Abstract – Given the present climate of heated political debate and social tension over the question of migration, the aim of this study is to investigate how the topic is represented to the general public. The study will examine texts from the British press and from blogs of migration organizations and research centres. The research centres offer themselves as a medium for intelligent discourse on migration and their intent is to bring this discussion out of academia and into an accessible forum for anyone interested in the question. They will therefore give a different perspective to the linguistic landscape of migration from the more politically coloured discourse of the press. The study first uses corpus linguistic methods to examine how migration is represented linguistically in the two subcorpora and then the Appraisal Theory for a qualitative analysis of some extracts from the texts. The analyses show that both the blogs and the press do not use primarily attitudinal lexis, preferring other linguistic resources, such as dialogistic positioning, intensification and evoked evaluation.
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1. Introduction

Globalization and the present dramatic geopolitical situations in the world have acted as strong stimuli to migration, leading to heavy migratory flows towards Europe. Even though migration has taken place ever since time immemorial, the topic still arouses strong emotions and reactions. In 2015 a survey carried out by the Economist showed that migration was a major concern for two thirds of Britons (Economist 2016). As a result, migration often becomes a significant political issue and a focal point in debates and campaigns, as in the case of the recent Brexit referendum.

Migration has, in fact, been the object of study from many disciplinary perspectives in the social sciences (Martínez Guillem 2015). Studies have also been made specifically on the language of migration, as for example in both American and European law (Cunningham-Parameter 2011; Incelli 2013) and in a recent work on political discourse (Salvi 2017). Of particular interest for this paper are the large-scale analyses carried out on the portrayal of migrants in the British press (Allen 2016; Blinder, Allen 2016; Baker et al.
In 2008, long before the current European migrant crisis, a paper called *Fleeing, sneaking, flooding* was published reporting on the findings of a Lancaster University research project into the discursive construction of refugees and asylum seekers (and immigrants and migrants) in a 140-million-word corpus of articles that appeared in the press between 1996 and 2005 (Gabrielatos, Baker 2008). The very title suggests the overall negative aura of migration discourse in the press which was confirmed by the findings that revealed “the deployment of nonsensical terms and collocates indexing negative *topoi* or embodying negative metaphors” (Gabrielatos, Baker 2008, p. 33).

Ten years on, and in the present climate of heated political debate and social tension, the aim of the present study is to investigate how the topic of migration is presented to the general public today by examining two different text types, namely articles from the press of different political alignments and the blogs of migration organizations and research centres.

What the press reports or, equally important, what it does not report, and how it does so, shapes and strongly influences public opinion and in turn, public debate and policymaking. The press discursively constructs and projects attitudes and stances in accordance with their political alignment, thus framing the discourse of a topic. It creates mental representations based on pre-existing conceptions of what that object or thing is (Blinder, Allen 2016, p. 4; Martínez Guillem 2013). As van Dijk (1996, p. 84) says, this influence can be seen as a form of social power, controlling the minds and actions of groups of people. However, Gabrielatos and Baker (2008, p. 9) point out that the relationship between the press and its readers is bidirectional. People read the newspapers that share their ideas and therefore papers also need to reflect the ideas and beliefs of their readers, and in doing so will reinforce them.

Although the press still has a very strong influence in the modern world, readers also draw on other sources for information, in particular the Internet and its various genres. For this reason, the study analyses blogs specialized in migration issues which will perhaps throw a different light on the subject as they aim to inform the public debate on migration in the UK and in Europe, as one research centre says on the homepage of its website, “by providing new insight helping to steer the current policy debate in a direction that is based on carefully researched evidence without partisan bias” (Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration, [http://www.cream-migration.org/](http://www.cream-migration.org/)).

Both the press and the migration and research centres may then be considered as important sources of influence and play an important role in facilitating or hindering the integration of migrants and refugees in host societies. The study will compare the more politically coloured discourse of the press with what may be expected to be a more balanced approach in the blogs and identify the focus of each genre, and how they deal with the topics.
2. Methodology and theoretical framework

The study has adopted a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods, following Baker et al. (2008), who suggest that each approach can provide different kinds of insights to the analysis. Basic corpus linguistic methods, frequency counts, collocations and concordance lines, were first used to examine how migration is represented linguistically in the two subcorpora. Bearing in mind the small size of the subcorpora, the quantitative findings cannot be considered as ‘totally accountable’ and the study is guilty of what Baker et al. call “a casual use of corpus-based techniques to give preliminary findings before the qualitative analysis” (2008, p. 275). However, it is hoped that it can orient the investigation. Qualitative analyses were then made to contextualise the findings and also bring to light the different rhetorical strategies used by the press and the blogs to present their arguments in a persuasive manner. Baker et al.’s study used Critical Discourse Analysis to complement the quantitative analysis, whereas for this study the qualitative analysis has been made using Martin and White’s Appraisal Theory, which I have already applied in previous research (Salvi, Turnbull 2010; Turnbull 2013). It explores and describes the way language is used to evaluate, adopt stances and manage interpersonal positionings. Its very broad and comprehensive approach covering different aspects of the linguistic resources available to the writer should therefore highlight the strategies adopted in the different texts.

The Appraisal Theory is a complex framework and methodology and there is space here only for a brief overview (Table 1, but for a full explanation see Martin, White 2005; White 2015). It works on three main domains:

- **Attitude**, which encompasses different options for expressing positive or negative evaluation,

- **Engagement**, which concerns the resources by which speakers/writers adopt a stance towards the value positions being referenced by the text and with respect to those they address,

- **Graduation**, which refers to the adjustments of attitude and engagement in terms of strength, the up-scaling and down-scaling of expressions.

*Attitude* itself is divided into three regions of feelings, each of which in turn is subdivided further: *Affect* in which assessments are based on emotional responses (happiness, security, satisfaction), *Judgement*, assessments of human behaviour (social esteem, social sanction) and *Appreciation*, assessments of aesthetic and social value of things (reaction, composition, valuation).

*Engagement* resources allow for alternative positions and voices to be expressed in the text (entertain and attribute), what Martin and White call dialogic expansion, but also the opposite, dialogic contraction, in which
positions may be challenged, dismissed or concurred with (disclaim and proclaim).

Graduation works across two clines, intensity and prototypicality and can be applied both to attitudinal meanings and the expressions of Engagement. It is an essential aspect of the Appraisal Theory because it interacts with the other two systems. Indeed, as Martin and White (2005, p. 159) explain, “Appraisal meanings do not operate as isolated values, but rather as integrated complexes of meaning”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATTITUDE</th>
<th>ENGAGEMENT</th>
<th>GRADUATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFFECT</td>
<td>Monogloss</td>
<td>Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happiness</td>
<td></td>
<td>intensification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td></td>
<td>quantification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUDGEMENT</td>
<td>Heterogloss</td>
<td>Focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social esteem</td>
<td>dialogic contraction</td>
<td>prototypicality:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social sanction</td>
<td>disclaim</td>
<td>sharpening/softening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPRECIATION</td>
<td>proclaim</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reaction</td>
<td>dialogic expansion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition</td>
<td>entertain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valuation</td>
<td>attribute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Appraisal Theory.

The Appraisal Theory is obviously a complicated system and methodology to be applied and Martin and White (2005) themselves highlight the difficulties or complications involved in applying it, two of which are of particular interest here. Firstly, appraisal or evaluation is very subjective and context-dependent, giving rise to the possibility of multiple interpretations. Secondly, evaluation is not always inscribed directly in the discourse. At times the simple selection of ideational meanings is enough to evoke evaluation, even if there is no attitudinal lexis that explicitly tells us what to feel or think. This may, once again, introduce an element of subjectivity but, as Martin and White say, a text “naturalises a reading position” (2005, p. 63), so the reader can be expected to capture the intended evaluation.

3. Corpus

The corpus is composed of texts from the British press and posts from blogs of migration organizations and research centres. Table 2 shows the composition of the two subcorpora. The press subcorpus is made up of ten articles about migration and migrants from two quality and two popular newspapers and a weekly magazine for a total of fifty texts in 2016 before,
during and immediately after the Brexit referendum in June 2016. There is admittedly a certain bias in the corpus because the two popular papers are more right wing, whereas the other publications are centre/centre left. Furthermore, although the same number of articles were collected from each publication, the popular papers have much shorter articles, integrated with many pictures and provoking captions. As a result, the weekly and the quality papers account for a larger part of the corpus than expected.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Blogs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Mail</td>
<td>The Migrationist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sun</td>
<td>MRN (Migrants’ Rights Network)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Guardian</td>
<td>CREAM (Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Independent</td>
<td>COMPAS (Centre on Migration, Policy and Society)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Economist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total words 47,261</td>
<td>Total words 51,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Types 5,933</td>
<td>Types 6,321</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2
Corpus.

The blogs are *The Migrationist*, an international academic/professional blog, the *Migrants’ Rights Network*, a national NGO working and campaigning in support of migrants in the UK, the *Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration* (CREAM), an interdisciplinary centre based in the Department of Economics at University College London and Oxford University’s *Centre on Migration, Policy and Society* (COMPAS). Ten posts were taken from each blog. However, as the focus of some blogs is much broader than the UK press and looks at migration throughout the world, it was necessary to cover a broader period for the selection of texts on migration in the UK. As a consequence, a few of the posts date back to 2015.

The two subcorpora taken together form what might be called a nano-corpus compared with the Lancaster research and will not give ‘statistically significant’ results, but they will perhaps give a snapshot of the linguistic landscape of migration in the UK today.

### 4. Analysis

#### 4.1. Quantitative

A frequency count was made for the keywords *migrant*, *migrants*, and *migration* (Table 3) and the number of occurrences is similar in the two subcorpora, though the blogs show a preference for the word *migration* rather than *migrant(s)* which could suggest that they focus more on the phenomenon
than on individuals, unlike newspapers where human interest stories are very frequent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Press</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Blogs</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>instances</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>instances</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0.1313</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>0.1016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrants</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>0.4723</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>0.3245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>migration</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>0.4109</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>0.4457</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Number of instances of migrant, migrants and migration.

However, when looking at their concordance lines it immediately became obvious that migrant was used as an adjective, rather than as a noun to refer to a person, the individual, in both the press and the blogs. Only three occurrences in the blogs were concerned with a migrant and two in the press. Interestingly, the blogs told personal stories of individual migrants, whereas the newspapers did not.

An indication of the attitude or feeling about the topic may be acquired from collocations, which give information about the most frequent or salient ideas associated with a word (Gabrielatos, Baker 2008, p. 10). The most frequent right collocates of migrant in the press are: children (10 occurrences), crisis (5), camps (2), which represent the dramatic aspects of the current situation, and other words which suggest numbers and quantity: flow (2), influx (3), rush (2), stream (2), numbers, march, route. There are also nine occurrences of the collocate workers, which reflects one of the major concerns in the Brexit debate – EU migrants taking British jobs.

A slightly different set of right collocates emerged in the blogs, though the topics remained basically the same. There were the words suggesting quantity, inflows and influxes, and also quite a few to do with the workplace – employees, labour, labourers, workers (9), but the use of communities (4), community (2) and exploitation suggests a broader social approach to the question.

To get a clearer idea of the image portrayed in the texts concordance lines of phrases including the key words were drawn up. Here are the examples of migrants are which shows that in both subcorpora most of the occurrences were concerned with employment and the migrants’ contribution to the economy. Given the moment in time around the Brexit referendum six out of the 14 occurrences in the press are concerned with EU migrants, whilst the discourse in the blogs concerns a more general view of the topic and migrants’ position and status, though also referring to EU migrants.
The cluster *migrants and* indicates a frequent grouping of migrants with refugees and asylum seekers in both the press and blogs, thus conflating the terms as Gabrielatos and Baker (2008) had shown. In the press we can also find the *migrants and people smuggling gangs*, an association that contributes to the negative discourse prosody also identified by Gabrielatos and Baker.
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The two subcorpora were also put through WMX which identifies the main semantic domains in the files. The results (see Table 4) seem to confirm the impression that the concordance lines were giving, that both the press and blogs were generally talking about the same things. The top 20 domains were similar, though sometimes their ranking differed.
However, there were some significant, albeit not surprising, differences. The high ranking of geographical terms in the press can be explained by the frequent reference to EU migrants in view of the Brexit referendum. But what stands out in particular is crime in fifth position and law and order in 14th position in the press subcorpus, neither of which appears in the blog subcorpus. A close examination of the concordance lines for migrants showed that their connection with crime was their illegal status, irregular, illegal, rather than as perpetrators of crimes such as theft.
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It is often more by grouping migrants with other categories, in what would appear to be a gratuitous way that the element of crime is introduced:

Among the semantic domains of the blogs corpus it is interesting to note in 12th position cause/effect and in 14th position location and direction that once again seem to reflect a broader sociological anthropological interest in the phenomenon, as indeed in 18th position belonging to a group.

4.2. Qualitative approach

The quantitative analysis has shown how the question of numbers is a recurring issue and, indeed, much of the debate about migration in the UK centres on the net migration rate which the Conservative party had pledged in 2010 to keep down to 100,000, but has failed to do so. The freedom of movement within the EU is often held responsible for this. In the second part of the analysis the Appraisal Theory will be used to examine and compare qualitatively some extracts dealing with this aspect of migration and the presumed effects of such heavy migratory flows.

The following examples, (10) from the Daily Mail and (11) from the CREAM blog, discuss the official statistics on migration that had just been published in May 2016. They are clearly positioned to argue against or in favour of Brexit on the basis of the figures on migration.

(10)
The shocking Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures are the last to be released before voters decide whether we should cut our ties with Brussels on June 23. […]

Some 630,000 people came into the country over the 12 months to December, marginally down on the year to December 2014.

But the number leaving the country was also down 22,000 to 297,000.

British citizens continued to dominate the emigration figures, making up 123,000 or 41 per cent of the total.

Meanwhile, long-term immigration from the EU was 270,000 - up from 264,000 the previous year - while 85,000 left.

Bulgarian and Romanian nationals alone accounted for 58,000 of the net migration to the UK, up from 44,000 in the previous year.
Some 101,000 of the EU migrants claimed they had a definite job lined up – but 77,000 said they were looking for work. The overall net migration total of 333,000 was up 10,000 on the year to September, although the ONS insisted the change was ‘not statistically significant’. (Daily Mail, May 26, 2016).

(11)
The long-term annual net migration figure of 333,000 is the difference between a gross inflow of 630,000 people and an outflow of 297,000 people. So people are arriving at roughly twice the rate at which they are leaving. What change the figures do record is a consequence of a fall in emigration (though still statistically insignificant) rather than of a rise in immigration. This illustrates a point that rises in net migration can be as easily a result of fewer individuals leaving as of more coming. Is insufficient emigration what worries those upset by migration numbers? It seems unlikely.

A closer look at the numbers
The Brexit debate is focused more on migration from within the EU than immigration from outside and the ONS figures are also illuminating on this. Net inflows of EU citizens (other than the UK) and non-EU citizens are very similar: 184,000 and 188,000 respectively. So are the gross inflows, 270,000 and 277,000. Whether measured net or gross, EU immigration therefore accounts for about half of the total. The statistics show that work is the most common reason for immigration, accounting for 308,000 arrivals, 58% of whom had a definite job to go to and the rest arriving with the intention of looking for work. Many more of these were EU citizens (61%) than were from outside the EU (24%). The number is currently rising. (CREAM, May 27, 2016).

As the figures are official statistics, the numbers quoted in the texts are obviously the same for the most part, but there are fundamental differences in the way the information is presented and the argument structured.

The newspaper opens with very large figures referring to the people entering Britain, which may alarm some readers. It also adds that nearly half of those leaving are British. It goes on to break the figures down in detail, distinguishing between EU and non-EU migrants, even highlighting certain nationalities. After having built up a series of large numbers, it finally gives the net migration figure attributed to the ONS. However, it also expresses its disagreement with the ONS’s judgement of the increase in net migration as not statistically significant, by saying it insists, which intensifies the expression and suggests it is in contrast with the paper’s own opinion. As a result, it clearly distances itself from that position.

In contrast, the blog starts from the net migration figure, which is obviously a much smaller figure than the newspaper’s opening figures, and proceeds in a more orderly manner, explaining the terms used and their significance. So introduces a reformulation of the information to give a clear understanding of their value. After having quoted the figures for EU and non-
EU migration, it points out their similarity and also observes that most migrants already have a job lined up when they arrive in the UK or are looking for one.

Both figures and percentages are used to present the information, though the newspaper seems to prefer numbers and uses a percentage only once. The effect of bare figures is to emphasise the large flow of migrants, whereas percentages put the numbers into a certain perspective.

Although there is very little attitudinal lexis in either text, both express a general evaluation of the figures. The blog post describes them as *illuminating*, using Appreciation: valuation, whilst the newspaper uses the word *shocking*, Appreciation: reaction. This more emotional appraisal is typical of the press and especially of the popular papers. In contrast, *illuminating* is a formal word with a fairly low frequency, so it intensifies its force.

It would appear, as might be expected, that the blog gives a more balanced presentation of the figures, whilst the newspaper ‘manipulates’ the information to further its position. With little implicit inscribed evaluation, how is it that the two texts clearly position themselves so differently?

In the blogs the ‘explanations’ are, in fact, comments. The complex sentence, *What change the figures do record [...]* is used to contrast the Brexit argument of large numbers of migrants. The cleft structure emphatically puts the focus on the *fall in immigration* as being the cause of the increased net migration rate rather than a rise in immigration and the use of the auxiliary *do* for contrastive emphasis also intensifies the force of the sentence. A further comment within the comment, *though still not statistically significant*, is given in brackets, which rather than diminishing its force actually heightens it, underscoring the author’s position that migration is not an argument in favour of leaving the EU. As the author gives explanations of what the statistics mean and how they should be interpreted, he clearly endorses them with the statement *the statistics show*, unlike the newspaper which, as we have seen, throws doubt onto the validity of what the ONS is saying.

The author of the blog then goes on to proclaim *This illustrates a point that rises in net migration [...]* which categorically argues against the interpretation of the statistics used by the Brexit campaigners. He then ironically asks and answers what Martin and White (2005, p. 110) call a “pseudo-question”, seemingly to entertain alternative views, *Is insufficient emigration what worries those upset by migration numbers?*

Similarly, the newspaper uses a combination of Engagement and Graduation resources to put forward its position. *Some* before a number intensifies the force, as if it were being underlined, as indeed *alone* when pinpointing Bulgarian and Romanian migrants and *dominate* when stressing not only so many foreigners are entering the country, but also how many
Britons are leaving. It also punctually specifies the direction the statistics are moving in compared to the previous year. When the figure is down, it is softened, *marginally down*, but when it is up the difference is given in thousands, sharpening the focus.

Although the extract is basically presenting the figures to the reader, it does express evaluations on the validity of the statements, as we have seen above with *insist*. Another example is *Some 101,000 of the EU migrants claimed they had a definite job lined up*, where the paper is attributing the proposition to migrants and also the ONS, but clearly distances itself and seems to challenge the veracity of the statement.

In another article in the *Daily Mail* published two weeks later a similar approach is used. There is a strong build-up of figures, before reporting a statement at the end attributed to Brexit campaigners which says that these numbers are responsible for putting enormous pressure on services in the UK. (*Daily Mail*, June 9, 2016).

The information is presented as fact, with no attitudinal lexis, but other means are adopted to convey a negative discourse prosody. The underlined expressions come from ‘voices’ external to the text that should make the facts appear more objective, especially as the figures are attributed to the UK Statistics Authority. However, the use of impersonal and passive forms without agency make the expressions, *it emerged yesterday* and *the number is expected*, vague, hinting at a negative semblance of secrecy or uncertainty.

The figures quoted are always massive, expressed in terms of millions, thus heightening the force of the statements. Similarly, Blair did not just open the borders, he *threw open the doors*. Repetition and reformulation are used
throughout the text building up tension and intensifying the facts. For example, the word *migrants* is used only twice and thereafter migrants are referred to as *European nationals* and *EU citizens*, which distances them from the reader. They are then grouped with *non-EU foreigners* and lastly, *overseas residents*, conflating EU mobility of labour with other international situations, and thus reinforcing the idea of being outsiders and not belonging. Another example is the variety of expressions denoting residence in the UK; migrants have *settled, come to live, set up home*, none of which are intrinsically evaluative, but can be interpreted as coming to occupy, colonise the UK.

There is also a powerful example of evoked evaluation in the text. The article compares the number of migrants with the size of Birmingham’s population, which may appear as a bare statement, but Birmingham is Britain’s second most populous city with a very large immigrant community, which implicitly suggests and associates new migrants as masses. It ends with the statement attributed to Brexit campaigners as the natural conclusion to be reached that the number of migrants indisputably puts pressure on public services and no further evidence is given to support the statement.

The question of pressure on the public services is also discussed in a newspaper broadsheet, *The Independent*, but with a completely different structure to the argumentation. The title of the article is: *UK migration: Six myths about immigration debunked as latest figures show fall in non-EU arrivals*. The use of the word *myth* immediately prepares the reader for the value position of the author and the text tackles the question from the opposite direction, not as a conclusion but as a supposition. As to be expected, it uses a balanced argumentative approach to counter negative ideas and opinions about one of the six myths of migration.

(13)

It puts a strain on public services, hospitals and schools
UCL’s Centre for Research and Analysis of Migration at University College London found that European immigrants to the UK pay more in taxes than they receive in benefits, effectively subsiding public services.
“A key concern in the public debate on migration is whether immigrants contribute their fair share to the tax and welfare systems”, co-author Professor Christian Dustmann wrote.
“Our new draws a positive picture of the overall fiscal contribution made by recent immigrant cohorts, particularly of immigrants arriving from the EU.”
While school places and hospital beds are under pressure in many areas, much of the change arises from rising birth rates, the effects of an ageing population and other factors that local and national government has failed to respond to by expanding provision analysis. (*The Independent*, February 25, 2016).

Attributions to institutions and individual professors together with direct quotes lend authority to the argument. A concurring concession, introduced by *while*, is made, admitting that there is real pressure in many areas, but the
explanation given is that it is due to internal factors, not immigration and is therefore contractive. This strategy of concede + counter is an attempt by the author to persuade the reader who may have some doubts about ‘discrediting’ this myth, by first recognizing the possibility of this point of view and establishing a point of solidarity and then putting forward the author’s own alternative view.

Unlike the previous examples, extract (14) presents many cases of inscribed evaluation.

(14)
THOUSANDS of stricken migrants including a five-day-old baby have been saved from the Mediterranean Sea in a dramatic rescue operation today.
The desperate refugees, mostly of from Eritrea, were pictured jumping into the water from massively crowded wooden boats off the coast of Sabratha, Libya. Rescuers from the NGO Proactiva Open Arms saved 700 migrants from just one boat while it’s believed as many as 1,500 more were crammed onto up to 20 boats.
Among those rescued in the daring maritime operation was a father and his newborn son.
Amazing photographs show the life or death risks some are taking for the chance of a new life in the west.
Dozens are seen launching themselves into the sea as the rescue boats arrive.
Those that can’t swim are seen bobbing up and down in the waters. Others cling onto the sides of their boats waiting to be lifted to safety.
It’s estimated a staggering 70,000 migrants have crossed the Med into Italy between January and June this year.
They mostly cram into rickety wooden boats unsafe for the 190-mile perilous journey from war-torn Libya’s shores.
More than 4,000 migrants and refugees have perished whilst looking for a better life mainly in Europe, the International Organisation for Migration said.
Of that total, some 3,120 died trying to cross the Med – including 120 who drowned off Libya’s coastal town of Sabratha at the end of July.
Meanwhile, European nations continue to argue about how to share the newcomers.
German Chancellor Angela Merkel said on Sunday that the refusal of some EU countries to accept Muslim refugees is ‘unacceptable’.
She called for quotas to divide the influx throughout the bloc. (The Sun, August 29, 2016)

The words in italics are evaluative, in the domain of Affect (‘desperate’), Judgement (‘unacceptable’), but mostly Appreciation (‘daring’, ‘massively’ ‘crowded’, ‘crammed’, ‘staggering’, ‘amazing’, ‘rickety’, ‘unsafe’, ‘perilous’). ‘Staggering’ and ‘amazing’ may also be considered as belonging to Affect. What is interesting, given the stance of the paper, is that they are describing the state of the migrants, the vessels they travelled in, the journey and the rescue, but are not negative evaluative expressions of migrants and migration. The text which totalled 331 words was accompanied by 12
photographs, each with a caption, totalling another 145 words. The photographs visually represented what was described in the article with overcrowded boats, people in the water and those who had been rescued, many of whom were young children. The article concludes by reporting Angela Merkel’s comments about the responsibility of the whole of the EU, to be read as Britain included, thus closing the circle and linking migration to the Brexit question.

At the end of the article readers placed comments, all of which are threatening and offensive. Two of the politer ones were: *Not our problem*, and *Soon to be in a home near you and paid for by you*. The ‘neutral’, almost sympathetic article, which can be considered as ‘politically correct’, provoked reactions which reflect the stance of the newspaper without it having to express its opinions explicitly. Just as “collocates can […] act as triggers, suggesting unconscious associations which are ways that discourse can be maintained” (Baker 2006, p. 114), so pictures trigger associations and perceptions. People’s assumptions or perceptions of something are often more important than ‘facts’; in this case the fear of the arrival of masses of migrants who are going to steal jobs and put strain on public services prevails over the desperate situation of human beings.

5. Conclusions

The analysis has shown that in recent years the question of migration still manages to provoke strong reactions among public opinion. The quantitative analysis, however, did not reveal such an explicitly negative discourse prosody as might have been expected. It would appear from the qualitative analysis of both the blogs and the press that linguistic resources other than explicit attitudinal lexis are used to present arguments in favour of or against tolerance towards migrants and migration. The different forms of *Graduation*, force and focus, and *Engagement*, expanding or contracting dialogistic positioning, enable authors to put forward their opinions strongly. Another linguistic tool that plays a very important role in the press is evoked *Evaluation*, where the reader can pick up the meaning of an apparently neutral assertion depending on how the text has naturalised the reading position and to what extent the reader shares the assumptions of the author. For example, if we take the following sentence: *EU migrants are more likely to be in work than UK nationals*. How is this to be interpreted? It could mean that EU migrants are ‘stealing’ jobs from British people or that migrants are paying their way in the UK, since as workers they will be paying tax and therefore contributing to the provision of public services. This statement appeared in fact in *The Independent*, arguing against accusations of ‘benefit tourism’.
The ultimate rhetorical effect is the result of which meanings have been chosen, in which combinations and in which sequences (Martin, White 2005). Public opinion is obviously influenced by newspapers and blogs (or other sources of information) that can select, highlight or ignore bits of information. Whilst they decide on the content and the coverage of stories, they also respond to readers’ interests and concerns. In the case of the press, in particular, they will closely reflect their readers’ opinions and attitudes. When we pick up a paper, we have a good idea of what we will find and very few people read around to see what other papers are saying. Papers can be ‘politically correct’, but nevertheless manage to get their message across, certain that their readers will read between the lines, contributing to and enlarging in their own way the linguistic landscape of migration. “In many respects a text is merely the tip of the iceberg of what is mentally represented” in the minds of individuals and society at large (Van Dijk 1998, p. 28).
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