



# RE M I N D E R

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS  
IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

## Language Use and Migration: Discursive Representations of Migrants in European Media in Times of Crisis

### WORKING PAPER

**Authors:** Sebastian Galyga  
Jakob-Moritz Eberl  
Fabienne Lind  
Tobias Heidenreich  
Hajo G. Boomgaarden  
Beatriz Herrero Jiménez  
Rosa Berganza

**Published:** September 2019



universität  
wien



Universidad  
Rey Juan Carlos



## REMINDER

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS  
IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

### **Language Use and Migration: Discursive Representations of Migrants in European Media in Times of Crisis**

Authors: Sebastian Galyga<sup>1</sup>, Jakob-Moritz Eberl<sup>1</sup>, Fabienne Lind<sup>1</sup>,  
Tobias Heidenreich<sup>1</sup>, Hajo G. Boomgaarden<sup>1</sup>, Beatriz Herrero Jiménez<sup>2</sup>, Rosa Berganza<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Vienna

<sup>2</sup> Universidad Rey Juan Carlos

Submitted: August 2019

Paper prepared as part of the REMINDER project

**[www.reminder-project.eu](http://www.reminder-project.eu)**

Correspondence address:

Jakob-Moritz Eberl, University of Vienna, Department of Communication  
Rathausstraße 19, 1010 Vienna, Austria, Mail: [jakob-moritz.eberl@univie.ac.at](mailto:jakob-moritz.eberl@univie.ac.at)



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020  
research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 727072

## Executive Summary

---

The goal of this working paper is to investigate the discursive representation of migrants in European media. It intends to illustrate the social inequalities and structures of discrimination against migrant minorities inherent to the migration discourse and (re)produced through language use. The paper is aimed at researchers in the field of quantitative as well as qualitative social sciences, as it follows a mixed-method approach, combining computational and critical approaches to media texts. We focus on the concept of linguistic modifiers and semantic surroundings to capture the language use employed in the discursive construction of migrants in five European countries – Spain, the United Kingdom, Germany, Sweden, and Hungary.

In the paper, we tackle three main gaps in existing work: (i) a lack of comparative studies dealing with European migration media discourses; (ii) insufficient evidence on differences in the representations of various migrant groups (intra- and extra-European migrants); (iii) insufficient longitudinal analyses that include both routine and crisis periods.

Based on our key findings on linguistic patterns regarding the discursive representation – and therefore (re)produced inequalities – of Eastern European as well as Middle Eastern migrants in European media coverage, we urge future research to continue this endeavor of studying discourse on a comparative level, especially in the European context. Furthermore, we advise journalists and policy makers to ensure language is used responsibly in migration coverage as they are elite actors who exhibit high levels of power and agency that will impact citizens' social representations of migrants.



---

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction .....	3
Language Use in Migration Discourse .....	7
The discourse-analytical approach .....	7
Power and prejudice .....	9
Migration discourse .....	10
Data and Methods .....	13
Text Copora .....	13
Linguistic Analysis with Multilingual Data .....	18
Corpus Linguistics.....	19
Results.....	20
Semantic Surroundings .....	20
Modifiers .....	24
Discussion.....	29
Literature .....	35

## Introduction

---

The free movement of persons is one of the “four freedoms” at the core of the European Single Market within the European Union (EU) and the European Economic Area (EEA)<sup>1</sup>. As stated in the Citizens’ Rights Directive 2004/38/EC, “Citizenship of the Union confers on every citizen of the Union a primary and individual right to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States” (European Parliament, Council of the European Union, 2004, p. 1). Since the directive came into force, every EU citizen, as well as citizens of EEA states, can freely cross borders between member states in order to travel to or seek work or residence in another state. The implementation of the right to free movement significantly furthered European integration, since, together with the Schengen agreement,<sup>2</sup> it removed physical borders between member states, making borders a quasi-foreign concept to many EU citizens. In fact, a majority of EU citizens rate this to be the most positive achievement of the EU (Commission of the European Communities, 2017).

However, in recent years free movement, and migration more generally, have become subjects of criticism and heated debates. Fueled by the so called “refugee crisis” of 2015 (from here on simply referred to as refugee crisis) that caught the European countries off guard (Niemann & Zaun, 2018) and the management of the crisis, immigration from outside the EU is discussed in both in politics and media alike. But also, regarding migration within the EU, the principle of free movement is being questioned with respect to its sustainability for European welfare systems and the labor market (Ruhs, 2015; Ruhs, 2017). Some scholars even argue that media discourse and public perception of intra-European migration may have paved the way for the Brexit referendum in 2016 and the subsequent decision of Great Britain to leave the EU (Hobolt, 2016). However, there is evidence that, during the Brexit campaign, media discourse about intra-European migration was strongly

---

<sup>1</sup> The EEA Agreement of 1992 enabled the extension of the European Single Market to non-EU member states. As of today, that includes Iceland, Liechtenstein and Norway. Switzerland, while not a member of the EEA, is also able to partake in the European single market due to multiple bilateral agreements.

<sup>2</sup> Note that, while not all EU members are part of the Schengen area and vice versa, there is a large overlap between the two groups. From here on, these states are implicitly included when referring the EU, EU-Citizens, migration within/into the EU or Europe, etc.



intertwined with coverage about the refugee crisis, resulting in a more negative portrayal of intra-European migration than usual (Walter, 2019). It thus seems vital to focus further analysis on these two processes – intra-European labour migration and extra-European immigration – and the respective representation of these groups of migrants in the media, especially in contexts of perceived crisis.

The underlying assumption here is that such representations in the media matter, influencing the formation of public opinion and eventually electoral decisions. It also stands to reason that, despite increasing fragmentation of the electorate and the media landscape (Mancini, 2013), media is the most important link between politics and citizens (Walgrave & De Swert, 2007). In fact, the media plays multiple roles in the political process. Traditionally, it is regarded as constituting the most important space for public discourse and enabling the formation and voicing of public opinion (Habermas, 1991). Furthermore, the media functions as a platform or arena for political actors to present and make a name for themselves (Van Aelst & Walgrave, 2016). Lastly, the media appears to be the most influential source of information on policy for many citizens. This appears to be especially true regarding EU policy (Boomgaarden & Vliegenthart, 2009; Boomgaarden, Vliegenthart, de Vreese, & Schuck 2010), with media coverage of EU policy issues significantly influencing attitudes towards the EU (van Spanje & de Vreese, 2014) and support for EU enlargement (Schuck & de Vreese, 2006; de Vreese & Boomgaarden, 2006; Maier & Rittberger, 2008).

But not only does the media influence perceptions and attitudes regarding issues, it also influences the public perception of individual actors or groups of actors (Eberl et al. 2018). As is commonly argued in critical discourse analysis, when investigating the role of actors in discourse it is important to consider the power dynamics affecting said actors (van Dijk, 2015); that is, to consider how the actor's position of power impacts upon his or her agency within the discourse. Elite actors such as politicians exhibit high levels of power and agency in participating in and shaping the discourse and their representation within it. On the other hand, minority groups possess less power, and thus are less able to enact agency and influence their own representation. Migrants, such as refugees and labour immigrants, can be seen as such a powerless minority group with regards to the host country's media discourse (Wodak, 2008). Arguably, for such groups, media effects – stemming from their



representation in discourse – are even more important, as they might be the prime influence on how a host society will perceive them.

Yet, especially regarding the portrayal of migrants, it has been established that the media often reproduces negative stereotypes of migrants and foreigners and perpetuates racism (Krzyżanowski & Wodak, 2017; van Dijk, 1989). Furthermore, it has been shown that it is not only the content of media coverage, but also the language used, that facilitates a prejudiced perception of migrants (Geschke, Sassenberg, Ruhrmann, & Sommer, 2010). Therefore, the linguistic modalities that are used to construct these representations are of interest (van Dijk, 1989). However, when examining migration in the media, many studies in communication science tend not to differentiate sufficiently between different groups of migrants. For example, little is known about intra-European migrants and how the manner in which they are represented compares to other kinds of migrants (although see Balch & Balabanova, 2016; Eberl, et al. 2019). There is also a general lack of comparative studies when it comes to migration in the media (Eberl et al., 2018). However, there are some first studies exploring especially the impact of the refugee crisis on European political and media systems (see e.g. Holmes, & Castañeda, 2016; Krzyżanowski, 2018; Kallius, Monterescu, & Rajaram, 2016), yet those mostly focus on individual countries. Furthermore, while specific events or crises, such as the refugee crisis, may be of particular interest when studying migration discourses, comparisons with, or studies of, so-called “routine periods” are equally if not more important for our understanding of media representation of migrants, as they signify the norm (Peter & de Vreese, 2004). In line with this, Georgiou & Zaborowski (2017) observe a shift towards negative, suspicious or even hostile responses towards arriving refugees throughout European media with regards to the refugee crisis.

In previous research for Work Package 8 of the REMINDER project, we took a more global –thus more aggregated – perspective on discourse and analyzed the framing and sentiment of migration coverage in particular (Eberl et al., 2019). However, this global perspective arguably only captures some aspects of discourse, as the “study of discourse meaning or content may take place at the local level of words and sentences, and on the global level of topics or themes” (van Dijk, 1989). And while a global perspective gives insight into the overall picture of discourse, it remains abstract and lacks detail. Therefore, our main objec-

tive in this paper is to map media discourses on migration in Europe on a more granular level, following a corpus linguistic approach that takes a look at migration discourses on a linguistic level (i.e., the analysis of words and their context). Considering the above-stated limitations of previous research in this area, we thus pose the following Research Question (RQ) and Sub-Research Questions (SRQ):

*RQ1: How are migrants represented in the migration discourse in European media?*

*SRQ1: How do media representations of intra-European migrants differ from media representations of other migrant groups?*

*SRQ2: How do media representations of these migrant groups differ between countries?*

*SRQ3: How do media representations of these migrant groups differ between routine and crisis periods?*

To investigate these questions, we take a discourse analytical approach, and focus on linguistic constructions of representation of migrants. In particular, we look at the representation of Eastern European migrants on the one side and of Middle Eastern migrants on the other. In order to capture the specific aspects of the language used in the discourse on migration, we apply corpus linguistic techniques (Hardt-Mautner, 1995; Baker et al., 2008) to mass media texts. More specifically, we look at the most common modifiers as well as the semantic surroundings of terms applied to migrants in the media and compare between (a) migrant groups, (b) countries, and (c) routine and crisis periods. Modifiers are direct attributions in the form of adjectives, and thus arguably are the most direct linguistic manifestation of certain evaluations and prejudices. The semantic surrounding is accessed via the most common nouns in the context of migrant terms. The texts in our corpus, described in more detail below, originate from Spanish, English, German, Swedish, and Hungarian media sources. The corpus is thus multilingual in nature. We review and discuss the applicability of linguistic analyses in the method section below.





This deliverable consists of three main parts:

- Part 1: A systematic review of (discourse-analytical) literature on language use in (migration) discourse.
- Part 2: A description and review of the corpus linguistic methodology and its applicability to the data.
- Part 3: The application of the analyses and interpretation of their results.

## **Language Use in Migration Discourse**

---

### ***The discourse-analytical approach***

The discourse-analytical approach has been established as a viable addition to the more quantitative forms of content analysis that dominate the extended body of communication research (van Dijk, 2002). The traditional, quantitative content analytical approach to media data can yield important insights into the *global* structure of discourse by analyzing e.g. salience and sentiment of certain phenomena, topics, and/or actors. We implemented such analyses in prior steps of this Work Package, and showed for example that the coverage in several countries exhibits strong shifts in visibility and sentiment with the onset of the refugee crisis (Eberl et al., 2019). Yet, while occurrence and valence of topics and frames are significant factors in the shaping of public opinion (Walgrave & de Swert, 2007), these are, as mentioned above, global aspects of discourse, concerned with more aggregate and abstract concepts. *Local* aspects, on the level of words and sentences, are another very important facet of discourse that is often neglected in favor of quantitative studies on global aspects (van Dijk, 1989). This is especially true for automated quantitative, so-called “bag of word” approaches that explicitly neglect aspects of language such as syntax, grammar, and generally the order of words. Yet, such local linguistic aspects can hold very important meaning when processed by human readers and may equally affect their beliefs about and options towards the objects of the text (e.g. van Dijk & Kintsch, 1983; Graesser, Millis, & Zwaan, 1997).

Critical analysis in this sense is less a method than a theoretical framework within which a variety of methodological approaches from different fields of research might be



employed. Anthropological as much as historical or linguistic methods might serve the aim of investigating the structures of power and prejudice in a society, which are reflected in the discursive text under study. These complex cultural and structural phenomena inevitably manifest in discourse. Therefore, critical analysis considers texts only as existing within intertextual contexts (van Dijk, 2001, 2008). According to Wodak (2000) such non-linguistic and extra-textual features of discourse must be considered by critical analysis. She argues that, not only do such features form the context for the creation of discursive text, but the texts themselves have to be understood within the contexts of the participants and audience of the discourse as well.

Linguistics is an important tool for critical analysis, as language is not only the most granular but also the most direct manifestation of the underlying structures of power and prejudice that are to be investigated. As Baker and colleagues (2008) put it, from the perspective of critical discourse analysis, language on its own is not powerful but only “gains power by the use people make of it and by the people who have access to language means and public fora” (ibid, p. 280). However, an analytical approach to discourse does not aim to quantify these underlying power dynamics but to understand them in a more qualitative manner, and to make them visible. That is to say, it is the goal to work out the latent, contextual factors implied in discourse, as manifested in media texts. To put it simply, while approaches such as the manual coding of tone or automated sentiment analysis tools can yield great insights into how negative and perhaps biased media coverage is (see Eberl, Boomgaarden, & Wagner, 2017), it still leaves us uninformed as to what textual structures actually cause such a bias, how this bias is (re-)produced through style and language – what is actually being said and, thus, what is being read, understood and (re-)produced once more.

In comparison to the understanding of critical analysis as a very broad framework for research outlined above, in the present paper we apply a somewhat narrower version of critical analysis, and primarily focus on corpus linguistic methodology to analyze the data in our sample. The combination of corpus linguistic methodology and critical analysis frameworks has been shown to be a good match in prior research (Baker et al, 2008), and will be discussed in more detail in a following section.



## ***Power and prejudice***

A great amount of research has investigated language as a key manifestation of the above-mentioned power dynamics that are enacted through discursive practices. That is to say, not just the topics that receive attention in the media but also the “quality” of the attention they receive is important, especially as regards migration discourse. For example, the language of respective media representations was found to be adopted by the audience when speaking about migrants (Fernández et al., 2013). This appears especially problematic when considering that it has consistently been shown that the media reproduce and perpetuate certain (negative) stereotypes and prejudices about migrants and foreigners (Eberl et al., 2018; Wodak & Reisigl, 2003). Such stereotypes serve as a basis for and foster racism (Quasthoff, 1989) and arguably constitute a mechanism to enact discursive power against the stereotyped minority groups.

Regarding the concepts of power and prejudice, van Dijk (2013) lists seven main aspects to be considered for the theoretical framework of the critical study of discourse. He states that (1) power is dependent upon social relations between individuals or groups, as social power. This social power can be understood as (2) the degree of control a certain actor is able to exercise over others and thus limit “the freedom of action of the others, or influenc[e] their knowledge, attitudes or ideologies” (van Dijk, 2013, p. 84). If unequally distributed among different actors, (3) there exist certain centers of power with elite actors controlling these centers. (4) The abuse of power is called dominance and often creates social inequality. The origin of power itself also (5) depends upon an unequal distribution of certain resources that might give an actor an advantage over others with regards to participation in public discourse. Both power and dominance can often be found (6) reproduced in institutionalized manifestations. (7) Dominance is not absolute but is a gradual phenomenon.

The inequality of power is especially relevant to media discourses about minorities as it is generally even more difficult for minority journalists to get access to leading influential media (van Dijk 2001, 2008). That is to say, the migration discourse is the prime example of an “elite discourse” (van Dijk, 2008). Almost exclusively, members of the in-group, the journalists and editors belonging to the majority group of the host country, hold power,



while the object of the discourse, the migrants, do not. Hence, the power in minority discourses lies almost completely with the majority group creating the discursive representation of the minority without the minority's influence. Accordingly, the representation of migrants is passive in nature. On the one hand, migrants themselves do not appear as active voices in the media but are primarily spoken about (Kluknavská, Bernhard, & Boomgaarden, 2019) they do not appear as actors but as objects. On the other hand, the discourse is not directed at the migrant actors, but at other members of the dominant group, hence further reinforcing the abovementioned power dynamic to enact discrimination against the minority group (van Dijk 2013, 2015).

Van Dijk (1984) further differentiates seven different mechanisms of discrimination in discourse – dominance, differentiation, distance, diffusion, diversion, depersonalization and destruction – that serve to create and legitimize the “otherness” in the minority out-group and thus work to justify the discrimination in discourse and subsequently in the real world. In short, minorities are represented in discourse via the construction of some kind of ethnically different “other”. Besides this “othering”, van Dijk (2015) identifies two other characteristics of racist, discriminatory discourse: firstly, a focus on how the behavior of the out-group, the “othered” minority, diverges from that of the in-group, and second, a framing of minorities as a threat.

### ***Migration discourse***

As discussed previously, representations of migrants are created, and hence power dynamics translated and reproduced, through language. It is common in the study of discourse on migration to focus on the (linguistic) modification of so called RASIM terms, an acronym of refugees, asylum seekers, and immigrants (Baker et al., 2008; KhosraviNik, Krzyżanowski, & Wodak, 2012). The power discrepancy manifests in a biased language, and thus in a biased way of speaking about different groups.

It is such “biased style”, as opposed to the common notion of biased content, that marks a linguistic inter-group-bias in discourse. While content refers to the things that are said and written, style means the way in which those things are talked and written about. For example, it has been argued that the abstractness of language signals a higher level of



stability when referring to certain behaviors. Differently said, a certain behavior of a person or a group is perceived as being more stable and unchangeable – therefore inherent to that person or group –, the more abstract the manner in which it is described. Subsequently media reporting adopts more abstract language when discussing positive behavior of members of the majority in-group than when discussing similar behavior of members of the minority out-group – and vice versa less abstract language is used when reporting about negative behavior of in-group members than when reporting about similar behavior of out-group members (Geschke, et al., 2010). “Abstract”, here, signifies a quality of the language itself. Based on the Linguistic Category Model (Semin & Fiedler, 1991), words themselves can be understood as varying in abstractness with certain verbs being very concrete and purely descriptive, and others already interpretive, this connoting further information that exceeds the scope of the word in its purely textual context.<sup>3</sup> In the original form of the Linguistic Category Model, adjectives were categorized as being the most abstract, while later publications also added nouns as being even more abstract (Carnaghi et al., 2008). Migrant actors undergo a similar discursive modification in news reports about crime. Here, additionally to the use of abstract language, minorities are often portrayed in a collective manner. While members of the in-group who allegedly committed a crime seem to be relatively individualized, viewed as individual alleged perpetrators, members of the “othered” out-group seem to be rather collectivized, viewed as belonging to said group with references to their origins, their nationality or their ethnicity (Jäger et al., 1998). The constructed representation thus further perpetuates and fosters a certain stereotype by insinuating and/or emphasizing how (supposedly and discriminatingly) the characteristic as member of the out-group “caused” the alleged perpetration, while only individual and personal factors were responsible on the side of the in-group member. When for example a reference to the ethnicity of an alleged perpetrator is made in the news, this in turn increases the audiences’ threat perception of people of said ethnicity in general (Arendt, 2017).

---

<sup>3</sup> To give a more concrete example: An act of physical violence might be described in very different ways. For example, saying that a person “kicked” someone can be considered as a concrete, purely descriptive account of the situation. Using the verb “attack” on the other hand, adds additional interpretative meaning to it. Further describing the person as “aggressive” or even an “attacker” can be seen as increasingly abstract and thus as a stable trait that is inadvertently part of the described person.



With regards to language, another relevant aspect of discourse is certain semantic units that hold a major function and form collective understandings of certain phenomena. More precisely, significant research has been done into the discursive working of metaphors and symbols. Such symbols constitute another in-group reaffirmation mechanism, unifying in-group members who share a common understanding of said symbols and, more importantly, further excluding and “othering” those who do not, and who may even be the objects of such collective symbols and metaphorical understandings (Krzyżanowski & Wodak, 2017). Reisigl and Wodak (2005, p. 26) explain and illustrate this as follows:

Water, natural disasters like avalanches and flood disasters, military activities like invasions, all persuasively representing immigration or migrants as something that has to be ‘dammed’, are examples of collective symbols, just as the ‘ship’ metaphor symbolises the effects of immigration as an ‘overcrowded boat’, and the ‘house-and-door’ metaphor symbolises the ingroup’s (e.g. ‘national’) territory as a house or building and the stopping of immigration as ‘bolting the door’.

Such semantic surroundings clearly further fuel the above-described discrimination. They combine the effects of othering, portraying the other only by referring to collective aspects of the group. It can be seen as a linguistic threat-framing. Migrants are not explicitly called a threat, but are framed as such through the use of the above-described semantic units – metaphors and symbols (see also El Rafeie, 2001). In the present paper, these semantic surroundings are captured by our focus on co-occurring nouns that form the field of words that commonly appear together in coverage of migrants.

Yet, such semantic ascriptions might even be more explicit when directed not at specific actors, but at the broader phenomenon of “migration”. Some of the most direct linguistic mechanisms in constructing a representation in discourse are modifiers of the object or the actor in question. Modifiers are “words that describe, characterize, or intensify” (Allen, 2016, p. 7) the object they are modifying and carry very immediate attributions towards and evaluations of the object or actor, e.g. “*illegal* migrants”. Allen (2016) finds that the five most common modifiers of “migration” in the British press are “mass”, “net”, “illegal”, “European”, and “uncontrolled” – with the first three making up over forty percent of all modifiers. With the exception of “European”, these words very directly emphasize the abstract or threatening aspects of “the others” – “net” of course being abstract but arguably rather



neutral compared to the others. Such direct attributions through modifiers are particularly important considering the nature of the migration discourse and its power dynamics as outlined above. Almost exclusively elite, those who are able to take part in the discourse are members of the in-group, with the discourse being *about* migrants. These linguistic modifications in media texts represent a strong manifestation of underlying power dynamics, thus shaping public representations of migrants.

## Data and Methods

---

The following analyses are based on a multilingual corpus of mass media texts from five member states of the European Union between January 1, 2013, and December 31, 2016. The data has been collected and analyzed within the REMINDER project. The media texts originated from Spanish, English, German, Swedish, and Hungarian media sources, both online and print. This selection of countries well reflects migration discourses across Europe, as the sample comprises a Southern, Western, Northern and Central European countries that received high numbers of refugees in 2015, and an Eastern European country.

Baker and colleagues (2008) note that discourse-analytical studies are often criticized for a strong selection bias in their data. It is frequently argued that the data chosen was not representative, but instead comprised of extraordinary cases selected in order to serve the interests of the researcher. By including a routine and a crisis period in our analysis, as well as adopting a broad approach in terms of the country and media sample, we are convinced that we do not run the risks described above.

### ***Text Corpora***

The media data used in this analysis was collected using several media archives, namely, *APA DeFacto*, *EMIS*, *LexisNexis* and *Webretriever*. Since our analyses focus on media coverage of migration, we preselected relevant news articles using appropriate keywords for each country and language. The Boolean search strings used for this procedure were designed to capture any article that relates to the topic of immigration, emigration, general migration and freedom of movement (see Table 1). The search strings were developed and validated with the help of five native speakers, one per language. Their average Recall and Precision

scores were  $R = 0.84$  and  $P = 0.90$ , respectively, and therefore represent an appropriate tool for the identification of migration related news articles.

*Table 1. Boolean search strings used for retrieval of migration-related news articles*

Country	Language	Search string
Spain	Spanish	asilo* OR inmigra* OR refugiad* OR migrante* OR migratori* OR "sin papeles" OR "campo de desplazados" OR patera* OR emigra* OR "libre circulación" OR "fuga de cerebros"
UK	English	asyl* OR immigrant* OR immigrat* OR migrant* OR migrat* OR refugee* OR foreigner* OR "undocumented worker*" OR "guest worker*" OR "foreign worker*" OR emigrat* OR "freedom of movement" OR "free movement"
Germany	German	asyl* OR immigrant* OR immigriert* OR immigrat* OR migrant* OR migrat* OR flüchtling* OR ausländer* OR zuwander* OR zugewander* OR einwander* OR eingewander* OR gastarbeiter* OR "ausländische arbeitnehmer*" OR emigr* OR auswander* OR ausgewander* OR personenfreizügigkeit* OR arbeitnehmerfreizügigkeit* OR "freier personenverkehr"
Sweden	Swedish	asyl* OR invandr* OR migrat* OR migrant* OR flykting* OR utlänning* OR immigrant* OR ensamkommande* OR EU-migrant* OR "utländsk bakgrund" OR gästarbetar* OR "utländsk* arbet*" OR papperslös* OR emigr* OR utvandr* OR "fri rörlighet"
Hungary	Hungarian	menedék* OR bevándor* OR immigrá* OR migrá* OR menekült* OR vendégmunk* OR elvándor* OR emmigrá* OR mozgásszabadság*

*Note:* The search strings, and correspondingly the news articles, are in the most-widely spoken language for each country (e.g., not Catalan, Basque or Galician, but Spanish for Spain).

Concerning the selection of the individual media outlets in each country, we reduced any further sampling bias by taking into consideration the variability of each country's media landscape. We thus included – whenever possible – the most important newspapers in each country, and tried to cover quality newspapers and tabloids alike, and left-leaning as well as conservative outlets. We tried to have as complete a picture of the discursive variability in each country as possible within the limitations of data and resource constraints.



The media selection therefore includes a diverse set of 28 European media outlets. For Spain, it contains the three highest circulating daily newspapers, the relatively center-left *El País*, the center-right *El Mundo del Siglo Veintiuno* (hereafter *El Mundo*), and the conservative national daily *ABC*. For the United Kingdom, it includes the tabloids *Daily Mail* and *Daily Mirror* (online & print) and the broadsheets *The Daily Telegraph* (online & print) and *The Guardian*. On both levels of quality, broadsheet and tabloid, this selection mirrors the British political environment, with *Daily Mail* and *The Daily Telegraph* leaning to the right and traditionally supporting the Conservative Party, and *Daily Mirror* and *The Guardian* leaning to the left and traditionally supporting the Labour Party. We furthermore included the free daily tabloid newspaper *Metro*, which has the highest circulation in the UK. For Germany, the selection includes the supraregional daily *Frankfurter Rundschau*, the national daily *Die Tageszeitung* (commonly shortened to *taz*), the *Süddeutsche Zeitung* and *spiegel.de*, which is the online version of the national weekly *Der Spiegel*. All four outlets are relatively left leaning, with *spiegel.de* being center-left, the *Frankfurter Rundschau* more social-democratic, *Süddeutsche* being a center-left broadsheet and *taz* progressive left. We also have the online version of the center-right *Welt* (*welt.de*) and the online version of the weekly *Die Zeit* (*zeit.de*). We also added the tabloid *Bild*, the highest-circulating newspaper in Germany. For Sweden, the corpus contains the two daily newspapers *Svenska Dagbladet* and *Dagens Nyheter*, and the two daily evening newspapers *Aftonbladet* and *Expressen*. Regarding their political leaning, both *Dagens Nyheter* and *Expressen* are independent liberal, while *Aftonbladet* describes itself as independent social-democrat and *Svenska Dagbladet* is center-right. For Hungary, we have the conservative daily broadsheet newspaper *Magyar Hírlap* and its online outlet *magyarhirlap.hu*, the national conservative daily newspaper *Magyar Idők*, which are all closely associated with the Fidesz party, as well as the left-wing daily broadsheet *Nepszabadság*, and the social-democratic left-wing daily *Nepszava*. We also added *blikk.hu*, the online outlet of the daily tabloid *Blikk*, the left-leaning *napi.hu*, and the liberal left *24.hu*.

This procedure resulted in a total of 426,070 articles. In order to eliminate duplicate articles that may arise due to faulty archiving, regional mutations of news outlets, or archiving of minimally-edited articles, a deduplication procedure was applied. While it is fairly



easy to exclude exact replications of an article, dealing with slightly altered news items requires additional efforts. To detect highly similar texts (e.g., Pouliquen, Steinberger, Ignat, Käsper, & Temnikova, 2004), we relied on the frequently used cosine similarity measure. Comparing the textual content of two articles, this measure indicates and predicts their resemblance. Whenever an article exceeded such manually predefined and language specific thresholds,<sup>4</sup> the shorter version of the article was excluded. With this step of deduplication, the total number of articles was reduced to 346,518 (see Table 2 for more details), which in turn represents what we would define as the broader migration discourse in the selected European media.

Table 2. Number of articles, paragraphs, sentences, words per corpus

Country	Complete Corpus			
	Articles	Paragraphs	Sentences	Words
Spain	29,184	368,246	1,224,699	18,695,839
United Kingdom	87,494	2,681,010	4,992,933	75,207,787
Germany	145,504	2,067,012	7,069,817	86,207,125
Sweden	38,937	129,288	1,758,804	24,057,263
Hungary	45,399	363,320	1,301,970	21,700,232

As we are specifically interested in the discourse surrounding Eastern European and Middle Eastern migrants, we subsetting the data once more and filtered out texts irrelevant to our particular focus of analysis. We searched the full corpus for paragraphs containing these two characteristics:

1. The mention of individuals in the process or with a background of migration (e.g. migrants, immigrants or emigrants<sup>5</sup>).
2. The mention of words referring specifically to Eastern Europe or the Middle East.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Following a qualitative inspection of a sample of articles and their calculated cosine similarity, three of the authors determined country-specific thresholds (Spain: 0.98; UK: 0.96; Germany: 0.95; Sweden: 0.95; Hungary: 0.95).

<sup>5</sup> Please note that our sub-datasets include only very few mentions of “emigrants”.

To make as clear a distinction as possible, we thus only look at the linguistic modification of the term “migrants” in the different languages in our sample in combination with the annotated regions. For this second annotation we compiled a complete list of all countries and all possible variations of country-specific adjectives as well as names of the inhabitants, in all languages of our sample. Based on this list we automatically annotated whether the focus of a paragraph lies on (a) Eastern Europe<sup>7</sup>, (b) the Middle East, (c) another region or has no clear regional focus. Our final corpora only rely on paragraphs referring to migrants (and variants) from Eastern Europe or the Middle East (see Table 3 below for more details on the sub-corpora). We only included in our analysis paragraphs that either featured a reference to Eastern Europe while not mentioning the Middle East and vice versa. All paragraphs that contained the word “migrants” but either referenced both regions or neither of the two were excluded (see category (c) above). This decision was made in order to ensure any comparisons drawn were as clean cut as possible. Paragraphs that contain neither a reference to Eastern European nor to middle Eastern countries simple do not fit the content-related rationale of the analysis. And any paragraphs that do contain a reference to both at the same time would not allow for a clear comparison between the two migrant groups as it remains unclear who is actually referenced due to our methodology.

---

<sup>6</sup> Of course, people from Middle Eastern countries are not the only immigrants coming into the area of the EU that can be considered as a stigmatized minority group. Migrants from African states could also very well be considered here. However, our period of analysis focuses on the refugee crisis around 2015 when we saw a particular increase in immigration from Middle Eastern countries. Accordingly it can be expected that during that time these extra-European migrants are the most strongly “othered”.

<sup>7</sup> Please note that for the annotation of the regions in the Hungarian data we did not count Hungary as an eastern European country while in the other languages we did. It stands to reason that a reference within the discourse of a particular country to this country itself cannot be treated the same way as a mention of other countries.



Table 3. Number of relevant paragraphs, sentences, words per corpus and migrant group

Country	Region-specific corpus					
	Paragraphs		Sentences		Words	
	Eastern Euro	Middle East	Eastern Euro	Middle East	Eastern Euro	Middle East
<b>Spain</b>	4,604	14,497	37,524	134,493	793,358	2,935,294
<b>United Kingdom</b>	8,768	31,665	20,789	82,315	437,476	1,606,964
<b>Germany</b>	63,041	40,365	448,071	212,148	6,424,369	3,115,668
<b>Sweden</b>	4,831	9,511	210,972	372,614	3,056,368	5,435,648
<b>Hungary</b>	15,563	12,469	104,614	64,804	1,951,261	1,235,815

### *Linguistic Analysis with Multilingual Data*

There is a lack of systematic country comparative linguistic analysis of discourse on migration. Yet, especially with a topic such as migration which by definition always affects at least two countries, it seems vital to also investigate it “across borders”. Of course, the biggest obstruction to such a task is immediately apparent: multilingual data.

The discourse in each country manifests in the country’s respective language and thus the media texts in their natural form cannot be directly compared. Especially when the research team is not native in all relevant languages, translation will be required. However, while machine translation of complete corpora into one base language (e.g., English) might not be problematic when following a methodology based on bag-of-word approaches (de Vries, Schoonevelde & Schumacher, 2018), it is counter-productive for linguistic approaches that are interested in upholding the grammatical structures and syntax of sentences.

We thus decided to base the linguistic analyses of the present deliverable on the media data in their language of origin. To these texts we applied natural language processing in the form of part-of-speech (POS) tagging. POS tagging is a procedure which automatically analyses each word in a text in its context and assigns the word its morphosyntactic tag. That means that each word is recognized for the proper position and function it holds in the syntactic structure of a given sentence (Màrquez & Rodríguez, 1998). POS tagging thus allows linguistic analysis on large bodies of text data in an automated way. For the POS annotation we employed the UDpipe annotator (Straka & Straková, 2017) via its R-



package implementation (Wijffels, 2019). UDpipe is an automated tool for natural language processing and offers, besides POS tagging, tokenization, morphological analysis, and lemmatization, and is available for all the languages of the data in our corpus. For the purpose of the present analysis we mainly rely on the POS tagging for which UDpipe reaches accuracy values of 90 percent and higher in all the languages in our sample.<sup>8</sup>

Only in a final step, all modifiers, nouns and verbs were translated into English. In few cases, where translation was not possible or the correctness of translations was uncertain (e.g., because of extensive lemmatization), a qualitative inspection of the non-translated words in their context (i.e., sentences) was conducted to manually assess correct translations.

### ***Corpus Linguistics***

To analyze our data and subsequently answer the research questions, we apply corpus linguistic procedures within the critical analysis framework outlined above. As Baker and colleagues (2008) illustrate, the combination of these two approaches promises to be of great use especially for the critical analysis of rather big amounts of text. A common approach in the linguistic analysis of discourse is to focus on certain keywords and their context.

In the study of migration discourses, such keywords are often focused on RASIM terms (Baker et al., 2008; Reisigl & Wodak, 2005). Others have taken into consideration certain root words of migration (Bleich et al., 2018), or have focused on the coverage surrounding the word “migration” itself (Allen, 2016) thus also investigating the abstract phenomenon of migration in text.

We have subsetting our data on the basis of the terms “migrant”, “immigrant” and “emigrant”, in combination with regional cues referencing Eastern Europe or the Middle East. The main reason for the focus on Eastern European and Middle Eastern migrants is that these two groups arguably constitute the strongest “othered” appearance of migrants for the comparative analysis between countries (see Eberl et al. 2018). Focusing on these

---

<sup>8</sup> For detailed information on UDpipe and for a complete list of accuracy scores see Straka, Straková, & Hajic, 2014; Straka, Hajic, & Straková, 2016; Straka & Straková, 2017.



two groups further allows us to go into depth with our two main analyses based on a corpus linguistics approach:

(1) the comparison of the most common semantically surrounding *nouns* of the two migrant groups.

(2) the comparison of the most common direct *modifiers* of the two migrant groups

Both the analysis of the semantic surrounding and the analysis of the modifiers rely on the linguistic concept of collocation. Collocation refers to the probabilistic co-occurrence of lexical items; that is, to the co-occurrence of individual words directly. See the number of relevant nouns, modifiers per corpus and migrant group in Table 4 below.

Table 4. Final number of relevant modifiers and nouns per corpus and migrant group

Country	Region-specific corpus			
	Modifiers		Nouns	
	Eastern Euro	Middle East	Eastern Euro	Middle East
Spain	450	1,245	157,016	589,174
United Kingdom	1,023	1,386	96,317	354,234
Germany	1,999	1,305	1,333,130	618,962
Sweden	393	618	692,791	1,221,468
Hungary	992	595	497,104	319,384

## Results

### *Semantic Surroundings*

The analysis of the semantic surroundings of migrants in the European media discourse focuses on the co-occurrence of nouns. Here we show the twenty most commonly co-occurring words per (a) migrant group, (b) country/language, and (c) time period. The results are presented in the Tables 5 and 6. There we see that, across all languages, certain themes emerge, or at least certain words arguably can be grouped into certain clusters that are visible throughout the results. The four major thematic clusters are the following.



Certain regulatory and societal aspects are present through words such as “government”, “law”, “citizen”, “politician” or “minister”. But also, words such as “border”, “police” and “authorities” arguably cluster together with these words. A work and employment related theme appears through words such as “work”, “job”, “labor market”, or “unemployment”. Both of these groups of words, while present in multiple countries and in both routine and crisis periods, appear relatively less common than the other two major themes that can be identified. These are, on the one hand, words of abstractness, quantity and time; and on the other, words conferring somewhat humanizing aspects. Abstract terms are those that refer to numbers, time or any other aspect of quantifying or measuring. Examples are words such as “number”, “percent”, “quantity”, “time”, or “year”, but also more concrete numbers, such as “thousand” or “million”. Humanizing words relate to actual human beings, such as “human”, “child”, “son”, “life”, or “woman”. An individual word that does not necessarily fall into these outlined major themes but is top of the list in all countries in the different groups is the word “country”.

Comparing the two different time periods, we see a clear change regarding the occurrence of work-related words, especially in Spain and in the UK. In the routine period, some aspects are present in both countries and they completely disappear from the top 20 list in the crisis period. The strongest change arguably occurs in the UK surrounding eastern European migrants, where the words “job”, “work” and “worker” are rather high up the list before they completely disappear during the crisis period. For Sweden this change is not as clear cut, at least regarding Eastern European migrants. While the word “job” decreases in frequency, the word “labor market” at the same time increases during the crisis period. For Middle Eastern migrants, however, work-related words only decrease in rank. In Germany, those words do not occur much. Even before the crisis period, the word “social benefit” is the only one that might fall into this group of nouns. Similarly, the thematic group does not play any particular role in Hungary.



Table 5: Most common co-occurring nouns per country and migrant group during routine period (2013–2014)

2013/2014	Spain			UK			Germany			Sweden			Hungary		
	Term		Freq	Term		Freq	Term		Freq	Term		Freq	Term		Freq
Eastern European	país	country	106	country		126	land	country	249	land	country	84	szám	number	54
	año	year	102	number		87	jahr	year	241	år	year	45	ország	country	45
	gobierno	government	56	benefit		79	prozent	percent	153	jobb	job	36	brit	Briton	36
	noche	night	55	year		73	zahl	number	131	dag	day	25	százalék	percentage	29
	persona	person	43	people		60	kind	child	117	procent	percent	23	év	year	28
	día	day	41	job		58	mensch	human	109	bidrag	contribution	20	rész	section	21
	parte	part	41	work		39	stadt	city	99	tid	time	20	arány	scale/proportion	20
	grupo	group	40	immigration		38	sozialleistung	social benefit	84	grupp	group	19	lakosság	population	14
	derecho	law	33	child		36	problem	problem	75	problem	problem	19	nő	woman	13
	frontera	border	33	worker		34	staat	country/state	73	del	part	17	rendszer	system	13
	número	number	33	restriction		32	sohn	son	63	samhälle	Society	17	helyzet	state/situation	12
	ciudad	city	32	government		30	integration	integration	62	antal	quantity	16	párt	party	12
	trabajo	work	32	influx		30	flüchtling	refugee	57	politiker	politician	16	probléma	problem	11
	hijo	son	31	minister		29	million	million	55	miljon	million	15	ember	human	10
	barrio	neighborhood	29	figure		28	frau	woman	52	arbete	work	14	felmérés	survey	10
	mes	month	28	week		28	gruppe	group	49	arbetsmarknad	labor market	14	menekült	refugee	10
	vez	time	27	pole		27	debatte	debate	43	barn	children	14	munka	work	10
	ciudadano	citizen	26	report		27	hilfe	help	40	område	area	14	többség	majority	10
	entrada	entry	26	family		23	familie	family	39	parti	party	14	vég	end	10
	mujer	woman	26	son		23	leben	life	39	andel	share	13	állam	state	9
Middle-eastern	país	country	284	year		91	land	country	89	land	country	66	ország	country	27
	año	year	269	country		78	jahr	year	86	år	year	59	állam	state	18
	persona	person	173	people		55	kind	child	77	dag	day	42	év	year	15
	centro	center	164	boat		51	prozent	percent	53	flykting	refugee	41	százalék	percentage	15
	gobierno	government	149	number		40	mensch	human	45	grupp	group	33	szám	number	14
	costa	coast	108	refugee		35	flüchtling	refugee	38	jobb	job	30	arány	scale/proportion	12
	grupo	group	108	woman		34	million	million	35	generation	generation	26	párt	party	12
	día	day	107	month		33	partei	party	34	människa	person	23	többség	majority	12
	frontera	border	105	government		31	tochter	daughter	33	problem	problem	23	menekült	refugee	11
	parte	part	103	thousand		30	sohn	son	31	miljon	million	22	világ	world	11
	hijo	son	102	camp		27	türke	Turk	30	kvinn	woman	21	ember	human	10
	hora	hour	97	man		27	welt	world	30	samhälle	society	21	határ	border	10
	situación	situation	92	worker		27	paß	passport	29	barn	children	20	ügy	business	10
	millón	million	90	war		26	frau	woman	27	del	part	20	brit	Briton	9
	vez	time	90	child		25	leben	life	27	båt	boat	19	hatóság	authorities	9
	derecho	law	89	city		25	integration	integration	26	procent	percent	19	élet	life	8
	origen	origin	84	group		23	staat	country/state	25	tid	time	18	rész	section	8
	trabajo	work	81	sea		23	generation	generation	24	liv	life	16	adat	data	7
	papel	paper	79	part		22	roman	novel	24	man	man	16	bevándorló	immigrant	7
	llegada	arrival	77	police		21	problem	problem	22	arbetslöshet	unemployment	13	elnök	chairman	7



Table 6: Most common co-occurring nouns per country and migrant group during crisis period (2015–2016)

2015/2016	Spain			UK		Germany		Sweden		Hungary	
	Term		Freq	Term	Freq	Term	Freq	Term	Freq	Term	Freq
Eastern European	país	country	183	border	907	flüchtling	refugee	418	land	country	95
	refugiado	refugee	156	country	474	land	country	361	flykting	refugee	72
	año	year	103	refugee	354	jahr	year	341	år	year	59
	frontera	border	102	police	340	grenze	border	197	gräns	limit/border	55
	gobierno	government	79	year	237	zahl	number	156	dag	day	32
	mil	one thousand	70	fence	211	mensch	human	150	jobb	job	27
	persona	person	69	thousand	194	prozent	percent	127	stad	city	26
	día	day	61	people	188	staat	country	123	del	part	24
	noche	night	58	benefit	181	kind	child	118	procent	percent	24
	policia	police	56	number	174	integration	integration	104	arbetsmarknad	labor market	23
	centro	center	55	train	147	million	million	94	kvinna	woman	23
	hijo	son	48	hundred	144	regierung	government	92	grupp	group	22
	asilo	asylum	44	minister	141	frau	woman	91	människa	person	22
	llegada	arrival	43	government	136	stadt	city	85	invandring	immigration	21
	número	number	41	day	121	polizei	police	83	antal	quantity	17
	ministro	Minister	40	child	117	sohn	son	83	barn	children	17
	grupo	group	39	camp	109	problem	problem	71	miljon	million	17
	hora	hour	38	week	109	gruppe	group	62	utbildning	training	17
	situación	situation	38	yesterday	109	insel	island	62	tid	time	16
	crisis	crisis	37	group	99	weg	path/way	60	väg	way	16
Middle-eastern	país	country	483	refugee	821	flüchtling	refugee	288	år	year	181
	refugiado	refugee	482	country	497	prozent	percent	167	flykting	refugee	145
	año	year	362	year	380	land	country	158	land	country	124
	persona	person	193	people	326	jahr	year	148	miljon	million	66
	costa	coast	173	deal	279	insel	island	105	dag	day	55
	gobierno	government	171	island	271	kind	child	88	antal	quantity	54
	millón	million	156	war	247	sohn	son	87	människa	person	39
	situación	situation	156	border	242	zahl	number	86	procent	percent	38
	centro	center	145	boat	235	mensch	human	75	barn	children	37
	frontera	border	142	thousand	235	staat	Country	68	gräns	Limit/border	37
	día	day	139	number	225	integration	integration	55	båt	boat	35
	llegada	arrival	139	camp	217	syrr	Syrian	53	jobb	job	35
	parte	part	131	flow	216	grenze	border	48	muslim	Muslim	35
	acuerdo	agreement	129	woman	171	gesellschaft	society	43	generation	generation	33
	hijo	son	125	child	163	million	million	42	del	part	32
	vida	lifetime	111	asylum	159	tag	Day	42	väg	way	32
	asilo	asylum	109	police	158	rückführung	return	40	grupp	group	29
	crisis	crisis	109	day	151	tochter	daughter	37	medelhav	Mediterranean	29
	vez	time	107	coast	145	frau	woman	36	stad	city	28
	derecho	law	106	month	145	behörde	authority	35	samhälle	society	26
	határ	border	346								
	ország	country	337								
	menekült	refugee	218								
	szám	number	205								
	kormány	government	195								
	rész	section	143								
	ember	human	142								
	százalék	percentage	129								
	migráns	migrant	121								
	helyzet	state	101								
	év	year	94								
	hatóság	authorities	84								
	kérdés	question	75								
	kerítés	fence	75								
	bevéndorló	immigrant	74								
	munka	work	71								
	állam	state	68								
	bevéndorlás	immigration	67								
	probléma	problem	64								
	többség	majority	63								
	ország	country	168								
	menekült	refugee	135								
	szám	number	116								
	határ	border	80								
	százalék	percentage	77								
	kormány	government	72								
	ember	human	58								
	befogadás	reception	54								
	év	year	48								
	rész	section	48								
	terület	area	48								
	migráns	migrant	42								
	hatóság	authorities	41								
	helyzet	state	38								
	bevéndorló	immigrant	37								
	kérdés	question	37								
	tartomány	province	36								
	többség	majority	36								
	elnök	chairman	34								
	eset	case	34								

Another difference we observe between the two time periods is that representations of Eastern European migrants first appear more abstract, and later during the crisis period seem to become more concrete. Especially in the UK, Germany, Sweden and Hungary, during 2013 and 2014 abstract terms relating to quantity and time are at the top of the list, including “percent”, “number”, or “year”, as well as words such as “contribution” or “benefit”, and “country”. During the crisis period, the top of the list includes more concrete words referring to individual beings, such as “refugee” or “human”, but also regulatory and legislative words, such as “border”, “police”, and “government”. This same shift is also evident in Hungary with respect to Middle Eastern migrants.

### ***Modifiers***

For the analysis of the modifiers of migration, a collocation analysis was performed. Similar to the analysis of the semantic field, the results reveal up to 20 of the most common modifiers per (a) migrant group, (b) country/language, and (c) time period, shown in Tables 7 and 8.<sup>9</sup> A qualitative inspection of these modifiers reveals certain themes that emerge across all countries. For one, geographical descriptive words make up the greatest share of modifiers, mostly words referring to migrants’ countries or regions of origin. Besides this more or less descriptive group of words, one common theme throughout the country corpora is that of illegality. Words such as “illegal”, “irregular” or “undocumented” appear during both periods of time and for both migrant groups. Two other themes, present throughout the different sub-corpora, are economics and the quantity and arrival of migrants. Economic and work-related themes are manifest in modifiers such as “economic”, “poor”, “qualified”, “skilled” or “educated”. With words such as “new”, “many”, “arriving” or “coming”, the focus lies on the process of immigration and the number of migrants in question. Other words that appear quite often in the different lists are “European” and “Jewish”.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Note that some the fields in the tables are left empty. This means that fewer than 20 modifiers were identified. Modifiers are only deemed relevant for a substantive analysis if the word appeared at least three times in the chosen sub-corpus.

<sup>10</sup> Note that the term “Jewish” was mostly used in the context of historical references.



These “bigger” themes mentioned above emerge throughout the different migrant groups, countries and time periods. However, we also see distinct differences across the different country discourses. For example, in the Spanish sub-corpus, we see that during the years 2013 and 2014, illegality-themed modifiers were most common when discussing Middle Eastern migrants, with “illegal”, “irregular” and “undocumented” being among the top four modifiers used with reference to this group. In the case of descriptions of Eastern European migrants such modifiers were far less common, with only “illegal” being in the top five. This, however, drastically changes during the crisis years of 2015 and 2016. In this period, “illegal”, “irregular” and “undocumented”, together with “economic”, are within the top five modifiers for both migrant groups.

A discursive shift between the routine and crisis periods, mostly regarding the economic-themed modifiers, can also be observed in the case of the UK. While “illegal” decreases in rank for both migrant groups in the second time period, “economic” now becomes one of the most important modifiers. As opposed to the Spanish discourse, in the UK the modifier “economic” is already quite visible for both migrant groups during the first time period, while it becomes drastically more salient in period two. This may well be explained by synchronous events concerning the Brexit referendum. The quantity-related modifiers become much more frequent in the crisis period, with “many” and “more” both increasing in rank. For Eastern European migrants, the most common modifier in both time periods is “European”. Furthermore, the clearly affective and emotionalizing modifier “desperate” is visible only in the UK.

In the German data, we observe that, for Eastern European migrants in the routine period, the job-related modifiers appear very salient, with “qualified” being the third most common and “highly qualified” and “job seeking” appearing among the top twenty. In the crisis period, however, this theme becomes much less common. The focus shifts towards more descriptive modifiers such as “young” or “other/different”, and to modifiers that are concerned with quantifying migrants, e.g. “new”, “hundred”, “thousand”. For Middle Eastern migrants, between 2013 and 2014 the discourse appears to have mostly been concerned with Turkish migrants. And while “Turkish” is still the most common modifier during the height of the refugee crisis, the modifier “Syrian” has now joined the list and immediate-



ly reached the top five. Similarly, the theme of Islamic religion only has become relevant in during the crisis period, with “Muslim” now being among the most common modifiers. In addition to “illegal”, which was already the second most common word in the routine period used with respect to Middle Eastern migrants, “irregular” is now also among the top five words for this group.

For the Swedish discourse, we generally find fewer direct modifications of migrants in discourse compared to Spain, the UK and Germany. For Eastern European migrants, we do not observe a particular change in the occurrence of modifiers between the two periods of analysis. The only notable difference is that it is only during the crisis period that economically themed modifiers (i.e. the words “economic” and “unskilled”) appear. Otherwise, the ranked list remains more or less the same across the two time periods. For Middle Eastern migrants the picture looks slightly different.<sup>11</sup> For example, economic modifiers during the routine period are clearly positively valenced (i.e. “highly educated” and “qualified”). During the height of the refugee crisis, however, those words disappeared. Instead the neutral term “economic” appears. Quantifying modifiers also became more prominent in this period (e.g. “many”, “more” or “newly arrived”).

Finally, for Hungary, we observe the least frequent use of direct modifiers out of all five countries, at least during the routine period. In contrast to all other lists, we find the word “anti” to be quite salient for Eastern as well as for Middle Eastern migrants – possibly indicative of anti-immigrants rhetoric present in the country. This assumption is supported by the word “aggressive” joining the list of modifiers during the crisis period. Furthermore, for both migrant groups, the general occurrence of modifiers strongly increases in the second period. The Hungarian discourse further differs from the other countries as we observe the lowest share of geographically descriptive modifiers. Instead, for both migrant groups we see a strong increase in frequency of modifiers concerned with quantifying migrants (e.g. “large”, “multitudinous”, “massive”) or with their movement (e.g. “coming”, “arrived”, “new”).

---

<sup>11</sup> Please note that “anti-immigrant” appears in the Swedish list for Middle Eastern migrants as a result of only three uses in the media. These instances all refer to one specific quote referring to the Swedish politician Hanif Bali and should thus not be overinterpreted.



Table 7: Most common modifiers of “migrants” per country and migrant group during routine period (2013–2014)

2013/2014	Spain			UK			Germany			Sweden			Hungary		
	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq
Eastern European	subsahariano	sub-Saharan	18	European		142	illegal	illegal	74	illegal	illegal	24	illegális	illegal	36
	rumano	Romanian	15	illegal		26	rumänisch	Romanian	33	många	many	24	érkező	coming/arriving	10
	ilegal	illegal	14	Polish		19	qualifiziert	qualified	25	annan	new/other	8	kelet-európai	eastern European	9
	europeo	European	11	Jewish		18	jüdisch	Jewish	24	fler	more	7	érkezett	arrived	7
	comunitario	common/joint	8	Bulgarian		15	bulgarisch	Bulgarian	23	nyanländ	newly arrived	7	elleni	anti	7
	procedente	coming	7	many		12	osteuropäisch	eastern European	22	polsk	Polish	6	lengyel	Polish	5
	irregular	irregular	6	more		9	neu	new	21	papperslös	paperless	4	új	new	4
	español	Spanish	6	new		8	polnisch	Polish	17	ung	young	4	afrikai	African	3
	indocumentado	undocumented	5	economic		6	afrikanisch	African	13	svensk	Swedish	4	származású	ancestry/descent	3
	judío	Jewish	5	recent		6	deutsch	German	13	europeisk	European	3	olyan	so/such	3
	polaco	Polish	5	skilled		6	jung	young	12	få	few	3			
	nuevo	new	4	Hungarian		5	italienisch	Italian	11	somalisk	Somali	3			
	búlgaro	Bulgarian	4	most		5	ander	other/different	10	utomeuropeisk	non-European	3			
	africano	African	4	Ukrainian		5	arme	poor	7						
	argelino	Algerian	3	Albanian		4	mittellos	destitute	7						
	clandestino	clandestine	3	black		3	ausländisch	foreign	6						
				Croatian		3	hochqualifiziert	highly qualified	6						
				German		3	europäisch	European	6						
				legal		3	alt	old	5						
				other		3	arbeitssuchend	job seeking	5						
Middle-eastern	ilegal	illegal	54	illegal		85	türkisch	Turkish	85	många	many	25	illegális	illegal	31
	irregular	irregular	47	African		23	illegal	illegal	47	illegal	illegal	20	elleni	anti	6
	subsahariano	sub-Saharan	31	afghan		15	türkischstämmig	Turkish origin	29	nyanländ	newly arrived	8	zsidó	Jewish	4
	indocumentado	undocumented	21	economic		9	jüdisch	Jewish	16	papperslös	paperless	8	generációs	generational	3
	procedente	coming	16	Turkish		9	ander	other/different	12	svensk	Swedish	8	török	Turkish	3
	africano	African	14	Jewish		8	jung	young	12	afrikansk	African	7	érkezett	arrived	3
	sirio	Syrian	10	Palestinian		8	afrikanisch	African	11	fler	more	7	érkező	coming	3
	propio	proper	8	many		7	neu	New	8	annan	new/other	5	nagy	large	3
	español	Spanish	8	most		7	russisch	Russian	8	rysk	Russian	5	afrikai	African	3
	europeo	European	7	Ethiopian		6	arabisch	Arabic	7	ny	new	4			
	extranjero	foreign	7	Lebanese		6	griechischstämmig	Greek origin	6	asiatisk	Asian	3			
	hispano	Hispanic	7	Syrian		6	alt	old	5	eritreansk	Eritrea	3			
	futuro	future	6	desperate		5	griechisch	Greek	5	få	few	3			
	nuevo	new	6	Nepalese		5	jugendlich	youthful	5	grekisk	Greek	3			
	chino	Chinese	6	Russian		5	lebend	alive/living	5	högutbildad	highly educated	3			
	italiano	Italian	6	more		5	kurdisch	Kurdish	4	kvalificerad	qualified	3			
	menor	less	5	Iranian		4	ausländisch	foreign	3	turkisk	Turkish	3			
	clandestino	clandestine	5	Armenian		3	europäisch	European	3	utomeuropeisk	non-European	3			
	residente	resident	5	Italian		3	früh	early	3						
	económico	economic	5	undocumented		3	islamisch	Islamic	3						

Note: In the case of Hungary, one word (“lakta” as in “Sesto San Giovanni is bevándorlók lakta milánói negyed”, “Sesto San Giovanni is also an immigrant inhabited Milan district”) that had incorrectly been identified during the NLP procedure as a modifier was excluded.

Table 8: Most common modifiers of “migrants” per country and migrant group during crisis period (2015–2016)

2015/2016	Spain			UK			Germany			Sweden			Hungary		
	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq	Modifier		Freq
Eastern European	irregular	irregular	19	European		106	illegal	illegal	142	illegal	illegal	29	illegális	illegal	491
	ilegal	illegal	19	Albanian		79	ander	other/different	38	många	many	18	gazdasági	economic	112
	económico	economic	11	illegal		68	jung	young	36	nyanländ	newly arrived	10	érkező	coming	80
	européo	European	8	economic		54	polnisch	Polish	36	fler	more	8	megélhetési	cost-of-living	55
	indocumentado	undocumented	8	desperate		37	muslimisch	Muslim	27	polsk	polish	7	elleni	anti	20
	comunitario	common/joint	6	more		29	jüdisch	Jewish	21	få	few	6	kötelező	obligatory	18
	mexicano	Mexican	6	many		28	qualifiziert	qualified	20	fattig	poor	5	nagy	large	16
	subsahariano	sub-Saharan	6	Jewish		19	osteuropäisch	eastern European	18	ny	new	5	érkezett	arrived	11
	judío	Jewish	5	new		16	rumänisch	Romanian	18	papperslös	paperless	5	első	first/top/prime	11
	nuevo	new	4	other		15	neu	New	18	ekonomisk	economic	4	kelet-európai	eastern European	10
	cubano	Cuban	4	Muslim		14	hundert	hundred	14	judisk	Jewish	4	tömeges	multitudinous	10
	español	Spanish	4	Ukrainian		12	deutsch	German	14	lågutbildad	unskilled	4	generációs	generational	7
	propio	proper	3	Lithuanian		10	afrikanisch	African	13	mexikansk	Mexican	4	rendelkező	mandatory	7
	marroquí	Moroccan	3	Polish		10	irregulär	irregular	13	utomeuropeisk	non-European	4	afrikai	African	6
	polaco	Polish	3	African		9	mexikanisch	Mexican	13	muslimsk	Muslim	3	élő	alive/living	6
	rumano	Romanian	3	Bosnian		7	lebend	alive/living	12	rik	rich	3	hatalmas	powerful/huge	6
	procedente	coming	3	fellow		7	bulgarisch	Bulgarian	10				szociális	social	6
				recent		7	tausend	thousand	10				várható	expected	6
				irregular		6	italienisch	Italian	9				agresszív	aggressive	5
				most		6	ankommend	arriving	7				belépő	entering	4
Middle-eastern	irregular	irregular	129	economic		165	türkisch	Turkish	92	illegal	illegal	56	illegális	illegal	245
	económico	economic	41	Syrian		155	illegal	illegal	81	många	many	30	gazdasági	economic	62
	ilegal	illegal	37	illegal		119	ander	other/different	33	fler	more	20	érkező	coming	39
	procedente	coming	21	more		67	syrisch	Syrian	28	papperslös	paperless	20	új	new	16
	indocumentado	undocumented	20	afghan		39	irregulär	irregular	20	annan	other/new	18	érkezett	arrived	12
	subsahariano	sub-Saharan	20	many		38	erst	first	19	ekonomisk	economic	16	nagy	large	11
	mexicano	Mexican	18	other		36	türkischstämmig	Turkish origin	19	nyanländ	newly arrived	11	tömeges	massive	8
	sirio	Syrian	15	African		31	jung	young	17	mexikansk	Mexican	8	megélhetési	cost-of-living	7
	cubano	Cuban	13	desperate		30	arabisch	Arabic	15	ny	new	8	elleni	anti	7
	européo	European	11	Turkish		27	jüdisch	Jewish	15	få	few	7	agresszív	aggressive	6
	africano	African	11	Muslim		24	mexikanisch	Mexican	14	muslimsk	Muslim	7	afrikai	African	5
	nuevo	new	10	irregular		22	muslimisch	Muslim	18	afrikansk	African	5	igyekvő	studious	5
	italiano	Italian	10	new		17	neu	New	8	afghansk	Afghan	4	észak-afrikai	North Africa	5
	judío	Jewish	10	Iranian		14	hundert	hundred	7	algerisk	Algerian	3	befogadás	accepted/admitted	5
	hispano	Hispanic	8	Mexican		13	russisch	Russian	7	enda	only	3	származási	of origin	5
	latinoamericano	Latin American	8	undocumented		13	afrikanisch	African	6	fattig	poor	3	fiatal	young	5
	chino	Chinese	6	Lebanese		11	algerisch	Algerian	6	invandrarfientlig	anti-immigrant	3	nélküli	without	4
	comunitario	common/joint	6	Iraqi		10	kurdisch	Kurdish	6	irregulär	irregular	3	pakisztáni	Pakistani	4
	magrebí	Maghreb	6	most		10	palästinensisch	Palestinian	6	kristen	Christian	3	szíriai	Syrian	4
	marroquí	Moroccan	6	Eritrean		8	französisch	French	6				török	Turkish	

Note: In the case of Hungary, two words (“lakta” and “iránti”, as in “Felhőborító továbbá, hogy a szocialisták mindig csak a bevándorlók iránti szolidaritásról beszélnek”, “It is also outrageous that socialists always talk only of solidarity for immigrants”) that had incorrectly been identified during the NLP procedure as a modifier were excluded.

## Discussion

---

The goal of this paper has been to map European migration discourse in terms of its linguistic features. More specifically, we took a closer look at the discursive construction of migrants. We employed corpus linguistic techniques and analyzed two key aspects, (a) the semantic field in which migrants are mentioned and (b) the modifiers that are used to describe them. Our approach differed from that of previous studies (e.g. Allen, 2016) as we differentiated between migrant groups (i.e., Eastern European and Middle Eastern Migrants) and compared their respective representation in the media. Furthermore, we examined the discourse on migrants comparatively across five different European countries. We attempted to both stay as close to the original language of the discursive texts as possible and gather comparatively comparable results in the end. To our knowledge such an approach represents an innovation in the field of discourse analysis, as prior studies mostly seem to have focused on individual discourses within a single context and language. However, we would argue that, especially for discourses on migration, a comparative perspective is fruitful and even necessary. For one, migration by the very definition of the word always effects at least two countries. Moreover, in the European context, where migration can be considered a constitutional right of all European citizens, different European discourses are worth comparing. That holds especially true for the given crisis period running up to and including the years 2015 and 2016, when the refugee crisis greatly impacted European discourses (Eberl et al., 2019). Migration in general appears to have become a divisive topic in different political contexts (e.g. Hobolt, 2016; Ruhs, 2017; Walter, 2019). Arguably due to the refugee crisis, the topic of migration has become one of international relevance with discourse also transcending previously national boundaries.

We would further argue that our approach of differentiating between discourses on different migrant groups adds a necessary level of granularity to the analysis. As stated before, in the European Union migration within the Union is a right that every citizen holds, which is why perspectives on different migrant groups are likely to change with the outset



of the refugee crisis and rising numbers of extra-European migrants.<sup>12</sup> And indeed, we find that the discursive representations of the two migrant groups do differ in our analysis.

In part due to our methodological approach, the most common modifiers attributed to migrants from the different country-groups are geographically descriptive modifiers. Salient Eastern European geographic modifiers are “Bulgarian”, “Romanian” and “Polish”, all referring to foreign nation states from the view of the respective host country. However, these references to migrants’ origins and nationality are also indicators of collectivization of “the other” (Jäger et al., 1998). Migrants from Middle Eastern countries are also semantically linked to manifold (not only Middle Eastern) foreign nation states. However, instead of referring to migrants from Eastern European countries by their specific nationality, the word “European” is often used for migrants from Eastern European countries. This is indicative of media coverage also highlighting commonalities across Europe, rather than pursuing practices of othering by only referring to countries of origin.

Nevertheless, both groups are still heavily othered in other respects. This becomes evident in the analysis of the semantic fields, where abstract quantifying terms make for a great share of the most common words. There are also very few instances where migrants appear as concrete individual beings and not as an abstract distant group. Modifiers such as “many”, “illegal”, “new”/“recent”, “coming”/“arriving”, etc. present migrants as an abstract mass, and nouns such as “percentage”, “number” or “scale” make them intangible and impersonal. Only very few words, such as “desperate”, “young”, or “alive/living”, refer to individual human qualities of group members instead rather than to collective qualities of the group. Furthermore, in only two instances do we see that these attributes go so far as to directly refer to emotional qualities. However, these instances clearly have different aims: the word “desperate” in the UK serves as a form of humanization/victimization, while the word “aggressive” in Hungary serves as a form of threat framing.

Some of the economic modifiers arguably refer to individual aspects of group members, including such words as “(highly) qualified” or “skilled”. Yet, we also observe an in-

---

<sup>12</sup> We acknowledge of course that migration is mostly a voluntary act and based on free choice while flight from war or persecution leaves no alternative for the people affected.





crease in othering tendencies between routine and crisis periods in terms of economic words, with the German media being the only corpus where the word “qualified” is still among the most common modifiers for Eastern European migrants in 2015–2016. In all other countries these individualizing words disappear, and only the abstract “economic” remains. Note that this may refer to the allegation that migrants from Eastern European countries are so-called “economic migrants”. Furthermore, words that very strongly stress the abstract aspects of “the other”, describing migrants with words relating to natural disasters (Reisigl & Wodak, 2005), are present only in the UK. The two words “influx” and “flow” do appear among the twenty most common co-occurring nouns; before the refugee crisis, the words are used to describe Eastern Europeans, during the crisis they are used with reference to Middle Easterners. In Sweden, on the other hand, another individual economic word appears among the most common modifiers for Eastern European migrants during the crisis period: the word “unskilled”. While humanizing, the word clearly emphasizes negative aspects of the individual out-group members.

Among the most common co-occurring nouns we also see a shift between routine and crisis periods with respect to security threat framing. In the routine period, regulatory and legislative words such as “government” and “law” or “party” are already present in the lists. “Border” also appears in Spain. Yet during the crisis period these words become much more common, with “border” being among the top five words in all countries for Eastern European migrants. Additionally, the words “police” and “authorities” appear in multiple countries among the most common co-occurring nouns. So, during the routine period, migrants appeared in a political context, it appears as part of a policy debate. During the crisis however, the focus of political public discourse shifted towards a more security framed language (e.g., “border”, “police” and “authorities”).

Migration discourse can be characterized by high levels of inequality in terms of access the resources necessary for participation (van Dijk, 2008; van Dijk, 2013). To a certain degree we would argue that this power dynamic also shows in our findings. To the degree that our methodology allows for such interpretations, it appears that the representation of migrants in discourse is mostly controlled by elite actors addressing other members of the in-group about migrants. Most of the modifying words arguably are ascribed from the per-



spective of in-group members pointing at “the others” and understanding them as objects. Geographical descriptive words identify the origin and place of belonging of migrants as foreign to the host-country. Words such as “other”, “new”, “foreign”, “undocumented”, or “illegal” and “irregular” also indicate objectification by describing migrants as in opposition or objection to the host country’s values, norms, and laws.

Hungary presents a somewhat special case in our data. It is an Eastern European country, and one may therefore expect the Hungarian media to portray Eastern Europeans differently from the other European countries in our sample. This was, however, not the case. Moreover, Hungary was center-stage during the crisis in 2015, when several hundreds of thousands of refugee migrants arrived and/or passed through the country. This can also be seen in our data, as both nouns and modifiers exploded in quantity between the routine and the crisis period – due to increased coverage about migration in general (see Eberl et al., 2019).

Reflecting upon these results, we want to stress the importance of these findings for non-academic actors. We show that established patterns of inequality and dominance can be observed throughout the different countries in our sample. We want to take this as a vantage point from which to advise journalists and policy makers in particular to consider their positions of power and their ability to enact said power through discursive practices. Particularly during the crisis period, manifestations of dominance become critical. Resorting to stronger dominating practices when in crisis and under pressure increases discursive inequalities. We want to urge journalists and policy makers to critically reflect on their own positions and the outcomes of their actions in social discourses with regards to powerless minority groups such as migrants.

There are, however, also limitations to this work that need to be addressed. For one, the data chosen for our analysis is limited. We chose to only look at direct adjectives as modifiers and at the semantic surrounding in the form of only the co-occurring nouns. We thus may overlook more complex linguistic phenomena applied to migrants. Other aspects of language, such as the most common actions ascribed to migrants in the form of verbs, or the grammatical activeness and passiveness in a sentence, may arguably influence the discursive representation of migrant actors.



Regarding our approach of differentiating discourses surrounding the two migrant groups, we acknowledge room for improvement. While we only included paragraphs that contained a reference to one or more Eastern European countries but did not refer to any Middle Eastern countries, and vice versa, there might still be some overlap migrant terms that were not used disentangle in the two groups. During the crisis period, many Middle Eastern migrants moved through various Eastern European countries, and several of these have EU external borders. Therefore, the wording associated with Eastern European migrants in the second period might be skewed, respectively the intra-EU mobility discourse might be somewhat overlayed by crisis coverage. Yet needless to say, there are also Eastern European asylum seekers mentioned in media coverage. Still, such possible blurring of key concepts becomes evident in our data, where geographically descriptive modifiers such as “African” appear for both Eastern European and Middle Eastern migrants (see also McNeil & Karstens, 2018). While this does not mean that Eastern European migrants are referred to as “African”, it does tell us something about the common discourse context of both of these migrant groups – as they are being connected to each other within media texts.

Finally, co-occurring nouns – while useful – did not prove to be suited for capturing phenomena such as metaphors and symbols (e.g. El Rafaie, 2001; Reisigl & Wodak, 2005). It appears that such metaphors are not among the most common words in our data. Still, metaphors are specifically important, because they offer such strong and memorable visual references for what they describe that they are powerful linguistic features even when rarely occurring. However, we would still argue that the investigation of the semantic field on its own still is of great value. For these much more frequent if possibly less powerful words, it is the frequency itself that cumulatively renders them impactful and important for the linguistic study of discourse.

We set out to investigate the representation of migrants in European media discourse by means of corpus linguistic analysis. First we asked if the different groups of migrants are portrayed differently and if so where those differences lie. We found that, for both groups, the discourse language exhibits strong tendencies of othering by emphasizing collective and abstract aspect of the group of “others”. However, we also find that the tendency toward othering is weaker in the case of Eastern European migrants. This differs,



however, between the different countries of our sample. Our findings of course speak primarily to language use within the media as a particular part of public discourse. Yet, it has been argued that different areas of discourse impact upon each other, and that media discourse influences public opinion, political discourse and, eventually, policy. For an international issue such as migration a comparative perspective on discourse therefore seems appropriate. And in our findings, we see that individual national discourses diverge in terms of the representation of migrants. Across different countries, the discourse on migration seems to be focused on the particular aspects of the topic that most strongly affect the country. For example, we see that African migrants feature most prominently in the migration discourse of Spain, which of the countries we analysed is closest to the African continent. In Germany, which has a large community of Turkish migrants, Turkish migrants are the most commonly mentioned migrant group. In the UK, where criticism of the EU eventually cumulated in the Brexit referendum, “European” migrants are the most frequently mentioned. Yet, we arguably observe the biggest change in language between the two periods of analysis. We had asked how the representation of migrants differs between routine and crisis periods in the media discourse. We observe that the representation of migrants underwent much stronger processes of othering during the years 2015–2016.

Language use in migration coverage and discursive representation of migrants in the media thus differs between countries and migrant groups as well as between routine and crisis periods. While this study is a first step towards filling in gaps in both comparative and aggregate research, adding to our understanding of the inter- and transnational phenomenon of migration, more research and more detailed analyses are still needed.



## Literature

---

- Allen, W. L. (2016). "A decade of immigration in the British press". Migration Observatory report, COMPAS, University of Oxford.
- Arendt, F. (2017). "Impulsive facial-threat perceptions after exposure to stereotypic crime news". *Communication Research*, 44(6), 793–816. DOI: 10.1177/0093650214565919
- Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T., & Wodak, R. (2008). "A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press". *Discourse & society*, 19(3), 273–306. DOI: 10.1177/0957926508088962
- Balch, A., & Balabanova, E. (2016). "Ethics, politics and migration: Public debates on the free movement of Romanians and Bulgarians in the UK, 2006–2013". *Politics*, 36(1), 19–35. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9256.12082
- Bleich, E., Callison, J. P., Edwards, G. G., Fichman, M., Hoynes, E., Jabari, R., & van der Veen, A. M. (2018). "The good, the bad, and the ugly: A corpus linguistics analysis of US newspaper coverage of Latinx, 1996–2016". *Journalism*. DOI: 10.1177/1464884918818252
- Boomgaarden, H.G. & Vliegenthart, R. (2009). "How news content influences anti-immigration attitudes: Germany, 1993–2005". *European Journal of Political Research*. 48(4), 516–542. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-6765.2009.01831.x
- Boomgaarden, H. G., Vliegenthart, R., De Vreese, C. H. & Schuck, A. R., (2010). "News on the move: Exogenous events and news coverage of the European Union". *Journal of European Public Policy*. 17(4), 506–526. DOI: 10.1080/13501761003673294
- Carnaghi, A., Maass, A., Gresta, S., Bianchi, M., Cadinu, M., & Arcuri, L. (2008). "Nomina sunt omina: on the inductive potential of nouns and adjectives in person perception". *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 94(5), 839.



- Commission of the European Communities, Autumn 2017. Standard Eurobarometer 88 [online]. [viewed 29 April 2019]. Available from: [ec.europa.eu/commission](http://ec.europa.eu/commission)
- de Vreese, C.H. & Boomgaarden, H.G., (2006). "Media effects on public opinion about the enlargement of the European Union". *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 44(2), 419–436. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5965.2006.00629.x
- de Vries, E., Schoonvelde, M., & Schumacher, G. (2018). "No longer lost in translation: Evidence that Google Translate works for comparative bag-of-words text applications". *Political Analysis*, 26(4), 417–430. DOI: 10.1017/pan.2018.26
- Eberl, J.-M., Boomgaarden, H. G., & Wagner, M. (2017). "One bias fits all? Three types of media bias and their effects on party preferences". *Communication Research*, 44(8), 1125–1148. DOI: 10.1177/0093650215614364
- Eberl, J.-M., Meltzer, C. E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., Berganza, R., Boomgaarden, H., Schemer, C., & Strömbäck, J. (2018). "The European media discourse on immigration and its effects: A literature review". *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 42(3), 207–223. DOI: 10.1080/23808985.2018.1497452
- Eberl, J.-M., Galyga, S., Lind, F., Heidenreich, T., Edie, R., Boomgaarden, H., Herrero Jiménez, B., Gómez Montero, E. L., Berganza, R. (August 2019). *European Media Migration Report: How media cover migration and intra-EU mobility in terms of salience, sentiment and framing*. Working paper prepared as part of the REMINDER project. Published August 2019.
- El Refaie, E. (2001). "Metaphors we discriminate by: Naturalized themes in Austrian newspaper articles about asylum seekers". *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 5(3), 352–371. DOI: 10.1111/1467-9481.00154
- European Parliament, Council of the EU. (2004). *Directive 2004/38/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and*



*their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States amending Regulation (EEC). Official Journal of the European Communities.*

Fernández, I., Igartua, J. J., Moral, F., Palacios, E., Acosta, T., & Muñoz, D. (2013). "Language use depending on news frame and immigrant origin". *International Journal of Psychology*, 48(5), 772–784. DOI: 10.1080/00207594.2012.723803

Georgiou, M., & Zaborowski, R. (2017). "Media coverage of the "refugee crisis": A cross-European perspective". Council of Europe Report DG1(2017)03.

Geschke, D., Sassenberg, K., Ruhrmann, G., & Sommer, D. (2010). "Effects of linguistic abstractness in the mass media". *Journal of Media Psychology*, 22(3), 99–104. DOI: 10.1027/1864-1105/a000014

Graesser, A. C., Millis, K. K., & Zwaan, R. A. (1997). "Discourse comprehension". *Annual review of psychology*, 48(1), 163–189. DOI: 10.1146/annurev.psych.48.1.163

Habermas, J. (1991). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge: MIT press.

Hardt-Mautner, G. (1995) "Only Connect: Critical Discourse Analysis and Corpus Linguistics". *UCREL Technical Paper 6*. Lancaster, UK: Lancaster University.

Hobolt, S.B., 2016. "The Brexit vote: a divided nation, a divided continent". *Journal of European Public Policy*. 23(9), 1259–1277. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2016.1225785

Holmes, S. M., & Castañeda, H. (2016). "Representing the 'European refugee crisis' in Germany and beyond: Deservingness and difference, life and death". *American Ethnologist*, 43(1), 12–24. DOI: 10.1111/amet.12259

Jäger, M., Cleve, G., Ruth, I., and Jäger S. (1998). *Von deutschen Einzeltätern und ausländischen Banden. Medien und Straftaten. Mit Vorschlägen zur Vermeidung diskriminierender Berichterstattung*. Duisburg: DISS.



- Kallius, A., Monterescu, D., & Rajaram, P. K. (2016). "Immobilizing mobility: Border ethnography, illiberal democracy, and the politics of the 'refugee crisis' in Hungary". *American Ethnologist*, 43(1), 25–37. DOI: 10.1111/amet.12260
- KhosraviNik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., & Wodak, R. (2012). "Dynamics of representation in discourse: Immigrants in the British press". In M. Messer, R. Schroeder and R. Wodak (Eds.): *Migrations: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 283–295). Vienna: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-7091-0950-2\_26
- Kluknavská, A., Bernhard, J., & Boomgaarden, H. G. (2019). "Claiming the Crisis: Mediated Public Debates about the Refugee Crisis in Austria, the Czech Republic and Slovakia". *Journal of Refugee Studies*. DOI: 10.1093/jrs/fez022
- Krzyżanowski, M., & Wodak, R. (2017). "The Production and Re/production of Institutional and Everyday Racism towards Migrants: The Role of Discourse". In M. Krzyżanowski, & R. Wodak (Eds): *The politics of exclusion: Debating migration in Austria* (pp. 1–32). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781315133959
- Krzyżanowski, M. (2018). "Discursive shifts in ethno-nationalist politics: On politicization and mediatization of the 'refugee crisis' in Poland". *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1-2), 76–96. DOI: 10.1080/15562948.2017.1317897
- Maier, J., & Rittberger, B. (2008). "Shifting Europe's boundaries: Mass media, public opinion and the enlargement of the EU". *European Union Politics*, 9(2), 243–267. DOI: 10.1177/1465116508089087
- Mancini, P. (2013). "Media fragmentation, party system, and democracy". *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18(1), 43–60. DOI: 10.1177/1940161212458200
- McNeil, R., & Karstens, E. (June 2018). *Comparative report on cross-country media practices, migration, and mobility*. Report prepared as part of the REMINDER project. Published June 2018.





- Màrquez, L., & Rodríguez, H. (1998). "Part-of-speech tagging using decision trees". In *European Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 25–36). Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer. DOI: 10.1007/BFb0026668
- Niemann, A., & Zaun, N. (2018). "EU refugee policies and politics in times of crisis: theoretical and empirical perspectives". *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(1), 3–22. DOI: 10.1111/jcms.12650
- Peter, J., & De Vreese, C. H. (2004). "In search of Europe: A cross-national comparative study of the European Union in national television news". *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 9(4), 3–24. DOI: 10.1177/1081180X04270597
- Pouliquen, B., Steinberger, R., Ignat, C., Käsper, E., & Temnikova, I. (2004, August). "Multilingual and cross-lingual news topic tracking". In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on Computational Linguistics* (959). Association for Computational Linguistics. DOI: 10.3115/1220355.1220493
- Quasthoff, U. (1989). "Social prejudice as a resource of power: towards the functional ambivalence of stereotypes". In: R. Wodak (Ed): *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse* (pp. 181–196). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Reisigl, M., & Wodak, R. (2005). *Discourse and discrimination: Rhetorics of racism and anti-semitism*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203993712
- Ruhs, M. (2016). "Is Unrestricted Immigration Compatible with Inclusive Welfare States? National Institutions, Citizenship Norms and the Politics of Free Movement in the European Union". Working Paper No. 125, Centre on Migration, Policy and Society, University of Oxford. DOI: 10.2139/ssrn.2625486
- Ruhs, M. (2017). "Free movement in the European Union: National institutions vs common policies?" *International Migration*. 55, 22–38. DOI: 10.1111/imig.12398



- Semin, G. R., & Fiedler, K. (1991). "The linguistic category model, its bases, applications and range". *European review of social psychology*, 2(1), 1–30. DOI: 10.1080/14792779143000006
- Schuck, A.R. & De Vreese, C.H. (2006). "Between risk and opportunity: News framing and its effects on public support for EU enlargement". *European Journal of Communication*. 21(1), 5–32. DOI: 10.1177/0267323106060987
- Straka, M., Hajic, J., & Straková, J. (2016). "UDPipe: Trainable Pipeline for Processing CoNLL-U Files Performing Tokenization, Morphological Analysis, POS Tagging and Parsing". In *LREC 2016*.
- Straka, M., & Straková, J. (2017). "Tokenizing, POS tagging, lemmatizing and parsing UD 2.0 with UDPipe". In *Proceedings of the CoNLL 2017 Shared Task: Multilingual Parsing from Raw Text to Universal Dependencies* (pp. 88–99). DOI: 10.18653/v1/K17-3009
- Straková, J., Straka, M., & Hajič, J. (2014, June). "Open-source tools for morphology, lemmatization, POS tagging and named entity recognition". In *Proceedings of 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations* (pp. 13–18).
- Van Aelst, P., & Walgrave, S. (2016). "Information and arena: The dual function of the news media for political elites". *Journal of Communication*, 66(3), 496–518. DOI: 10.1111/jcom.12229
- van Dijk, T. A., & Kintsch, W. (1983). *Strategies of discourse comprehension*. New York, London: Academic Press
- van Dijk, T. A. (1984). *Prejudice in discourse: An analysis of ethnic prejudice in cognition and conversation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1989). "Mediating racism: The role of the media in the reproduction of racism". In: R. Wodak (Edt): *Language, Power and Ideology. Studies in Political Discourse* (pp. 199–226). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.



- van Dijk, T. A. (2001). "Critical discourse analysis". In: D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton (Eds): *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352–371). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2002). "Media contents: The interdisciplinary study of news as discourse". In K. B. Jensen and N. W. Jankowski (Eds): *A handbook of qualitative methodologies for mass communication research* (pp. 122–134). London and New York: Routledge.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2005). *Racism and discourse in Spain and Latin America*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2008). "Elite discourse". In: C. McCarthy, & C. Teasley (Eds): *Transnational perspectives on culture, policy, and education: Redirecting cultural studies in neoliberal times* (pp. 93–112). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- van Dijk, T. A. (2013). "Discourse, power and access". In: C. R. Caldas-Coulthard, & M. Coulthard (Eds): *Texts and practices. Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis* (pp. 93–113). Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780203431382
- van Dijk, T. A. (2015). "Critical discourse analysis". In: D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin (Eds): *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 466–485).
- van Spanje, J. & de Vreese, C. (2014). "Europhile media and Eurosceptic voting: Effects of news media coverage on Eurosceptic voting in the 2009 European parliamentary elections". *Political Communication*. 31(2), 325–354. DOI: 10.1080/10584609.2013.828137
- Walgrave, S. & De Swert, K., 2007. "Where does issue ownership come from? From the party or from the media? Issue-party identifications in Belgium, 1991-2005". *Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*. 12(1), 37–67. DOI: 10.1177/1081180X06297572
- Walter, S. (2019). "Better off without You? How the British Media Portrayed EU Citizens in Brexit News". *The International Journal of Press/Politics*. DOI: 10.1177/1940161218821509



Wijffels, J. (2019). “udpipe: Tokenization, Parts of Speech Tagging, Lemmatization and Dependency Parsing with the ‘UDPipe’ ‘NLP’ Toolkit”. R package version 0.8.2.  
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=udpipe>

Wodak, R. (2008). “‘Us’ and ‘them’: Inclusion and exclusion—Discrimination via discourse”.  
In: G. Delanty, R. Wodak, & P. Jones (Eds): *Identity, belonging and migration* (pp. 54–77). Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Wodak, R., & Reisigl, M. (2003). “Discourse and Racism”. In: D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen, H. E. Hamilton (Eds): *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 372–397). Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers.





# REMINDER

ROLE OF EUROPEAN MOBILITY AND ITS IMPACTS  
IN NARRATIVES, DEBATES AND EU REFORMS

The REMINDER project is exploring the economic, social, institutional and policy factors that have shaped the impacts of free movement in the EU and public debates about it.

The project is coordinated from COMPAS and includes participation from 12 consortium partners in 8 countries across Europe



This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research & innovation programme under grant agreement no 727072

