those claims, they still had to cover them, thus giving them visibility. The challenge for journalists was (and is) how to report on legitimate security concerns without becoming a mouthpiece for xenophobia.

The analysis suggests that some outlets navigated this better than others. *Bild*, arguably, often crossed into amplifying xenophobic tropes (intentionally or not), whereas *Spiegel* took care to differentiate the terrorist from the migrant collective. This is fundamentally an ethical consideration: reporting the facts (if an attacker was a refugee, that is relevant) versus framing those facts in a way that doesn't unfairly stigmatize millions of innocent refugees.

Ethical considerations in journalistic practices were evident throughout this study. One key ethical issue is accuracy vs. impact. All newspapers reported factual information about these attacks, but the framing of those facts can either inform or mislead public perception. For instance, stating someone's nationality is a fact; but if every headline screams about the attacker’s nationality and refugee status, it can create a misleading impression of causality (as if being a refugee made them a terrorist).

The ethical guideline of minimizing harm comes into play – journalists must weigh the public’s right to know details against the risk of fueling prejudice. The differences I saw suggest that some outlets (*FAZ, Spiegel*) were more mindful of this balance, whereas others (*Bild*) prioritized the dramatic impact regardless of potential social harm. Moreover, there is the ethics of context: giving context that most refugees aren’t violent, or that terrorists have varied backgrounds, etc. Including such context is part of fair reporting. I did see context being included more often in Spiegel and *FAZ*.

Another ethical aspect is tone in crisis reporting. Sensationalizing terrorism has been criticized because it can serve terrorists’ aims of spreading fear, and it can cause unnecessary panic. Recommendations by scholars and security experts often urge media to report calmly and avoid glorifying or over-hyping terrorists. In the analysis, *FAZ’s* restrained tone aligns with those recommendations, whereas Bild’s approach would be considered the opposite – potentially amplifying the terrorists’ impact by sowing fear. Journalists also have to consider if they are inadvertently advancing extremist propaganda. For example, ISIS wants attacks by refugees to pit Western societies against Muslim immigrants.

Media that frame attacks as evidence of a refugee threat may unwittingly further ISIS’s “clash” narrative. Ethically, journalists should strive not to become pawns in that strategy. Outlets like *Der Spiegel* explicitly discussed this risk, indicating a self-awareness about how framing can play into extremist narratives. This self-reflection is a positive ethical practice that not all media engaged in.

The findings of the analysis also touch on the responsibility of media in a polarized environment. With populism on the rise, media have a dual role: to report what populist figures say (because it’s news) and to scrutinize it. The varied treatment of far-right responses in the four outlets shows different philosophies. *Spiegel* and *FAZ* generally critically examined populist claims (or at least contextualized them), whereas *Bild* sometimes essentially echoed them.

The *Die Welt* stance was interesting: they are conservative but establishment, so they sometimes served as a bridge – validating some concerns raised by AfD (e.g., about deportations) but couched in moderate language. The ethical question for such outlets is how to address genuine public concerns (some people truly were fearful) without legitimizing scapegoating. It’s a tough balance, and arguably *Die Welt* tried to occupy that space by being the “rational voice of conservative concern,” differentiating itself from the rawer AfD rhetoric but still pushing for stricter policies. This might have helped channel some populist pressure into policy discussion rather than outright hate. Conversely, one might argue it also helped normalize some far-right talking points in mainstream discourse.

From a broader perspective, the study highlights that media are not monolithic – internal pluralism allowed for different frames to compete. This is good for democracy, but it also means the public discourse can become segmented (“echo chambers” for different ideological audiences). The German case, with strong legacy newspapers, still fosters cross-reading to an extent (many people see headlines from various sources, especially via social media).

But as audiences trust certain outlets, they might reject others’ frames entirely (e.g., *Bild* readers dismissing *Spiegel* as too liberal, *Spiegel* readers dismissing *Bild* as gutter press). This dynamic can affect social cohesion: during crises like terrorist attacks, a society ideally would have a shared sense of reality and come together. Divergent media frames can either contribute to unity or discord. For instance, after Berlin 2016, some media emphasized unity (memorials, leadership speeches) while others stoked division (“who’s to blame for letting this happen?”). The impact of these choices is subtle but important – they can either bolster resilience or exacerbate fear and anger in society.

# Recommendations

Lastly, the findings have implications for responsible journalism moving forward. They suggest several recommendations:

(1) Avoid overly simplistic labels – as seen, nuanced terminology can prevent vilifying whole groups.

(2) Maintain a measured tone – sensationalism may attract clicks, but it can distort public risk perception and policy responses.

(3) Provide context and counterpoints – e.g., mention that security forces have also prevented many attacks (successes), or that terrorists come from various backgrounds, to avoid singular narratives.

(4) Fact-check political claims – when populist figures link migration to terrorism in broad strokes, media should investigate those claims critically (some German outlets did, showing that the majority of violent crimes were not by refugees, etc.).

(5) Highlight unity and solutions – coverage that not only details problems but also how communities respond and how issues can be addressed might help society deal with the aftermath constructively. For example, showing interfaith gatherings or successful de-radicalization programs would add a constructive frame that was largely missing in immediate coverage.

The interplay between media, public opinion, and policy in this context is complex. While this study focused on content, it suggests that the media both respond to and shape the discourse. The rise of populism influenced media frames, and those frames likely further influenced the trajectory of public debate and even election outcomes.

This underlines media’s responsibility: in times of societal strain, how they frame events can either pour fuel on the fire or help douse it with reason. Germany’s experience 2015–2025 serves as a case study for other democracies on the importance of vigilant, ethical journalism in the face of terrorism and divisive politics.

Conclusion  
This research paper set out to compare the language and framing used by four major German newspapers – *Die Welt*, *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* – in reporting on terrorist attacks involving perpetrators with a migration background from 2015 to 2025. Through both quantitively and qualitative content analysis of six key cases and numerous articles, I uncovered distinct patterns in terminology, tone, metaphors, and narrative focus across these outlets, as well as notable shifts over the decade.

Key findings include:

* **Terminology and labels:** *Bild* was quick to label attackers by their origin or status (e.g., “refugee terrorist”), implicitly linking terrorism with immigration in the public mind. *Die Welt* also foregrounded the migration aspect but in a somewhat more formal context, often to critique policy. *FAZ* mentioned such details more neutrally and later in the text, while *Der Spiegel* provided full context but avoided sensational labeling, often humanizing the individual beyond just “the refugee” or “the Islamist.” These choices in nomenclature reflect and reinforce each outlet’s framing bias – from populist alarm to cautious delineation.
* **Tone and emotional charge:** The outlets ranged from *Bild*’s sensational, emotion-laden reporting to *FAZ*’s dry, fact-centric style. *Bild* routinely employed fear-inducing language (“huge wave of terrorism” etc.), likely heightening readers’ sense of threat.

*Die Welt* maintained a sense of urgency but with more journalistic restraint, and *FAZ* remained calm and authoritative, potentially instilling a more measured public reaction. *Der Spiegel* balanced factual reportage with narrative elements that invoked empathy and reflection rather than panic. These tonal differences matter: they shaped how the public experienced news of each tragedy – whether as a nightmarish onslaught or a challenge to be faced with resolve.

* **Metaphors and symbolism:** I found that powerful metaphors (e.g., comparing refugee inflow to a natural disaster, or framing Germany as “defenseless” against a “terror wave”) were present mostly in right-leaning and tabloid narratives. Such metaphors contributed to a securitized, conflict-oriented framing (suggesting an invasion or war).   
    
  More moderate outlets eschewed or explicitly critiqued these metaphors, seeking to avoid dehumanizing portrayals and oversimplified clash scenarios. The use of metaphors is not a mere embellishment – it encapsulates an outlet’s worldview and can deeply influence audience interpretation by situating events in familiar story arcs (e.g., flood, invasion, war).
* **Framing strategies (security vs. humanitarian):** *Bild* and *Die Welt* overwhelmingly adopted security frames – treating attacks as evidence of security failures tied to migration and pressing for tougher laws. *FAZ* also focused on security but with a more system-oriented critique (how to improve state response) and less collective blame. *Der Spiegel* kept security as a key theme but consistently layered it with humanitarian/contextual frames – discussing integration, cautioning against scapegoating, and exploring root causes.   
    
  When it came to assigning responsibility, *Bild* pointed to migrants and politicians broadly, *Die Welt* to policy shortcomings and extremist networks, *FAZ* to individual perpetrators and any official lapses, and *Spiegel* to individuals and social conditions in tandem. These framing choices could sway whether the public discourse post-attack centred on fear and punishment or on problem-solving and maintaining social cohesion.
* **Changes over time:** There was a discernible shift from 2015’s relatively humanitarian media tone to a heavily securitized and sometimes sensational narrative by 2016-2017, followed by a slight tempering in later years. Early optimism (“I can do this,” as Merkel said) gave way to grim headlines in 2016, and eventually to a more routine, if still security-conscious, approach by the mid-2020s. All outlets by 2025 were more upfront about perpetrators’ backgrounds than they might have been pre-2015, indicating the pervasiveness of the issue. Yet, differences remained: *Spiegel* and *FAZ* never adopted the populist rhetoric even at the height of tensions, and *Bild* never fully embraced humanitarian nuance even after things settled.

Across the newspapers, the comparative analysis confirmed expected ideological alignments – the tabloid right press framed migrant-linked terrorism in a markedly different way than the liberal press – but also highlighted the media’s collective drift towards securitization under external pressures. Even the more liberal outlets in 2025 discussed terrorism in a security frame more than they might have a decade earlier (though still counter-balanced by context), which underscores how populist-driven discourse can shift the center of gravity in media narratives.

Broader implications of these findings are multifold. For one, they emphasize the media’s responsibility in conflict-sensitive reporting. How German media choose words like “terrorist” vs. “attacker” or “refugee” vs. “immigrant”, and whether they choose a calm vs. alarmist tone, can influence social cohesion in a diverse society. Irresponsible framing can contribute to stigmatization of minorities and foster an atmosphere of fear or even backlash violence (e.g., hate crimes can spike after highly publicized incidents). Conversely, responsible framing can inform the public without inflaming tensions, supporting an informed citizenry that can push for effective yet proportionate policies.

Additionally, the study has implications for policy and political discourse. Media frames can either narrow or broaden the policy options perceived as viable. If all media were to frame an incident solely as a failure of immigration policy, policymakers might feel public demand only for restriction. But because some media added other frames (like integration issues or the dangers of overreaction), the policy conversation in Germany did include diverse responses – from stricter security measures (which were indeed implemented) to continued investment in integration programs (which also persisted).

In effect, media framing set boundaries on what was politically palatable. Notably, Germany did not reverse its refugee intake or close borders after 2016, partly because influential media and public figures resisted an all-out securitization narrative. This suggests that media can serve as a bulwark against extreme policy swings if they present balanced perspectives.

Finally, I will offer recommendations for balanced and responsible journalism drawn from the findings: (1) Use precise language – avoid unnecessary emphasis on a perpetrator’s ethnicity or status unless directly relevant, and even then, provide nuance (e.g., don’t use it as the sole defining label). (2) Refrain from sensationalism – report the severity of events without resorting to metaphors of apocalypse or inundation that distort scale and incite fear.   
  
(3) Contextualize each incident – remind the audience of the broader picture (for instance, the rarity of such attacks relative to the refugee population, or the fact that terrorism has multiple forms including far-right terror which also needs attention). (4) Include diversevoices – such as experts on terrorism, voices from the affected communities, and government perspectives, to avoid one-dimensional framing.   
  
(5) Uphold ethical standards – as per journalism codes, avoid spreading stereotypes, verify information (especially about motives, to not jump to conclusions), and balance the public’s need to know with potential harms of certain framings. By implementing these practices, media can contribute to a well-informed public that can resist panic and prejudice even in the face of terrorist provocations.

In conclusion, the comparative analysis of *Die Welt*, *FAZ*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* demonstrates that media outlets can tell very different stories about the same events. These stories collectively shape the narrative that society accepts about the linkage (or lack thereof) between immigration and terrorism.   
  
Between 2015 and 2025, German media narratives have both reflected and shaped Germany’s negotiation of a difficult period – one that tested the balance between openness and security. The press’ evolving framing – from initially welcoming to increasingly wary – mirrored the nation’s journey. Understanding these media dynamics is crucial because, in the fight between fear and fact, and between polarization and unity, journalists often write the first draft of history. How they frame that draft can influence the outcome of the actual story society ends up living.
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# Appendix

Comparative analysis across newspapers   
Bringing the threads together, I compare how *Die Welt*, *FAZ*, *Bild*, and *Der Spiegel* each approach the language and framing of terrorist attacks involving migrants. Table 1 summarizes key characteristics of each outlet’s coverage as identified in our analysis:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Aspect** | **Bild (Tabloid)** | **Die Welt (conservative Daily)** | **FAZ (Center-right daily)** | **Der Spiegel (Center-left weekly)** |
| Political/editorial stance | Populist right-leaning; sensationalist; anti-PC tone | Conservative, pro-security, critical of Merkel’s refugee policy | Center-right establishment; classical liberal-conservative values | Liberal/progressive; critical of extremism and overreaction |
| Terminology & labels | Emphasizes migrant status and terror: e.g. “asylum seeker terrorist”. Frequent use of 'Islamist', 'refugee'; little distinction between individual and group. | States origin/status early but factually. Labels imply policy context. Mix of factual and ideological terms. | Neutral terms: 'attacker', 'suspect'. Uses 'terrorist' only with confirmation. Distinguishes individuals. | Detailed identity context; avoids epithets. Uses names for individualization. |
| Tone & emotionality | Highly emotional and sensational. Fear-inducing, shocking language; simplistic blameful tone. | Concerned and urgent tone, serious but not hysterical. Emotive in commentary. | Calm and objective tone. Emotion limited to quotes. No sensationalism. | Mixed tone: objective facts + empathy. Humanizes story without fear-mongering. |
| Metaphors & symbolism | Crisis/invasion metaphors ('flood of refugees', 'terror wave'). Frames as part of war on Germany. | Occasional metaphors like 'Trojan horse'; national security frames. | Avoids metaphors in news; some analogies in commentary. Legalistic framing. | Metaphors used in analysis. Critiques oversimplified metaphors; adds narrative depth. |
| Primary framing focus | Security and threat narrative; collective responsibility implied. | Security and policy failure; links to global Islamist threat. | Security with rule-of-law focus; avoids framing as clash or war. | Dual framing: security + social causes. Warns of political overreaction. |
| Attribution of responsibility | Broad-brush blame: attacker, government, and often migrant community/system. | Attacker and policy lapses blamed. Government security failures highlighted. | Responsibility on attacker and extremists. Reviews state performance without group blame. | Blames attacker and societal failures (e.g., integration, radical content). Rejects group blame. |
| evolution 2015→2025 | Always sensational; post-2015 more migrant-focused. Echoes AfD narratives by 2025. | Post-2015 harder on immigration. By 2025, normalizes stricter policy framing. | Shifted from neutral to pragmatic security discussion post-2016. Balanced and experienced tone by 2025. | Evolved from idealistic (2015) to pragmatic (2025), balancing liberal and security concerns. |

**Table 1: Comparative summary of framing characteristics in the four newspapers.**   
As Table 1 highlights, *Bild* and *Der Spiegel* often represent opposite ends of the spectrum in this coverage: one using populist language reinforcing fear and blame, the other contextualizing and cautioning. *Die Welt* and *FAZ* fall in between, with *Die Welt* closer to *Bild* in message (though not style) and *FAZ* closer to *Spiegel* in restraint (though not in political leaning). These differences reflect each outlet’s editorial mission and audience.

The comparative findings also suggest that these outlets, through their framing, potentially influence different segments of the public in distinct ways*. A Bild* reader’s takeaway (immigration = danger) could be very different from a *Spiegel reader’s* (extremism is the danger, but I must uphold our values), which in turn diverges from a *FAZ* reader’s (I need competent security policy without hysteria). This fragmentation of narratives is important in a democracy as it can lead to divergent public pressures on policymakers.