Key trends in news coverage of the 501 deportees from Australia in prominent Australian and New Zealand news media outlets.

A thesis presented in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree of

Master of Health Science

in

Psychology

at Massey University, New Zealand.

Dineka Mahadurage

Abstract

The Australian government introduced Section 501 of the Migration Act 1958 in December 2014, which has resulted in thousands of New Zealand citizens living in Australia on Special Category Visas being deported back to New Zealand. These deportations have become one of the most controversial migration issues between these countries; a controversy that has been played out across media outlets in both Australia and New Zealand. As news media still play a major role in public deliberations regarding contentious issues, there is a need to explore the exercise of symbolic power in how media frame this controversy in both countries. News coverage of the issue from 2015 to 2021 in Australia and New Zealand was collected to gain a sense of how the dominant narrative in each country developed over time, who the main stakeholders or characters afforded the right of appearance were, and what roles these characters played in various plotlines. A mixed method approach encompassing quantitative and qualitative content analyses was deployed to discern common trends in coverage for 2015 and 2021. The quantitative analysis identified percentages relating to stakeholders' representation and how 501 deportees and section 501 processes were portrayed as a percentage in the media. Using the qualitative method, the thesis also looked at key major events and overall evolving narratives related to the research topic. This then led to an examination on how 501 deportees were being positioned in news items as 'strangers' (in the George Simmel sense of the term) who did not belong in either Australia or New Zealand. Key findings demonstrate that the majority of news items were dominated by the voices of elites such as government officials, and the exercise of symbolic power promoted the perspectives of political leaders, who tended towards positioning 501 deportees outside the scope of justice. This thesis contributes to a growing body of literature demonstrating how migrant groups are often depicted in a negative light in countries such as Australia and New Zealand and increases understanding of discriminative practices in news media coverage.

Acknowledgements

Thank you to everyone who supported me throughout this thesis – I am truly grateful.

I would want to especially mention my supervisor, Dr. Darrin Hodgetts. Without his support, I would not have been able to finish this thesis. I am so grateful to have you as my supervisor and for everything you taught me. I would also like to thank Dr. Veronica Hopner who was a huge support and mentor throughout my thesis.

My biggest appreciation goes to my husband, Johann Hillman. Without your support an encouragement, I would not have been able to complete – or even start – my Masters. Thank you for helping me proofread my work, and for all the sacrifices made during my studies.

I would also like to thank two special people who taught me the importance of education and made me who I am today, that is my father, Chandradasa Mahadurage and mother, Daya Managalika Maldeniya.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Background

> *"It's taking the trash out, then we can make Australia a safer place"* (Napier-Raman, 2021)

The above quotation has been broadcasted on an Australian news channel and reported in many news articles in both Australia and New Zealand. Who is being referred to as trash and why? These are two of the questions that came to mind when I saw this news. This curiosity led me to explore how news relating to 501 deportees is playing out in Australia and New Zealand media.

Introduction

The deportation of New Zealand citizens from Australia is one of the most controversial migration issues currently facing Australia and New Zealand. This thesis explores online news articles related to Section 501 of the Migration Act in both Australia and New Zealand. This chapter begins with a brief overview of the migration histories of both countries. It then discusses how the current deportations began and the ensuing controversies. This is followed by an exploration of the key theoretical concepts of 'crimmigration' (Stumpf, 2006), the 'mediapolis' (Silverstone, 2007), 'symbolic power' (Bourdieu, 1979), and the 'scope of justice' (Opotow, 1990), which inform my understanding of the current situation regarding deportees and media constructions of the issue.

A brief overview of migration between Australia and New Zealand

Australian and New Zealand are both migrant nations. The ancestors of the Australian Aboriginals first dispersed from the African continent into East-Asia. It is believed that Aboriginals people migrate to Australia from South-East Asia around 40,000 to 75,000 years ago (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015). Prior to European settlement, it was estimated that the Aboriginal population was approximately 300,000 to 1.5 million. However, the Aboriginal population started to decline dramatically following European settlement in Australia. This was due to conflict, disease, and declining birth rates. By 1901, the Aboriginal population was estimated to have fallen to around 94,000 (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015; Department of Immigration & Border Protection, 2017).

The first European to reach Australia is thought to be a Portuguese explorer in 1522 (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015). Recorded history features several visits to Australia by Dutch ships. However, European migration to Australia officially started in 1788 when the first convicts deported from Britain and Ireland started arriving on Australia shores (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015; Department of Immigration & Border Protection, 2017). Initially, approximately 1,300 convicts and military personnel arrived at the same time. By 1868, around 160,000 convicts had reached Australia. The convict settlers and their guards struggled for survival as the environment was harsh and foreign to them. They battled to find adequate water supplies and food shortages made life extremely hard. However, these colonies continued to grow (Commonwealth of Australia, 2015). Currently, the population in Australia is around 22 million with migration contributing significantly to population growth. For instance, in 2013, 60% of the country's population were migrants (Australian Human Rights Commission, n.d.).

The first settlers in New Zealand were Polynesians who discovered the country on voyages of exploration (Wilson, 2005). The first group of Polynesians who came to New Zealand became known as Māori. In 1792, a group of 200 sealers in Dusky Sound became the first non-Māori to settle in New Zealand (Phillips, 2015; New Zealand History, 2014). At the beginning of European migration, many individuals were temporary visitors from Australia who came to New Zealand to trade. By 1840, approximately 2000 non-Māori had settled in New Zealand, although the number of temporary British people who lived in New Zealand was much greater at the time (New Zealand History, 2014).

During this period, New Zealand was seen as an extension of the commercial world of Sydney. Many of the British sealers and whalers came via New South Wales (New Zealand History, 2014). Some of them were escaped convicts seeking a new chance and others were traders, linking the mercantile world with Māori. A few also arrived as missionaries bringing the gospel to the 'heathen' (New Zealand History, 2014). From 1840 to 1914, 90% of people who reached New Zealand were born in Britain or Ireland. New Zealand's population began to grow and by 2020, the New Zealand population was around 5 million. Hence, New Zealand has evolved through the process of immigration (Environmental Health Intelligence New Zealand, n.d.). The population continues to grow, and immigration continues to be one of the main contributing factors towards this growth (Stats New Zealand, 2018).

In general, the nature of migration is changing, as industrialised countries attract both temporary and permanent migrants to their borders (Safdar & Vijver, 2019). There are multiple reasons why people migrate between countries such as for work, economic opportunities, study, or reuniting with families. Others move to escape from human rights violations, conflict, persecution, and terrorism (United Nations, n.d.-a). The current number of active migrants has never been larger, which is creating added complexities (Safdar & Vijver, 2019). According to the World Migration Report 2020, there were around 272 million people globally who were living in a country other than their country of birth – 51 million more than the 2010 data (United Nations, 2017; United Nations, n.d.-a). In recent years countries such as Australia and New Zealand have become highly popular destinations, attracting a large number of new permanent immigrants from diverse backgrounds (Safdar & Vijver, 2019). One in four people in Australia (25% of Australia's 22 million people, Australian Human Rights Comission, n.d.) and approximately the same number in New Zealand (27.4% of 5 million people, Stats New Zealand, 2018) were born overseas.

Every country has rules and regulations surrounding immigration, as well as expectations that migrants will fulfil their obligations. Each country monitors its borders and maintains its immigration policies according to government requirements (UN, n.d.-a). Australia and New Zealand share a special bond in terms of migration policies. This due to their shared histories as British colonies and their subsequent close ties in terms of trade, defence, and foreign policy. (New Zealand MFAT, n.d.). For instance, when New Zealand was declared a British colony in 1840, an ongoing exchange of people across the Tasman Sea became increasingly common (Origins, 2017). Since 1920, there has been a free flow of people between these two countries under various arrangements (Love & Klapdor2020). The current Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangement is unique to these two countries as it provides freedom for people in both countries to travel freely between them (Love & Klapdor, 2020; New Zealand MFAT, n.d.).

Australia introduced Trans-Tasman Travel Arrangements (TTTA) in 1973, which allowed New Zealand citizens to visit, live, and work in Australia indefinitely without any restrictions on arrival (Australia DFAT, n.d.). As a result, there are currently hundreds of thousands of both Australians and New Zealanders travelling between countries each year for tourism, business, or to visit family and friends (Australia DFAT, n.d.). Australian citizens and permanent residents are also automatically granted a residence visa upon entering New Zealand (Parliament of Australia, 2020). In 2022, there were around 70,000 Australians living in New Zealand (Australia DFAT, n.d.) and around 670,000 New Zealand citizens living in Australia.

This is approximately 15% of the total population of New Zealand (Australia DFAT, n.d.). New Zealanders make up one of the largest migrant communities in Australia, accounting for 2.6% of the Australian population (Australian Human Rights Commission, n.d.) and contributing around Australia $5bn in taxes each year (Chenery, 2016).

Since 1 September 1994, all non-citizens in Australia have been required to hold a valid visa. New Zealand citizens travelling to Australia are given a special category visa on arrival, which allows them to stay indefinitely. However, this visa does not provide the same rights and benefits as Australian citizens or permanent residents (Parliament of Australia, 2020). Prior to 2001, New Zealand citizens with a special category visa could access social security and obtain Australian citizenship without first becoming permanent residents. However, from 26 February 2001, all New Zealand citizens who arrive in Australia need to apply for permanent residence through a migration programme if they want to access certain social security payments, obtain citizenship, or sponsor family members for permanent residence (Parliament of Australia, 2020).

Federal Australian government expanded visa cancellation powers by introducing further legislative amendments including sections 116 and 501 of the Migration Act 1958 (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). Under section 116, the Minister of the Department of Home Affairs is afforded general powers to cancel visas. There are number of grounds on which a person's visa can be cancelled: Firstly, the initial decision to grant a visa was based wholly or partly on a particular fact or situation that no longer exists (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). Secondly, the visa holder has not complied with the visa conditions. Thirdly, the visa holder poses a risk to the health and safety of the Australian community or an individual. Fourthly, the visa should never have been granted because the application or its granting was in contravention of the Act or another law of the Commonwealth. In December 2014, Australian government introduced section 501. Section 501 of the Migration Act was a significant expansion of the policy by affording the Minister the power to cancel a visa under 'character' grounds (Commonwealth Consolidated Acts, n.d; Parliament of Australia, n.d.).

The Section 501 of the Migration Act allows for the cancellation of a person's visa when certain requirements are not met (Law Institute Victoria, 2018). According to section 501, there are multiple reasons for visa cancellation, including the following: Under subsection (6), a visa can be cancelled if an individual has a substantial criminal record, the person represents a danger to the Australian community, or the Minister of Immigration is satisfied that the person

in question is not of good character (e.g., due to their past or present criminal behaviour or general conduct) (Administrative Appeals Tribunal, n.d.).

These legislative amendments (section 116 and 501) have resulted in the visa cancellation of many foreign nationals who were residing in Australia. As a result, thousands of New Zealand citizens on a special category visa have been deported to New Zealand. This thesis study will only focus on New Zealand citizens who are affected by section 501. New Zealand individuals deported and caught up in legal processes by the section 501 deportation policy are commonly referred to in political and media deliberations as "the 501s" (Martin & Keyzer, 2018). During this study, these individuals will also be addressed as 501 deportees. According to the Australian Department of Home Affairs, statistics show that after the legislative amendments, there was a 660% increase in New Zealand deportees between 2014-2015 compared to the previous years, and a further 69% increase in the year following (2015-2016) (Love & Klapdor2020). The issues surrounding these 501 deportee deportees has increased tensions between Australia and New Zealand (Gibb, 2015).

It has been questioned why New Zealand residents in Australia cannot access the same services as Australian citizens or permanent residents, especially when New Zealand citizens are paying taxes in Australia (Parliament of Australia, 2020). In contrast, Australians living in New Zealand are eligible for New Zealand residence on arrival and can access all the same benefits as New Zealanders (New Zealand Immigration, 2022). Furthermore, there is a stark contrast between how New Zealand and Australia treat criminal conduct. For instance, if an Australian is convicted of a crime in New Zealand and has lived there for more than 10 years, the individual will not be deported due to their criminality (Department of Immigration and Border Protection, 2017; Love & Klapdor, 2020).

The impact of the new migration policy was felt as soon as the deportation process was implemented. As a result, the New Zealand High Commission, central government, and other advocacy groups began contesting Australia's deportation stance and requested that the deportation policies be reconsidered. Many New Zealanders have been deported from Australia to New Zealand despite having little or no connection with their country of origin. This has led to additional vulnerabilities and hardships and increased the likelihood of some committing criminal offences upon their return to New Zealand ((Love & Klapdor2020).

In fact, the deportation of New Zealanders under Section 501 of the Migration Act has sparked considerable political and media discourse that associates these arrivals with increased criminal

activities (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). Police intelligence reports revealed almost half (49%) of individuals reoffending once returning to New Zealand (Trevett & Pearse, 2022). Some view expressed that this is due to Australia failing to take responsibility for the rehabilitation of people who have committed criminal offences and who have lived in Australia for a long time (Parliament of Australia, n.d.).

According to a report by the *New Zealand Herald*, between January 2015 and 2022, 2572 New Zealand citizens were deported from Australia (Trevett & Pearse, 2022). According to New Zealand police report in total, 99% of these deportees had overseas criminal convictions and nearly 200 of them had outlaw or motorcycle gang affiliation (New Zealand Police Association, 2018). The New Zealand Police Association also noted that one-third of the deportees had been living in Australia before the age of 10, with at least 40% of the deportees arriving in New Zealand having lived in Australia for more than 10 years (New Zealand Police Association, 2018).

Historically, similar to Australians in New Zealand, New Zealand citizens in Australia had access to "*welfare benefits which are available for permanent residents*" (McMillan, 2021, p. 352). However, over time, these benefits have been eroded. Having little or no chance of gaining Australian citizenship and experiencing diminishing welfare support, many New Zealanders live Australia in a state of limbo. Nolan (2015, p. 262) claims this has devolved into the stigmatisation of New Zealanders as "*bludgers... soaking up the sun on Bondi beach*". Further, Stanley (2018, p. 523) argues that "such debates have been tinged with wider racism as Australia sought to constrain the 'backdoor' immigration of Pasifika and Māori populations, resident in New Zealand, deemed culturally unsuitable to the Australian dream".

The racial nature of this issue is reflected in New Zealand Police data that shows that up to 60% of Australian deportees identify as either Māori or Pasifika (New Zealand Police Association, 2018). Therefore, there is a need to understand how immigration policies and criminal law are affecting these individuals in contemporary society and how this relates to media coverage of such issues. Below, I draw on the related concepts of 'crimmigration', 'mediapolis', 'symbolic power', and 'scope of justice' to address these issues.

Crimmigration

'Crimmigration' is defined as a process where immigration and criminal law come together (Stumpf, 2006) to "…marshal the sovereign power of the state to punish" (Stanley, 2018, p. 521). Immigration and border control officials in Australia have expanded their level of

surveillance and police powers to find, control, and severely punish individuals who are labelled as 'illegals'. Furthermore, as part of the process, non-citizens who commit crimes face immigration responses and deportation (Stanley, 2018). Crimmigration has become a global phenomenon that has gained particular momentum in many Western countries (Hopner, et al, 2022). For example, it is firmly established in the United States and other countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, and Australia, which are also deporting states (McNeill, 2021a). New Zealand is at the receiving end of crimmigration as well as actively deporting non-citizens (McNeil, 2021).

In the United States, the criminalisation of immigration law has affected thousands of individuals who were previously protected with legal and cultural barriers to deportation (Stumpf, 2006). However, the United States is currently deporting many permanent residents and other long-term non-citizens. According to United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement data, in 2020, 185,884 non-citizens were removed from the country (ICE, 2021; Stumpf, 2006). Similarly in Europe, according to immigration legislation statistics, in 2022, 681,200 non-EU citizens were found to be illegally staying in Europe, which is 22% more compared to the previous year (Euro Stat, 2022). As part of the crimmigration process, the state informs its citizens of their role in protecting the state. It is also a common practice to monitor and expel non-citizens from the country by strengthening state power (McNeil, 2021).

Crimmigration is expanding in an era of neoliberal reponsibilisation of New Zealanders in Australia. As Keyzer and Martin (2018) state, "*Prisons throughout the world are filled with the poor and people of colour. The deportees in Australia are often both. So, is this law then reminiscent of a White Australia Policy*?" (para. 16). There is evidence that crimmigration disproportionately impacts marginalised groups in society (Keyzer & Martin, 2018). As stated above, deportees from Australia are predominantly Māori and Pasifika who are experiencing a lack of financial support and are being blamed for their failure to thrive in Australia (Stanley, 2018). Furthermore, deportees are typically characterised by the Australian government in a negative light as being a drain on societal resources and a burden for the Australian people (Chamberlin, 2015). Moreover, as part of the deportation process, Australia has proposed that when deportees appeal their deportation decision, they are required to pay their original deportation cost if they want to return to Australia, which is a significant expense – estimated to be Australia $22,000 per person (Keyzer & Martin, 2018).

As part of crimmigration, it is also common for governments to use pre-emptive strategies, developed in response to likely or imagined risks or threats. As such, crimmigration not only impacts persons who have committed crimes, but also impacts those who might do so in the future in efforts to halt crime before it is committed (Stanley, 2018). For example, in Australia there are New Zealanders who are targeted based on their perceived associations, moral conduct, or 'bad character' (Stanley, 2018) and the Australian authorities' decision to cancel their visas, or order their deportation, is justified on the grounds of suspicion.

Australian government officials are involved in making laws such as section 501 of the Migration Act, therefore they have the power to decide the fates of New Zealand citizens residing in AU (Administrative Appeals Tribunal, n.d) This includes making any decision about 'good' character based on past and present crimes, and general conduct (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). According to legislation, a mandatory cancellation could be revoked by a delegate of the minister or the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. However, it is important to note, the immigration minister has full power to overturn any decision made (Administrative Appeals Tribunal, n.d.). It has been noted that the majority of New Zealanders who have lived in Australia for decades have clean records and have never committed a crime, but many have been marked as 'bad characters' and deported back to New Zealand (Stanley, 2018).

These efforts project a strong image of the governing state at a time of politically charged debates and rhetoric around the need to secure the border by managing 'risky' or 'threatening' populations through whatever means necessary (Stanley, 2018). Even during the Covid-19 global pandemic and the border closers, Australia continued the deportations. It was estimated that an average of 951 persons per year have been deported under Section 501 of the Migration Act since 2014. Australia deported 1021 people over 2019/2020, and a further 554 in the six months to 30 December 2020 (McNeill, 2021).

Crimmigration processes are used to reassert power and establish the boundaries of inclusion/exclusion. These processes have enabled nation states to reaffirm who they consider belongs with a focus on white morality and cultural and political norms (Stanley, 2018). Martin and Keyzer (2018) explored the human impact of Australia's deportation policy through interviews with 31 New Zealanders who were affected by the changes to immigration law. The study emphasised the grief caused by families being torn apart and the loss of contact with children and loved ones. These deportees often face certain human rights violations (Stanley, 2018).

The current practice of crimmigration identifies certain individuals as separate to the normal system whereby the established rules do not apply to them – "principles of punishment or rights are displaced in favour of promoting compliance, security or belonging'' (Stanley, 2018, p. 531). For example, most non-citizens are detained in immigration detention centres while waiting for their deportation or potential revocation decision (Stanley, 2018). These immigration centres are known to have very strict and harsh environments and tend to be in remote areas far away from everyday life.

Detention centres that are located across the country, including the Immigration Detention Centre on Christmas Island and the Villawood Immigration Detention Centre in Sydney (Australian Boarder Force, 2022). It has been established that non-citizens who are serving time in prison are given little notice when transferring to detention centres. Detainees have great difficulty in accessing legal advice and family visits are impossible (Stanley, 2018). It has also been established that the help that detainees need to cope is often denied or minimised (Stanley, 2018). Advocacy groups and Human Rights committees have sought to challenge Australian law and policy related to violations in immigration detention centres (Stanley, 2018).

An Australian study utilising government data from 2014 to 2018 suggests the length of time an individual is detained in a detention centre has a significant impact on their mental health (Essex et al., 2022). Research conducted in Canadian and Australian detention centres also found consistent evidence that even short-term detention can lead to high levels of depression and post-traumatic stress amongst asylum seekers. Long-term detention tends to further aggravate these issues (Kronick et al., 2011). Similarly, von Werthern et al. (2018) conducted 26 studies that involved 2099 participants and found that it is common for children, adolescents, and adults to experience mental health issues, including anxiety, depression, post-traumatic stress, self-harm, and suicidal ideation in detention centres (von Werthern et al., 2018).

Grewcock (2011) identified that self-harm in Australian immigration detention centres is very common, noting that it can be used as a form of protest. For example, a former detainee in an Australia detention centre, after being told that he would be handcuffed during an appearance in the Family Court (to seek contact with his daughter), decided to slash his arm, hands and stomach with a razor blade (Grewcock, 2011). Moreover, there are reports about dozens of non-citizens who have died in Australia in immigration custody in the past, although the actual

number of deaths are omitted from official statistics (Powell et al., 2013). In addition, these individuals are also part of cross-border securitisation after arriving in New Zealand. New Zealand uses a strong rhetoric of danger surrounding deportees and the government has introduced legislation that further punishes deported individuals, as upon arrival they have to go through monitoring regimes (McHardy, 2021, Stanley, 2018).

The removal of New Zealand citizens on a special category visa from Australia has become a high-profile social issue (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). The New Zealand government argues that sections 501 and 116 of the Migration Act have disproportionately affected New Zealand citizens in Australia (Parliament of Australia, n.d.). New Zealand's political leader Prime Minister Jacinda Arden regarded the issue as 'corrosive' to the Trans-Tasman relationship (Cowie, 2019). While previous Australian Prime Ministers, including Scott Morrison, responded by stating that this policy is not targeting New Zealand citizens but rather, is part of Australia's stronger stance on criminality and visa compliance (Remeikis, 2019), their stance regarding 501 and 116 deportations has been widely reported in in the media in both countries with special reference to detention centres (Stanley, 2018). However, there remains a lack of research on how this crimmigration process is portrayed in Australian and New Zealand news (Stumpf, 2006). As detailed below, I will analyse news coverage of these issues in both countries. Before considering the empirical basis of this thesis, it is necessary to conceptualise the role of news media in crimmigration and the characterisation of deportees.

The mediapolis and processes of symbolic power

It has been established that news media do not simply 'select' and 'report' on issues, topics, and events as they transpire in the outside world. When constructing the news, journalists also tend to interpret events and relationships between groups and offer their own analysis (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). There is a tendency for the media to pay attention to some elements of events whilst obscuring other aspects when discussing issues of public interest. As news is a part of many peoples' daily lives, social scientists have often examined the role of media and their ability to sustain or undermine intergroup relations, political structures, and social policies (Hodgetts et al., 2020). Examining the news can provide a greater understanding of the wider power relationships in society (Hodgetts & Chamberlain 2014; Silverstone, 1999; Sliverstone, 2007).

The concept of the mediapolis was developed by Silverstone (2007) to explain the contemporary presence of various media forms in everyday civic life. The mediapolis concept

constitutes an extension of the ancient Greek polis – the administrative centre of the city. In the polis, communication occurred face to face, although participation was restricted to male participants while women and slaves were excluded. However, it was here that public communication took place (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2011). The importance of sites for public deliberations and the creation of collective meaning making led Silverstone (2007) to propose that contemporary media reproduce aspects of the polis and thus termed the current method of communication as the 'mediapolis'. However, he notes that the media's involvement in meaning making raises issues of elite interest and processes of symbolic power (Silverstone, 2007). It is through news and related media that issues, including the issue of deportees, are debated and become grounded in particular case exemplars (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2011; Silverstone, 2007).

The mediapolis is a place that provides a narrative and images of suffering as well as hope, conflicts, and instances of cooperation. The mediapolis provides the familiarity of others, the neighbour, the dangerous criminal, and the deportee. The mediapolis is also a mediated place where members of parliament, senates, or other committees appear. It is a place shaped by political interests and the power dynamics of various countervailing powers, including nation states (Silverstone, 2007). The mediapolis coverage of Section 501 of the Migration Act is important as it is through the media that the public has become aware of the news related to this Act. Concepts such as crimmigration, mediapolis, and symbolic power, as well as the scope of justice (see below), provide the conceptual foundations of this study and aid an understanding of how the power dynamic plays out in news media in relation to the controversial topic of deportations from Australia to New Zealand.

Symbolic power in the characterisation of 501 deportees as a suspect community positioned outside the scope of justice

Power can be seen in many shapes and forms in society. This is due to different relationships between persons and groups that are shaped by wealth, gender, age, ethnicity, histories, social status, and various other factors. Social power is the ability to control or have an influence in society through one's own or one's group's behaviour and ideas. Due to its multiple levels, structures, and the complex nature of power in the social world, there are various conceptualisations of power. For example, Couldry (2019), and others have considered various aspects of symbolic power, including a key aspect that links news and other media forms to broader societal power relations that have material, political, and economic consequences.

Different forms of media are central to the reproduction of symbolic and material power relations in society (Bourdieu, 1979; Bourdieu (1989).

According to Bourdieu (1979), symbolic power is "the power of constructing reality" (p. 163) This reality is one which is dominated by one sector of society (Couldry, 2002; 2003). Symbolic power is also about who is able to characterise different groups and influence how they are presented to us the audience (Bourdieu, 1979; Couldry, 2019). Institutions like the media can wield symbolic power and influence the thoughts and actions of others towards both just and unjust ends. One of the ways that media can act unjustly is by denying or distorting the voices of marginalised persons and groups (Silverstone, 2007). According to Bourdieu (1979) and Couldry (2019), this is often done to legitimise or delegitimise particular perspectives and events. For example, news media have played a prominent role in ignoring structural explanations for poverty and differential health outcomes between different population groups (e.g., why on average poor people get sicker and die more quickly than more affluent people) and encouraging individualistic explanations that help preserve structural and socio-economic inequalities (Hodgetts & Stolte, 2008).

This form of symbolic power can contribute to processes of estrangement whereby other people seem different to us or even criminals and threats. Strangers may be depicted as close geographically but socially distant (McLemore, 1970). Strangers are often characterised in media narratives as both near and far, foreign yet familiar (Rogers, 1999). Central to the use of symbolic power to characterise 501 deportees as strangers is the mode of address used by news media to speak to their audience. That is, who the news imagine are 'us' or 'the right minded' people of Australia or New Zealand. News items address the group they include as the rightful inhabitants – people who belong in Australia or New Zealand, leading 'others' to be regarded as strangers (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). Here, Anderson's (1991) concept of 'imagined communities' allows a deeper understanding of how news media's modes of address that name and define 501 deportees as strangers (Castelló, 2016). Such an estranging mode of address often draws on existing prejudices within in groups whilst also policing boundaries that distance us from outgroups or marginalised persons such as 501 deportees Castelló, 2016).

Over time and through shared repetition, these characterisations become part of the national consciousness and are regarded as accurate portrayals when in fact they may be highly partial and socially constructed (Castelló, 2016). For example, to Australians, 501 deportees are presented as criminals that should be socially estranged and placed at a greater geographical

distance via deportation. To New Zealanders, the deportees are presented as being geographically and socially distant residents of Australia, who are now being sent to New Zealand where many no longer belong. The media's modes of address are at least partially responsible for how many audience segments perceive deportees as dangerous threats to society (McNeill, 2021b). As will be demonstrated below, deportees are often presented (with notable exceptions and nuances) to the imagined audiences in both countries.

Also relevant to issues of symbolic power and mode of address, is the concept of suspect communities (Cherney & Murphy, 2016). The term 'suspect community' was initially applied to the Northern Irish population, who were rendered suspect through the design and operation of counter-terrorism" by the colonial British government during the 'troubles' or war for Irish independence (Cherney & Murphy, 2016. p. 281). According to Breen-Smith (2014) a 'suspect community' is not necessarily targeted by law or policies, but they are imagined to be problematic and contrasted with supposed in-group non-suspect communities. Scholars have also used this concept to describe communities or groups of people who are facing various forms of social marginalisation or out-grouping (Cherney & Murphy, 2015). For example, this term is currently also used to highlight the cultural, political, and ideological discourse that defines and consolidates Muslims as the 'enemy within' (Hopner et al., 2022). Concepts such as 'imaginary' and 'suspect' communities help facilitate an understanding of current news coverage of 501 deportees in both Australia and New Zealand.

The Purpose of my research is to document and interpret key trends in news coverage of the 501 deportees (New Zealand citizens who were affected by Section 501 of the Migration Act). I was unable to find prior research which covered the nature of this topic in Australia or New Zealand, and this gap was a driving force to examine these issues. There were similar studies which researched how certain marginalised groups and immigrants were depicted in societies. For example, there was a study done in NZ which examined how Muslim people were represented in news media and the study results displayed there was a strong dimension of positive and inclusive coverage of Muslim people. It was also reported that the coverage positioned Muslim people as being part of community events, as well as having a positive relationship with non-Muslim communities. However, there was also negative framings which carried the potential to hurt the perception of Muslim people (Hopner et al., 2022). In addition, a study including the meta-analysis of 345 published studies examining how the media construct Muslims and Islam identities, investigated how this was done before and after the 9/11 terrorist attacks in United States. The results found the portrayal of Muslims in the media

post-9/11, were mostly negative worldwide. The findings also suggest that Muslims were framed as religious extremists, causing a clash of civilizations and cultures (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017).

There has also been research conducted on marginalised populations such as homeless people. A study done by Hodgetts et al. (2006) focused on homeless individuals in England and explored how images published by the media were portraying these individuals. The study discussed how the media characterised homeless people as diseased, passive, voiceless individuals who were overly reliant upon charitable assistance and management. The study findings further discussed how various characterisations towards homeless people were constructed by various political and professional groups (Hodgetts et al., 2006). Furthermore, a study conducted on the representation of Pacific Islanders in NZ media suggests certain characterisations are made about the population, as they are positioned as an immigrant minority who drain the resources of the dominant group. These findings also identified how the media tends to criticise these individual's dependency, and portray them as 'incompetent', 'corrupt' and 'exploitative', who are not only costing society but also attributing to reducing the educational standard for everyone (Loto et al, 2006). A number of overseas studies also focused on immigrants featured in news media - a study which focused on major national news magazines from 2000 to 2010 in United States, identified that immigrants have been disproportionately portrayed in a negative manner, and such reporting highlighted the illegality and low-wage professions associated with immigrants (Farris & Mohamed 2018).

McNeill (2021a) documented the way the media depicted 501 deportees during the Covid-19 global pandemic by examining how the securitised discourse played out in media (in newspaper and television reports). McNeill (2021a) focused on how news coverage portrayed an incident in which a deportee escaped from a quarantine facility for a brief period. Due to the nature of his arrival a 501 deportee, the news related to this incident had an international reach. There were nine other escapees from these facilities prior to the 501 deportees' escape whose cases did not attract such widespread or international coverage and which were also treated more sympathetically (McNeill, 2021a). Although there is no evidence of how the public or audiences responded to the news coverage of this incident, however, Stanley (2018) argues that coverage of criminalised strangers can promote public fear of deportees and their criminality. Links between news coverage and audience responses are yet to be substantiated, however, and we must always be wary of inferring media effects from researcher interpretations of news

texts. This is because audiences often simply ignore or read such texts in ways that are not predicted by researchers (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014).

When an individual or a group are positioned as 'strangers' or 'suspect communities', they are more likely to experience prejudice and discrimination and they are vulnerable to harmful treatment (Breen-Smith, 2014; Franko, 2019; Hodgetts et al., 2011). The scope of justice refers to how moral decision making can position groups either inside the scope of justice, where they enjoy rights as citizens (people who belong to a society), or outside the scope, where they do not have to be treated fairly and can be more readily treated punitively (Opotow, 1990). This concept has been applied to different individuals, groups, and even animal species (Kals & Strubel, 2017). For some persons or entities, justice can be perceived as being irrelevant or unwarranted. According to Opotow (1990), who developed the 'scope of justice' concept, there are key situations in which a group is at an increased risk of exclusion from the scope. For example, when those policing the scope perceive dissimilarity between themselves and the group/individual in question, the latter is placed at increased risk of exclusion from the scope.

In times of war, heightened fear of threats or intense conflict can mean that marginalised groups are positioned outside the scope of justice and regarded as an 'enemy'. Who must be controlled and punished, this would be perceived to be unfair or immoral if that group had been positioned within the scope of justice (Kals & Strubel, 2017). A number of studies have been conducted to identify the consequences of such exclusions, including reductions in government policies that support target groups, denial of legal procedures and rights (reduced procedural fairness), and apathy in relation to the needs of the marginalised groups or their experiences of negative treatment (Abrams & Hogg, 2005). For example, the Community Law Centre Aotearoa, as part of their third universal periodic review, identified a number of inconsistencies in Australia's international human rights obligations as reflected in Section 501 of the Migration Act. Eight human rights breaches were identified, such as the right not to be subject to arbitrary detention, the right to family life, and the right to justice (The Migration Amendment (Strengthening the Character Test) Bill 2019, cl 24).

Thesis structure

This introductory chapter has discussed migration, policy, and the conceptual context for the study of news coverage of the 501 deportees in Australian and New Zealand. The chapter introduced relevant concepts that are foundational to this thesis, including crimmigration, the mediapolis, symbolic power, mode of address, the stranger, suspect communities, and the scope

of justice. Correspondingly, the key aim of this thesis is to document and interpret key trends in news coverage of the 501 deportees in prominent Australian and New Zealand news media outlets. This study explores news narrative around the 501 deportees, identify who wields symbolic power in the framing of the issue and the characterising of 501 deportees, determine what this can tell us about contemporary exclusion and the harsh treatment of people deemed to be members of suspect communities, and further identify how these communities are positioned beyond the scope of justice.

Chapter 2 the following chapter of this thesis provides the methodology for this thesis. It discusses the rationale for focusing on news media and the strategy needed to deconstruct the news narrative. The chapter will then elaborate on why content analysis has been chosen using both quantitative and qualitative methods. The chapter then outlines how the study will be conducted and explains the data collection process. This is followed by a step-by-step description of the data analysis process. Finally, the chapter will conclude by discussing the ethics of this study.

Chapter 3 provides an overview of news related to 501 deportees for both the Australian and New Zealand. The main purpose of this chapter is to show how news related to 501 deportees evolved during the given time frame (2015 to 2021). It also examines the prominent trends during this time, identifies key stakeholders, and discusses events. The chapter first focuses on Australia then moves on to New Zealand new articles. The chapter concludes by providing a brief comparison between Australia and New Zealand news coverage.

Chapter 4 is the first part of the analysis of this research, it discusses results about who were the main stakeholders as represented in media 2015 and 2021 using percentages. The chapter then draws attention to some of the key events that occurred during the data period. The analysis then focuses on how each individual event represents the stakeholders. Finally, the chapter provides example quotes related to individual event and analyses them further to make sense of the data of this research.

Chapter 5 continues the data analysis and examines how deportation process, and 501 deportees are portrayed in the news media. This chapter outlines the certain portrayals of media whether they are negative or positive. The chapter documents how deportation process and 501 deportees are portrayed using percentages for the years 2015 and 2021. Then it examines these findings alongside examples quotes and analysing the findings in depth in relation to the media portrayal.

Chapter 6 is the concluding chapter and provides an overview of the thesis. It further discusses the results of the thesis using concepts such as symbolic power and scope of justice. The chapter then outlines how the study findings can contribute to the body of literature on this subject. The chapter also discusses the limitations of this study before providing recommendations derived from the study results of the thesis.

Chapter 2: Methodology

This chapter provides an outline of how the study was conducted. It begins by firstly justifying the rationale for analysing news media coverage related to this research topic. The chapter then elaborates on the reasons of using content analysis. The narrative informed approach was adopted using both quantitative and qualitative methods. This is followed by an outline of how the study was conducted, including the data collection, gridding process, and broader analysis procedure. Finally, the chapter concludes by outlining the ethical consideration of this research.

News Constructions of the 501 deportees

This research focused on news relating to 501 deportees. It is important to note that this study only focused on New Zealand citizens who were affected by Section 501 of the Migration Act. The study first explored who the main stakeholders were, meaning whose voices were more prominent in news relating to this topic in Australia and New Zealand. Next, the study focused on how 501 deportees were depicted in news items by examining the whether the tone of the article towards the 501 deportees was negative or positive. In the analysis, I have also focused on how the processes of section 501 (news relating to 501 deportees' deportation, visa cancellation, detention, etc) was depicted in news media outlets in both countries.

Meijer (2010) argues that it is important to explore media as socio-politically embedded institutions. This is because these institutions are entangled within social processes as active meaning-making participants that help shape public understandings of events in the world. As such, analysis of news coverage of particular events can be conceptualised as an attempt to look beyond what news organisations tell us. This extended vision can enable an understanding of broader power relations and societal processes that are embedded in media and which shape the social construction of issues such as Section 501 of the Migration Act (Castells, 2019). An analysis of news coverage can tell us a lot about how such contentious issues are framed through the inclusion and exclusion of different perspectives and voices. This method of coverage allows some news stories to become more dominant in the framing of events and coverage, whilst other voices are subordinated (Hodgetts et al., 2011).

Evidence of symbolic power was identified during the data collection process. As such, greater attention will be paid to this aspect in order to provide an understanding of whose perspectives are most dominant and whose views are repressed in the news. Consequently, the first part of the analysis (presented below) focuses on issues of symbolic power and more specifically on

how key stakeholders contribute to shaping news narratives on deportations. Identifying the key stakeholders of the news articles makes it possible to determine whether the reality of the deportees and their deportation stories are largely influenced by power relations in society (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014).

Adding both complexity to the new landscape, but also utility in terms of researcher access to news coverage of particular events or issues, various digital news platforms have merged in recent years (Chyi & Chadha, 2011). For example, newspapers have long been an important news source in many nation states, and with shifts from print to digital dissemination, many have moved online with their own websites, as well as supplying content to other social media platforms (Chen et al., 2019; Mudgal & Rana, 2020). According to Barthel et al. (2020), in 2010, for the first time ever, online news consumption surpassed that of print newspapers. Considering the development of news in this contemporary period and the timing of Section 501 of the Migration Act, this research focused on online news items from reputable news publishers. Furthermore, analysing online news articles also allowed for a more expansive coverage of articles to be included in the data collection pool pertaining to both Australia and New Zealand media.

Content analysis has been used in disciplines such as communication, psychology, and sociology for a long time (Neuendorf, 2017). It is accepted as a useful methodology for analysing news representations because it provides a systematic and flexible approach to compiling and managing large news data sets, such as those identified above (Neuendorf, 2017). It is also useful for identifying key trends in news coverage of particular issues (Hodgetts & Chamberlain 2014; Schreier, 2012). In the past, scholars have utilised content analyses to examine news coverage of contentious societal issues such as homelessness and the representations of marginalised groups, including migrant populations (Ahmed & Matthes, 2017; Farris & Mohamed, 2018; Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014; Hodgetts, et al., 2006). For example, research conducted by Hodgetts et al. (2005) on homeless individuals utilised both quantitative and qualitative content analysis and identified that using both methods meant that quantitative analysis was able to support the qualitative analysis process. The authors concluded that quantitative analysis helps identify the initial general trends across news items, and qualitative analysis provides an opportunity to explore these patterns and link them meaningfully within storylines (Hodgetts et al., 2005). Similar qualitative studies conducted to explore how Muslim people are depicted in media identified key patterns in coverage and story trends by organising the items in a gridding format, and focusing on whose voices were

included and whether the tone of the items was positive or negative towards the Muslim population (Hopner et al., 2022).

Qualitative content analysis is systematic, flexible and, when compared to other qualitative analyses which open up data, it enables a reduction in the amount of content. This helps the researcher focus on a selected aspect of meaning which is related to the research question (Schreier, 2012). In this research, two phases of content analysis were employed to explore the evolving news coverage of Section 501 of the Migration Act. Phase one of the analysis involved using quantitative methods to ascertain key trends in coverage over a time period and between both countries. In the second part of the analyses, these trends were then qualitatively explored in more detail (Schreier, 2012). The quantitative content analysis offers an overview of trends in coverage, including who wields the symbolic power to influence the framing of the issue. Correspondingly, the qualitative analysis allowed an exploration of key trends in more detail in relation to specific exemplars or news items.

Data collection

For Australia, I used the Factiva database and for New Zealand, the Newztext database. Access to both databases was obtained through the Massey University library, although I explored various news websites in both countries to get a sense of how much coverage there might be on this research topic. I decided that, given the large number of items, it was important that I made use of a purpose-built database which included high quality search engines. For Factiva (Australian news articles), the key search terms included – (New Zealand* or kiwi*) and deport*. In Newztext (New Zealand news articles) the search words were – deport* AND Australia* AND (New Zealand* OR kiwi*).

I downloaded all news articles from legacy news websites in both Australia and New Zealand between 2015 and 2021. I used this material to develop an overview or plot synopsis for each country for this period (see Chapter 3). Between 2015 and 2021, there were 3,599 items from Australia and 5,390 from New Zealand. I read the articles within this timeframe, noting significant stories and trends, to understand how the narratives evolved over time (see chapter 3). However, for data analysis, the years 2015 and 2021 was selected. I then selected the first year of the coverage (2015) and the latest full year of coverage (2021). This was so I could explore the early framings of the issue and where the evolving news narrative had reached by the seventh year of the story. As the story originated in 2015 with changes to Australian legislation and deportation processes, the analysis began with news items from Australia.

This was followed by an exploration of coverage in New Zealand where many items comprised reactions to events in Australia and associated news coverage there. The search strategy revealed 1218 articles for Australia and 1907 articles for New Zealand across the sample period. Table 1 shows the number of articles that were utilised for the study between the years 2015 and 2021. The duplicate articles were identified by the database and removed; however, there were articles that were not identified by the database as duplicates yet contained similar content to other articles. This was due to some articles having different headlines or being slightly edited versions of the same article. Such quasi duplications were also removed manually from the sample.

Table 1: Number of Articles between 2015 and 2021

2015 Topic	Australia	New Zealand
Total number of articles	653	1166
Number of articles utilised in the study	161	199

2021 Topic	Australia	New Zealand
Total number of articles	565	741
Number of articles utilised in the study	92	123

All the articles in the Australian and New Zealand datasets appeared in the news outlets presented in Table 2. It is important to note that the same article was often published by various publishers. However, when multiple publications of the same article occurred, the article was only counted once in the content analysis (see next section).

Table 2: All News Publishers for Australia & New Zealand

New Zealand Publishers	Australian Publishers	
	Australian Broadcasting Corporation	South-West News
Stuff	Advertiser	Sunday Times
The New Zealand Herald	Albert and Logan News	Sunshine Coast Daily
The Daily Post	Bendigo Advertiser	The Advertiser
The Northern Advocate	Brisbane Times	The Age
The Dominion Post	Cairns Post	The Australian
The Northland Age	Canberra Times	The Border Mail
Waikato Times	Caulfield Glen Era Leader	The Conversation
Manawatu Standard	Courier Mail	The Courier Mail
Bay of Plenty Times	Crickey	The NewsMail
Hawkes Bay Today	Chronicle	The Standard
Otago Daily Times	Daily Mercury	The Sydney Morning Herald
Southland Times	Daily Telegraph	The West Australian
Sunday Star Times	Frankton Standard Leader	The Queensland Times
Taranaki Daily News	Gold Coast Bulletin	Townsville Bulletin
The Marlborough express	Geelong Advertiser	Wyndham Leader
The Nelson Mail	Herald Sun	Northern territory News
The Press	Hills Shire Times	Parramatta Advertiser
Timaru Herald	Leader Today	Sunday Times
Waikato Times	Maribyrnong Leader	Sunshine Coast Daily
	News.com.au	Quest News
	Northern Territory News	

Mixed Quantitative and Qualitative Content Analysis of News Coverage in AU and NZ

Procedure (Step-by-Step Process of the Analysis)

I began the systematic quantitative coding or analysis by categorising items using a gridding system (See Table 3). This technique was useful for "breaking texts open and getting inside specific empirical objects and to gain an overview of the data set" (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014, p. 387). The articles for 2015 and 2021 were organised in a separate sheet in the grid tables and included each article's date of publication; news outlet and title; depiction of 501 deportees and section 501 processes; stakeholders; and a brief synopsis and each article. This

coding grid enabled a better understanding of the story trends and patterns across time and helped identify the stakeholders who were prevalent in the items. I then extracted general patterns from across the grids and entered these into an Excel sheet for further analysis. I first undertook a quantitative analysis while taking notes about issues and particular news items which could be explored in more depth through qualitative content analysis (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). The section below offers further details in terms of how I operationalised this mixed methods analysis strategy using a step-by-step process.

Table 3: Datasheet Example for this Research

Item	Date	Online Source	Heading of the article	Portrayal of 501 Deporte	Portrayal of Migration ACT	Stakeholders	first-hand acco in the article?	Primary or main discussion points of the article
NZ1	4/01/2015	NZ Herald	Australia sends violent killer back to New Zealand	Negative	Negative	Immigration and b	No	Kiwi Criminal who has no family in NZ will be deported back to NZ
NZ2	5/01/2015	STUFF	Jailbird Russell Packer walks free afte	Negative	Nuetral	Magistrate, deport	No	Criminal was brought up in both AUS and NZ and the history of

Quantitative Analysis

The stakeholders found in news items were entered into a grid on an Excel sheet. For example: the Foreign Minister, Immigration Minister, and Prime Minister were categorised under government officials; the Attorney General, the defence barrister, and the deportee's lawyer were categorised as legal/court representatives. The next step was to explore basic frequencies in coverage meaning the percentages of appearance for each character type or stakeholder category. The total number of stakeholders was obtained by calculating the number of stakeholders represented in all items across a year. If an item had two stakeholders representing a particular character type, then two stakeholders were included in the total number of stakeholders. Following this, I collated this information using percentages.

I then categorised the news items into negative, positive, or other categories. In this section I focus on how 501 deportees as well as section 501 processes (news related 501 deportees' deportation, visa cancellation, detention etc) were depicted in media. If a news item depicts 501 deportees in a negative manner, then the 501 deportees section was categorised as negative. Similarly, if an article depicts section 501 processes in a negative manner, then the section 501 process section was categorised as negative. If an item depicts 501 deportees in positive manner then that section was categorised as positive. Similarly, if the section 501 processes were

depicted positively then section 501 processes were categorised as positive. The items sections were categorised as other if the article did not belong to either positive or negative. The percentage of each category was then also obtained. Similar to the previous analytical process, which was conducted to identify the stakeholders, this process also began with a quantitative process. A quantitative method was used to identify the percentage of the negative, positive, and other categories.

Through the analysis, I also identified key events for both countries. To do this, I first familiarised myself with the data by referring to the gridding table. This was done by reviewing, reading, and the re-reading the synopses and becoming familiar with the news items, i.e., the stories. I then identified a number of key events between 2015 and 2021 – for example, one of the key events was the riots on Christmas Island in November 2015 which will be discussed in detail (Chapter 4). The second step was to record the stakeholders in these events in a separate Excel sheet. I followed the same process utilised in the previous section (under stakeholders) to obtain the percentage of stakeholders in these key events.

Analysing the stakeholder category percentages for each year and the key events allowed me to compare and determine whether these numbers were similar on both occasions. I found that the same stakeholders who were prominent throughout the time period were also prominent during key events. Therefore, for an in-depth analysis, I chose to focus on key events, as the amount of data was smaller compared to the entire year, and therefore more manageable. The stakeholder category percentages provided me with a basic understanding of which stakeholders were most involved in telling the stories, indicating whose voices were most represented and whose voices were repressed. This knowledge helped me to identify which areas or news items required an in-depth analysis, i.e., how to approach the next part of the analytical process.

Qualitative Analysis

The next stage was to conduct the analysis using qualitative methods. The items relating to certain events were highlighted on the gridding table for easier recognition. I referred to the gridding table to understand and familiarise myself with how the stakeholders were represented. I then referred to news items, where I noted quotes that were common and mostly represented particular stakeholders. These were then noted on a word document for further interpretation and for writing reports (illustrated in Chapter 4). The purpose of examining

stakeholders in media is because there are organisations and professional practises that influence which issues are covered by the media. Stakeholders such as the government, journalist advocacy groups, and researchers, have an influence on shaping media coverage (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). In addition, this enabled me to understand which perspectives were promoted by the news items and which views were neglected (Couldry & Curran, 2002).

The qualitative analysis firstly focused on issues of symbolic power - how news relating to 501 deportees was depicted and the extent to which this contributed to the framing of their deportation. The analysis also explored whether the framing was influenced more by other stakeholders in the narrative, such as politicians and lawyers. Secondly, when reading the items, certain portrayals were identified. These were examined in depth and quotes were extracted for reporting. After reviewing each news item, as discussed above, the portrayal of the 501 deportees and section 501 processes (501 deportees' deportation, their visa cancellation, detention processes) was assigned to one of three main categories – either negative, positive, or other. I have demonstrated the rationale behind how I categorised these items above.

I reviewed, read, and re-read the items relating to a particular category – for example, when a 501 deportee was negatively represented – to understand and familiarise myself with how those portrayals played out in the media. When reading and re-reading, those quotes relating to the portrayal of deportees were extracted for interpretation. Chapters 4 and 5 will introduce all the main findings of the research. The main purpose of the two chapters is to interpret the result by applying theory and providing a coherent argument about the meaning of the results. By interpreting the results, I will be able to identify any links and gain a broader understanding of the role of media in societal processes. It is an important step in any research to analyse and interpret the data as, without this step, it will be difficult to make sense of how the data relates to everyday society and how this information can contribute to current knowledge.

Ethics and Limitations

This research did not include any direct engagements with human participants. The focus was on analysing publicly available online news content. For this reason, I was not required to obtain ethical approval from the Massey University Human Ethics Committee. However, this does not mean I have not considered ethical issues related to this project. Some of the news articles which were used in this research had very painful accounts of individuals' who had been deported from Australia to New Zealand. I made sure to treat this information sensitively and avoided using unnecessary details such as graphic and otherwise sensitive information. Even though this information is available publicly, I decided not to include any names of the family members of deportees when engaging directly with quotes from the news articles.

Chapter 3: Overview of the News Narratives

This chapter provides an overview of Australian and New Zealand news coverage of the 501 deportees between 2015 and 2021, inclusive. The aim is to provide an overview of how the news narrative relating to 501 deportees evolved over time, whilst identifying key stakeholders and events and how these are presented for public consumption. This section offers a brief plot synopsis of news coverage in Australia, before moving on to offer a similar synopsis of news coverage in New Zealand. This is followed by consideration of similarities and differences between Australia and New Zealand that will be discussed further in subsequent sections of the analysis.

Australian plot synopsis

Coverage related to 501 deportees in Australia in 2015 began with a story on Immigration Minister Peter Dutton's deportation of a man with "bikie" and "gang" connections. The deported person was from New Zealand and was allegedly involved in several offences in Queensland. According to reports, he had links to outlaw gangs in his "home country", which was presented as New Zealand rather than Australia, where he had actually made a home for himself ("Dutton Deports Man," 2015). The Immigration Minister also emphasised that, *"This New Zealand man is a perfect example of somebody we do not want in this country."* Furthermore, the Minister also highlighted the importance of section 501 by stating that "*this is about protecting Australia and its citizens. Coming to Australia is a privilege and not a right*" ("Dutton Deports Man," 2015). Although this is one news item about an individual, it also serves as an example of how other Australian media stories portrayed section 501 in 2015 and beyond. Most Australia new stories tend to highlight the criminal aspect of New Zealand 501 deportees and to position them outside the moral envelope of Australia and as belonging to New Zealand. This framing served as a rhetorical justification for their deportation throughout the period 2015–2021. Several key events and plotlines emerged during these years, but were all based on the seminal rhetorical framing identified above.

As well as a series of articles presenting the same framing in relation to different cases of deportation and responses from the New Zealand government (discussed below), there were also a series of major events that were covered across a number of different news items or instalments in the evolving news narrative. In 2015, one of those major plotlines was Junior

Togatukis' death in Australian incarceration (Vissentin, 2015b). This event was reported in both Australian and New Zealand media, however the number of articles reported in Australia was lower compared to New Zealand. This event will be discussed further as a part of the analysis in the next chapter. The other major plotline in Australia for 2015 was the riot on Christmas Island. This was the most discussed event in Australian news at the time and included the highest number of articles per single event. As a result, this plotline evolved over 2015 and this will also be discussed in detail in the next chapter. It is worth noting that during these events, the main characters who informed and updated the public about the situation were government officials. Among them, Australian Immigration Minister Peter Dutton had the most dominant voice.

Australian government officials continually underlined the importance of Section 501 of the Migration Act in protecting Australia from foreign individuals. It was common to find Australian officials defending this policy, particularly when New Zealand raised concerns about it. New Zealand continued to raised concerns over this policy throughout the years (Kenny, 2021). Australian officials also clearly outlined that section 501 related to every foreign national and New Zealand could not expect to have special treatment under the law. Legal representatives and human rights commissioners argued against the deportation policy, but there was no significant reference to this in Australian media. However, New Zealand opposition parties also raised concerns over section 501 and these concerns were widely reported in the media, along with counter-responses from Australian government officials. However, actual accounts of 501 deportees in Australian news articles in 2015 and throughout the following years were low.

The main media trend on this topic in both 2015 and 2016 was discussions on the criminal aspect of the New Zealand 501 deportees. There were two main elements to these discussions – the first was the criminal history of an individual and the second concerned their "gang" or "bikie" associations and character issues. Media articles also explained the reasons for an individual's deportation or the cancellation of their visa under the section 501. In 2016, there was a story about how an Australian football star's father, Shane Martin, faced being deported due to links to the Rebels Motorcycle gang ("Football Star's Dad," 2016). This became one of the plotlines in both Australia and New Zealand throughout the of the chosen time period. Towards the end of 2021, the deportee passed away in New Zealand. One article from New Zealand highlighted that the case had been "*a remarkable abuse of power and a terrible*

injustice" as there was no evidence to show that Shane Martin was associated with a gang, and therefore he should not have been deported (Clark, 2021).

In 2017 and 2018, the trend continued by mostly including stories of deportees who were associates of "gangs". The newly appointment New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Arden visited Sydney to meet her Australian counterpart Malcolm Turnbull. During this visit, Jacinda Ardern asked Australia to reconsider deporting individuals who had spent the majority of their life in Australia (Yaxley, 2018). This caused a reaction in Australian media and, as a result, Mr Turnbull responded stating that Section 501 of the Migration Act was moral and "fair and just" (Norington, 2018). He also advised that 40% of deportees' appeals were successful in Australia ("NZ: Deportation of Youths," 2018). Furthermore, in 2018, there was an appeal against deportation following the imprisonment of a minor in an adult immigration detention facility in Melbourne ("NZ: Deportation of Youths," 2018). Later in 2018, it was reported that the appeal was successful, and the minor was reunited with his family in Sydney ("NZ: Deportation of Youths," 2018).

New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern voiced her concerns again in 2019 during the Australia Prime Minister's visit to New Zealand. She said that section 501 had a "corrosive" effect on the relationship between Australia and New Zealand ("NZ: Deportations of Kiwis," 2019). She again raised concerns over deporting individuals who lived most of their life in Australia and who had no real ties to New Zealand. Again, her Australian counterpart highlighted that the policy was not targeted at New Zealand citizens and promised to manage individual cases sensitively (Dziedzic, 2019). Apart from this, 2019 followed a similar trend to the previous years. In 2020, New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Arden again raised concerns over the deportation policy during her visit to Australia. She stated, *"do not deport your people and your problems"*. This again intensified the tension between the two leaders and as a response Scott Morrison stated that non-citizens had no right to stay in Australia (Harris, 2020). In 2020, a new issue arose of two Aboriginal men who were at risk of deportation as they were not Australia citizens. The high court ruled that Aboriginal people cannot be deemed "aliens" under the constitution and this was something the court needed to consider before making a decision ("Court Rules Aboriginal," 2020). This story again appeared in 2021 as part of an ongoing appeal hearing.

By 2021, the media focused strongly on discussions relating to crimes committed by New Zealand deportees as well as their appeal hearings. Consequently, the main stakeholders for

2021 were legal representatives such as judges, defence lawyers, and other legal representatives. Opposing views on Australia's deportation policy – both in Australia and in New Zealand – were also discussed in two Australian media articles, but those stories were insignificant. In summary, the overall Australian media narrative strongly emphasised the criminality of the 501 deportees and the importance of removing them. As part of the plotline, the deportees' criminal history and the reasons for their visa cancelation were highlighted. This dominated the entire Australian media narrative on the topic. In the next section, attention was drawn to New Zealand narrative.

New Zealand plot synopsis

At the start of 2015, the first New Zealand news item on the topic of 501 deportees began with a sensationalist fear appeal – Australia had sent a "violent killer" back to New Zealand. The New Zealand 501 deportee was Rebecca Papalii who was one of the three people convicted for kidnapping, torturing, and killing a 14-year-old boy in Perth (Denette, 2015). The arrival of the deportee caused a strong reaction in a New Zealand public concerned about the potential danger deportees may pose to New Zealand society. As a result, numerous news articles highlighted the issues associated with the deportee's arrival and the public's negative reaction. Again, the 501e was positioned outside of the scope of New Zealand justice and as belonging to Australia. This narrative plotline evolved further by including a story from a family member of a previous deportee's victim. This person expressed the importance of a monitoring regime and included details of a petition addressed to the New Zealand government (Miller, 2015; "Murdered teen's mum," 2015). During this time, the narrative scope extended to include articles featuring Rebecca Papalii's account of her new life in New Zealand, along with her firm belief that she was not a threat to the society (Denette, 2015).

At the same time, another story was developing about an Australian national rugby league player, Russel Parker, who was jailed for 12 months after committing a vicious assault. This story began by expressing how the risk of deportation weighed heavily on this individual and the impact this may have on his career (Barclay, 2015). This was one of the main plotlines found throughout 2015. After several news items framed this event in the manner described above, the Australian Federal Immigration Department cancelled the decision to deport him, and he was able to remain in Australia (Skipwith, 2015). However, after the articles on the need for monitoring, followed by Russel Parker's story, the majority of the articles that followed

focused on the criminal histories of the deportees arriving in New Zealand. This trend continued until September 2015 in a modified form, along with articles discussing the fact that deportees who had lived most of their life in Australia were being deported to New Zealand even though they lacked any familiarity with this country.

In 2015, another major plotline was the death of New Zealand 501 deportee Junior Togatuki while in Australian incarceration (Vissentin, 2015c). Up to this point, there was a tendency to find plotlines that framed New Zealand and Australian government officials' perspectives. However, the death of Junior Togatuki led journalists, New Zealand political parties, human rights representatives, and legal representatives to voice their opinions on Section 501 of the Migration Act to the media. Media articles framed these opinions in numerous articles dealing with the ramifications of this harsh deportation policy and the negative consequences on the special relationship between Australia and New Zealand, suggesting that the Australian government should reconsider its deportation policy.

Around the same time as this event, there were concerns raised over detaining deportees in Australian detention centres. Andrew Little, the opposition party (Labour) leader, was contacted by the solicitor of a group of New Zealand 501 deportees (detainees) who requested him to intervene in issues around Australia detention centres. As a result, Labour MP Kelvin Davis organised a trip to visit a detention centre. Several articles focused on his visit and the detainees' experiences during the deportation process, with a number of detainees describing the situation as "horrendous" (Jones, 2015b). Later, in November 2015, Andrew Little also visited a detention centre and talked to the detainees about their experiences. This led to the media increasingly pressurising the New Zealand government to take actions against deportation and to raise concerns with their Australia counterparts. However, Prime Minister John Key had himself already raised concerns about this policy several times.

In November 2015, another major plotline developed regarding the riots on Christmas Island. This plotline had one of the highest number of articles per single event. This event will also be analysed in depth in the next chapter. At the start of 2015, there were discussions around the importance of monitoring deportees. This story re-emerged in November 2015 when the information sharing/monitoring law between Australia and New Zealand was passed which allowed New Zealand to monitor deportees arriving from Australia ("Trans-Tasman info," 2015). However, a number of media items raised concerns about the lack of support for 501 deportees who were arriving in New Zealand. There were also news items that pointed out how

the grounds for deporting people from Australia to New Zealand had extended to those with no criminal convictions, i.e., to those who demonstrated they were undesirable characters. Nevertheless. towards the end of 2015, a number of articles included reports of New Zealand 501 deportees reoffending after arriving in New Zealand, articles which increased in volume in 2016.

In 2016, the discussion around section 501 and New Zealand 501 deportees followed a similar trend to 2015. However, there was an extension to the overall narrative which now entailed "gangs", whereby some New Zealand 501 deportees who were reoffending in New Zealand were identified as gang associates. This resulted in many articles presenting gang-related issues as a point of focus. These articles also highlighted the future risk posed by deportees due to the growing number of organised crime related activities in New Zealand. However, there were also discussions around the importance of funding to support the 501 deportees who were arriving in New Zealand. In 2017, the crime trend continued, with a high number of articles focusing on the increased amount of organised crime and other criminal activities associated with New Zealand 501 deportees. In 2017, there was a change of New Zealand government, and the new Prime Minister, Jacinda Ardern of the Labour Party, expressed her concerns about section 501 by stating Australia should not deport individuals who had no genuine ties or roots in New Zealand ("NZ, Australia's Junior," 2018).

Throughout 2018, 2019, and 2020, coverage continued to feature the trends noted above for the previous years. In fact, the news items relating to organised crime, the establishment of gangs, and the negative impacts of the New Zealand 501 deportees became more prevalent. In early 2018, an article reported that nearly half (44%) of deportees who had arrived from Australia had reoffended (Walters, 2018). At the same time, there was a story of a young New Zealand male under 18 years of age who was detained in an adult detention centre ("Young Kiwi in Detention," 2018). An Australian human rights lawyer working on this teenager's case declared that Australia was in breach of the United Nations Convention (Bennett, 2018). In 2019, the number of news items which discussed gang issues associated with New Zealand 501 deportees were higher than in 2018. By 2020, the coverage on gang issues had surpassed 2019 and 2018. In 2020, there were a brief hold in deportations due to the Covid-19 pandemic; however, according to *Stuff,* deportations resumed by the beginning of June that same year. There was a new addition to the deportation process, and it was reported that the deportees had to go through quarantine facilities upon arrival in New Zealand (Clent, 2020).

The 2021 coverage will be discussed in detail over the next two analysis chapters. The 2021 coverage showed similar trends to the previous years, with similar threads going all the way back to 2015. However, there was a shift whereby a high number of news items focused on the New Zealand 501 deportees rather than other news related to section 501. This was due to discussions around an increase of gun and gang violence in New Zealand due to the presence of New Zealand 501 deportees. The New Zealand Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern also said in 2021 that the New Zealand 501 deportees had contributed to the recent increase of gun violence in New Zealand ("PM Arden Blames," 2021). Furthermore, new articles were appearing on the criminal activities of New Zealand 501 deportees and how these was affecting New Zealand society. A few of the news items highlighted safety concerns in Auckland and Wellington Central in response these problems.

In 2021, a new plotline emerged that contrasted with previous years, concerning a group of New Zealand 501 deportees who took legal action against the Australian government over the treatment they received (Block, 2021). The major plotline in 2021 featured the deportation of a 15-year-old boy to New Zealand (Mckay, 2021). Similar to the 2015 plotline of Junior Togatuki, this story caused a great deal of controversy and increased tensions between Australia and New Zealand. There were concerns raised about human rights and the legal issues associated with deporting a minor under section 501 (Mckay, 2021). This is discussed in more detail in the next chapter. In addition, another story also caused trans-Tasman tension to strengthen, when the Australian Immigration Minister referred to the New Zealand 501 deportees as "trash" (Chung, 2021). This will also be examined in Chapter 5 as part of the discussion on the portrayal of the New Zealand 501 deportees.

To recap, the overall New Zealand narrative contained many different stories and some evolved over time. At the start of 2015, when section 501 was in its infancy, the articles highlighted how the policy worked and how it affected New Zealand. Alongside these discussions, other stories emerged about how section 501 had affected the relationship between Australia and New Zealand. The reaction in New Zealand was mainly negative towards section 501 and news related to the Australian detention centres were also criticised. However, by 2021, most of the New Zealand news items portrayed deportees negatively due to the increased number of gangs, gun violence, and other criminal activities they were associated with. Again, however, along with New Zealand 501 deportees reoffending stories, there were also stories that highlighted the deportees' struggle to integrate into New Zealand society. What was also common was a tendency for the voice of government officials to remain dominant. They were the main party

to inform the public about these stories. The following section of this chapter discusses the similarities and differences between these two countries' narratives.

Chapter discussion: Similarities and differences between Australian and New Zealand narratives

As the deportation policy and its processes were initiated in Australia, it was common to find stories originating from Australia news outlets. With some notable exceptions when New Zealand items were reprinted in Australia, Australian coverage set the news agenda and the framing of the 501 deportees narrative within New Zealand news articles. Despite this, differences in coverage remained. Australian news items tended to emphasise the criminal aspect of the deportees. This meant a focus on 501 deportees' criminal history, character issues, or "gang" affiliations as a means of justifying their deportations. Australian coverage did not discuss the implications of these 501 deportees for New Zealand in any substantive manner. New Zealand, on the other hand, focused on the negative effects or potential threat/danger towards New Zealand society from 501 deportees, as well as on issues of 501 deportees' welfare.

New Zealand items also offered more nuanced engagements with the Section 501 of the Migration Act narrative that did not rely almost entirely on a single dominant plotline as was the case in Australia. For example, in 2015 a number of New Zealand articles discussed how section 501 worked and its impact on New Zealand. Also, the fairness of the policy was discussed in terms of individuals who had lived most their life in Australia and were then deported back to New Zealand, as well as the deportees' treatment in detention centres. In addition, there were stories on how the special relationship between Australia and New Zealand was being impacted negatively by the deportation policies and process of Australia. Nevertheless, what was consistent in both countries in 2015 was the dominant voices of government officials. Additionally, there was a near total absence of deportee voices in Australian coverage, and although evident in isolated cases in New Zealand coverage, these were also drowned out by those of other characters in the evolving narrative such as the 501 deportees' lawyers.

This tendency to rely on government officials to inform and update the public about the situation in both countries continued. In many instances, New Zealand government officials also relied on information from their Australian counterparts to update the New Zealand public.

In 2021, Australian news articles coverage remained consistent with coverage in 2015 as most of the articles included stories highlighting the New Zealand 501 deportees' criminal aspects. However, in 2021, New Zealand media showed a significant change in the stories they were reporting compared to 2015. The majority of the articles discussed the establishment of gangs, gun violence, and other organised crime-related activities involving New Zealand 501 deportees. As a result, the New Zealand Police were one of the main government officials to provide commentary and perspective to journalists. In comparison, in Australia, legal representatives had a greater voice and coverage consisted of deportees' appeals or court hearings.

In summary, the overall narrative of New Zealand between 2015 and 2021 raised concerns over Section 501 of the Migration Act by highlighting how New Zealand was facing an increase in organised and other crime due to the influx of deportees from Australia. Along with these stories of concern, New Zealand news items also emphasised the unfair aspect of the deportation policy, for example, the deportation of people who had lived most their life in Australia and deportees being held in harsh detention centres. In contrast, the majority of Australian articles discussed the criminal aspect of New Zealand deportees and the positive impact the policy was having on Australian society through the removal of these individuals.

This chapter provided an overview of 501 deportees news coverage in Australia and New Zealand between 2015 and 2021. The next chapter will discuss the research findings in depth. This will be done by looking at the overall results for 2015 and 2021, as well as the major plotlines during these two years.

Chapter 4: Analysis of Stakeholders in News Media

The previous chapter provided an overview of the news narratives in both Australia and New Zealand on the issues surrounding 501 deportees between 2015 to 2021. This provided a sense of how each narrative evolved over time, who were the main stakeholders, and what plotlines (events) were prominent. My approach to the analysis was a narrative perspective in orientation whereby each news item was approached as an instalment in the ongoing news story that featured various plotlines, twists, characters, and relationships. Within this multi-year narrative emerged various events or developments that sparked news plotlines that propelled the news narrative forward. The focus of this chapter is to look at some of the findings in depth. The main purpose of this analysis is to identify whose voices were present, or rather who were the key stakeholders, in the media narratives.

For data analysis year 2015 and 2021 was selected. As 2015 was the first year of the coverage, the year where the story originated. The latest full year of coverage was 2021. This allowed me to explore the early framings of the issue as well as where the evolving news narrative had reached by the seventh year of the story. The first section of this chapter will explore the percentage results of the most prominent stakeholders. The second section will focus on how these key stakeholders' voices were represented in the media in detail, by examining some of the major events that were identified in the previous chapter.

Key stakeholders of news articles for 2015 and 2021

I began by analysing the coding grids (see Chapter 2), which showed that the majority of articles consisted of more than one stakeholder for each item. This was consistent throughout the two years in both Australia and New Zealand. The key stakeholders are listed below (see Figures 4 and 5). After identifying the key stakeholders, the next step of the research was to undertake a quantitative analysis to identify the representation of each key stakeholder as a percentage. This enabled me to understand whose voices were being highlighted in news items. For example, in New Zealand, government officials appeared 122 times in 2015, which is 34% of the total number of stakeholders present in news items that year. This is compared with 43% of government official stakeholders in Australia for the same year. Table 4 to 5 present the results for 2015 and 2021.

The Table below provide data on who were the key stakeholders for 2015 (Figure 4) and 2021 (Table 5) in Australia and New Zealand. The stakeholders are listed in Table 4 from the highest to lowest percentage.

Table 4: Year 2015 key stakeholder categories

Australia

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
NZ/AU Government Official	124	**43%**
Legal/Court Rep	28	**10%**
NZ Other Political Parties	27	**9%**
Deportee	21	**7%**
Asylum Seeker/Refugee	17	**6%**
Journalist	16	**6%**
Deportee's Family/Friend	15	**5%**
AU Other Political Parties	6	**2%**
Human Rights Rep	4	**1%**
Witness	4	**1%**
Public	3	**1%**
Prison/Corrections Rep	3	**1%**
Detainee	3	**1%**
Victim	3	**1%**
Former Immigration Minister	2	**1%**
SJN Founder	2	**1%**
Christmas Island SHIRE President	2	**1%**

New Zealand

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
NZ/AU Government Official	122	**34%**
Journalist	60	**17%**
NZ Other Political Parties	56	**16%**
Public	31	**9%**
Deportee	18	**5%**
Deportee's Family/Friend	16	**4%**
Legal/Court Rep	13	**4%**
Prison/Corrections Rep	7	**2%**
Victim	7	**2%**
AU Other Political Parties	5	**1%**
Media	4	**1%**
PARS Organisation	3	**1%**
Human Rights Rep	3	**1%**
Asylum Seeker/Refugee	**2**	**1%**
Education Institution	1	**0%**
Camberra Press Gallery	1	**0%**
Social/Political Commentator	1	**0%**

According to the above table results, in 2015, government officials had the highest representation in both countries. In comparison, 501 deportees only received 5% of the overall media coverage of the issue in New Zealand and 7% in Australia.

Table 5: Year 2021 key stakeholder categories

Australia

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Legal/Court Representative	86	**59%**
NZ/AU Government Official	42	**29%**
Journalist	12	**8%**
Victim	10	**7%**
Deportee	6	**4%**
Education Institution	5	**3%**
AU Other Political Parties	5	**3%**
Uber	2	**1%**
Deportee's Family/Friend	2	**1%**
AAT	1	**1%**
Prisoners NZ Aid & Rehabilitation	1	**1%**
Chapter President	1	**1%**
Photographer	1	**1%**
Migration services	1	**1%**
Prison/Correction Rep	1	**1%**
Multi-Cultural Affairs	1	**1%**
NZ Other Political Parties	1	**1%**

New Zealand

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
NZ/AU Government Official	80	**33%**
Legal/Court Representative	26	**11%**
Journalist	17	**7%**
Public	15	**6%**
Deportee	13	**5%**
Council	12	**5%**
Prison/Corrections Rep	8	**3%**
Deportee's Family/Friend	8	**3%**
NZ Other Political Parties	8	**3%**
Witness	6	**2%**
Media	4	**2%**
MIQ	3	**1%**
Education Institution	**3**	**1%**
Victim	2	**1%**
Sociologist	2	**1%**
Coordinator of Iwi in AUS group	1	**0%**
AU MP	1	**0%**

In Australia in 2021, legal representatives had the highest percentage in news media, followed by government officials. However, in New Zealand in 2021, government officials still had the highest representation. Similar to 2015, 501 deportees still represented a lower number at only 5% in New Zealand and 4% in Australia.

It is important to point out here that there are two main parties directly involved in and impacted by section 501 and its process. One party is made up of government officials who are directly involved in making the law, and the other consists of individuals who are directly affected by this process (501 deportees). However, the representation of 501 deportees directly affected by this policy is low. As such, the results from the news media stakeholder analysis raised concerns on symbolic power. As explained in Chapter 1, the concept of symbolic power includes who gets to speak in the media on social issues (Bourdieu, 1979). When symbolic power is supported by the media, then the perceived reality of section 501 is mostly defined and influenced by key stakeholders, who in this case, are government representatives (Couldry & Curran, 2002). Having established the overall representation of the stakeholders, the discussion that follows is on the key events that took place in the two relevant years.

The next section of this chapter will focus on three key events in 2015 and 2021. These key events resulted in a large number of news items. Singling out key events enabled me to identify the key stakeholders for each event. It also allowed me to compare the event findings with the

overall results for 2015 and 2021 (as discussed at the start of this chapter). Focusing on specific events in the context of the overall narrative allowed me to work with data that were more manageable for in-depth analysis.

There were two major events in 2015, the first involving a 23-year-old man, Junior Togatuki, who was found dead in an Australian prison while waiting for deportation. The second major event was the 2015 riots in a Christmas Island detention centre. The third major event occurred in 2021 and was related to the deportation of an unnamed 15-year-old boy. These are discussed in the following:

Major event 1: Death of Junior Togatuki in Goulburn's prison

Media readers were informed that the Togatuki family relocated from Auckland to Sydney when Junior Togatuki was 4 years old. He had previously mentioned that he had "*no memory*" of New Zealand and was "*uncomfortable with the identity of a kiwi"* (Visentin, 2015a, n.p.). In addition, he also further mentioned that, "*all my family live here in Australia. This is our home. Not New Zealand"* (Visentin, 2015a, n.p.). His siblings were born in Australia and they were Australian citizens. He also stated that "*I'll lose all I have. I'll lose my family. I'll lose hope in life if I go to New Zealand. I'll break down completely*" (Visentin, 2015a, n.p.). Seven years after he had entered the New South Wales's prison system as a juvenile for armed robbery and assault, and after having been through 20 transfers between prisons Visentin, 2015c). It was reported that he had spent most of his adult life in prison. His prison cell was subsequently converted seamlessly into a de facto immigration detention cell. By the time of his death, his Australian visa had been revoked and his prison sentence had expired, yet he was still languishing in solitary confinement in Goulburn's Supermax prison. More than a month after his prison sentence expired, on September 12, 2015, Junior was found dead at 6am in a solitary confinement cell in Goulburn's Supermax prison. Officially, his death was ruled to be suicide. It was reported that Junior was suffering from mental illness, as he had been diagnosed with schizophrenia and anxiety (Visentin, 2015c).

After removing the duplicate news items related to this event, there were 19 articles in New Zealand and 7 in Australia. The tables below present the percentages of key stakeholders in the news construction of this event.

Table 6: All stakeholders for Australia

Total number of stakeholders 17

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	8	47%
Category – 501 deportees' families	3	17%
Category – 501 deportees	1	6%
Category - Legal representatives	1	6%
Category - Prison/corrections reps	1	6%
Category - NZ opposition party	1	6%
Category - Mental health	1	6%
Category – Other	1	6%

Table 7: All stakeholders for New Zealand

Total number of stakeholders 33

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	12	33%
Category – Journalists	7	21%
Category - NZ opposition party	5	15%
Category - Other political parties	2	6%
Category - Human rights reps	2	6%
Category- 501 deportees' family/friends	1	3%
Category - 501 deportees	1	3%
Category - Legal representatives	1	3%
Category - University professionals	1	3%
Category - Civil rights representatives	1	3%

The most dominant voice for both countries by frequency was that of government officials. Overall, New Zealand articles had a higher representation of other political parties compared to Australia. In addition, other non-government representation of opposition parties and human/civil rights representatives was also more noticeable in the New Zealand news items compared to Australia. What is striking, however, is that the voice of the 501 deportees in both

countries, was low, with only 3% in New Zealand and 6% in Australia. Also, the 501 deportees' family representation was 3% in New Zealand, compared to 17% in Australia. The findings related to the death of Junior Togatuki are similar to the results for 2015 and 2021 articles overall. As noted earlier, government officials had the most prominent voice in this event in both countries. That is, this event produced prominent trends in coverage in terms of who exercised the symbolic power to label and define the deportation issue, namely government officials rather than deportees and their families. During this event, it was common for government officials to inform the public about the situation. The following New Zealand news item excerpt refers to Australian Foreign Minister Julie Bishop and how she informed the public about the circumstances of the event:

> *Bishop said she had also discussed New Zealand's concerns about Junior Togatuki's death with Prime Minister John Key. "I confirmed there will be an investigation by New South Wales police, I also confirmed that our Immigration Minister will meet with your Immigration Minister to discuss this matter." Bishop would not be drawn further, saying it was a matter for the immigration ministers to discuss "over the coming days and weeks."* ("Pledge to Investigate," 2015)

New Zealand government officials often relied on their Australian counterparts for updates on the situation. Australian government officials continued to reassure them there had been no ill-treatment, which was a common response from Australian officials throughout the event coverage. The strong presence of the government in media coverage reflects the power they hold in society – they have the authority to inform the public on these events, as displayed in the example above. In addition to this, even in instances when concerns were raised about detaining individuals in prisons or detention centres, government officials in both Australia and New Zealand were the first to reject these arguments and reassure the public that deportees suffered no ill treatment. For example, the then-New Zealand Deputy Prime Minister Bill English stated that:

> *If there was any evidence that these people who are meant to be on their way back to New Zealand were in appalling conditions, then we would be taking up those individual cases. The first duty of the Government is to ensure they are treated properly, and there isn't any evidence of shocking treatment or appalling treatment.* (King, 2015)

This does not mean that the voice of this government was not contested. The above quote from the deputy Prime Minister was largely criticised in New Zealand media. New Zealand opposition and political parties urged the New Zealand government to take the matter more seriously with Australian government officials, noting it was a human rights issue: "*If someone taking their own life while waiting to be deported isn't evidence that something is wrong, I don't know what is*" (King, 2015), responded acting Labour (the opposition party) leader, Annette King, in a media statement (King, 2015). Similarly, the Australian Greens immigration spokeswoman Sarah Hanson-Young expressed concerns about the detention centres and described them as worse than a prison (King, 2015).

The contestation around the deportations as well as the conciliatory statements by government officials was often framed within the bounds of a notional special relationship between New Zealand and Australia. It was typical to report this relationship in the media, as evidenced when Prime Minister John Key spoke of the special relationship between New Zealand and Australia, and the harm which can be caused when Australians treat New Zealanders poorly. He stated that *"there is an Anzac bond and an Anzac spirit ... that surely means we might get some treatment that's different from other countries* (Conifer, 2015, n.p.). This special relationship between the nations was echoed by Australian Foreign Minister Julie Bishop:

> *"I discussed more generally with Prime Minister Key and with foreign minister [Murray] McCully whether there are other arrangements that Australia and New Zealanders could reach in relation to the deportation of New Zealanders," she said. "There is no closer relationship than Australia and New Zealand, and so I think it's appropriate that we consider this matter as Prime Minister Key has asked us to do". I just hope we receive answers.* (Conifer, 2015)

These quotes display the dominant presence of government in news media. At the start of the event, government officials stated they were still looking into the matter before informing the public, which is another example of how officials from both countries discussed the current situation. During this time, it was common to see discussions around the Australia/New Zealand relationship or other political subjects that arose from this reporting. Despite conciliatoriness, the Australian government's stance on the matter was clear when Scott Morrison said:

> *It was "obvious" and "just common sense" that non-citizens who run afoul of Australian law faced deportation. "The fact that we have more people in our detention centres now because they've been convicted of various offences and they should be going home: well good," he told Sydney radio 2GB. "I have no doubt about the strong position the government under Malcolm Turnbull will take on border protection."* (Owens, 2015).

These 'non-citizens' who break Australian laws were framed as violent and dangerous individuals. Despite prison officials being allegedly aware of his declining mental health, Junior Togatuki was transferred to a High-Risk Management Correctional Centre (HRMCC), which is a purpose-built maximum-security facility (Supermax) at Golburn Prison, and he was kept in solitary confinement in a cell. It was not clear why Togatuki was transferred, with media reporting that:

> *The Department of Corrective Services would not comment on the reason for his final transfer, but a spokesman said inmates were "placed in the HRMCC because of the risk they pose within the prison system" and included those with "a history of violent behaviour."* (Visentin, 2015a)

Evident in such extracts is the common framing of 501 deportees as violent and dangerous individuals. Although this characterisation is not used to directly warrant the inhumane treatment of prisoners, it is also not balanced by contextual explanations of why someone might become violent. One cluster of stakeholders that emerged from these tragic key events, which did appear to provide a different perspective, was the family members of deportees. Both Australian and New Zealand articles included snippets of representation from the family of 501 deportees. The representational practices around these stakeholders were similar in both countries. In New Zealand, there was only one incident of a family member appearing in an article whereas, in Australia, three incidents were found. Below are examples of this representation from Junior Togatuki's families' narrative:

> *"It's like an unsolved puzzle in my mind. I don't know where to start. He went inside without any sickness. Nothing," his mother … told The Sun-Herald. "Even though he is gone, we need answers. I can't live every day of my life wondering what happened."* (Visentin, 2015b)

The excerpt appears to indicate the family of the deportee raised concerns over this matter and sought clarity on what was happening in detention centres. However, it appears that there was little information given to them and they were relatively powerless to engage with the system, as shown by reports of family members' comments:

> *"Why didn't they inform us of anything? Was he sick? Was he mentally ill? Is there any way we could we have helped him? We don't know anything," his sister ...said.* (Visentin, 2015c)

In terms of media representation of the deportees themselves, in this case it was done posthumously. The following excerpt of a letter written by Junior Togatuki to Mr Peter Dutton was found in both New Zealand and Australian coverage. In this letter, Junior pleaded with the minister to reconsider his deportation.

> *"All my family live here in Australia. This is our home. Not New Zealand." His three younger siblings were born in Australia, he wrote, and were Australian citizens. "I'll lose all I have. I'll lose my family. I'll lose hope in life if I go to New Zealand. I'll break down completely"* (Visentin, 2015c)

The above excerpt highlights how important it was to the individual to stay in Australia. He moved to Australia with his family when he was 4 years old and, as per the news item mentioned above, he had "no memory" of New Zealand and was "uncomfortable with the identity of a kiwi" (Visentin, 2015a, n.p.). That was further reflected in the above quote, as he mentioned he would, "break down completely'' if he were to go to New Zealand. This excerpt only provides a glimpse of the deportee's suffering; however, it is one of the few deportee stories which drew the media's attention (Visentin, 2015a, n.p.). This shows the importance of providing a voice for the deportees in the media. Other than the quote mentioned above, there is no other account from a 501 deportee found in the entire coverage of the event. However, this trend is not limited to this event as, throughout the entire narrative of Australia and New Zealand for both years, similar results were found, which is that the 501 deportees had little to no representation. Other deportees' perspectives could provide more information on their experiences in correction or detention centres. Having no accounts from deportees in a similar

position, does not give sense to what Junior Togatuki's experience was or what other deportees in similar situations were going through.

The results also recognised other stakeholders who had significant representation throughout the coverage. The stakeholders in New Zealand ranged from representatives from political parties, Human Rights representatives, legal/court representatives, and education institutions. In Australia, the stakeholders also included the New Zealand opposition party, legal/court representatives, and mental health professionals. Despite the lack of direct deportee input, most of these reports raised concerns about the treatment of individuals in detention centres. There were also concerns about the mental health struggle of Junior Togatuki and the treatment he received in solitary confinement.

Despite the dominance of government officials' stories on the event, other non-government officials' accounts were also reported in the media. Several articles underlined the issues and concerns arising from section 501. The example below includes the words of the New Zealand opposition party (Labour) leader Andrew Little, who urged the National-led New Zealand government of the time to take action against the section 501. Furthermore, he stated enquiries must be made with the Australian government about Junior Togatuki's mental health struggle and the reasons he was left unsupervised (Jones, 2015a).

> *Togatuki died after writing farewell messages to his family in his cell, the Sydney Morning Herald reported. Authorities in Australia say he killed himself. He suffered from schizophrenia and anxiety. "The death of Junior Togatuki was a preventable tragedy. The Government must seek an urgent explanation about why the 23-year-old – who had a recognised mental illness – was left unsupervised in solitary confinement," Mr Little said.* (Jones, 2015a)

The above quote is an example of a non-government official raising concerns over the deportation process, and such concerns can help push for answers about the inhumane treatment of the soon-to-be deportees. The Australian government's perspective on why Junior Togatuki was kept in a managed correction centre highlighted his behaviour in order to justify the inhumane treatment such individuals face as part of the deportation process. Furthermore, Junior Togatuki's death clearly showed the dominant voice of the government in both countries as expressed through government officials. As stakeholders involved in informing the public about the situation, their perspective was the most influential in news relating to this event.

This could also indicate that the inhumane treatment towards 501 deportees is usually obscured by stories that stress the need to punish these individuals, who are portrayed as individuals who 'violent' and 'criminal'. In the following section of this chapter, our attention turns to a second event, which is the riots on Christmas Island.

Major event 2: Christmas Island Riots

The Australian immigration detention centres are facilities that used to detain asylum seekers and 501 deportees (Moir, 2015). These centres are known to have very strict and harsh environments (Stanley, 2018). Mostly these centres are offshore away from civilians and everyday life. A detention centre is run as a high security military camp and control is based on fear and punishment where extensive internal use of extrajudicial punishment and force and isolation is evident (McLoughlin & Warin, 2008; Stanley, 2018). The Australian Human Rights Commission has raised numerous concerns about these detention centres as they recognise they are not an appropriate place to keep people. These detention centres have limited infrastructure, a lack of community-based accommodation, and little access to essentials, services, and a support network (McLoughlin & Warin, 2008; Stanley, 2018).

This is located around 2500km or a six-hour flight from Perth (Stanley, 2018). This is a secluded island away from civilians and in many ways, a secret. In this facility, the potential deportees face a maximum-security environment, which includes electric fences, CCTV, solitary cells, etc. (Stanley, 2018). As with other detention centres, non-citizens on Christmas Island are not expected to return to society and the usual process of rehabilitation or reintegration does not take place (Stanley, 2018). In November 2015, there was a riot following the death of an asylum seeker. According to the media, the riot began when a detainee was assaulted after enquiring about the death of an asylum seeker (Chaos at Christmas Island," 2015). Based on this event, there were approximately 56 articles in Australia and 47 in New Zealand. After removing the duplicates and similar articles, there were 34 in Australia and 32 in New Zealand. These were utilised for analysis as per the tables below.

Tables 8 and 9 show whose stories or accounts were the most prominent in this event. These tables present the total numbers and percentages of key stakeholders in the news construction of this event.

Table 8: All stakeholders for Australia

Total number of stakeholders 76

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	38	50%
Category - NZ political parties	10	13%
Category - Asylum seeker/refugee	8	11%
Category – Deportee	8	11%
Category – Journalist	4	5%
Category - Australia political party	4	5%
Category - Christmas Island Shire	2	3%
Category – Witness	1	1%
Category – 501 deportees' family/friends	1	1%

Table 9: All Stakeholders for New Zealand

Total number of stakeholders 67

Key stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	21	31%
Category – Journalist	13	19%
Category - Political parties	12	18%
Category - 501 deportees	4	6%
Category - 501 deportees' family	3	5%
Category – Public	3	5%
Category - Australia political parties	3	5%
Category – Media	2	3%
Category - Legal/court representative	2	3%
Category - Asylum seeker/refugee	2	3%
Category – Detainee	1	1%
Category - Prison/correction rep	1	1%

Similar to the previous event, the most dominant voice in this coverage was also government officials, followed by the opposition party, other political parties, and the Refugee Action Coalition. The voices of the deportees were sparse, compared to the overall coverage. In addition, when a 501 deportee had representation in an article, it was usually a small snippet of the entire news item. As explained earlier, government officials were the main party

responsible for providing updates/outcomes on events. That 501 deportees were ‘dangerous criminals’ was reiterated in Australian media by drawing on comments from government officials, such as this from the then Minister of Immigration, Peter Dutton:

> *Mr Dutton emphasised that the vast majority of detainees were "hardened" criminals including rapists and murderers, adding a significant number of them were from New Zealand.* (“Christmas Island rioters,” 2015)

In the above quote, we see a government official labelling the deportees as ‘hardened’ criminals, rapists, and murderers, which is a clear example of these individuals being placed outside the moral envelope. It is important to note, due to the dominant presence the government has in the media, they can potentially influence public perceptions, and may cause the 501 deportees to be viewed negatively. The notion that New Zealanders were particularly dangerous was further reinforced by comments reportedly made by other detainees in the Christmas Island Detention Centre:

> *“Kiwi guys are going to get in here when they get bored and they will start bashing people up,” he told The West Australian newspaper.* (Meers, 2015).

> *A refugee, who did not want to be named out of fear for his safety, said a gang of New Zealand criminals had “blades and wires” and threatened to kill a group of Sri Lankan asylum seekers on Friday. “We come (to Australia) to have a safe place to live, and in detention, we don’t feel safe at all,” he said.* (Argoon & White, 2015).

This type of reporting tends to frame the 501 deportees as violent and dangerous criminals. Even though these characterisations are not directly used to warrant the poor treatment at these detention centres, the articles are missing balanced discussion by not providing contextual explanations of why these individuals were rioting. In addition, Australian government officials also emphasised that the safety of the Australian public through deportation was an unequivocal necessity. For example, statements such as the following were common to see in Australian media: “*The Australian government takes seriously its responsibility to protect the Australian community from the risk of harm posed by foreign nationals who engage in criminal conduct*” (Fernando, 2021).

Likewise, Minister Dutton said:

> *"We have a job to do of repatriating people back to their country of origin if their visas have been cancelled and the government won't step back from the position at all."* ("We won't cower." 2015).

Processes of detention became legitimated as a safety mechanism and ironically were often positioned as the choice of the New Zealand 501 deportees; therefore, the Christmas Island riots were seen as an event which did not warrant New Zealand intervention. There was an implicit suggestion that New Zealanders were deserving of detention and underserving of New Zealand protection. For example, the point of view of the New Zealand Prime Minister John Key is outlined in the following:

> *The prime minister has ruled out intervening on behalf of New Zealanders involved in a riot at the Christmas Island detention centre, saying they are "free to leave" whenever they choose. John Key has said he will not call Australian Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull to discuss the situation, and warned that Kiwi rioters may be jeopardising their chances of staying in Australia.* ("PM Won't Intervene," 2015).

The actions taken by Australian authorities in terms of the riots were positioned by New Zealand government officials as within the sovereign jurisdiction of the Australian government, and it was made clear that there would be no action taken by New Zealand, as shown below:

> *Prime Minister John Key said he had been told that New Zealanders might be involved in the rioting.… Mr Key said the Government would not intervene because it was a matter for Australian authorities. He said the New Zealand detainees had chosen to stay at Christmas Island; they had been given the option to leave. He was not aware of anyone who had applied to leave and been unable to, and reiterated that their appeal to stay in Australia would not be affected by returning to New Zealand.* (Davison, 2015b)

Although Prime Minister Key indicated that he didn't necessarily agree with the Australians, he indicated that New Zealand was and has been historically powerless in the face of Australian authority and will: *"I don't agree with what the Australians are doing, but I can't make them*

change the law any more than Helen Clark could stop them creating the category [for New Zealanders]" (Sachdeva, 2015).

Despite this somewhat tacit disagreement with Australian processes, Key further supported the Australian government's depiction of the 501 deportees as highly dangerous criminals, saying that:

> *[The] figures showed a third of those in or on their way to detention centres were responsible for serious crimes like rape, murder and assault. I actually have a responsibility to the New Zealanders who are coming home too, to make sure they are safe.* (Sachdeva, 2015)

It was also common for Australian and New Zealand government officials to place the 501 deportees outside the moral envelope by providing their own explanations for what was occurring. In the above example, New Zealand Prime Minister John Key emphasised that he needed to protect New Zealanders from deportees, which shows the how the characterisation of the 501 deportees was being constructed despite these individuals soon to be part of the New Zealand community.

New Zealand journalists who commented on the riots tended to take a more ambivalent position. They represented the 501 deportees as unwanted dangerous criminals, undeserving of sympathy but also as people caught up in environments with questionable human rights, as shown below:

> *Our unfriendly neighbour, Australia, is, after all, sending scores of criminals our way, though not before holding them in detention centres. This week's riot at Christmas Island once again highlighted the questionable conditions at these centres, of which Australia has hindered scrutiny.… There will be little sympathy for Kiwi criminals caught up in this but the Government also has a duty to promote human rights.* (Miller, 2015)

The excerpt above addresses the 501 deportees as 'criminal', which thus constructed a stigma around the 501 deportees arriving from Australia. The article also discusses how Australia is "*sending scores of criminals our way*" which positions the deportees as 'others' who are not

part of New Zealand community (Miller, 2015). Despite this, the above quote also addresses the conditions the 501 deportees faced in detention centres and highlights the importance of protecting the human rights of these individuals. The most sympathetic accounts of the 501 deportees relating to this event occurred following New Zealand opposition Labour Party MP Kelvin Davis's visit to the detention centres following the riots. It was reported that the detainees had:

> *told the Labour MP they had been beaten, handcuffed and dragged "like crocodiles" by emergency staff after the riots. Some were no longer sleeping in their cells but on black mats in the dirt, and did not have access to a bathroom. Seven alleged riot ringleaders have been moved to a maximum security prison in Perth,* (Davison, 2015b)

Labour party MP Kelvin Davis discussed how:

> *The decision cut off their "final connection to the outside world" and would make it difficult for them to contact their lawyers or families. "It just increases their isolation – remember these people aren't prisoners, they're detainees.* (Sachdeva & Hatch, 2015)

In response to the above accusations, a spokesperson for the Australian Department of Immigration and Border Protection responded that detainees could use the detention centre's landline phones or a hotline, which had been set up for concerned relatives. However, MP Kelvin Davis responded:

> *It was too hard for people to make contact. "So many families are saying, 'I haven't heard from my son, my partner, I don't know what's going on.' Everyone I've spoken to has tried that hotline and they can't get through – it's fine to say this is set up, but the reality is that on the ground it is not working as it should."* (Sachdeva & Hatch, 2015)

These were common exchanges of messages that generally occurred in news relating to section 501 in which the Australian authorities defended statements around poor treatment of 501 deportees. Another similar finding to the previous event the low representation of 501 deportees themselves, compared to other stakeholders. The excerpt below is one of the few examples of 501 deportees providing their perspective:

> *New Zealand-born detainee Ricardo Young, 29, said he had applied a week ago to travel to New Zealand after being "treated like a dog" during his nine weeks at Christmas Island. "We have already signed the papers to go back home but they won't accept us," he told the Herald.* (Davison, 2015b)

Despite the above excerpt being a small part of the overall news, it provides a glimpse into the struggle the deportees were facing in Christmas Island detention centre. However, these first-hand accounts from the 501 deportees remained minimal in the event coverage. Below is another example of a detainee's account of the riots and the treatment they received:

> *New Zealand inmate Lester Hohua said ex-crimnals like him with cancelled visas were involved in the incident. But he said no punches were thrown and they were only attempting to defend asylum seekers who were allegedly being abused by an emergency response team.… Mr Hohua alleged that after Mr Chegeni's death, a prison guard challenged an asylum seeker to a "one-on-one" fight. "That's when us 501s [convicted criminals with cancelled visas] got involved." He said the rioting had been brewing. Over-crowding and assaults by the emergency response team had put the detainees at "breaking point", he said. You can only back someone into a corner so much.* (Davison, 2015b)

Such accounts of the soon-to-be deportees showed their side of the story concerning the riots. The excerpt below is another example of a deportee's experience in relation to the riots:

> *He said conditions on Christmas Island were often unpleasant.… "They sent me to Christmas Island, way away from all my family." He said the death of an Iranian detainee triggered the riots earlier this month. "It was pretty scary. A lot of us were concerned for our welfare because the officers actually left the centre... we weren't getting looked after that well. They were playing up." Mr Branks said a group of detainees, some of whom had no role in the riots, were held in a roughly 72sq m room, and half the room was "actual dirt". He said he was held in the room for 30 hours* ("Con Air" arrival," 2015).

Likewise:

> *A New Zealand detainee told NZME people being "treated like animals" sparked the riots that saw fires lit and walls smashed…. The detainee said the guards appeared to have left the centre and he was worried they would return with guns. "They're gone. We can't see them. They'll probably come back with heavy artillery. Everybody's scared, you know. Everybody's panicking," he said.* ("United Nations Looking at," 2015)

The above excerpts reflect the suffering and poor treatment of the soon-to-be deportees (501 deportees) in the Christmas Island detention centre. However, most other coverage on this event showed a different angle – these individuals were 'serious criminals' who were causing trouble in detention centres. In summary, this event's results were like the previous event and the overall findings for 2015 and 2021. There was ample evidence of symbolic power, where government officials framed 501 deportees as being responsible for and involved in the riots. Furthermore, the government officials highlighted the consequences the 501 deportees were facing due to their behaviour in the riots. In some media accounts, the 501 deportees raised concerns over their treatment in detention centres, however these accounts were minimal compared to the overall news items on this event. There were other discussions which developed from this event, but many of them were political in nature and served to obscure the concerns raised about poor treatment towards the detainees and other issues that were mentioned which were happening in the detention centre. The following section analyses the results of coverage relating to minor New Zealand 501 deportees and their deportation to New Zealand.

Major event 3: Minor New Zealand 501 deportee

In March 2021, the Australian government deported a 15-year-old-boy to New Zealand who had been in a managed isolation facility, separated from other New Zealand deportees (Vance, 2015a). According to the media, he was the first minor deported from Australia under the section 501 and this caused further tension and controversy. There were 13 articles published in New Zealand and 4 in Australia related to this event, which this research proceeded to analyse.

Table 10 and 11 The tables below show whose stories or accounts were the most prominent in this event. These tables present the total numbers and percentages of key stakeholders in the news construction of this event.

Table: 10 All stakeholders for Australia

Total number of stakeholders 09

Key Stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	6	67%
Category - NZ political parties	2	22%
Category - Education institute	1	11%

Table: 11 All stakeholders for New Zealand

Total number of stakeholders 38

Key Stakeholders	Number	Percentage
Category - Government officials	23	60.5%
Category - NZ political parties	5	13%
Category - Legal/Court rep	4	10.5%
Category – Journalists	2	5%
Category - Iwi in Australia group	2	5%
Category – Community Law group	1	3%
Category - Education institute	1	3%

The number of items included in this event was low compared to the previously mentioned events, however similar results were found. It is important to point out that, in this event, there were no accounts from 501 deportees in any news item. Similar to the previous events, government officials were the most dominant stakeholders in both countries, and were involved in providing information and updates about these events. For instance, the following article shows how the government officials were involved in updating the situation about the 15-year-old boy's deportation:

> *Foreign Minister Nanaia Mahuta yesterday confirmed she had been informed by Australia of the minor's upcoming deportation on March 10. "I was notified some weeks ago about the situation and at that point, noting that there were some complex family issues around this matter, and that he was a minor, that we would ensure that*

> *Oranga Tamariki and the relevant Australian agency would be engaged in this process," she said.* (Manch, 2021b)

As illustrated above, a New Zealand government official provided updates on this event, and the ambiguity surrounding this event caused it to be widely discussed in the media. In New Zealand, other political parties raised questions about Australia deporting a minor to New Zealand:

> *Green Party foreign affairs spokeswoman Golriz Ghahraman says Australia has become a "rogue state" that New Zealand should complain to the UN about…. Ghahraman said this was an "alarming escalation" of Australia's policy. "We know now that they are willing to make a child essentially an orphan," Ghahraman said. "It seems like he has no strong familial and cultural links to New Zealand. Because we know Oranga Tamariki are on call to take him. "He appears to now be made homeless but stranded in a country he has no links with. It's incredibly traumatising."* (Cooke, 2021)

> *Ms Collins [NZ National Party opposition leader] said the deportation was inhumane and Mr Dutton's comments were poorly timed given the second anniversary of the Christchurch Mosque terror attack on Monday. "The 15-year-old no doubt has been involved in something they shouldn't be involved in. But actually, you have to be human."* (Mckay, 2021).

This sort of moral kindness was more often found in New Zealand coverage, although as previously noted, such representation was found in Australia coverage as well. The following is an example from another member from opposition party in New Zealand. The New Zealand opposition (National), despite previously taking a more ambivalent position towards the 501 deportees, began to stress the importance of protecting the human rights of the individual and highlighted the need to obtain more information about the situation through questioning the government's actions:

> *National Party MP Gerry Brownlee said the Government needed to front up with details about the deportation and its circumstances. "The prime minister can't know*

> *everything, but I hope she's asking some pretty serious questions, and is prepared to release information to New Zealand," he said.* (Manch, 2021b)

The importance of obtaining information from the Australian government was highlighted by the political parties in New Zealand. At the start of the event coverage, there was uncertainty about the situation due to limited information. Towards the end of this event, Foreign Minister Nanaia Mahuta provided more clarity about the situation:

> *Mahuta said she had not been advised Australia's actions constituted a breach of the United Nations on the Rights of the Child.* (Manch, 2021b).

government officials later confirmed this event was not a breach of the United Nations Rights of the Child. Australian government officials also offered reassurance that the rights of the child were considered in their decisions. Regardless, deporting a 15-year-old to New Zealand intensified tension between the two countries and generated questions about the section 501, causing New Zealand to demand answers from Australian officials. An Australian government spokesperson for Home Affairs responded by saying:

> *[W]hile it "does not comment on individual cases", visa cancellation of minors was approached "with a high degree of caution and consultation". "A non-citizen's visa must be cancelled if they are serving a full-time term of imprisonment for an offence committed in Australia and they have, at any time, been sentenced to a period of 12 months or more imprisonment, regardless of their age or nationality."…."The Australian government takes seriously its responsibility to protect the Australian community from the risk of harm posed by foreign nationals who engage in criminal conduct."…"The Department complies with its legal obligations in circumstances where the removal of a minor is considered, including those under the Convention on the Rights of the Child.* (Fernando, 2021)
>
> The Australian government expressed that the deportation of the minor was done with a "*high degree of caution and consultation*" while (Fernando, 2021), at the same time, reinforcing the importance of protecting the Australian community from the deportees. The Australian government reiterated its hard-line stance, as reported below:

> *The push comes as the Morrison government faces backlash for accelerating visa cancellations for anyone sentenced to 12 months or more of prison and, specifically, deporting a 15-year-old boy to New Zealand, although Guardian Australia reports that Dutton yesterday declared he was "proud of this government for the way in which we have kicked these people out of our country."* (Woods, 2021).

The issues surrounding the deportation of a minor to New Zealand, and the ongoing issues associated with the overall section 501, were extensively discussed in New Zealand news media. The excerpt below shows the Community Law Centre Aotearoa demanding the New Zealand government take actions against Australia during the United Nations Universal Periodic Review of Australia, which proceeded as follows:

> *The Universal Periodic Review examines the human rights record of each UN member state every five years. The country, along with local and international organisations, contribute reports. Australia appeared before the UN Human Rights Council for its review in Geneva in January.* (Vance, 2021b)

However, this request was denied by the New Zealand government, and they refused to raise concerns against Australia's deportation policy with the United Nations (Vance, 2021b). Despite New Zealand political parties and legal representatives initially pushing for further action, after the government confirmed there was no breach of human rights, the event coverage slowly faded from the media. However, some journalists openly criticised Australia for its decision to deport this child:

> *The news that a 15-year-old has been deported from Australia to New Zealand will rub even more salt into the recently opened wounds in New Zealand's relationship with Australia. Australia's Home Affairs Minister Peter Dutton, a former Queensland cop and failed Liberal leadership candidate, last week was filmed saying that flights deporting those who'd failed "character tests" were Australia "taking out the trash.* (Malpass, 2021)

> *Despite our many common causes and shared endeavours, the much-vaunted Anzac relationship has been sorely tested, most notedly in recent times by the deportation of New Zealand-born criminals under Australia's notorious Section 501 of its Migration*

> *Act…. The latest expressions of disgust involve the deportation of a 15-year-old boy* ("No Justification," 2021).

In such examples, it was common to see journalists highlighting the relationship between Australia and New Zealand. The following excerpt from a new item by Patrick Keyzer (Dean of Law at the Australian Catholic University) and Ian Coyle (Adjunct professor, School of Psychology and Public Health at La Trobe University) also shows empathy with the overall negative view on the section 501, by extracting and illustrating research-based evidence:

> *Recent reports about the deportation of a 15-year-old from Australia to New Zealand have reignited a dispute between the two countries about the proper management of offenders who have been born overseas…. What is clear is that these deportations have torn families apart. Imagine arriving in a country with a few hundred dollars, lacking knowledge of the complexities of navigating the systems you are forced to engage with just to survive…. Our research found many of the people detained under Australian immigration legislation were removed from the Australian state they were living in prior to deportation. This meant they were deprived access to family life (a human right) even before they were deported.* (Keyzer & Coyle, 2021)

Excerpts such as above manage to display some of the consequences of section 501. As there is a lack of representation from actual 501 deportees about their experience, articles such as this can be used to document their struggle. Through providing evidence-based information on the aftermath of this deportation policy, it can allow the public to see the effects of such laws. However, this may not make up for the missing voice of deportees in the media. The following section discusses the overall results for 2015 and 2021, as well as the results for three major events.

Chapter discussion

This chapter illustrated the findings in relation to whose voice were more prominent in news related to Section 501 of the Migration Act. The results were obtained by observing stakeholders of the items for the 2015 and 2021 and main events. In summary, the three major events that occurred in 2015 and 2021 found that the most dominant voice in the media came from government officials in both countries. This is in line with the overall results for both years in New Zealand, and 2015 in Australia. This does not imply that the 501 deportees

accounts were not found in the media. There were first-hand accounts of real experiences from deportee which provided insight as to what they faced due to section 501. What is striking, however, is that those accounts were only a small portion of the overall news narrative in both countries for such an important contemporary societal issue for both countries. Even when the news related to 501 deportees was noted, they were mostly found through secondary accounts which were given by officials such as government representatives, legal representatives. Therefore, these results indicate ample evidence of symbolic power in news media in both counties, and the majority of 501 deportees accounts were obscured by those of government officials.

Within the media coverage, it was common for government officials to imply 501 deportees were strangers who were not part of their community. Australian government officials often stated that 501 deportees were non-citizens who were born in New Zealand, so they do not belong in the Australian community. For example, Australia Immigration Minister Peter Dutton stated "…*they're New Zealand citizens, they're not Australian citizens. And it's not a breach of human rights*" This quote was found in a speech where he explained the reasons why 501 deportees should be deported, and why deporting 501 deportees to New Zealand is not a breach of human rights. (FitzSimons, 2018). However, some of those individuals spent most of their lives in Australia and identify themselves as Australians (Stanley, 2018). On the other hand, New Zealand rejects them because they are criminals or have spent most of their life in Australia. For example, when New Zealand Prime Minister was asked, when New Zealanders become a *"product of Australia*" her response to the media was, if they have been brought up and spent most of their life in AU, they are Australia's problem (McMillan, 2021). These examples from media show, how the media text could potentially influence the deportee to be "stranger" in both Australia and New Zealand society.

It was often noticed that Australian government officials typically placed a strong emphasis on how these laws had been created to protect the Australian community. For example; Australian Minister Peter Dutton called 501 deportees "trash" and media was reported that "We're talking about the most serious offenders here, and our country is safer for having deported them," (Chung, 2021). What this indicates is that excluding deportees from society suggested that their suffering, pain, or death was irrelevant to the moral conscience of Australians and their government officials. Placing them outside the moral envelope suggested that detaining 501 deportees in locked up detention centres away from the mainland, with limited family contact

and legal support, was the right thing to do. The actions of government officials were justified because the 501 deportees were believed to be a threat to society. On a surface level, it indicates that the government was doing the right thing by detaining and deporting individuals, even if some had lived most of their life in Australia. The intention to remove unwanted 'criminals' may have appeared humanitarian; however, labelling them as 'criminals' or 'gang members' also worked to dehumanise the 501 deportees.

An implication of symbolic power is the potential for the public's understanding of the situation to be based mostly on the government's perspective. The media has the power to create a "reality" around a situation and, if the government's beliefs (such as 501 deportees are underserving) are perpetuated, this has the potential to reach the wider societal members through media. The media maintains norms in society and are responsible for its transmission. When the majority of media coverage feature the 501 deportees as underserving, they are constantly placed outside the moral envelope and excluded them from society (Opotow et al., 2005). As a consequence, 501 deportees have been refused from both Australia and New Zealand media. The reasons to exclude 501 deportees from society and punish them could be justified by creating the perception of a lack of moral legitimacy due to their criminal behaviour/non-citizen portrayal, etc.

The Australian detention centres, where most 501 deportees are sent before deportation, was a controversial topic in news articles over the period of this study. There were claims about poor treatment in these centres by detainees from time to time. An Australian study utilising government data from 2014 to 2018 suggests that the length of time individuals is detained in detention centres has a great impact on their mental health issues. In addition to this, the study also concluded that offshore detention has a larger impact on individuals, with long-term detention tending to increase mental health issues (Kronick et al., 2011). von Werthern et al. (2018) conducted 26 studies involving 2099 participants made up of adults, adolescents, and children who were dealing with mental health problems related to detention. These individuals commonly developed anxiety, depression, and post-traumatic stress disorder during and following detention. Self-harm, and suicidal ideations were found to be common among them.

Furthermore, Australia's opposition party and other parties only had 2% representation in Australian news articles in 2015, and 3% in 2021, while New Zealand's other political parties had 16% New Zealand representation in 2015, and 3% in 2021. It is worth mentioning, however, that New Zealand political parties also had 9% representation in Australia articles in

2015. Political parties' representation was higher compared to that of Australia's other political parties. It is unclear whether Australia's other political parties were willing to engage in this matter, or whether their voice was suppressed in the news articles. Leeper and Slothuus (2014) suggest that political parties make appeals to public opinion as a means of winning office and legitimising their policy activity. In addition, it is clear that in some instances (as illustrated in the analysis section), reporting on section 501 was political in nature. These discussions tended to obscure the concerns about the deportation policy by taking the conversations away from the actual issues surrounding the policy.

There were also articles which appealed to moral kindness, and those items highlighted the negative consequences of the section 501. It is the social duty of the media to support moral justice by speaking against unfairness, which some news media did concerning the deportation events discussed in this chapter. These news items expressed concern about the detainment of 501 deportees in detention centres and the negative impact of the section 501. These accounts highlight the importance of challenging the status quo and seeing a different perspective. As the media plays a major role in society, having other voices in the news can play an important role in achieving justice for individuals deemed as "undeserving". Even the favourable news items appealing to moral kindness, by highlighting the unfair treatment towards the deportee were the voice of supporters or sympathetic actors. As a result, the voices of the individuals who are directly affected by these harsh crimmigration processes are all but absent from the coverage.

What is clear from the above discussion is that based on political deliberations and media coverage, 501 deportees are often characterised as not worthy to be part of current progressive societies. In simple terms, this implies that fairness and justice only apply to people who deserve it and those who are deemed to be worthy of inclusion in society. As a result, they are positioned as outside the scope of justice. When positioned outside the scope of justice or the moral envelope, as a non-citizen, the 'crimmigrant other' is potentially deportable and can be subject to particularly punitive forms of governance (Franko, 2019; Hodgetts et al., 2011). This chapter illustrated which stakeholders were prominent in news relating to 501 deportees. The next chapter examines how these stakeholders were involved in the depiction of 501 deportees in news media.

Chapter 5: Prominent trends in news portrayal of the New Zealand 501 deportees

The previous chapter determined whose voices were being represented in the media by analysing the appearance of key stakeholders in online news articles from 2015 and 2021. This chapter outlines the tone of the articles by examining whether they were negative or positive towards the New Zealand 501 deportees as well as section 501 processes (news related 501 deportation, visa cancellation, detention etc) from 2015 and 2021. In doing so, this study contributes to current understandings of processes of moral exclusion and discriminatory or punishing practises associated with processes of crimmigration (see Chapter 1). Certain positionings of the subject matter in online news articles will identify any consequences that may have arisen from these positionings. Analysing media issues such as this will allow the researcher to identify any stigmatisation and discriminatory practises found in the media which can then be refuted and challenged (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). Tables 12 and 13 display a quantitative analysis of how 501 deportees and section 501 processes were portrayed in Australia and New Zealand as a percentage.

Table 12: Portrayal of the New Zealand 501 deportees and 501 deportation processes as a percentage for the year 2015

2015

Topic	**Australia**	**New Zealand**
Total number of articles	**653**	**1166**
The number of articles recorded	**161**	**199**
Portrayal of 501 deportees		
Negative	**91 (56%)**	**62 (31%)**
Positive	**4 (2.5%)**	**5 (2.5%)**
Other	**67 (41%)**	**132 (66%)**
Portray of section 501 processes		
Negative	**50 (31%)**	**107 (54%)**
Positive	**16 (10%)**	**4 (2%)**
Other	**96 (59%)**	**88 (44%)**

The 2015 results highlighted in Table 12 indicate there were considerable differences between Australia and New Zealand media portrayals, despite the coverage being related to the same topic and in some instances, reporting on the same events. For example, Australian media

tended to portray the 501 deportees in a negative manner. Conversely, in the New Zealand media, the majority of articles portrayed the New Zealand 501 deportees in a more neutral light as most of them did not fall in to positive or negative categories and a higher proportion of positively framed stories compared to Australia. Another key finding concerning the section 501 processes was that most Australian online news articles portrayed this in a neutral manner as most of the articles did not fall into either positive or negative, whereas the New Zealand media portrayed the section 501 processes in a negative light. In addition to this, Australian media also had a noticeable number of articles that positioned the section 501 processes positively, in contrast to New Zealand media. While both countries produced a similar number of articles that portrayed 501 deportees in a positive light, the results of 2015 reveal mostly contrasting findings for both countries. In general, these trends were replicated again in coverage in 2021 (see Table 13).

Table: 13 Portrayal of the New Zealand 501 deportees and 501 deportation processes as a percentage for the year 2021

2021		
Topic	**Australia**	**New Zealand**
Total number of articles	**565**	**741**
The number of articles recorded	**92**	**122**
Portrayal of 501 deportees		
Negative	**68 (72%)**	**71 (58%)**
Positive	**1 (1%)**	**1 (1%)**
Other	**25 (27%)**	**51 (41%)**
Portrayal of section 501 processes		
Negative	**12 (13%)**	**50 (41%)**
Positive	**12 (13%)**	**1 (1%)**
Other	**69 (74%)**	**71 (58%)**

As illustrated in Table 13, the 2021 results suggest similarities and differences between Australian and New Zealand news articles. In both Australia and New Zealand, the majority of articles portrayed 501 deportees negatively. However, in New Zealand, there was a significant number of articles categorised under other. Among them there were articles that depicted the 501 deportees in a more neutral manner. When examining the section 501 processes, both countries had a high number of articles under the other category. Yet, in comparison to

Australia, New Zealand had a greater number of articles that positioned the section 501 deportation process negatively in 2021. On the other hand, Australia had some articles that depicted the section 501 processes positively, whereas in New Zealand that number was lower. Similar to 2015, both countries had similar results and only one article that portrayed the 501 deportees in a positive light. The next section of this chapter discusses the portrayal of the 501 deportees in depth through qualitative exemplars from key news articles. The main purpose of this study to examine how 501 deportees are positioned in news media therefore the section 501 processes will only be discussed briefly. This analysis provides depth and context to the frequencies provided in the two tables above. It enables us to engage further with how these articles actually constructed 501 deportees negatively or positively. This differs from the analysis in Chapter 4 which looked at key events in 2015 and 2021. In this chapter the entire coverage for years 2015 and 2021 will be examined. The analysis is divided into two main sections. The first presents the results for Australia and the second the results for New Zealand.

Australia

Negative portrayal towards 501 deportees

As noted above, in Australia, the majority of articles for the year 2015 and 2021 positioned deportees negatively, and the section 501 processes did not fall into the negative or positive categories. For instance, the following Australian article places a lot of emphasis on the criminality of the deportees:

> Article title: *Sick paedophile jailed for molesting four young girls*
>
> *A Logan man has been jailed for four years for molesting four young girls, one aged as young as 18-months when she was first abused, over a period of four years, and now faces likely deportation to New Zealand…. His four-year sentence was immediately suspended, with James, a New Zealand citizen who moved to Australia when he was five with his family, having spent 556 days remanded in custody since his arrest on August 30, 2019.* (Treacy, 2021)

The article presents James in a negative light by highlighting his crimes against four young girls, one of which was only 18 months old. Combined with his status as a New Zealand citizen, he is positioned as not belonging in Australia and as such deportation is warranted. Here we see an example of the positioning of James outside the moral envelope or scope of justice,

which is necessary to rhetorically construct the need for his deportation. No other possible courses of action such as restorative justice or rehabilitation are mentioned and by omission deportation is presented rhetorically as the logical course of action.

Another overt example of how the 501 deportees were positioned negatively in articles can be seen below in the emphasis placed on the impacts of a 501 deportee's crimes on an innocent victim, a five-year-old:

> Article title: *Murder devastates family*
>
> *...was a bubbly blue-eyed "girlie-girl" who would have celebrated her 21st birthday last week, if her life had not been tragically cut short by her mother's former partner when she was just five years old. She was also a doting big sister to her two half siblings, a four-year-old brother and 2½-month-old baby sister. "She was full of life, always smiling and loved animals." But in December 1999, Tayla met a horrific end when ...estranged partner Risati Laupama took her from her bed during the night and hanged her from a pergola behind the family home on the north coast.* (Morris, 2015)

The humanising of victims is used as a justification for the deportation of offenders, while the omission of information such as how the offender has spent most of his life in Australia is omitted as such information would complicate the rhetorical construction as an offender who does not belong in Australia. In addition to the exemplars above of how the deportees were positioned negatively, there were even more overt instances of the use of the negative impact of offending on the Australian community as a key justification to warrant deportation, and this relates to the construction of 501 deportees as "FOREIGN criminals":

> Article title: *NZ crims cost us millions*
>
> *FOREIGN criminals in Queensland jails are costing taxpayers $47 million a year. As the state's jails burst at the seams, it can be revealed that one in 10 prisoners are foreign nationals. New Zealand crimes top the list with 283 inmates, followed by 67 from England, 29 each from Samoa and Vietnam, and 27 from Papua New Guinea.* (Chamberlin, 2015)

Revealing that the cost of offending had entered the millions again positions the offenders as not part of the body politic of Australia. The logical inference is that these offenders are and should be New Zealand's problem. The article also presents information concerning other foreign deportees, which serves to further warrant and normalise the deportation process. New

Zealand offenders are also presented as the largest group of 'foreign' offenders who are costing Australia a lot of money in terms of their imprisonment. As such, deportation becomes a means of cost saving to the Australian taxpayer.

Similarly, and extending the framing of New Zealand 501 deportees as particularly problematic criminals. Prominent news contributors, such as Australian government officials, characterised the New Zealand 501 deportees as "hardened" criminals. These officials often emphasised that action was necessary as these 501 deportees were some of the "worst" criminals in Australia. This characterisation was often presented as a way of warranting the deportations despite the political tensions that this practice was causing between Australia and New Zealand and as a means of avoiding coverage of issues of social justice and procedural fairness:

> *A major diplomatic stoush is brewing over Christmas Island's transformation into a "Kiwi Alcatraz", with another batch of hardened New Zealand criminals waiting to be deported expected on the island soon…. New Zealand is concerned the change affects its nationals jailed for several minor offences. But a senior Government source said the New Zealand detainees were among some of the worst criminals in Australia. The source said a higher proportion of Kiwis were in detention because background checks were not done on New Zealanders entering Australia.* (Probyn, 2015)

This excerpt provides yet another example of New Zealand 'soon-to-be' deportees being compared negatively to other foreign 501 deportees. Also evident is how coverage was able to incorporate responses by the New Zealand government that rhetorically questioned the deportations into the evolving story. This further warrant the deportations via the rhetorical construction of 501 deportees as '*the worst of the worst'*. The reference to the Easter Island detention centre as "Kiwi Alcatraz" reinforces this negative construction of 501 deportees and is important in that the infamous prison of Alcatraz used to house some of the most notorious offenders in the United States.

As is evident in the extracts above, 501 deportees themselves were not often given a voice and in the rare instances when they were, their accounts were often still framed negatively. The following quote came from a Slovakian detainee, 25, who was awaiting deportation for overstaying his tourist visa. The exact quote (below) was repeated in a number of articles in the Australian media:

> Article title*: Inmates running the asylum*

> *There are a number of outlaw motorcycle gang members and criminals convicted of serious charges including manslaughter and sex offences. There is a significant population of New Zealanders on the island awaiting deportation…. "We're pretty sure that the Kiwi guys are going to get in here when they get bored and they will start bashing people up," he told The West Australian newspaper.* (Meers, 2015).

Here we see the contrasting of different groups of 501 deportees as a means of emphasising how extra dangerous New Zealand offenders can be. The self-contrast of the Slovakian detainee with New Zealand detainees and the former's fear of the latter provides further justification for the deportation policies and actions of the Australian government. In contrast, on occasion it was disclosed in coverage that not all New Zealand detainees were being deported for such severe or violent crimes as those depicted above. Cases of more minor offending clearly posed a threat to the dominant framing of New Zealand 501 deportees as the worst of the worst, and as such again reflected the complex and often contradictory nature of coverage. For example, one of the New Zealand 501 cases depicted implicated a former New Zealand Army Lance Corporal, Ko Haapu. Central to the framing of this case was the contribution of Australian government officials who on this rare occasion actually questioned whether the detainee should have been deported for a 30-year-old cannabis conviction. An Australian Senator was also depicted as avoiding this challenging question by stating that they were unable to comment on individual cases, but had officially responded to some of the concerns that were raised about the deportation policy:

> *…asked if New Zealanders should be deported from Australia for 30-year-old cannabis convictions and raised the case of Ko Haapu, 34, who is reported to be in maximum security Casuarina Prison near Perth because of his links to the Rebels motorcycle gang…. "The Minister just doesn't willy nilly deport people because he doesn't like the colour of their hair," he said. He says "I don't think you'll find too many" cases of New Zealanders deported for cannabis convictions or for shoplifting* ("Senator firm on NZ," 2015).

In this extract the thorny issue of deporting New Zealand 501 deportees for minor offences is dealt with by stating that such decisions are not made "willy nilly" or in other words, not without due consideration. The rhetorical challenge to the characterisation of New Zealand 501 deportees as threats to Australia is managed rhetorically here by invoking the offender's gang

affiliation and the statement that deportations for minor or non-violent offenses are relatively rare.

References to New Zealand 501 deportees' gang or organised crime affiliations was also a common device for characterising 501 deportees as threats to Australian society and for warranting their deportations even for more minor offenses. This was particularly apparent in coverage of challenges to deportation by the New Zealand 501 deportees themselves. The extract below comes from an article on court hearings for 'bikie A.J. Graham' in which government Minister Peter Dutton denied the applicant appeal:

> *TANIAN bikie A.J. Graham's appeal against a deportation order is set to be knocked back by Immigration Minister Peter Dutton…. "These people will need to provide the Minister sufficient reasons why their visa should be reinstated." Graham has been held in the notorious SuperMax prison in Goulburn, NSW, since raids in Tasmania that resulted in 14 arrests and 19 summonses.* (Beniuk, 2015)

The characterisation of the applicant of the appeal is that of a 'bikie' who was arrested along with 14 other people and in the context of 19 summonses. This serves to position him as being part of organised crime and as such, a threat to Australia. The use of the term 'bikie' is particularly revealing as this was one of the most common words used to describe New Zealand 501 deportees. Related negative labels included 'racist thug', 'crook', and 'dodgy kiwi'. In addition, addressing "these people" indicates 501 deportees are outsiders and individuals who are not part of the Australian community. Furthermore, these terms serve to dehumanise and 'other' the 501 deportees as outside the scope of justice. As is evident in the extract below, several negatively framed articles did not focus on specific cases but rather supported the euphemistic label of 'dodgy kiwis' with various offense-based characterisations:

> Article title: *Dodgy Kiwis sent home*
> *ONE murderer, eight rapists, 25 child sex offenders and 42 armed robbers are among the hundreds of Kiwi violent criminals who New Zealand Prime Minister John Key claims Australia is treating poorly by deporting them back across the Tasman. After Mr Key launched a scathing attack on Australia's treatment of Kiwi crimes, News Corp obtained a frightening list of offences that has prompted 484 New Zealand offenders to be stripped of their Australian visas since Christmas.* (Carswell, 2015)

Here, the challenge mounted by the then Prime Minister of New Zealand to the unfair treatment of 501 deportees by the Australian government is diminished or dismissed by this support for the category 'dodgy Kiwis' and its link to murderers, rapists, child sex offenders, armed robbers, and violent criminals. This is an appeal to a stereotype the serves rhetorically to dismiss the New Zealand Prime Minister's challenge to the deportations. The deportations are again warranted by the negative reduction of 501 deportees to "a frightening list of offenses". As such, the actions of the Australian government are constructed as reasonable in removing the threats these unnamed New Zealanders pose to Australians.

This section has documented how 501 deportees were positioned negatively by the deportation news narrative throughout the years 2015 and 2021. This positioning emphasised the criminal side of the 501 deportees, thus suppressing the real issues that arose from the deportation process. In addition to this, a higher number of articles focused on individuals' present/past criminality with a lesser or no focus on the deportation process. In other words, while attention was being given to creating negative characterisations of New Zealand 501 deportees based on the 'worst of the worst' trope, journalism was concurrently minimising and/or dismissing challenges to the deportation process. Furthermore, the dominant voice of Home Affairs Minister's voice was obvious throughout the coverage. His comments were broadcast by the Nine Network in Australia. News report into channel said there was a "*secret prisoner plane booting foreign criminals out of Australia*" (Napier-Raman, 2021). Australia's Home Affairs Minister Peter Dutton's comment was also broadcast:

"*taking the trash out to make Australia a safer place".* (Napier-Raman, 2021)

This is an example of how government officials dehumanised the 501 deportees as "trash". Labelling the 501 deportees as trash implied they were not worthy of being in the Australian community and needed to be removed. Again, the 501 deportees were placed outside the moral envelope as 'other' and their removal would make Australia a safer place. In Australian news media, it was common to find contributions from Australian government officials voicing the importance of section 501 for the safety of Australians. Depicting 501 deportees as unwanted visitors further helped frame the deportation process in a positive light. The following article presents section 501 processes positively. The quotes are similar to those presented in 2015.

Such exemplars suggest that the Australian government of the time remained resolute with regard to the deportation process:

> Article title: *No place for you: Foreign-born crims kicked out of Queensland*
>
> *Criminals including murderers, paedophiles, violent thugs and rapists are among the 10,000 visas which have been cancelled or refused on character grounds since 2014…. Minister for Home Affairs Karen Andrews said the Federal Government had zero tolerance for non-citizens who endangered Australians or engaged in criminal activity. "Coming to Australia and staying here is a privilege. There's no place in Australia for anyone who would abuse our laws or harm our community," Ms Andrews said.* (Chamberlin, 2021)

When comparing the results of Australian coverage for 2015 and 2021, it is evident that government officials continued to strongly support section 501 and associated deportation processes. For instance, in one article from 2015, the then Immigration Minister said to the media, *"coming to Australia is a privilege and not a right*" ("Dutton Deports Man," 2015). Furthermore, it is interesting to point out that six years on, the Home Affairs Minister, Karen Andrews, used very similar words: "coming to Australia and staying here is a privilege" (Chamberlin, 2021). In the following section, the focus turns some of the articles that did not come under either negative or positive.

Additional complexity was evident in articles that included sources from both New Zealand and Australia. These items tended to combine negative constructions of the 501 deportees who were not wanted by either country, and the accompanying section 501 processes. For example, in the item below, the Immigration Minister of Australia, Peter Dutton, defended the deportation process against challenges from the then New Zealand Te Pāti Māori leader, Marama Fox, who had questioned the section 501 processes and treatment towards the 501 deportees. These tensions were particularly apparent in relation to stories regarding deportations for minor offenses (e.g., shoplifting), which Marama Fox contrasted with more serious offences:

> *Mr Dutton … denied New Zealanders convicted of only minor offences had been locked up on Christmas Island, saying the Maori Party was promoting a raft of inaccurate claims. "Nobody is jailed for 12 months for shoplifting, and it defies common sense, so I think people should frankly stick to the facts and I think we'd have a better debate,"*

> *he said…. But co-leader of the Maori Party, Marama Fox, told Lateline the numbers did not add up. "Australia currently has 585, my understanding is, since May, people tagged for deportation and held," she said. "Some of those have committed a variety of crimes, and yes, while we accept there may be some serious crimes, our numbers show that only 86 of those are murderers, paedophiles or rapists and the rest are a combination of crimes."…. Ms Fox also said New Zealanders in detention faced double jeopardy, having already served prison sentences"* ("Christmas Island Riot: Seven Detainees," 2015).

In this piece, Mr Dutton challenges the legitimacy of Ms Fox's claims. In return his appeals to common sense are challenged by Ms Fox, who likewise challenges the legitimacy of Mr Dutton's claims in relation to official statistics that she asserts support her point of view. Ms Fox goes on to challenge the legitimacy of deportation that also targets people who have committed only minor offenses. She points out that these offenders have already paid for their crimes and in a sense are being punished a second time through the 501 processes. This is an example how 501 deportees as well as section 501 processes depicted negatively. The following section illustrates the results which did not fall under either the positive or negative categories.

Other portrayal towards 501 deportees

Despite the dominance of negative depictions of New Zealand 501 deportees documented in the previous section, there were several Australian articles that underlined the issues or concerns that arose in relation to section 501 processes. There were also articles that did not belong in either positive or negative categories, that is, some of them tended to provide a neutral depiction of 501 deportees or section 501 processes. In the former case, it was common to see articles that raised issues or concerns by referring to legal representatives for particular 501 deportees, human rights commissioners, or academics. In these instances, a focus on the 501 deportees was not at the centre of the argument. These articles presented more contextualised accounts that actually referred to the socialisation of offenders in Australia, rather than simply asserting that they were New Zealanders and as such, by logical inference, their criminality came to Australia with them. For instance, some articles made direct challenges to the section 501 processes, particularly in cases where the offender may have been born in New Zealand but had grown up and been socialised in Australia. The articles demonstrated how individuals

who had lived most of their life in Australia could then quickly and unfairly become displaced as unwanted criminals. The fairness of this process was questioned with the belief that New Zealand 501 deportees should be dealt with within the Australian scope of justice and therefore subject to Australian judicial processes, rather than deporting them to become New Zealand's problems.

Challenges to deportation processes were also evident through references to the absurdity and injustice of attempts to deport indigenous or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Australians to New Zealand:

> Aritcle title: *Indigenous people cannot be aliens in their own land. Why challenging this fact (again) is so concerning*
>
> *Attorney General v Montgomery raises important questions about the unique legal status of First Nations peoples in Australia…. The case concerned whether the Commonwealth* [Government] *had the power to deport two Aboriginal men who were born overseas. Neither man was an Australian citizen under Commonwealth law. If the men were deemed "aliens", then the Commonwealth could validly deport them. This meant that Brendan Thoms, a New Zealand-born Gunggarri man and native title holder, could not be deported…. Shayne Paul Montgomery, who was born in New Zealand and has been traditionally adopted by Aboriginal people. Traditional adoption is recognised in both Aboriginal and Australian law.* (Galloway et al., 2021)

This highlights the rights of 501 deportees whose links to Australia predate the colonial imposition of the present nation state of Australia. This discussion is particularly noteworthy in terms of issues of indigenous rights and the imposition, and many would argue the illegitimate imposition, of a British derived nation state. Central to such contributions to the evolving narrative were issues around citizenship and the rights of the state to deport people with rights to Australian citizenship. As such, coverage included some engagement with issues around the power of the state and the rights of citizens, thereby introducing considerable complexity in terms of the reductionist and negative characterization of 501 deportees as criminals, rather than Australian citizens who have rights under the justice system.

> *…If a man who was granted a passport was deported as a non-citizen, his lawyers argue. Edward McHugh was enrolled to vote when he turned 18 in 1986 and more than*

> *30 years later he was issued an Australian passport. Both are rights given only to Australian citizens – a passport is legal proof of Australian citizenship, his lawyers told the Federal Court in a bid to stop him being deported. Mr McHugh was born in the Cook Islands, a New Zealand territory, but was adopted by a Queensland family when he was six…. A man who believed his entire life that he was an Australian citizen, who as a registered voter was eligible to stand in parliament, he spent 31 months in immigration detention.* ("Aust Passport," 2021)

The above passage highlights how an individual who holds an Australian passport could be placed at risk of deportation due to Section 501 of the Migration Act. This evidently a direct challenge to the legal legitimacy of such deportations. More generally, the exemplars above reflect how Australian coverage of the section 501 processes presented a hegemonic rather than a strictly ideological framing of the 501 deportees and section 501 processes. Whereas an ideological coverage tended to present one perspective, hegemonic coverage was predominantly constructed from the perspective of the Australian government, but also contained challenges to this perspective, including those documented in this section. These exemplars also speak to how coverage could be neutral in orientation to 501 deportees when mounting challenges to the section 501 processes.

Arguments over the deportation process between Australia and New Zealand officials were a key aspect of coverage whereby the 501 deportees were presented in more nuanced ways based on both negative and more neutral characterisations. The deportation processes itself was also reported as being openly contested between the two governments:

> Article title: *Tensions erupt between New Zealand and Australia over controversial criminal deportations*
>
> *Those being deported have committed serious crimes and do not hold Australian citizenship. But successive New Zealand Governments have complained that many of those deported have no meaningful links to New Zealand or have spent the vast bulk of their lives in Australia…. New Zealand's Opposition Leader Judith Collins said Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern should consider retaliating by sending Australian criminals back home. "We cannot be the dumping ground for everything wrong that's happened in Australia with people and criminal behaviour," she said…. Mr Dutton told radio station 2GB the deportations sent a "real message" to people in Australia on visas that they need to be law-abiding…."I don't care whether you're a Kiwi, a Brit, whatever*

> *nationality you might be – if you're out on a Friday night, king-hitting people or murdering your girlfriend's parents, well what else could you expect?"* (Dziedzic, 2021)

In such items, Australian government policy was defended with reference to serious crimes and challenged by the New Zealand government and non-government officials as unjust due to factors such as 501 deportees having no real ties to and therefore no place to come back to in New Zealand because they were products of Australian society. Again, there is a clear dispute regarding the conflation of belonging with citizenship in that in practical terms many New Zealand citizens who had grown up and knew nothing else but life in Australia were being deported to a country in which they were citizens but had little means of belonging. As such, the situation and section 501 processes were brought into question in a negative light. The following section will illustrate how the 501 deportees were portrayed positively.

Positive portrayal towards the 501 deportees

There was only one article which positioned a 501 deportee positively. The article is about the father of Richmond superstar. This article also expressed concerns about the section 50 processes:

> *THE man who co-wrote Shane Martin's biography has paid tribute to the former bike boss, saying he was a good man who had suffered a terrible injustice.…Mr Martin should not have been deported to New Zealand on bad character grounds in 2016 and that the separation from his three sons hurt him terribly. Writing for the New Zealand Herald, …the father of Richmond superstar "died all alone" and was found "face down on his kitchen floor". It was a suspected heart attack.* (Clark, 2021)

The above extract is an example of a 501 deportee's side of the story. It presents the 501 deportee's struggle during the deportation process and how unjust the process was. The article also highlights how the basic human rights of 501 deportees are violated by removing them from their families. Here we also see an example of 501 deportee being positioned positively, which was uncommon within the entire news narrative. As mentioned previously, the 501 deportees were rarely given the opportunity to voice their experience or side of the story. This article is not a first-hand account from a 501 deportee, thus it allows a glimpse into what 501 deportees were going through from an outside perspective. The following section will discuss

how New Zealand depicted 501 deportees. The first part of this section will begin with the New Zealand negative portrayals of 501 deportees.

New Zealand

Negative portrayal 501 deportees

In 2015 and 2021, a number of articles highlighted the criminal actions of the deportees. These articles included the reason for their deportation by reporting their past or present (reoffending in New Zealand) crimes and the terrible consequences of such acts. The following article highlights these issues and includes narratives from the 501 deportees and legal representatives, as well as the overall outcome of the stories:

> Article title: "Man, 43, who went to Australia as a baby to be deported to NZ
>
> *A 43-year-old man who has been in Australia since before his first birthday has lost an appeal against being deported to New Zealand.… Australia's Administrative Appeals Tribunal, sitting in Perth, heard he had more than 130 convictions and had served six years in jail for aggravated burglaries in 1998.…"The tribunal concludes that although there are countervailing considerations that favour revocation of the cancellation decision, including the best interests of minor children, the applicant's links to Australia and the extent of impediments if removed to New Zealand, they are outweighed by the primary conditions of the protection of the Australian community, whether [he] engaged in family violence, and expectations of the Australian community.* (Bonnett, 2021).

The article above positions the impending deportee negatively, highlighting his criminal convictions and the threats he poses to the Australian community. Although the article discusses the deportee's struggle briefly, mentioning he has no family or support for his mental health or drug issues in New Zealand, the main emphasis is that these issues are outweighed by the importance of protecting the Australia community and removing him to New Zealand – despite the article clearly stating the individual has been in Australia since his first birthday. This is another example showing deportees being placed outside the moral envelope or scope of justice, by highlighting this individual is not worthy of being part of the Australian community because of his behaviour. Although the article states the deportee has been in Australia since his first birthday, further discussion relating to this matter is omitted as this

would complicate the rhetorical construction that he is a criminal who does not belong in the Australian community. The article also highlights how deportation has been identified as the logical course of action.

In New Zealand coverage, there was a difference between the 2015 and 2021 results, where the number of articles positioning the 501 deportees negatively increased in 2021. This is because many of the articles contained information on gang affiliations and the increase in violence associated with the deportee. There was also a large number of articles describing incidents involving 501 deportees and, as a result, the centre of discussions was about the 501 deportees themselves rather than the section 501 processes.

> Article title: *Gang tensions sprout like noxious weed in Garden City*
>
> *Their war lasted for months, says Jarrod Gilbert, a sociologist and author of Patched: the History of Gangs in New Zealand, and involved stabbing, shootings, bombings. Remarkably, only one person was killed. And despite flare-ups through history, deadly inter-gang warfare has been rare. But gang numbers are booming. Almost 900 people joined a gang last year – up by 13 per cent – according to police data. There are now well more than 7000 gang members in the country, and rising. New outfits are muscling in on the lucrative drug trade, including gang members with Kiwi ties who have been deported from Australia.* (Bayer, 2021).

Similarly, the excerpt below also shows how the 501 deportees were shown in a negative light by the current Prime Minister of New Zealand. The reporting discusses how deportees influence the gang landscape of New Zealand and expresses concerns around the increasing number of 501 deportees:

> Article Title: *PM Ardern blames 501s for gun violence*
>
> *Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern has admitted it is going to take time to turn around growing levels of gun violence, saying the recent rise is down to Australian deportee gangsters* ("PM Ardern blames," 2021)
>
> Article title: *Gangs, Aussie deportees linked to surge in shootings*
>
> *Chambers also singled out Australia's so-called deportees and their influence on the New Zealand gang landscape. Inter-gang tension in South Auckland likely reflected*

> *gangs asserting their influence and control of illicit drug markets, he wrote.…"Gang membership using firearms in New Zealand is not a recent phenomenon, but the frequency with which firearm are being used has increased in recent times."* (Nichols, 2021)

Here again we see the framing of deportees as problematic criminals, who are influencing the gang landscape in New Zealand. It is another example in which the Prime Minister of New Zealand appealed to a stereotype which rhetorically served to dismiss the current issues of gang violence in New Zealand. In addition to this, by addressing the 501 deportees as 'gangsters' who influenced violence and the gang landscape, leaders were reinforcing the negative construction of the 501 deportees and the stigma which prevented them re-establishing themselves in the community. In 2021, this type of reporting was more common and there was a large number of articles which included police representation. As discussed in the previous analysis chapter, under the 'government official' category, the police had the most dominant voice in this year.

> *Gang violence harms communities: Police – fifteen arrests in six-week crackdown on gang activity.* (Fuller, 2021)

> *The increasing use of firearms in Hawke's Bay gang disputes has put gang members in the sights of a new police operation. But the sheer number of Mongrel Mob chapters, and a rise in public displays of violence with rivals Black Power, mean the challenge for officers on the streets is significant, police say.… Police Association president Chris Cahill said an influx of gang members deported from Australia, increased availability of methamphetamine, and inter-gang tensions caused escalating dangers to officers and the community.* (Fuller, 2021).

The excerpt below includes similar discussions:

> Article title: *Guns, gangs and the 501 policy*
>
> *Residents of New Zealand's largest city need to be able to feel safe on its streets.… In September it was reported there was a 32 per cent rise in gun crime, and a 49 per cent rise in gun-related injuries in Auckland city during the preceding 18 months. National Māori Authority chairman Matthew Tukaki has pointed the finger at Australia's policy*

> *of sending back "501 returnees". He warned of potential Sydney-style gang battles and wants the Government to turn back the planes of deportees.* ("Guns, gangs and the 501," 2021).

Many reasons were given on why the deportees did not belong or the threat they posed to society, hence they were placed outside the moral envelope or scope of justice in New Zealand. Similarly, there were incidents in which government officials were also part of these characterisations. The quote below is by Covid-19 Response Minister Chris Hipkins after 501 deportees were called 'trash' in Australian media:

> *This is Australia exporting its garbage to New Zealand. These people have, you know, their criminal offending has been in Australia. To all intents and purposes, many of them have lived the vast bulk of their lives in Australia.* (Manch, 2021a)

This an example of how New Zealand government officials placed the deportees outside the moral envelope. The above excerpt points out that deportees are not part of the New Zealand community because they have "*lived the vast bulk of their life in Australia*". Minister Chris Hipkins also labels the deportees as 'garbage' in this reporting. In line with this form of reporting, one article discusses how the Rotorua community are concerned over 501 deportees living in emergency housing with other community members. The article emphasises how the Australian government regards deportees as 'trash':

> Article title: *Fears for kids living in motels: 501s sharing space with vulnerable youngsters*
>
> *A Rotorua district councillor has expressed concern about children growing up in motels next to gang members and Australia's deportees. Rotorua Lakes councillor Merepeka Raukawa-Tait made the comments at a council Strategy, Policy and Finance Committee meeting yesterday as part of discussions about a draft council plan to address community safety.… This week Australian Home Affairs Minister Peter Dutton described the scheme as "taking the trash out". "We've got mothers with children living beside someone who's just been released from overseas, come back to New Zealand, a 501. You've got other people with gang relations waltzing in and out of those motels.* (Desmarais, 2021).

This is an example indicating how exercises of symbolic power in media led to stigmatisation of certain groups in society. It is evident 501 deportees were often positioned as 'others' for many different reasons. This study also includes concepts such as suspect communities to explain how this estrangement further developed to exclude these individuals, on account of them being perceived as threats to society (Breen-Smith, 2014; Cherney & Murphy, 2015). This type of reporting further reinforced the fear and anger felt toward the 501 deportees in society and is an example of how the 501 deportees were constantly placed outside the moral envelope by journalists, government officials, and the Australian/New Zealand public. There were also a number of articles which included opinions from the general public about the deportation process. The following excerpt exemplifies the public reaction to the 501 deportees and the section 501 processes:

> *The test of a true democracy is that all citizens are protected from human rights abuses, including the citizens we don't like. Human rights are something we all have, or nobody does. If crime is wrong, then all crime is wrong, not just the crimes we don't like. As difficult as it might be to accept, we must treat people in prison with some degree of dignity, even when we feel they don't deserve it. We may not like it, but the fact is that criminals will eventually be released from prison. If their time inside has been a period of pain and abuse, how can we possibly expect them to now become productive members of our communities?* (Fraser, 2015)

Although this article portrays the 501 deportees negatively, it also shows disagreement with the section 501 processes by highlighting the importance of protecting basic human rights and treating the deportees with dignity. However, there were items that did not belong to either positive or negative portrayal of the 501 deportees. In the following section, the focus turns to accounts of how New Zealand 501 deportees were positioned positively.

Positive portrayal towards 501 deportees

In 2015, most articles which framed the deportees positively were in relation to NRL player, Russell Packer. His visa was cancelled due to criminal convictions; however, later on, the Australian government decided not to revoke his visa. A number of articles reported on this individual's story:

Article title: *Australian government clears Packer to resume NRL career with Dragons*

Former Kiwis international Russell Packer will resume his NRL career with the St George Illawarra Dragons next season after being cleared by the Australian Federal Immigration Department to remain in the country after serving a jail sentence for assault.… His impressive form saw him captain the side and he was named the Cutters Player of the Year and earned selection in the NSW Cup Team of The Year. He also completed alcohol rehabilitation and education programs at the Dragons and attended other courses without prompting, while also studying towards a Certificate IV in Community Services.… Dragons and former Kiwis teammate Benji Marshall added their names to an online petition calling on the Australian Government not to deport him. (Skipwith, 2015)

This was one of the very few articles reports in 2015 which portrayed a 501 deportee positively in the New Zealand media. However, in this case, items around the particular 501 were published more frequently in the overall narrative compared to other 501 deportees' stories, clearly because of the deportee's popularity.

In 2021, there was only one article which positioned a 501 deportee positively – an article on Shane Martin who was deported based on character grounds in 2016 due to his membership in the Rebels gang:

Article title: *TALKING POINT Goodbye, Shane, you deserved better*

Shane "Kiwi" Martin was a man who was defined by labels. He was a bikie. A gang member. A 501 deportee. These labels gave people all they needed to know about Shane.… Shane was deported from Australia on "bad character" grounds in 2016 – seemingly because of his membership of the Rebels. That membership wasn't illegal. If he'd been given a choice to break from the club to stay with his family, he would have chosen his family. He wasn't given that choice. And so he became a number, he became a 501. He was held in a detention centre until he was deported to New Zealand. There was no evidence that he was some gang crook, as many readers of this will imagine. In fact, no evidence has ever been presented to suggest that but he was torn from his family

nevertheless. On that basis it was a remarkable abuse of power and a terrible injustice. (Gilbert, 2021).

The above excerpt is again another example of how the 501 deportees were positioned in a positive manner. This provides an opportunity to get insights on how the actual section 501 process was applied to this individual and the consequences of the deportation. The following section highlights some of those examples that did not belong to either negative or positive portrayals of the 501 deportees.

Other portrayal towards 501 deportees

In New Zealand coverage, most articles in 2015 did not belong in either the negative or positive category or they were found to be more neutral towards the 501 deportees. Similarly, in 2021, there was a high number of articles which depicted the 501 deportees neutrally by underlining issues or concerns arising from the section 501 processes. When positioning the 501 deportees neutrally, it was common to see the re-occurrence of discussions, among which a major argument highlighted the unfairness of deporting people who, despite being born in New Zealand, had spent most of their life in Australia with no family ties or connection to New Zealand. Below are some examples drawn from the key articles:

Article title: *Mum faces deportation after living 37 of 40 years in Australia*

The teenage daughter of a Kiwi woman who has lived in Australia for 37 years is pleading with the Government to prevent her mother's deportation. Angela Russell was serving her jail sentence for a theft conviction when she was told her visa had been terminated and that she'd face deportation back to her birth nation, New Zealand …But the 40-year-old mother of two has been deported on grounds of "character" by Australian Border Security. Russell's other convictions for theft dating back to 2008 were also said to have been taken into consideration while making the decision. Her lawyer Lyma Nguyen said Russell had complained about the "unpleasant circumstances" she has had to face in the detention centre. There had been "multiple attempts of suicides" and the uncertainty of an unending detention period was driving people to despair. "That's not an environment anybody should be in. (Nadkarni, 2015)

Even though this person was Australian in every sense of the word and called Australia their home, they suddenly became an outsider due to the current laws. Not only did she face deportation to a country she knew little about, but she would also be torn from her family. By highlighting the issues and struggles that the 501 deportees are facing, the article is questioning the existing Australian scope of justice. This article provides a glimpse of the 501 deportees struggle and shows why the individual does not deserve to be deported. This article therefore, did not position the deportee either in a negative or positive manner. Additionally, there were other concerns raised about the deportations. The issues were centralised on the actual process of removing an individual from Australia to New Zealand, whereby the 501 deportees were held in detention centres before being deported. The excerpt below describes the perspective of a 501 deportee:

> *Instead of going home after his sentence ended in August, Haskell said he was sent to Villawood detention centre in Sydney and then, about two weeks ago, to Christmas Island, where he described conditions as "bottom of the pits". The centre was overcrowded, violent and there was no medical assistance, he said. Before he went into prison, Haskell was diagnosed with a possible brain tumour. While in prison, he continued to receive treatment but said he had not seen a doctor since arriving at Christmas Island. He suffers repeated headaches and nose bleeds. "They just give me painkillers, but they don't do much.* (Heather, 2015)

Laws and policies were clearly being prioritised over basic human rights. The excerpt shows an individual suffering from the process. Here, instead of focusing on the deportee's criminal aspects, the excerpt highlights the actual issues that individuals were facing as part of the section 501 processes and therefore the process is positioned negatively. While the 501 deportee was not positioned in either a negative or positive way, in this instance. These detention centres have been a controversial topic due to the treatment individuals experience and the amount of time they may have to spend while waiting for deportation. The excerpt below further discusses the negative consequences of the section 501 process:

> Article title: *Treatment of Kiwis bizarre: academic* (Gibb, 2015)
>
> *Australia's treatment of New Zealanders being held in remote detention centres, or facing deportation despite living in that country since childhood, has highlighted the ''limits'' of the transtasman "special relationship". That is the view of Professor Bill*

> *Harris, of the University of Otago's Politics Department. Prof Harris said it seemed "bizarre" that some New Zealanders were being held for months in remote detention centres, and others were facing deportation to this country despite having lived in Australia since they were young children. About 200 New Zealanders were being held in seven detention centres awaiting deportation, after Australia toughened its rules to deport criminals, some of whom had not lived in New Zealand for many years and committed relatively minor offences, The New Zealand Herald has reported.* (Gibb, 2015)

Some of these articles also revealed that many of the 501 deportees had already served their prison sentence and fulfilled their debt to society. The opinion was clearly that keeping them in detention centres was excessive and unnecessary. These articles tended to discuss the section 501 processes and position it negatively, meaning the 501 deportees were not the focal point of the argument. Central to such arguments in this evolving narrative were breaches of human rights as a result of the section 501 processes. The article below highlights the breach of human rights associated with the section 501 process. In the process, notions regarding the universality of human rights is used to extend the moral envelope to included people who commit severe crimes such as murder.

> Article title: *Don't cherry-pick human rights*
>
> *Besides, you can't cherry-pick human rights; even murderers have the right to humane treatment…. Come Monday, Australia will be on the rack at the UN as it faces questions into its suitability as a member of the Human Rights Council. Does New Zealand plan on speaking out about Australia's long dismal record of human rights abuses – especially against indigenous Aboriginals – and these latest cases of Kiwis being thrown out for nothing more than someone's jaundiced opinion of their character? No." "I don't think the Australians would accept that there are human rights issues," Key said.* (Bisset, 2015).

Most of these human rights issues were argued by legal representatives and human rights commissioners; however, the article below also illustrates the section 501 processes negatively from a personal point of view, and highlights the breach of human rights in a manner rarely seen in Australia coverage:

Article title: *Deportee mum not NZ 'trash'*

Woman who won't see her children grow up says she has served her time and wants a second chance. She talks to Elizabeth Binning.

The mother-of-two spent more than 30 years living in Australia – gaining a bachelor's degree, paying taxes, holding down good jobs – even working for the prison system at one stage…. "The reason they deport us is because they say we are too much of a risk to society. I believe I'm intrinsically a good person. I have hurt myself and my family but I don't think I was ever a risk to the community". "Anybody else in the same circumstance, who did what I did and went to jail, they get to go out, live their life and go back to their families". While O'Dowd doesn't defend Turia's actions, and acknowledges some deportees will never reform, she feels many are being set up to fail…. "We're like the rejects of society not wanted by anyone, even though most of us have a lot to offer if given half the chance…. O'Dowd says she isn't sharing her story in the hope of gaining sympathy or changing Morrison's mind – she knows she'll never return to Australia ("Deportee mum not."2021)

Similarly, the following article also personalises the deportation process:

Article title: *Oz dumps tetraplegic; Australia extradites wheelchair-bound Kiwi under controversial new law*

A tetraplegic sent to New Zealand after 36 years living across the Tasman is the latest victim of Australia's tough new immigration laws. The 56-year-old New Zealander, who asked to be identified only as "Paul", said the Australian Government "dumped me at Auckland Airport" three weeks ago. He has no friends or family here and landed with only $200 and a voucher for a week's accommodation. It comes as Prime Minister John Key and his Australian counterpart met in Auckland yesterday when Turnbull described the transtasman neighbours as "family". (Plumb, 2015)

So far, this section has provided different examples that portray deportees either neutrally or did not belong to negative or positive categories by giving them the chance to express their struggle. The example below also expresses similar concerns, but points out that laws and policies come first, even when an individual is in a vulnerable position. Furthermore, it was at

this point that the then-Australian Foreign Affairs Minister, Peter Dutton, addressed New Zealand-deportees as 'trash'. The Minister said he was "taking the trash out", and he also highlighted that "we're talking about the most serious offenders here, and our country is safer for having deported them". The same article also discusses an instance where a journalist questioned a deportee, asking, "*How does it feel to be kicked out of Australia*?" – "Our country doesn't want you, are you excited to go home?" (Chung, 2021). The excerpt below was drawn from an article that was published following the Minister and journalist's comments mentioned earlier. The importance of responsible news media is highlighted:

> *"These people have parents, they have families. You wouldn't want your children to be called trash. It's so wrong. Why would they talk about a human being like that?" Auckland University of Technology head of journalism Dr Greg Treadwell reviewed the email trail and described it as a "far-too-friendly alliance". "Newsgathering should never become a conspiracy between the journalist and the newsmaker against the audience. In fact, in ways this seems a conspiracy between them against New Zealand, which is patently absurdist. If people are concerned about journalism being too chummy with government and its agendas, this isn't a bad example."* (Fisher, 2021)

The excerpt above shows the importance of responsible news media, and that calling the 501 deportees 'trash', dehumanises these individuals. The label strongly suggests that 501 deportees are not worthy of being part of the community, where they will likewise be 'trash'. Having a voice denouncing such news content appeals to the moral kindness of readers, asking them not to place the 501 deportees outside the scope of justice.

This section has provided some examples in which the 501 deportees were depicted neutrally or did not fall under positive or negative category, and this was usually through a discussion on the concerns around section 501 processes and the struggle the deportees were facing as a result. There were also second-hand and direct accounts of the 501 deportees' stories. Providing 501 deportees with the symbolic power to tell their side of the story was important in understanding their perspective on the issue. In addition, having news items which appealed to moral kindness challenged the characterisation that 501 deportees were experiencing. However, the amount of coverage that positioned them negatively, outside the scope of justice, was still much higher. To summarise, the results in the following section discuss the overall results of this thesis.

Chapter discussion

This chapter illustrated the findings in relation to prominent trends in the news portrayal of the New Zealand 501 deportees as well as briefly discussing the portrayal of the section 501 processes. The tone of the items, how 501 deportees were portrayed in news media. Analysing the news in both Australia and New Zealand in 2015 and 2021 helped me to understand how the media operated in both countries in relation to this matter. This also enabled me to identify the similarities and differences in the framing of events in relation to shifts in political processes in both countries within which the two respective news narratives were located. This chapter illustrated the way in which both countries positioned 501 deportees and section 501 processes within the media. This enabled me to compare how news portrayals on this topic developed in these two countries. The crimmigration process started in Australia and, in Australian media, the majority of news items in both years positioned section 501 processes mostly neutrally as most of the items did not fall under either positive or negative category. What was unique to Australia, was that some news items positioned the section 501 processes positively compared to New Zealand. There were also a number of government officials who reinforced the importance of the section 501 processes as a stance of the policy is to protect Australia from criminals.

As demonstrated earlier, the highest number of Australian news articles portrayed New Zealand 501 deportees in a negative light. When deportees were positioned negatively, it was done in several different ways. Among them, it was common to encounter instances where New Zealand 501 deportees were highlighted as the most ‘dangerous’ and ‘worst’ criminals of all 501 deportees. As noted, there were also some common words that were used to label and describe New Zealand deportees, such as ‘bikie’, ‘racist thug’, ‘crook’, and ‘dodgy kiwi’, etc. By demarking the deportees and labelling them, the news positioned them outside the justice boundaries.

This positioning or placing of certain groups of people outside the moral envelope was done via mode of address. According to the findings, the majority of the news articles in Australia highlighted that New Zealand 501 deportees did not deserve to be in Australia. Highlighting the deportees in such a manner positioned them as unwanted by society – a message which would eventually reach the public. The concept ‘imagine community’ by Benedict Anderson emphasises the role of the popular press in fostering national consciousness (Castelló, 2016).

This enables us to understand how important a sense of belonging to a community is for a group of people (Kavoura, 2014). It was evident that the Australian government was repeatedly highlighting how important it was to protect the Australian community from 501 deportees.

Anderson also highlights how 'print capitalism' has created concepts such as 'us' and 'them' (Castelló, 2016) – in this context, 'us' being the Australians and 'them' being the foreign persons (501 deportees). When news media created an 'us' and 'them' situation, the deportees became strangers who did not belong or were not worthy of being part of Australia. This also explains how the deportees were seen as different from the rest of the Australians. George Simmel's concept of 'stranger' describes how an individual who is part of the system may not be strongly attached to the system. This person may have a spatial sense but not be a member in a social sense (Simmel, 2016). The concept defines how the stranger is often viewed with suspicion and prejudice by others in the system because of the stranger's behaviours and the uncertainty and unpredictability of the strangeness (Rogers, 1999). Australia predominantly classed deportees as strangers by stressing that they had different morals and values than Australians. By doing so, 501 deportees were positioned outside the scope of justice.

In contrast to this, a number of articles also appealed to the moral kindness of humanity, and these texts expressed the importance of addressing issues such as breaches of human rights. However, these articles were scarce in Australian news articles in comparison to New Zealand. As discussed earlier in this chapter, the majority of New Zealand articles positioned deportees more neutrally compared to Australia. There was also a higher number of articles that expressed the importance of protecting deportees' basic human rights. However, it is important to point out that there were also several articles in New Zealand that positioned deportees outside scope of justice. For example, when Australia called deportees 'trash', government minister Chris Hipkins told media that, "*This is Australia exporting its garbage to New Zealand. These people have, you know, their criminal offending has been in Australia. To all intents and purposes, many of them have lived the vast bulk of their lives in Australia*" (Manch, 2021b). This is another example of how these deportees were regarded as 'strangers' as well an instance where they were dehumanised by calling them 'garbage' who do not belong in New Zealand.

In New Zealand news articles, it was also common to see New Zealand 501 deportees positioned negatively by utilising public opinion. For example, quotes from the public such as the following were included in articles about the situation: "We don't want to be burdened by overseas criminals costing us taxpayers millions" (Lindsay, 2015). The consequence of this

attitude is that 501 deportees who arrived in New Zealand were more likely to face discrimination from society. According to Stanley (2018), upon deportation, New Zealand 501 deportees face hardships due to their experience in immigration detention centres. Apart from the physical and mental health problems that they face, these detainees also face economic hardship and social isolation by having to settle in a country that they know little about. In addition, these individuals are bound to experience stigma, worry, guilt, helplessness, insecurity and relationship problems. The studies done overseas also have similar results, and research done in the United States has identified that deported individuals experience issues with employment and feel demoralised, estranged, and are more likely than the general population to engage in substance misuse and to avoid accessing healthcare services due to issues of stigma (Brabeck et al., 2014). This chapter discussed the depiction of 501 deportees and section 501 processes in news media. The next chapter, which is the concluding chapter of this thesis, will discuss the overall summary of the study results.

Chapter 6: Conclusion

The deportation of New Zealand citizens from Australia to New Zealand became one of the most controversial topics in news media between 2015 and 2021 and the topic is still an issue today. Current practices of crimmigration offer one mechanism for nation states to reaffirm who belongs in the country and who does not belong and who should be removed due to criminal behaviour or association. This thesis aimed to explore the media construct of news related to section 501 of the Australian Migration Act in both Australia and New Zealand.

Silverstone (2007) pointed out that in Ancient Greece, the polis was the public space where face-to-face communication occurred among the elites. A large part of the Athenian population's exclusion and exploitation was dependent on the debate and judgement of these elites. Similar trends were evident in news coverage during the period of this study, with results showing that the most dominant voice across both countries were government officials who hold the power concerning deportation law and it's processes. The 501 deportees had very little power to name and define the deportation processes that were impacting their lives. Exercises of symbolic power played out in the media showed who was able to speak and to characterise the 501 deportees and other news related to the section 501 processes (Bourdieu, 1979). This study found that the majority of news items between 2015 and 2021 were dominated by elites, who had the symbolic power as well as the rights to decide the fate of individuals and to define the issue for the public (Stanley, 2006).

Even though the mediapolis is not the place where decisions are made (like ancient Greek practises in the polis), it is where judgment and decisions are represented and debated (Silverstone, 2007). As a result, exercises of symbolic power in media lead to stigmatisation of certain groups in society. What was evident in the period of study was that the media tended to perpetuate the idea that deportees were 'others', 'strangers', or people who were part of a 'suspect community' who carry a potential threat to society (Breen-Smith, 2014; Cherney & Murphy, 2016; McLemore, 1970). Silverstone (2007) also highlights that the 'mediapolis' is not necessarily a specific location or place, but rather it is a mediated public space inhabited by current political life. Similarly, the news coverage under investigation indicated that there was a tendency for news outlets to report stories that were more political in nature. Political events such as general elections and political leaders' foreign visits increased the number of reports relating to deportation and its processes. However, these reports highlighted the more

political aspect of the topic and obscured the actual issues of the deportation process or what the 501ds faced as consequence of this deportation policy.

One of the strong arguments made by the political figures who fashion Australian legislation was to protect Australia from future harm caused by foreign nationals. It was common for deportees to be known or addressed by government officials as ‘criminals’, ‘trash’, ‘bikies’, ‘racist thugs’, ‘crooks’, ‘gang members’, and ‘dodgy kiwis’ and by many other labels in news media. Australian articles mainly highlighted the criminal aspect of the 501 deportees and the positive aspect of the section 501 processes. New Zealand, in contrast, emphasised that these individuals had lived in Australia for a long time and should be considered Australian and therefore should not be deported. What we see here is how both countries voiced their opinions as to why 501 deportees were not eligible to be part of their respective communities. On a surface level, such estrangement can be seen as morally justified as these individuals were potential ‘dangers’ to society, particularly those who were presented as ‘hardened criminals’, from whom the community needed protection (Australia deports teen, 2021; Sachdeva, 2015).

Those who are morally excluded from a society are perceived as ‘evil’ and deserve to be harmed, exploited, and generally punished. This is regarded as acceptable and the right thing to do (Opotow, 1990). As a result, such individuals are seen as unworthy of fair treatment and can be more readily treated punitively (Opotow, 1990). This can be seen in the issue of deportation and as part of the crimmigration processes that both countries exercised on 501 deportees between 2015 and 2021. Individuals who were considered ‘evil’ were excluded from Australian society and often held in locked-up detention centres. To many, this seemed like the right thing to do in order to protect the Australian community. Moreover, on top of the punishments sanctioned by the Australian government, New Zealand also had a rhetoric of ‘dangerousness’ and introduced legislation to further punish deportees upon arrival (by requiring them to follow the New Zealand government’s protocols under a monitoring regime Stanley, 2018).

The serious harm that was caused by some of the 501 deportees during the period under study should not be ignored. However, it is the role of the law and judicial processes to take the appropriate actions against persons who might pose threats to the community (Lang, 2022). Nevertheless, some of the 501 deportees had served their sentence or prison terms in Australia, and therefore they should have been released from prison or correctional centres instead of

being detained in detention centres. In addition, as discussed in chapter 1, some individuals who were affected by this policy have never committed crime, but many have been marked as having 'bad character' and were deported (Stanley, 2018). According to criminal law, once an individual serves their prison sentence, they have the right to re-enter the community with or without further conditions. Grewcock (2011) notes that in virtually all cases, imposing further punishment on top of the sentencing that the court has imposed, undermines parole and risk assessment procedures, as well as the whole sentencing system.

When an individual is excluded and placed outside the moral envelope, they are deemed eligible for punishment, exploitation, harm, etc. According to Opotow et al. (2005), any form of exclusion, whether it is a minor or severe, can deny people's rights, autonomy, and dignity. According to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, human rights apply to everyone regardless of their criminality (United Nations, n.d.-b). In addition, arbitrary detention is against the declaration of human rights (United Nations, n.d.-b). Keyzer and Martin (2018) interviewed a number of 501 deportees and stated that, after hearing the deportees' stories, the human costs of this policy outweighs any benefit. It has been found that often these individuals who return to New Zealand have no family ties or any friends (Martin & Keyzer, 2018). The stigma associated with being a 501 deportee makes it difficult for them to survive in a country they may know little about. They are placed at increased risk of mental and physical illness and the chances of them abusing drugs and continuing criminal behaviour is greater (Essex et al., 2022; von Werthern et al., 2018).

As the results of this study show, during the sample period, the deportation of New Zealand citizens from Australia remained an intractable conflict between these two nations. According to Bar-Tal (2007, p. 1431), intractable conflicts are "conflicts between societies or nations which erupt when their goals, intentions, and/or actions are perceived as mutually incompatible". Bar-Tal (2010) also points out that almost all conflicts in the current world are associated with intense socio-psychological forces, which makes it difficult to come to a resolution, instead leading to escalation and eruption of the situation. Australia believes that 501 deportees are born overseas so do not belong in Australia, while New Zealand believes 501 deportees have lived in Australia for a long period and do not belong in New Zealand. During the sampling period of this study when this policy emerged, the situation escalated to an impasse as both countries were firm in their divergent perspectives on this matter. However, recently there has been a shift in the position of the Australian government with the election of

a Labor government. The new government has agreed to take a more 'common-sense' and less conflictual approach to deportations for people who have lived most of their life in Australia (Hevesi, 2022).

This research was based on online media articles. It is important to point out that news items do not contain a single set of meanings and the meaning of media content is not simply located in the text of the media either (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014; Hodgetts et al., 2006). These news texts can tell us a lot about how the issues of section 501 were framed in coverage during the study period, but not how they were interpreted by different audiences. Therefore, like any research, this study also has limitations. As the research did not examine audience responses to media coverage, I am unable to make more definitive assertions about what impacts coverage might have on public perceptions of the issues.

The interpretation of news varies and depends on the interpretation of the people who read a story as it evolves across the years of coverage (Hodgetts & Chamberlain, 2014). Additionally, how media advocates, such as community service providers and researchers, interpret and respond to the production of news remains unexplored in this study. It is important to analyse these aspects, as it will provide a broader understanding of how the media is embedded in public deliberations relating to issues such as section 501. There is an avenue for future research around audience responses to the news as this could provide insights into how news items are interpreted by people as part of their everyday lives. Understanding how the audience interpret news items could give indications on the impact that news media has on the public.

Furthermore, this research only examined online print style news articles. However, the issue of section 501 has also been covered across other news formats including television, radio and social media news. A more complete study would also have examined other popular forms of media such as television news, social media, and radio news coverage. Furthermore, this research was also limited in terms of understanding the processes through which journalists and the publisher selected some information and ignored other information when producing the news items. Despite these limitations, the analysis of the news coverage was able to reveal the types of news frames and ideological positions that were circulated by news articles in both Australia and New Zealand during the study period. Therefore, I can still communicate how various issues of symbolic power manifested in news coverage and what this tells us about the symbolic and moral positioning of deportees in terms of the moral envelopes of both countries.

Silverstone (2007), suggests that media can "act both justly and unjustly. They can act unjustly by: denying or distorting the voices of others; by refusing airspace to the indigenous, the diasporic, the marginal and the minority" (p. 144). Media helps us to know about the 'other' or the 'stranger' or the 'neighbour' but the mediated judgment of good and evil can lead to connection as well as disconnection with others. This research showed that the accounts of 501 deportees who were affected by the section 501 were minimal. Including the voices of the marginalised and people directly affected by the deportation laws could give fairer insights by acknowledging their perspective and the accounts of their actual stories. Silverstone (2007) highlights that the current mediated global world is a manifestation of mediapolis because the right to speak and the obligation to listen is still common in contemporary media. The research results indicated the importance of balanced and inclusive coverage of the deportation issue by including the actual accounts of 501 deportees (and their representatives). As they can provide a fuller picture of the issues involved. Media justice is where the narrative is not overwhelmed by the powerful; instead, the voices of the weak, minorities, and the marginalised also can be heard (Silverstone, 2007).

There is no similar research that examines how news related to section 501 of the Australian Migration Act is positioned in news media. However, previous research noted in this thesis provided valuable insights on how other immigrant populations and marginalised individuals have been positioned by the media. Media's involvement in representing the world and its social issues was made very clear in this research. The power that the media has in society is evident from the research results and to foster social justice, it is important to address issues such as symbolic power and certain discriminatory practises found in the media. The knowledge gained from this research study can be used to challenge and mitigate discriminatory practises in the media towards marginalised groups such as 501 deportees. The results of the research can also shed light on ways to reduce social issues that marginalised and certain groups of the population face in everyday life.

The media has power and a great responsibility when representing the world. Therefore, news production, transmission, and the people appearing in media have an equal responsibility of delivering a balanced narrative on topics such as section 501 deportees. Consequently, instead of discrimination, characterisation, and stigmatisation, media should be used as a platform to reduce social barriers and bring communities closer together. Following the results of this media analysis, I would like to propose that current crimmigration practices in both countries must be reconsidered to provide these individuals ongoing integration support services to

become progressive members of society. However, most importantly, instead of excluding 501 deportees as ‘others’ or ‘strangers’ or individuals who are part of ‘suspect communities’, the media should instead be used as a platform that helps integrate these individuals into society and gives them their best chance of thriving in the community while providing them with the human decency they deserve.

References

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2005). A social psychological framework for understanding social inclusion and exclusion. In D. Abrams, M. A. Hogg, & J. M. Marques (Eds.), *Social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 1–23). Psychology Press.

Administrative Appeals Tribunal. (n.d.). *The character test explained*. https://www.aat.gov.au/about-the-aat/learn-more/the-character-test-explained

Ahmed, S., & Matthes, J. (2017). Media representation of Muslims and Islam from 2000 to 2015: A meta-analysis. *International Communication Gazette*, *79*(3), 219–244. https://doi.org/10.1177/1748048516656305

Argoon, A., & White, A. (2015, March 30). Racist thugs' threat to kill. *Herald-Sun*. https://www.heraldsun.com.au/news/law-order/racist-thugs-threat-to-kill-refugees-at-maribyrnong-immigration-detention-centre/news-story/9b895a6c48aa3b4ade7d52ddf4d8a211

Aust passport holder fights deportation. (2021, May 13). *Australian Associated Press.* Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Australian Border Force. (2022, March 18). *Detention facilities*. Australian Government. https://www.abf.gov.au/about-us/what-we-do/border-protection/immigration-detention/detention-facilities

Australia deports teen to New Zealand. (2021, March 15). *News.Com.Au.* https://www.news.com.au/national/australia-deports-15yearold-to-new-zealand/news-story/f4afc6bffd84e899fb6e60e2854fc89f

Australian Boarder Force. (2022, March 18). *Immigration detention in Australia.* Australian Government. https://www.abf.gov.au/about-us/what-we-do/border-protection/immigration-detention/detention-facilities

Australian Human Rights Commission. (n.d.). *Face the facts: Cultural diversity*. Retrieved July 18, 2022, from https://humanrights.gov.au/our-work/education/face-facts-cultural-diversity

Balogh, S. (2015, November 10). Security review after centre riot. *The Australian*. https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fnation%2Fimmigration%2Fsecurity-review-after-christmas-island-detention-centre-riot%2Fnews-

story%2F6e1b246028c25e130aa3e1d8a4043659&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

Barclay, C. (2015, May 1). Jailbird Russell Packer walks free after just 12 months for vicious assault and seeks NRL contract. *Stuff*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Bar-Tal, D. (2000). *Shared beliefs in a society: Social psychological analysis*. SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452204697

Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. American Behavioral Scientist, 8(10), 1430-1453. https://doi.org/10.1177/0002764207302462

Barthel, M., Mitchell, A., Asare-Marfo, D., Kennedy, C., & Worden, K. (2020, December 8). *Measuring news consumption in a digital era*. Pew Research

Center. https://www.pewresearch.org/journalism/2020/12/08/measuring-news-consumption-in-a-digital-era/

Bayer, K. (2021, June 1). Gang tensions sprout like noxious weed in Garden City. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Beniuk, D. (2015, July 26). Rebel's deportation appeal set to fail. *Hobart Mercury*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Bennett, L. (2018, April 7). Detained Kiwi teen's lawyer welcomes Peters' comments. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Bisset, B. (2015, November 13). Don't cherry-pick human rights. *Hawkes Bay Today*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Block, G. (2021, April 23). 501 deportees plan legal class action. *The Press*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Bonnett, G. (2021, September 8). Man, 43, who went to Australia as a baby to be deported to NZ. *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/man-43-who-went-to-australia-as-baby-will-be-deported-to-new-zealand/6O36W4KKID2CW55KMN6ZKWY3FU/

Bourdieu, P. (1979). Symbolic power. *Critique of Anthropology, 4*(13-14), 77-85.

Bourdieu, P. (1989). Social Space and Symbolic Power. *Sociological Theory, 7*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.2307/202060

Brabeck, K. M., Lykes, M. B., & Hunter, C. (2014). The psychosocial impact of detention and deportation on US migrant children and families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 84*(5), 496–505. https://doi.org/10.1037/ort0000011

Breen-Smyth, M. (2014). Theorising the “suspect community”: Counterterrorism, security practices and the public imagination. *Critical Studies on Terrorism*, *7*(2), 223–240. https://doi.org/10.1080/17539153.2013.867714

Carswell, A. (2015, October 1). Dodgy kiwis sent home. *Cairns Post*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Castelló, E. (2016). Anderson and the Media: The strength of “imagined communities.” *Journal on Culture, Power and Society*, *1*, 59–63. http: //www.researcherid.com/rid/B-2834-2012

Castells, M. (2019). Communication power: Mass communication, mass self-communication, and power relationships in the network society. In J. Curran and D. Hesmondhalgh (Eds.), *Media and society* (pp. 83-101). Bloomsbury.

Chamberlin, T. (2015, April 18). NZ crims cost us millions. *Courier Mail*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Chamberlin, T. (2021, October 28). ‘No place for you’: Foreign-born crims kicked out of Queensland. *Courier Mail.* https://www.couriermail.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=CMWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.couriermail.com.au%2Ftruecrimeaustralia%2Fpolice-courts-qld%2Fforeignborn-criminals-kicked-out-of-queensland%2Fnews-story%2F728053786c332dae13103394d3b83f58&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-control-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

Chaos at Christmas Island detention centre. (2015, November 9). *Otago Daily Times*. https://www.odt.co.nz/news/australia/chaos-christmas-island-detention-centre

Chen, C.-H. S., Wu, M.-S. S., Nguyen, B., & Li, S. (2019). Digitally facilitated newspaper consumption and value co-creation. *The Bottom Line*, *32*(1), 16–46. https://doi.org/10.1108/BL-09-2018-0038

Chenery, S. (2016, April 15). New Zealanders in Australia are still treated like second-class citizens. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. https://www.smh.com.au/national/new-zealanders-in-australia-are-still-treated-like-secondclass-citizens-20160414-go691n.html

Cherney, A., & Murphy, K. (2016). Being a ‘suspect community’ in a post 9/11 world – The impact of the war on terror on Muslim communities in Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *49*(4), 480–496. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865815585392

Christmas Island rioters face criminal charges. (2015, November 11). *Australian Associated Press.* Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Christmas Island not safe. (2015, November 9). *The Australian*. https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WR

E170_a&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fnation%2Fimmigration%2Fchristmas-island-detainees-riot-over-death-of-refugee%2Fnews-story%2Fb99eb8e2a9933b69de59516278053311&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupb-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

Christmas Island riot: Seven detainees moved to "correctional facility" in WA as vision emerges of damage. (2015, November 11). *Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*. *https://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-11-11/christmas-island-riot-seven-detainees-moved-to/6933040*

Chung, F. (2021, March 11). Kiwis furious over Aussie TV *report. News.Com.Au*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Chyi, H. I., & Chadha, M. (2012). News on new devices: Is multi-platform news consumption a reality? *Journalism Practice*, *6*(4), 431–449. https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2011.629125

Clark, J. (2021, December 28). Dusty's dad died alone in 'terrible injustice.' *The Advertiser*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Clent, D. (2020, September 7). *Coronavirus: Kiwis stuck in Australian detention protest deportation delays*. Stuff. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/122063069/coronavirus-kiwis-stuck-in-australian-detention-protest-deportation-delays

Commonwealth of Australia (2015). *A history of the department of immigration—managing migration to Australia*. Department of Immigration and Border Protection (DIBP). https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about-us-subsite/files/immigration-history.pdf

Commonwealth Consolidated Acts. (n.d). *Migration Act 1958—SECT 501 Refusal or cancellation of visa on character grounds*. Retrieved April 22, 2022, from http://www8.austlii.edu.au/cgi-bin/viewdoc/au/legis/cth/consol_act/ma1958118/s501.html

"Con Air" arrival calls camp "scary." (2015, November 20). *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/con-air-arrival-calls-camp-scary/DUSFEVSMCZK3NFZMLDJJ3ZLDMA/

Conifer, D. (2015, September 30). New Zealand prime minister John Key says detainment of NZ citizens by Australia "not in Anzac spirit*." Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2015-09-30/john-key-australia-detaining-nz-citizens-not-in-anzac-spirit/6816090

Cooke, H. (2021, March 16). Australia a "rogue nation" NZ needs to call out at the UN after 15-year-old deported, say
Greens. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/300253657/australia-a-rogue-nation-nz-needs-to-call-out-at-the-un-after-15yearold-deported-say-greens

Wood, C. (2021, March 17). Cormann knew of an "incident*."* *Crikey*. https://www.crikey.com.au/2021/03/17/mathias-cormann-knew-of-an-incident/

Couldry, N. (2002). Mediation and alternative media, or relocating the centre of media and communication studies. *Media International Australia, 103*(1), 24–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X0210300106

Couldry, N. (2003). Media meta-capital: Extending the range of Bourdieu's field theory. *Theory and Society, 32*(5/6), 653–677. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:RYSO.0000004915.37826.5d

Couldry, N. (2019). *Media: Why it matters*. Polity Press.

Couldry, N., & Curran, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Contesting media power: Alternative media in a networked world.* Rowman and Littlefield.

Court rules Aboriginal men not "aliens." (2020, February 11). *Australian Associated Press*.

Cowie, T. (2019, July 18). *"Corrosive effect on our relationship": Jacinda Ardern criticises Australia's deportation laws.* Stuff. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/114356149/corrosive-effect-on-our-relationship-jacinda-ardern-criticises-australias-deportation-laws

Coyle, I., & Keyzer, P. (2016). The removal of convicted noncitizens from Australia: Is there only a 'minimal and remote' chance of getting it right? *Alternative Law Journal, 41*(2), 86–88. https://doi.org/10.1177/1037969X1604100203

Davison, I. (2015a, November 13). Riot crackdown hits Kiwis. *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/riot-crackdown-hits-kiwis/EZZUVZJZ62YBSUNZ3SKSSST5GM/

Davison, I. (2015b, October 11). Riots: Kiwis blamed detainees say they're treated like dogs and feel abandoned by NZ, Aust govts. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Dennett, K. (2015, January 25). *Monitoring issues as Kiwi killer sent home.* Stuff. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/65391584/monitoring-issues-as-kiwi-killer-sent-home#:~:text=BACK%20IN%20NZ%3A%20Rebecca%20Papalii,no%20way%20of%20monitoring%20her.

Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (n.d.). *New Zealand country brief.* Australian Government, Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. https://www.dfat.gov.au/geo/new-zealand/new-zealand-country-brief

Department of Immigration and Border Protection. (2017). *A history of the department of immigration—Managing migration to Australia*. https://www.homeaffairs.gov.au/about-us-subsite/files/immigration-history.pdf

"Deplorable": NZ politicians lash out after Australia "trash" comments on deportees. (2021, November 3). *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/nz-politicians-lash-out-at-australias-deportation-policy-and-peter-duttons-trash-comments/W3BVUSO7HU3FXOPBY25CUYTLIM/

Deportee mum not NZ 'trash.' (2021, March 14). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Desmarais, F. (2021, December 3). Fears for kids living in motels. *The Daily Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Dick, T. (2015, February 18). Citizenship a human right, not a gift you can have repossessed. *Sydney Morning Herald*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Dutton deports man with bikie gang links. (2015, January 24). *Australian Associated Press*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Dziedzic, S. (2021, March 11). *Tensions erupt between New Zealand and Australia over controversial criminal deportations*. Australian Broadcasting Corporation News. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2021-03-11/tensions-new-zealand-australia-criminal-deportation-peter-dutton/13238244

Eurostat. (2022, May 16). *Enforcement of immigration legislation statistics.* https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php?title=Enforcement_of_immigration_legislation_statistics

Environmental Health Intelligence New Zealand. (n.d.). *Ethnic profile.* https://www.ehinz.ac.nz/indicators/population-vulnerability/ethnic-profile/

Essex, R., Kalocsányiová, E., Young, P., & McCrone, P. (2022). Psychological distress in Australian onshore and offshore immigration detention centres from 2014–2018. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, *24*, 868–874. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10903-022-01335-7

Farris, E. M., & Silber Mohamed, H. (2018). Picturing immigration: How the media criminalizes immigrants. *Politics, Groups, and Identities*, *6*(4), 814–824. https://doi.org/10.1080/21565503.2018.1484375

Fernando, G. (2021, March 17). Australia accused of flouting international obligations over child's 'disturbing' to New Zealand. *SBS news*. https://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/australia-accused-of-flouting-international-obligations-over-childs-disturbing-deportation-to-new-zealand/0pgq3i44t

Fisher, D. (2021, September 7). How ‘trash’ broadcast on 501s was set up. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

FitzSimons, P. (2018, July 17). Don’t Call Australia Home!. *Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*. https://www.abc.net.au/foreign/don%E2%80%99t-call-australia-home!/10005152

Football star’s dad in line for the boot. (2016, March 11). *The Advertiser*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Franko, K. (2019). *The crimmigrant other*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351001441

Fraser, A., (2015). Human rights abuses. *Chronicle*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Fuller, C. (2021, February 27). Gang violence harms communities: Police. *Hawkes Bay Today*.

Galloway, K., & Castan, M. (2021, October 21). *Indigenous people cannot be aliens in their own land. Why challenging this fact (again) is so concerning*. The Conversation. https://theconversation.com/indigenous-people-cannot-be-aliens-in-their-own-land-why-challenging-this-fact-again-is-so-concerning-170203

Gibb, J. (2015, October 21). Treatment of Kiwis bizarre: Academic. *Otago Daily Times*. https://www.odt.co.nz/news/dunedin/treatment-kiwis-bizarre-academic

Gilbert, J. (2021, December 28). Talking point: Goodbye, Shane, you deserved better. *Bay of Plenty Times*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Grewcock, M. (2011). Punishment, deportation and parole: The detention and removal of former prisoners under section 501 Migration Act 1958. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *44*(1), 56–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865810392866

Guns, gangs and the 501 policy. (2021, December 29). *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Harris, R. (2020, February, 28). Do not deport your people and your problems’, Arden Tells PM. *Sydney Morning Herald*. https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/do-not-deport-your-people-and-your-problems-ardern-tells-pm-20200228-p545f3.htmlHo

Heather, B. (2015, October 10). Health or family choice in deportation battle. *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Hevesi, B. (2022, August 7). Anthony Albanese says Australia will take a ‘common sense’ approach to deporting New Zealand criminals under Section 501 | Sky News Australia. *Sky News*. https://www.skynews.com.au/australia-news/politics/anthony-albanese-says-australia-will-take-a-common-sense-approach-to-deporting-new-zealand-criminals-under-section-501/news-story/cf6474f82f1a429d36742dd916f65f1e

Hodgetts, D., & Chamberlain, K. (2014). Analysing news media. *The SAGE handbook of qualitative data analysis* (pp. 380-393). SAGE.

Hodgetts, D., Cullen, A., & Radley, A. (2005). Television characterizations of homeless people in the United Kingdom. *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, *5*(1), 29–48. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1530-2415.2005.00054.x

Hodgetts, D., Hodgetts, A., & Radley, A. (2006). Life in the shadow of the media: Imaging street homelessness in London. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *9*(4), 497–516. https://doi.org/10.1177/1367549406063166

Hodgetts, D., Stolte, O., Chamberlain, K., Radley, A., Nikora, L., Nabalarua, E., & Groot, S. (2008). A trip to the library: Homelessness and social inclusion. *Social & Cultural Geography*, *9*(8), 933–953. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649360802441432

Hodgetts, D., Stolte, O., Radley, A., Leggatt-Cook, C., Groot, S., & Chamberlain, K. (2011). "Near and far": Social distancing in domiciled characterisations of homeless people. *Urban Studies*, *48*(8), 1739–1753. https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098010377476

Hodgetts, D., Stolte, O., Sonn, C., Drew, N., Carr, S., & Nikora, L. W. (2020). *Social psychology and everyday life*. Bloomsbury. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/massey/detail.action?docID=6235082

Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D., King, P., & Carr, S. (2022). From crimmigration to reintegration following the removal of "undesirable" people from Australia to New Zealand. In F. M. Moghaddam & M. J. Hendricks (Eds.), *Contemporary immigration: Psychological perspectives to address challenges and inform solutions.* (pp. 263–280). American Psychological Association. https://doi.org/10.1037/0000294-014

Hopner, V., Hodgetts, D., Nelson, N., Battersby, J. (2022). Islam in the News: Persistent yet Changing Characterisations. *Journal of religion, media and digital culture*, 11(3), 287-310. https://doi.org/10.1163/21659214-bja10064

Jones, N. (2015a, October 21). High-level meeting over Kiwi's death. *Otago Daily Times*. https://www.odt.co.nz/news/national/high-level-meeting-over-kiwis-death

Jones, N. (2015b, September 29). NZ caught in Aussie crackdown net. *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/nz-caught-in-aussie-crackdown-net/OTBXCG7AK2LTXE6OT6WJGQL6EM/

Kals, E., & Strubel, I. T. (2017). Volunteering to support refugees: A question of one's scope of justice. *Refuge*, *33*(2), 66–77. https://doi.org/10.7202/1043064ar

Kavoura, A. (2014). Social media, online imagined communities and communication research. *Library Review*, *63*(6/7), 490–504. https://doi.org/10.1108/LR-06-2014-0076

Keany, F. (2015, November 19). *First New Zealanders deported from Australia under tough new immigration rules.* Australian Broadcasting Corporation News. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Kenny, M. (2021, May 31). As Morrison and Ardern meet, differences of opinion give way to the enduring close relationship. *The Conversation*. https://theconversation.com/as-morrison-and-ardern-meet-differences-of-opinion-give-way-to-the-enduring-close-relationship-161580

Keyzer, P., & Coyle, I. (2021, March 30). New Zealanders have a right to be angry when Australia deports a 15-year-old. *The Conversation*. https://theconversation.com/new-zealanders-have-a-right-to-be-angry-when-australia-deports-a-15-year-old-157583

King, A. (2015, June 10). English's detention claims disputed. *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Kronick, R., Rousseau, C., & Cleveland, J. (2011). Mandatory detention of refugee children: A public health issue? *Paediatrics & Child Health*, *16*(8), e65–e67. https://doi.org/10.1093/pch/16.8.e65

Lang, K. (2022, March 3). *Area of Law: Criminal law*. https://guides.lib.monash.edu/areaoflaw/crim-law

Law institute of Victoria. (2018). Information for Criminal Lawyers. *Refusals and cancellations under s 501*. Refugee Council. Retrieved March 25, 2021, from Section-501-Information-for-Criminal-Lawyers.pdf (refugeecouncil.org.au)

Leeper, T. J., & Slothuus, R. (2014). Political parties, motivated reasoning, and public opinion formation. *Political Psychology*, *35*, 129–156. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12164

Lindsay, C. (2015, July 10). Strong deterrent or we become soft. *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Loto, R., Hodgetts, D., Chamberlain, K., Nikora, L. W., Karapu, R., & Barnett, A. (2006). Pasifika in the news: The portrayal of Pacific peoples in the New Zealand press. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *16*(2), 100–118. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.848

Love, S., & Klapdor, M. (2020 February, 13). *New Zealanders in Australia: A quick guide*. Parliament of Australia. https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1920/Quick_Guides/NewZealandersInAustralia

Malpass, L. (2021, March 16). Mates or mugs? The Australian relationship is now frosty on several fronts. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/opinion/124544841/mates-or-mugs-the-australian-relationship-is-now-frosty-on-several-fronts

Manch, T. (2021a, November 3). *Australian Minister Peter Dutton "trashes his own reputation" by insulting NZ deportees, Foreign Minister Nanaia Mahuta says*. Stuff. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Manch, T. (2021b, March 17). Australia notified NZ of young deportee. *The Southland Times*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Martin, D., & Keyzer, P. (2018, July 12). Why New Zealanders are feeling the hard edge of Australia's deportation policy. *The Conversation*. http://theconversation.com/why-new-zealanders-are-feeling-the-hard-edge-of-australias-deportation-policy-99447

McHardy, C. (2021). Punishment on arrival: New Zealand's Returning Offenders Act 2015. *Punishment & Society, 24*(4), 622–641. https://doi.org/10.1177/1462474521999912

McKay, B. (2021, March 16). Child's deportation sinks Aus-NZ relations. *AAP Bulletins.* Retrieved from Factiva library database.

McLemore, S. D. (1970). Simmel's "stranger": A critique of the concept. *The Pacific Sociological Review, 13*(2), 86–94. https://doi.org/10.2307/1388311

McLoughlin, P., & Warin, M. (2008). Corrosive places, inhuman spaces: Mental health in Australian immigration detention. *Health & Place, 14*(2), 254–264. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthplace.2007.06.008

McMillan, K. (2021, April 16). When is a New Zealander actually an Australian? *Australian Institute of International Affairs*. https://www.internationalaffairs.org.au/australianoutlook/when-is-a-new-zealander-actually-an-australian/

McNeill, H. (2021a). Dealing with the 'crimmigrant other' in the face of a global public health threat: A snapshot of deportation during COVID-19 in Australia and New Zealand. *Social Sciences, 10*(8), 278–291. https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci10080278

McNeill, H. (2021b). Oceania's 'crimmigration creep': Are deportation and reintegration norms being diffused? *Journal of Criminology*, *54*(3), 305–322. https://doi.org/10.1177/00048658211008952

Meers, D. (2015, November 10). Inmates running the asylum. *Cairns Post*. https://www.dailytelegraph.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=DTWEB_WRE170_a&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.dailytelegraph.com.au%2Fnews%2Fopinion%2Fjohn-heffernan-juvenile-justice-the-inmates-are-running-the-asylum%2Fnews-story%2F14aede7c4f77ab9a0b2c6395db9fe37b&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupb-control-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

Meijer, I. C. (2010). Democratizing journalism?: Realizing the citizen's agenda for local news media. *Journalism Studies*, *11*(3), 327–342. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700903500256

Miller, G. (2015, December 11). Human rights must be promoted. *Manawatu Standard*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade. (n.d.). *Things to consider*. New Zealand Government. https://www.mfat.govt.nz/en/countries-and-regions/australia-and-pacific/australia/new-zealand-high-commission-to-australia/living-in-australia/moving-to-australia/things-to-consider/

Moir, J. (2015, October 19). Kiwis detained on Christmas Island should come home tomorrow—Key. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/73168403/kiwis-detained-on-christmas-island-should-come-home-tomorrow---key

Morris, C. (2015, June 24). Murder devastates family. *Parramatta Advertiser*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Mudgal, R., & Rana, P. (2020). Future of print and e-newspaper in India: A critique. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*, *6*(5), 159–164. https://doi.org/10.36713/epra4457

Murdered teen's mum backs crim register. (2015, July 16). *The Timaru Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Nadkarni, A. (2015, September 13). Mum faces deportation after living 37 of 40 years in Australia. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/crime/71977410/mum-faces-deportation-after-living-37-of-40-years-in-australia

Napier-Raman, K. (2021, March 12). Dutton barks, New Zealand fumes, Australia shrugs. *Crikey*. https://www.crikey.com.au/2021/03/12/dutton-barks-new-zealand-fumes-australia-shrugs/

Neuendorf, K. A. (2017). *The content analysis guidebook* (2nd ed.). SAGE.

New Zealand Immigration. (2022.). *Australian resident visa: Visa details*. New Zealand Government, Ministry of Business, Innovation & Employment. https://www.immigration.govt.nz/new-zealand-visas/apply-for-a-visa/visa-factsheet/australian-resident-visa

New Zealand History. (2014, December 8). *British & Irish immigration, 1840-1914*. New Zealand *Government. https://nzhistory.govt.nz/culture/immigration/home-away-from-home/summary*

New Zealand Police Association. (2018, January 3). *Crime and banishment*. https://www.policeassn.org.nz/news/crime-and-banishment

Nichols, L. (2021, March 15). Gangs, Aussie deportees linked to surge in shootings. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

No Justification for Australia's appalling 501 deportations. (2021, March 17). *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/editorial-no-justification-for-australias-appalling-501-deportations/TCF2PGPHDDLODZJDT3Q3SCFKRE/

Nolan, M. (2015). Welfare limbo? Social welfare and citizenship debates about New Zealanders living in Australia. *Commonwealth & Comparative Politics*, *53*(3), 253–273. https://doi.org/10.1080/14662043.2015.1043689

Norington, B. (2018, March 2). Turnbull dismisses Ardern call to stop deporting Kiwi criminals. *The Australian*. https://www.theaustralian.com.au/subscribe/news/1/?sourceCode=TAWEB_WRE170_a_GGL&dest=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.theaustralian.com.au%2Fnational-affairs%2Fforeign-affairs%2Fturnbull-dismisses-ardern-call-to-stop-deporting-kiwi-criminals%2Fnews-story%2F4983765551d7aa371884731724f6404e&memtype=anonymous&mode=premium&v21=dynamic-groupa-test-noscore&V21spcbehaviour=append

NZ, Australia's junior Anzac partner. (2018, January 15). *Manawatu Standard*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

NZ: Deportation of youths a concern: Lawyer. (2018, July 18). *Australian Associated Press*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

NZ: Deportations of Kiwis "corrosive": NZ PM. (2019, February 22). *Australian Associated Press.* Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Opotow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of Social Issues*, *46*(1), 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb00268.x

Opotow, S., Gerson, J., & Woodside, S. (2005). From moral exclusion to moral inclusion: Theory for teaching peace. *Theory into Practice*, *44*(4), 303–318. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4404_4

Origins. (2017). *Immigration History from New Zealand to Victoria*. Museums Victoria. https://origins.museumsvictoria.com.au/countries/new-zealand/

Owens, J. (2015, September 28). Morrison backs deportations policy. *The Australian*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Parliament of Australia (2020, March 13). *New Zealanders in Australia: A quick guide*. https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/pubs/rp/rp1617/Quick_Guides/NZAust

Parliament of Australia (n.d). *Power of the minister to cancel a person's visa on public health grounds.*

https://www.aph.gov.au/About_Parliament/Parliamentary_Departments/Parliamentary_Library/FlagPost/2022/January/Migration_Act_-_Visa_Cancellation#:~:text=Section%20116%20of%20the%20Act%20provides%20for%20a%20number%20of,)(a)%20and%20(b))

Phillips, J. (2015, August 1). *History of immigration*. Te Ara, New Zealand Government. https://teara.govt.nz/en/history-of-immigration

Phillips, J. (2015, August 1). *History of immigration*. Te Ara, New Zealand Government. https://teara.govt.nz/en/artwork/2102/arrivals-and-departures

Pledge to investigate jailed Kiwi's death. (2015, September 30). *The Timaru Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Plumb, S. (2015, October 18). Oz dumps tetraplegic. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

PM Ardern blames 501s for gun violence. (2021, March 16). *The Northern Advocate*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

PM won't intervene over island riot. (2015, October 11). *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Powell, R., Weber, L., & Pickering, S. (2013). Counting and accounting for deaths in Australian immigration custody. *Homicide Studies, 17*(4), 391–417. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088767913501078

Probyn, A. (2015, October 14). NZ criminals pose a test for Turnbull. *The West Australian*.

Public backs tracking of violent crims. (2015, February 16). *Manawatu Standard*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Remeikis, A., Roy, E. A., & Jong, E. de. (2019, February 22). Jacinda Ardern tells Scott Morrison Australia's deportation policy "corrosive." *The Guardian*. https://www.theguardian.com/australia-news/2019/feb/22/jacinda-ardern-tells-scott-morrison-australias-deportation-policy-corrosive

Rogers, E. M. (1999). Georg Simmel's concept of the stranger and intercultural communication research. *Communication Theory, 9*(1), 58–74. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00162.x

Sachdeva, S., & Hatch, P. (2015, November 14). Detainees "cut off" from world: MP. *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Safdar, S., & Van de Vijver, F. J. R. (2019). Acculturation and its application: A conceptual review and analysis. In K. C. O'Doherty & D. Hodgetts (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of applied social psychology* (pp. 2–22). SAGE. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781526417091

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. SAGE.

Senator firm on NZ detainee issue. (2015, November 14). *Australian Associated Press.*

Silverstone, R. (1999). *Why study the media?* SAGE.

Silverstone, R. (2007). *Media and morality: On the rise of the mediapolis*. Polity.

Simmel, G. (2016). The stranger. *In Social Theory Re-Wired* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Skipwith, D. (2015, December 18). Australian government clears Packer to resume NRL career with Dragons. *New Zealand Herald*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Stanley, E. (2018). Expanding crimmigration: The detention and deportation of New Zealanders from Australia. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Criminology*, *51*(4), 519–536. https://doi.org/10.1177/0004865817730858

StatsNZ. (2018, August 14). *Migration drives high population growth*. New Zealand Government. https://www.stats.govt.nz/news/migration-drives-high-population-growth

Stumpf, J., & Inda, J. X. (Eds.). (2006). 2. The crimmigration crisis: Immigrants, crime, and sovereign power. *Governing Immigration Through Crime*, *56*(2), 367–419. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804785419-004

Survivor: Christmas Island. (2015, October 11). *Stuff.* Retrieved from Newztext library database.

The Migration Amendment (Strengthening the Character Test) Bill 2019

Thomson, J. B., (Eds.). (1991). *Language and Symbolic Power*. Harvard University Press

Trans-Tasman info sharing deal signed. (2015, September 30). *AAP Bulletins*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Trash talk just plain rubbish. (2021, March 13). *Taranaki Daily News*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Treacy, A. (2021, March 18). Sick paedophile jailed for molesting four young girls. *Albert & LoganNews*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Trevett, C., & Pearse, A. (2022). 501 deportees and the risk to NZ public: Police reveal overload; sex offenders housed near schools. *New Zealand Herald*. https://www.nzherald.co.nz/nz/police-reports-reveal-fear-of-501-deportee-overload-and-risk-to-public-safety/MBFXGFDIBRB47CKIUVNVAE2B7I/

United Nations. (n.d.-a). *Migration*. https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/migration

United Nations. (n.d.). *Universal declaration of human rights*. https://www.un.org/en/about-us/universal-declaration-of-human-rights

United Nations. (2017). *International migration policies* [Data set]. international_migration_policies_data_booklet.pdf (un.org)

United Nations looking at human rights record just hours after riot. (2015, November 10). *The Gympie Times*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

US Immigration and Customs Enforcement. (2021, May 12). *ICE statistics*. https://www.ice.gov/remove/statistics

Vance, A. (2021a, March 15). Kiwi teenager first minor to be deported to New Zealand from Australia. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/300253182/kiwi-teenager-first-minor-to-be-deported-to-new-zealand-from-australia

Vance, A. (2021b, March 16). New Zealand refused to call out Australia at UN over deportees. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/124561763/new-zealand-refused-to-call-out-australia-at-un-over-deportees

Visentin, L. (2015a, September 27). From juvie to supermax to despair. *The Sydney Morning Herald*. https://www.smh.com.au/interactive/2015/junior-togatuki/

Vissentin, L. (2015b, September 27). The sad life and death of Junior Togatuki. *Sun Herald*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Vissentin, L. (2015c, September 27). Tragic puzzle of how Junior Togatuki killed himself in jail. *Stuff*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

von Werthern, M., Robjant, K., Chui, Z., Schon, R., Ottisova, L., Mason, C., & Katona, C. (2018). The impact of immigration detention on mental health: A systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry*, *18*(1), Article 382. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-018-1945-y

Walters, L. (2018, February 23). Nearly half of deportees reoffend. *The Dominion Post*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.

Watkins, T. (2015, September 29). Australia pledges to investigate death of Junior Togatuki in jail cell. *Stuff*. https://www.stuff.co.nz/national/politics/72501290/australia-pledges-to-investigate-death-of-junior-togatuki-in-jail-cell

We won't cower, Dutton says of deportation. (2015, November 9). *AAP Bulletins*. Retrieved from Factiva library database.

Wilson, J. (2005, February 8). *Māori arrival and settlement*. Te Ara, New Zealand Government. https://teara.govt.nz/en/history/page-1

Yaxley, L. (2018, March 2). Jacinda Ardern pressures Australia not to deport Kiwis if they have never set foot in New Zealand. *Australian Broadcasting Corporation News*. https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-03-02/jacinda-ardern-asks-australia-not-to-deport-kiwi-citizens/9501924

Young Kiwi in detention centre. (2018, January 6). *The Press*. Retrieved from Newztext library database.