

Corpus-assisted analysis of water flow metaphors in Slovene online news migration discourse of 2015

Zoran Fijavž, Faculty of Education, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia

Darja Fišer, Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia, Jožef Stefan Institute, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Abstract

The chapter examines metaphorical expressions of water flow in online news from the national public broadcasting service during the period of increased migration through Slovenia in 2015. Existing critical discourse research on migration in Slovenia from that period shows that water flow metaphors were used to highlight the threatened safety of citizens and state, while occluding concerns for the safety of the refugees and serving as a justification for border militarization. With theoretical grounding in conceptual metaphor theory, this chapter uses corpus-based critical discourse analysis to examine a corpus of 215 news articles from a public broadcaster using the Pragglegjazz metaphor identification method. The results show that the words in the identified metaphorical expressions were nearly never used in the literal sense and that metaphorical expressions were ubiquitous in the discourse. They were used by most journalists and increased in frequency throughout the examined period. While most frequently found in reported statements, water flow metaphorical expressions were also used in journalists' own voice, suggesting that the metaphorical frame was mediatized and reproduced without significant contestation by the broadcaster. The chapter also compares the use of metaphorical expressions across various terms used for those migrating, finding that while all terms were used within metaphorical expressions, *migrant* was not used in non-metaphorical descriptions of the people arriving.

Keywords: corpus-assisted discourse analysis, migration, metaphor, online news, mediatization

1 INTRODUCTION

Cognitive linguistics research suggests that the preferred solutions to social issues can change based on the metaphors used to describe the issues (Thibodeau and Boroditsky 2011). Discourse analysis studies from various countries and time periods also show that migration-related discourse often involves metaphors comparing those migrating¹ to animals, criminals, goods, natural disasters, or warfare, which frames the perceived cause of migration and responses to the related social issues (O'Brien 2003, van der Valk 2003, Santa Ana 1999). In the context of Slovenia, Pajnik (2016) notes that the media coverage on the increased arrival of refugees in 2015 was profoundly negative, mostly reproducing the language used by politicians, including the use of euphemisms, (the razor wire as a *technical barrier*) and metaphorical expressions (*floods of migrants*).

This chapter builds on those observations and attempts to quantify them by providing an extended analysis of the use of water flow metaphors in the Slovene discourse on migration in 2015, using critical discourse analysis operationalized through insights from cognitive and corpus linguistics. The chapter analyses water flow metaphorical expressions (WFMEs) in online news published between August and December 2015 by MMC RTV Slovenia, the national public broadcaster.

In this chapter, we first provide the political context of the increased movement of refugees and the responses to this in Slovenia in 2015. We then lay out the theoretical and methodological framework. Specifically, we work on the premise that metaphors are used in migration discourse to achieve specific aims by the speakers using them, and that such language use is further reproduced by the media through citation or incorporation. We then provide a methodology for metaphor identification and describe how the migration corpus under investigation in this chapter was created.

In the empirical part of this chapter we analyse water flow metaphors in the compiled migration corpus, describing the frequency of the metaphorical expression across the time period, and their literal or metaphorical usage. Next, we examine if the metaphorical expressions were present in the news mainly through citations or were also used by journalists when not reporting statements. In addition, we examine if any notable difference of the use of water flow metaphors can be observed among individual journalists. We also examine if various namings for those migrating interacted with the use of metaphorical expressions. Lastly, we discuss the conclusions of our findings and provide ideas for future research.

1 In this chapter we use the neutral terms *those arriving*, *those migrating*, *refugees*, and *people* (when the reference is clear) for people who were migrating through the Balkan route in 2015, not implying their legal protection status.

2 THE 2015 MIGRATION IN SLOVENIA

Due to increased socio-political unrest in the Middle East and North Africa, closures of alternative routes through Italy, France and Spain and pressures in Turkey, Europe saw historic migration through practically the only channel enabling the arrival of migrants from Arab and African countries, mostly from Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan, through the so-called Balkan Route in the period from July 2014 to March 2016. The route consisted of the so-called bridge countries (Greece, Macedonia, Serbia, Croatia and Slovenia) that migrants crossed in order to reach their destination countries (Germany, Sweden).

The peak of the Balkan Route was late 2015, when nearly one million refugees reached Germany, over 300,000 of whom crossed through Slovenia. Due to insufficient institutional preparations, measures taken during the period to provide basic services to refugees were inadequate at worst and erratic at best. As the capacities for provision consolidated and improved over the period (and new arrivals also decreased towards December 2015, due to international measures taken towards closing the Balkan route by March 2016), migration became increasingly securitized, which was symbolized by the erection of a razor-wired border fence on the Croatian border and the transfer of police powers to the army.

Ladić and Vučko (2016) provide an extensive timeline of the events from July to November 2015.² In July 2015, the Slovene government adopted a contingency plan in case of an increased number of arrivals, yet focusing only on asylum seekers, despite the fact that in neighbouring Hungary and Croatia most refugees did not apply for asylum but only transited through them. Between September and December 2015, out of more than 300,000 people transiting only 100 lodged an application for asylum and half of those left Slovenia in 2016 without waiting for the asylum procedure to end.

In September 2015 Hungary completed fence construction on its Serbian border and closed it. After the first larger group of refugees arrived in Slovenia from Croatia, the Slovenian Police tried to return them in accordance with the contingency plan, but Croatia refused. People were left stranded between the two countries without basic necessities, sparking protest from refugees and activists, during which the police also used tear gas. Afterwards, Slovenia pursued the policy of a humanitarian corridor, opening the border crossings and enabling people to continue en route to Austria. In mid-October 2015, Hungary closed its border with Croatia, rerouting the main West Balkans

² The specific sources of the statements in this overview of events, such as government body statistics or newspaper articles, can be found in Ladić and Vučko (2016). The Peace Institute, the publisher of this report was one of the non-governmental organizations with the capacity to perform monitoring inside short-term reception and long-term accommodation centers with full access.

migration route through Slovenia. Initially, the conditions for refugees entering Slovenia were poor due to a lack of coordination with Croatian authorities as well as within short-stay reception centres; e.g. at the Brežice reception centre, refugees resorted to burning wood, blankets, and trash for heat, as no heated tents were available.

The provision of basic necessities at the reception centres improved over time, but varied greatly by location and day, depending on the coordination between a multitude of actors. Information on the situation was spread mainly through social media, as the press was barred from the camps and only non-governmental organizations who were part of a monitoring group had access. Throughout this, the movement of refugees was restricted, making them rely on state-provided services by necessity. Accounts on the conduct of the police and army include humiliating remarks, pushing and yelling, which in some critical moments even resulted in the separation of families to different locations. For at least three weeks and without explanation, 79 Moroccans were detained in the Aliens Center, which accommodates foreigners undergoing deportation, while new arrivals from Morocco were not separated from the rest of the refugees.

The period was also marked by increasing securitization of migration, despite police records showing an insignificant number of interventions involving refugees. Newspaper polls reported a shift in public opinion on a border fence, from heavy opposition in September 2015 to wide support in November 2015 when the Slovene government started erecting a razor-wire fence, in spite of a decreasing number of arrivals, no reported border crossings outside of agreed entry points, and greatly improved coordination with Croatian authorities. In October 2015, the Defense Act was amended through a fast-track procedure and granted some police powers to the army, reportedly to buttress insufficient police capacities, despite the fact that the army was already supporting the police on the ground under pre-amendment legislation. Furthermore, the amendment was not limited to 2015, but could be activated at any time by a National Assembly supermajority vote. The power transfer also lacked a complaint mechanism in cases of civilians seeking recourse against the conduct of army members.

3 CONNECTING METAPHORS, CORPORA, AND CRITICAL DISCOURSE

In this section, we lay out the theoretical framework for this chapter from the perspective of conceptual metaphor theory, critical discourse analysis, and corpus linguistics.

3.1 Conceptual metaphor theory

Lakoff (1993) foregrounds that metaphors are a fundamental way of organizing human experiences, a part of daily language use, and a basic feature of conceptual systems. Metaphor in this sense is defined as the conventionalized ontological correspondence between a source and target domain. The term *metaphor* is distinguished from the term *metaphorical expression*; the former refers to a cross-domain correspondence (e. g. TIME IS MONEY, capital letters serve to indicate a comparison of domains, not just the two particular words used to name the domains), the latter refers to the language used to express the former (e.g. *to waste time*). While Lakoff and Johnson (1999) assume that metaphors are grounded in embodied human experiences (through direct sensimotor experience or other embodied concepts), Kövecses (2007) argues for a multi-layered understanding between embodiment and specific conceptual metaphors, which allows for the possibility of the social environment and cognitive processes to alter or diminish a metaphor rooted in the embodied experience.

3.2 Critical discourse analysis

Assuming metaphors are intertwined with social and cultural experience, that relationship can be subjected to critical discourse analysis (CDA), defined by van Dijk (1993) as the discipline that analyses how dominant social groups influence public discourse and the impacts thereof on other social groups. While the field does not have a unitary understating of what *discourse* encompasses, in this chapter we will use the term *discourse* as a collection of meanings, metaphors, representations, pictures, narratives, and statements that form a particular perspective about a person, object or event (Baker 2006). Language use in the context of discourse is understood as social action, which both shapes and is shaped by societal and historical circumstances (Austin 1962, Levinson 1983). Discourses may also achieve a state of *naturalization*, which establishes power relations, ideologies, social roles and knowledge systems as self-evidential (Fairclough 2010).

With regard to applying CDA to media content, Fairclough (1995) proposes three levels of analysis: (1) the analysis of socio-cultural practices of a communicative event, which examines the economic, political and cultural context of the communicative acts with various degrees of abstraction; from the immediate situational context to the broader institutional context or the yet wider frame of society and culture, (2) the analysis of discursive practices which uncovers processes of text creation and text reception, and (3) the analysis of a text that investigates traditional linguistic categories, such as vocabulary, semantics, orthography and

phonetics. CDA approaches can sometimes be criticized for a lack of rigorous methodology and a relatively small number of texts which are included in the analysis (Fairclough 1995). The question of operationalization of discursive theories thus becomes vital, and the next two sections propose that corpora may offer a suitable way forward.

3.3 Corpus linguistics

Corpus linguistics is the study of language through examples of its use (McEnery and Wilson 1996). It is distinct from purely qualitative research on text because it employs corpora, large collections of authentic texts in machine-readable form that enable the use of qualitative as well as quantitative methods in order to describe linguistic phenomena (Baker 2006). In the context of CDA, corpora can expand the number of texts in the analysis, reduce researcher bias, make the research more easily replicable, and enable comparative corpus analysis, for example across time or text sources (Baker 2006).

The basic techniques of corpus analysis are the use of concordances, which show how a queried word is used in context, and frequency lists which give a quantitative summary of the phenomena under investigation. Co-occurrence frequencies are used to determine collocations, words or phrases that are typically used with the queried word (Baker 2006). These techniques are provided by most corpus querying tools called concordancers, such as AntConc (Anthony 2014), which is used in this study. However, we use the Sketch Engine concordance (Kilgarriff et al. 2014) as well, which in addition to the basic corpus analysis techniques also provides Word Sketches, which are summaries of a word's collocations organized in lists according to the syntactic relationship between the key word and its collocates, for example all subjects of the verb *to fly*. Krek and Kilgarriff (2006) adapted the tool for Slovene. In this study, the Word Sketch feature is used for the analysis of semantic preferences of a word.

4 RELATED WORK

This section summarizes research relevant to the design and interpretation of the empirical analysis of this chapter. It examines the impact of metaphorical framing of social issues, the metaphors appearing in the discourses on migration, the specific work done on Slovene migration discourse, and lastly presents the metaphor identification methodology we used in our study.

4.1 Metaphors on migration and their impacts

O'Brien (2003) reports the metaphors used in the discourse on migration in the United States during the early 20th century, a time when the country witnessed increasingly restrictive immigration policies. Drawing on historical sources, the primary metaphor to describe the US was that of a body (a country as a body), while migrants were described in the conceptual frames of unhealthy organisms, resources, natural disasters, war, animals and sub-humans. Van der Valk (2003) analysed the discourse on migration in French parliamentary debates between 1996 and 1997 and found that the French state was referred to in metaphors related to a house or a home, and that migrant-related metaphors were those of war, water flow and traffic. Santa Ana (1999) examined the use of metaphoric language in the media during the Proposition 187 initiative in California, which restricted access to public services for undocumented migrants and introduced stricter citizenship checks. The most commonly used metaphors compared migrants to animals. Other metaphors referred to criminals, plants (weeds) and goods.

Metaphorical expressions in migration discourse, however, do not always entail negative evaluations. Salahshour (2016) identified examples of water flow metaphors used positively to describe the effects of migration on the economy in the analysis of *New Zealand Herald* articles published between 2007 and 2008. Furthermore, the metaphors seem to be naturalized, as suggested by the analysis of Baker and McEnery (2005) that identified water flow, vermin and attacker metaphors not only in the 2003 British newspapers corpus, but also identified water flow metaphors in the corpus of the website of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees.

Most similar to the empirical work of this article is the analysis of metaphors in the Croatian newspaper *Večernji list* by Šaina (2016), that compared metaphor use in October 2015, as an increased number of people migrated through the region, and again in February 2016. The metaphors compared migration to water flows and the country to a home. The discourse was thus subject to securitization along the lines defined by Buzan, Wæver, and Wilde (1998): the process of political actors casting situations primarily as a threat and thereby enabling non-conventional responses.

That metaphorical expressions may frame discourses on social issues is suggested by a series of experiments by Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011) showing that metaphors may shape opinions on social issues in experimental conditions, such as judgements on which societal response is the most appropriate towards acts of crime. However, Marshall and Shapiro (2018) show that such effects likely depend on the prior beliefs of readers. In their experiments, participants with a high degree of identification with the US were more prone to experience disgust and support restrictive policies when subjected to texts using vermin metaphors to describe migrants.

4.2 Slovene migration discourse

In a comprehensive critical discourse analysis of 965 news articles from the Slovenian Press Agency, Tumas (2017) identifies three predominant discourses regarding those migrating: those of management, crime, and war. Firstly, the arrival of people was framed as an amorphous and difficult logistical burden on Slovenia that needed to be managed efficiently, entailing that maintaining control was the goal. The bearers of the burden were also exclusively Slovene citizens or government agencies: what burdens those arriving might face due to these political responses was not discussed. The managerial discourse was also reflected in book-keeping-like reports on how many people were moved where each day, and various ways of subdividing them into more and less desirable categories. Another way the media emphasized the burden on the state and need to control refugees was through equating refugees with a natural disaster, such as a flood or wave: Slovenia was at risk of “sinking in this migration wave” and “grappling to manage the surging wave of refugees pouring into the country” (Tumas 2017, 35–36). Secondly, Tumas identified the discourse of criminality. Criminological and detective terminology can be found in the texts (the police *catching* refugees after *detecting* them despite *deterrent* measures). The texts also featured generalizations on the unwillingness of refugees to cooperate with the authorities (e. g. through stories of refugees *breaking through* restrictive fences without any further context to the story, such as the treatment of police, long processing times or other factors). Extraordinary incidents were given explanatory power for the entire group of people, and were juxtaposed with calls from various actors for the expansion of the authority of the military. Condemnations of illegal migration also cast refugees as criminals, as in many cases no strictly legal paths existed for those migrating (Kogovšek Šalomon and Bajt 2016). Thirdly, Tumas (2017) observed a war discourse, reflected in war-related terminology (*rapid interventions*, *convoys of refugees*, *making peace in refugee camps*), as well as the fact that the detractors of handing police powers to the military were dismissed as *ideological*, *with partial interests*, and *unpatriotic*.

Pajnik (2016) provides a media analysis for the period between August and December 2015 through the lens of the mediatization of society (Mazzoleni and Schulz 1999). This concept describes the transformation of the media from a place of public deliberation into a space for displays of power by elite publics in front of the people. In doing so, the media redefines the public (as mere recipients of the government’s discourse) as well as politics (as party politics exclusively). Pajnik (2016) observes that this dynamic was in place throughout the reporting in the time period. “Strong publics” such as the government, police and army were reflected in the source selection, while “weak publics” such as non-governmental organizations, intellectuals, activists and volunteers on the

ground found no or marginal media space. This selection led to an uncritical reproduction of the language of the former, reflected in parallelisms between the discourse used by the media and by the political elites. One example of this is the use of the term *refugee* by government representatives when talking about supporting those migrating and the terms *economic migrant* and *potential terrorist*, when talking about increased border control. This form of terminological shifting was reproduced and left uncontested in the media reports. The framing of migration as a natural disaster, thereby casting migration as a threat, was also reproduced through the use of water flow metaphorical expressions, such as *refugee flood* and *stopping the refugee wave*. Lastly, the media discourse largely replicated the use of euphemisms for the razor wire placed on the Slovene-Croatian border by the authorities, by referring to it as *a tool to direct migration*, *a technical obstacle*, *a professional tool*, and *a wire that is actually not a wire, but only appears as one* without contestation.

4.3 Overview of metaphor identification procedures

In related work, many authors have not explicitly mentioned a metaphor identification methodology, which likely means they were determined by the authors' judgement. Baker and McEnery (2005) used concordances of a target word (e. g. *refugee*) which were sorted alphabetically according to the letter of the following word. Salahshour (2016) used collocations from a 3-word window to the left and right of the key word (*migrant*, *immigrant*, *Asian* and the plural forms). The corpora used by Baker and McEnery (2005) and Salahshour (2016), were not lemmatized or tagged for parts of speech. Semino et al. (2017) used manual annotators using the Pragglejazz (Steen et al. 2007) metaphor identification procedure, which we will also apply in this chapter. It includes four steps:

1. Reading and comprehending the texts and discourse.
2. Identification of individual lexical elements.
3. Checking for each lexical unit in text:
 - a. its contextual meaning in the text;
 - b. its basic meaning in other contexts, where basic meaning is presumed when it is more concrete, related to bodily activity, more specific, or historically older than the contextual meaning;
 - c. if the basic and contextual meaning differ and if the contextual meaning can be understood through the basic meaning.
4. If the lexical unit fulfils the criteria in step 3, it is considered metaphorical.

5 CORPUS ANALYSIS OF WATER FLOW METAPHORS

This section describes the process for selecting the material that was included in the migration corpus and the method for determining metaphorical expressions. Different methods from corpus linguistics then provide insights into the use of water flow metaphorical expressions (WFMEs) in the migration corpus. The conceptual theory of metaphor assumes that metaphors are a cornerstone of language use, on the basis of which we hypothesize that WFMEs in the migrations corpus were used mostly in a metaphorical sense. Since the metaphor of migration as a water flow has already emerged in related research (Salahshour 2016, Baker and McEnery 2005, Šaina 2016), we hypothesize that the use of WFMEs in the migration corpus was naturalized and persistent across journalists and the months in the period examined in 2015. Pajnik (2016) highlights the parallelism between the discourse of politicians and the media, so we hypothesized that WFMEs were mostly used in reported statements of other speakers and not by the journalists themselves. Kövecses (2007) notes that metaphors also relate to social experience, so an additional hypothesis was that WFMEs were used differently in relation to the semantic preference of the terms referring to those migrating (e. g. *refugee* vs. *migrant*).

5.1 Research dataset and methodology

5.1.1 Text selection and migration corpus creation

The time frame for the analysis was selected to begin with the increased arrival of refugees (mostly from North Africa and the Middle East) to Slovenia from August 2015 to December 2015. We analysed articles published on the web portal of the national public broadcasting service MMC RTV Slovenia under the news category Slovenia. We chose this news portal because it is a wide-reaching³ public service broadcaster and considered to be (relatively) ideologically and regionally neutral in comparison to other news sites. All articles from the news site from the aforementioned period were manually reviewed, and only those that directly related to the arrival of refugees were included. We also discarded all interviews, since they tend to be longer texts focusing on a single speaker, which could affect the analysis of frequencies. Article subheadings, images, links to other articles, editorial notices and reader comments were not included in the corpus. Journalists' initials were retrieved as metadata.

3 For December 2019, the website was ranked the 6th most visited website in Slovenia, according to data commissioned by the Slovenian Chamber of Advertising (<https://www.moss-soz.si/rezultati/>, accessed 13 January 2019).

The selected texts were saved in a .txt file and imported into the open-source concordance software AntConc (Version 3.4.4; Anthony 2014). Metadata was also retrieved from article links using the Python package *beautifulsoup* and included the journalists' initials and publication date.

5.2 Description of the migration corpus

After applying the selection criteria, 215 articles were included in the corpus and analysis. The number of articles and tokens⁴ per month are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1: Number of articles and tokens per month.

Month	Num. of articles	% of all articles	Num. of tokens	% of all tokens
August	8	4	4,971	3.99
September	58	26	38,901	31.22
October	63	30	37,836	30.36
November	59	27	31,361	25.17
December	27	13	11,543	9.26
Total	215	100	124,612	100

There were 124,612 tokens and 15,597 token types in the entire corpus. The average article length was 360 tokens, spanning from 86 to 1,998 tokens, which suggests the corpus included a wide array of text types. In total, there were 24 different journalists, but nine journalists authored approximately 80% of the articles. In case of multiple authors, each journalist was given a share (e.g. for two authors of an article with 86 tokens, each was considered to have contributed 43 tokens).

We first checked whether the corpus reflected actual events during the selected period. It was expected that the use of words to describe obstacles at the border would increase in November, when Slovenia began to set up a fence at the Croatian border. First we conducted a concordance search of the word *build* (*postaviti*) and sorted the first words right of the keyword to get a list of words referring to border obstacles, which were *obstacle* (*ovira*), *barrier* (*pregrada*), *technical means* (*tehnična sredstva*), *fence* (*ograja*), and *wire* (*žica*). A second concordance was done with the new key words and non-border-related senses of the key word were removed. As summarized in Table 2, the migration corpus clearly reflected the media discourse relating to border descriptions, since it is much higher in November than October.

⁴ The smallest unit in a corpus. Typically each word and punctuation mark is a separate token. Spaces between words are not tokens.

Table 2: Term frequency of border obstacle expressions.

Term	August	September	October	November	December
obstacle	0	1	13	36	15
barrier	0	3	1	1	2
technical means	0	0	0	10	0
fence	4	24	58	124	121
wire	0	24	1	21	49
Total	4	52	73	192	187
Num. of tokens	4,971	38,901	37,836	31,361	11,543
Rel. freq. per 1000 tokens	0.8	1.3	1.9	6.1	16.2

5.3 Metaphor identification process

WFMEs in the corpus were identified through the Pragglejazz metaphor identification process (Steen et al. 2007). The authors of the procedure recommend the use of reference sources in identifying basic and contextual meanings, which was done through the Word Sketch feature in Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2014) with the Slovene reference corpus Gigafida (Logar Berginc et al. 2012) as a source.

The metaphor identification process in this chapter was performed in the following steps:

1. All articles were read during the selection process, familiarizing the researcher with the texts and discourse.
2. A frequency list of all types was inspected and candidate words that could be a part of the metaphor *MIGRATION IS A WATER FLOW* were included in the third step. The corpus was not lemmatized, so inflected forms of the same words were skipped.
3. The migration corpus was concordanced for all the words identified in the previous step and the forms in which metaphorical expressions occurred were noted. The Word Sketches in the Sketch Engine tool were then used (using the Gigafida reference corpus), and the collocations that had the same syntactic form as the potential WFMEs were examined.
4. If at least two collocates in the Word Sketch suggesting a water flow metaphor were observed, the word was added to the list of identified WFMEs.

5.3.1 Results of the identification procedure

WFMEs occurred at least once in 45% of the articles in our corpus (99 articles). Table 3 presents the WFMEs identified in the Migration Corps along with examples of use from the migration corpus, all identified forms in the migrant corpus, and the semantic preference of the same term in the Gigafida reference corpus. Semantic preference was determined via Word Sketches in Sketch Engine in the Gigafida corpus, examining only the collocations that had the same syntactic properties as the identified forms in the migrant corpus. We grouped these collocations into semantic fields.

Table 3: Results of the identification procedure.

WFME	Example of use	Identified forms in the migration corpus	Semantic preference from Gigafida corpus
flow (tok) ⁵	Slovenia is progressing and has economic growth, so the migrant flow has not caused much damage to the country, said the Prime Minister in one of his answers.	migration flow, refugee flow, migrant flow, flow of migrants, flow of refugees (migracijski tok, begunski tok, prebežniški ⁶ tok, migrantski tok, tok migrantov, tok beguncev)	physical quantities, bodies of water, goods
flow (pretok)	Interior Minister Vesna Györkös Žnidar noted that the flow of migrants across the external borders is too high /.../	migration flow, refugee flow, flow of people, flow of refugees (pretok migracij, pretok prebežnikov, pretok ljudi, pretok prebežnikov)	people, goods and services, water flow, fluids, thoughts, physical quantities.

5 In this paper, we use flow as a translation equivalent for the Slovene expressions *tok* and *pretok*, and *influx* for *dotok* and *pritok*. However, the analysis was performed on the individual original Slovene expressions.

6 Both *begunec* and *prebežnik* were translated as refugee in this paper. However, as we further analyse in 4.4.4., they carry different connotations regarding the (il)legal status of people. *Begunec* readily translates to refugee, but *prebežnik* is more complex. The Slovene reference dictionary (*Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika*) defines the word as “those fleeing over”. In the context of migration studies (Pajnik, Lesjak-Tušek, and Gregorčič 2001), *prebežnik* denotes people who severed economic and social ties with their previous environment due to various circumstances, crossed the border without documents and were detained in Slovenia and it is an informal term rather than a legal category (such as *refugee* or *asylum seeker*). Adding to the complexity, the term *immigrant* was used as the English equivalent in the aforementioned research (Pajnik et al. 2002), yet *immigrant* in Slovene would likely have a distinct profile of collocations from *prebežnik* as well as a different frequency of occurrence as a loanword. The analysis, however, was performed on the individual original Slovene expressions.

WFME	Example of use	Identified forms in the migration corpus	Semantic preference from Gigafida corpus
influx (dotok)	And until the factors that push them from their home countries are settled, the influx of refugees will not stop, said [Bojan Dobovsek].	influx of refugees, influx of migrants. (dotok beguncev, dotok migrantov, dotok prebežnikov)	goods, immigrants, water, substances and physical quantities
influx (pritok)	Although the influx of refugees who arrived to Slovenia at the end of last week has decreased /.../.	Influx of people, influx of refugees, influx of migrants (pritok ljudi, pritok beguncev, pritok migrantov, pritok prebežnikov)	river names, goods
wave (val)	Bojana Muršič from SD said that the estimates of the government's unpreparedness to the refugee wave were only approximate.	Immigrant wave, [second] refugee wave, migration wave, waves of migrants and refugees, wave of refugees, wave of migrants, second wave of the refugee crisis, wave of economic migrants (imigrantski val, [drugi] begunski val, prebežniški val, selitveni val, valovi migrantov in beguncev, val prebežnikov, val beguncev, val migrantov, drugi val begunske krize, val ekonomskih migrantov)	radio stations, physical phenomena (e.g. gravity wave), destructive natural phenomena (e.g. flood wave), sea, protest, violence, immigrants and refugees, emotions (positive and negative)
to dam (zajeziti)	Failure to comply with the commitments will prove that European policy is not working and Slovenia will need to step up border measures and measures to dam the flow of refugees, /.../.	to dam migrations, to dam the refugee flow (zajeziti migracije, prebežniški tok)	bodies of water, criminal acts

WFME	Example of use	Identified forms in the migration corpus	Semantic preference from Gigafida corpus
damming (zaje-zitev)	On the Austrian side of the Špilje border crossing with Slovenia, a wire fence was set up for the damming of the refugee flow.	damming the flow of refugees, damming the refugees (zajezitev toka beguncev, zajezitev toka prebežnikov, zajezitev prebežnikov)	migration, water flow, impurities, crime
river (reka)	The river of refugees on an endless walkway on a cold rainy day is reminiscent of a line of prisoners.	river of refugees (reka beguncev)	river names
to splash (pljuskati)	[Janez Janša] also pointed his finger at Germany /.../, and now that this problem is splashing across Slovenia, Germany should enable Slovenia to catch its breath.	to splash [over] (pljuskati [čez])	bodies of water
to dry up (usah-niti)	In the near future, the refugee flow that Europe witnessed this fall will dry up /.../.	[the refugee flow] dries up (begunski tok usahne)	water sources, emotions
throughput [of rivers, borders] (pretočnost)	In the event of a reduction of the throughput at the northern border, our country should also increase the control at the southern Schengen border / ... /.	the throughput of the Slovene-Austrian border, sufficient throughput (pretočnost slovenskoavstrijske meje, dovoljšna pretočnost)	water flow, traffic, blood vessels
to overflow (preplaviti)	/.../ because we cannot allow Slovenia to be overflowed by an uncontrolled number of refugees or migrants /.../.	uncontrolled numbers of refugees or migrants overflow [Slovenia] (nenadzorovano število beguncev ali migrantov preplavi)	emotions, bodies of water, larger groups of people

5.4 Quantitative analysis of metaphorical expressions

The identified WFMEs were further analysed quantitatively. We examined if the WFMEs appeared in the corpus in their basic sense, the naturalization of the WFMEs through examining their occurrence over the months and across different journalists, the use of WFMEs in reported speech as opposed to the journalists' own statements and lastly the interplay between the naming of those arriving and the use of WFMEs.

5.4.1 Proportion of metaphorical uses

In this subsection, we analyse whether the identified WFMEs in the migration corpus appeared solely in the metaphorical sense. A concordance was queried for each of the WFMEs, using word roots and a wildcard to find all inflections of the search term. We then manually removed all irrelevant hits from the number of hits and divided the results into metaphorical uses related to refugee groups, metaphorical phenomena not related to refugee groups, and non-metaphorical occurrences. The results of the analysis are shown in Table 4 in order of frequency.

5.4.2 Naturalization analysis

We tested the hypothesis that the use of WFMEs in migration discourse is stable via frequency analysis by months and authors. The data in Table 5 shows that the relative frequency of WFMEs in the articles increased from August to December 2015.

Table 4: Metaphorical and non-metaphorical uses of WFMEs.

Word	Count (all)	Metaph. use (related to migration)	Metaph. use (other)	Nonmetaph. use	% of metaph. use (related to migration)
tok (flow)	108	105	3	0	97.2
val (wave)	101	98	2	1	97.01
pretok (flow)	17	15	2	0	88.24
dotok (flow)	16	14	2	0	87.5
pritok (flow)	6	6	0	0	100
zajezitev (to dam, nominalized)	5	5	0	0	100
pretočnost (throughput)	4	4	0	0	100
zajeziti (to dam)	2	2	0	0	100
usahniti (to dry up)	2	2	0	0	100
pljuskati (to splash)	1	1	0	0	100
preplaviti (to overflow)	1	1	0	0	100
reka (river)	21	1	0	20	4.76
Total	284	254	9	21	0.89

Table 5: WFMEs use by month.

Month	Num. of tokens	Absolute frequency of WFMEs	Num. of WFMEs types	Rel. freq. of WFMEs per 10000 tokens
August	4,971	8	4	1.61
September	38,901	67	6	1.72
October	37,836	68	7	1.82
November	31,361	79	7	2.52
December	11,543	32	5	2.77
Total	124,612	254	12	2.05

We also analysed the use of WFMEs across different authors. The analysis is based on two pieces of information: the relative proportion of articles written by each journalist and the relative frequency of WFMEs in each journalist's texts. The full results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: WFMEs use by journalist.

Journalist	WFMEs (English ⁷)	WFMEs (Slovene)	Num. of WFMEs	Total tokens by author	Rel. freq. of WFMEs by author (per 1000 tokens)	% of written articles
T. H.	to overflow, damming, flow, wave, to dam, influx	tok, preplaviti, zaježitev, pretok, val, zaježiti, pritok, reka	60	21,458	2.80	10.5
A. Č.	flow, damming, to splash, wave, to dam, influx,	tok, zaježitev, pretok, dotok, pljuskati, val, zaježiti, pritok,	71	31,383	2.26	16.39
G. K.	flow, influx, wave, to dam, throughput	tok, pretok, dotok, val, pretočnost, zaježiti	56	25,091	2.23	8.2
B. V.	flow, influx, wave	tok, dotok, val, pritok	27	13,251	2.04	4.28
G. C.	flow, wave, to dry up, influx	tok, pretok, dotok, val, usahniti, pritok	69	34,995	1.97	19.01
Al. Ma.	flow, damming, influx, wave, throughput	tok, zaježitev, dotok, val, pretočnost	49	25,148	1.95	9.53
Sa. J.	flow, influx, wave, throughput, to dam	tok, pretok, dotok, val, pretočnost, zaježiti	52	27,825	1.87	7.73
L. L.	influx, flow, wave	pretok, dotok, tok, val	13	7,191	1.81	3.84
B. T.	wave, influx, flow, throughput	val, dotok, tok, pretočnost	16	9,128	1.75	2.3

7 The number of unique WFMEs differs in the English and Slovene column because both *tok* and *pretok* were translated as flow and both *dotok* and *pritok* were translated as influx. All the figures in the table, however, correspond to the Slovene original expressions on which the analysis was performed.

Journalist	WFMEs (English ⁷)	WFMEs (Slovene)	Num. of WFMEs	Total tokens by author	Rel. freq. of WFMEs by author (per 1000 tokens)	% of written articles
G. V.	flow	tok	4	2,597	1.54	1.82
A. K. K.	flow, wave, influx	tok, val, pritok	9	12,120	0.74	4.66
K. T.	wave	val	3	6,453	0.46	2.25
B. R.	none	none	0	2,574	0	2.42
A. P. J.	none	none	0	2,502	0	0.39
J. B.	none	none	0	2,437	0	2.33
To. G.	none	none	0	1,719	0	0.7
M. R.	none	none	0	968	0	0.47
P. P.	none	none	0	689	0	0.15
S. B. L.	none	none	0	584	0	0.47
M. N.	none	none	0	569	0	0.23
Ka. Br.	none	none	0	468	0	0.12
A. M.	none	none	0	386	0	0.47
E. Š.	none	none	0	308	0	0.23
K. Št.	none	none	0	238	0	0.15

Two observations arise from this analysis: the first is that WFMEs were a prevalent feature of the texts, and second, none of the journalists with a high share of the articles had a markedly lower relative frequency of WFMEs. From this it can be concluded that the use of WFMEs in the migration corpus was a discursive norm and not a feature of any individual journalist.

5.4.3 *WFMEs in reported statements*

In this section, we tested the hypothesis that WFMEs in the articles were mostly produced when journalists reported statements from their sources. WFMEs were classified into three categories according to their source: unknown, journalists, and others (politicians and officials),⁸ the latter including WFMEs in direct or indirect reported speech or structures with a similar function (e.g., “According to the mayor, the flow needs to be controlled”). The source of WFMEs was marked unknown when it could not be precisely determined. The results in Table 7 show that the majority of WFMEs in the articles did indeed stem from reported statements.

⁸ Some of the authors of the statements were MPs, ministers (especially the Interior Minister at the time, Vesna Györkös Žnidar) and the Prime Minister (Miro Cerar at the time).

Table 7: WFMEs by source in order of occurrence.

WFMEs	Num. of occurrences	Journalists	Others	Unknown
flow (tok)	105	22	65	18
flow (pretok)	15	1	12	0
influx (dotok)	14	8	6	0
influx (pritok)	6	4	2	0
wave (val)	98	26	63	11
zajeziti (to dam)	2	0	2	0
damming (zajezitev)	5	4	1	0
Throughput (pretočnost)	4	1	3	0
to dry up (usahnuti)	2	1	1	0
river (reka)	1	0	1	0
to splash (pljuskati)	1	0	1	0
to overflow (preplaviti)	1	0	1	0
Total	254	67	158	29
%	100	26.4	62.2	11.4

5.4.4 WFMEs in relation to naming practices

In this section we examine the occurrence of WFMEs in relation to the semantic preference of the terms used to designate people arriving. Through the familiarity established through reading the text during corpus creation, we decided to further examine three nouns used to refer to those migrating: *begunec* (refugee), *prebežnik* (refugee), and *migrant* (migrant).⁹ We examined the semantic preference of these terms through observing adjectival collocations by using Word Sketches in Sketch Engine (Kilgarriff et al. 2014) from the Gigafida reference corpus. From the results in Table 8, two observations were further made. Firstly, the adjective *illegal* (*illegalen*) was most strongly associated with *prebežnik*, followed by *migrant*, and lastly *begunec*. It should be noted that documents containing the phrase *ilegalni prebežnik* (*illegal refugee*)¹⁰ were written from 1997 to 2011, however 459 out of 1,125 occurrences of the phrase date to 2001 (further investigation of which is however beyond the scope of this chapter). Secondly, a difference was observed in the collocation of these nouns with the adjective *ekonomski* (*economic*) which was associated with *migrant*, but not with *prebežnik* and *begunec*.

⁹ In this section we first provide the Slovene terms followed by a translation to avoid confusion due to the translation of *prebežnik* (see Footnote 5).

¹⁰ This oxymoron is due to the lack of a better translation of *prebežnik*.

Table 8: Comparison of adjectival collocates between *begunec*, *prebežnik* and *migrant*.*

	begunec/migrant	prebežnik/migrant	begunec/prebežnik
	Kosovar, Palestinian, Bosnian, Bosniak, Istrian, Albanian, Afghani, Chechen, Hague, accommodated, Kurdish, Dalmatian, temporary, Vič, ¹¹ Tibetan, Serbian, North Korean	detained, North Korean, Cuban, Iranian, Albanian, Chinese, foreign, political	Kosovar, Palestinian, Bosnian, Bosniak, Istrian, Afghani, Chechen, Hague, accommodated, Kurdish, Dalmatian, temporary, Vič, Tibetan, Serbian
	numerous	illegal	Albanian, political
	African	unlawful	Cuban, North Korean
	economic, illegal		Illegal
	working, unlawful, crossborder, daily	numerous, working, African, economic, cross-border, daily	Foreign, Chinese, Iranian, unlawful, detained.

* Adjectives in the dark red row only occurred with the first noun in the column. Adjectives in the dark grey row only occurred with the second noun in the column. Light red and light grey denote a partial preference and white denotes no preference for either noun in the compared pair in each column. The minimum frequency for a collocation to be included was set to 20 occurrences in the Gigafida reference corpus.

Next we designated a non-metaphorical expression to serve as a comparison to the commonly observed noun phrases of *refugee* or *migrant waves* and *flows* and decided upon the word *arrival* (*prihod*). We performed the same procedures as for candidates for metaphorical expressions with Sketch Engine's Word Sketches from the Gigafida corpus. Genitival collocations were selected from the reference corpus because those were the forms retrieved in a concordance of *arrival* in the migration corpus. All genitival collocations were related to people, in stark comparison to *wave* and *flow* (shown in Table 9).

We then examined all combinations of the words *arrival* (*prihod*), *wave* (*val*) and *flow* (*tok*) and the words *begunec*, *prebežnik*, and *migrant*. The combination count included the namings for people in both nominal and adjectival forms.¹² The results are summarized in Table 10. Of all possible combinations, the phrase *prihod migrantov* (*arrival of migrants*) did not appear under the given criteria.

11 Vič is a district in Ljubljana which has an asylum home. In this context, viški beguneci refers to refugees staying at the asylum home in Vič.

12 That is both *begunski val* and *val beguncev* were counted, translating into *refugee wave* and *wave of refugees*.

Table 9: Semantic preferences of *arrival*, *flow*, and *wave*.

Word	Semantic preference from Word Sketches
arrival (prihod)	government services, vehicles, seasons, different persons
flow (tok)	physical quantities (e.g. electricity), water bodies, goods
wave (val)	radio stations, physical phenomena, destructive natural phenomena (e.g. flood wave), sea, protests, violence, immigrants and refugees, emotions (positive and negative)

Table 10: Co-occurrence frequencies of refugee or migrant and *wave*, *flow*, and *arrival*.

Target word	Naming used	Num. of occurrences
wave (val)	begunec (refugee)	49
	prebežnik (refugee)	17
	migrant (migrant)	11
flow (tok)	begunec (refugee)	23
	prebežnik (refugee)	23
	migrant (migrant)	13
arrival (prihod)	begunec (refugee)	23
	prebežnik (refugee)	33
	migrant (migrant)	0

Finally, we compared the occurrence of WFMEs in phrases with the three terms, sorting them along the axis of their collocation with *illegal* and separately for their collocation with *economic* (shown in Tables 11 and 12). We could not determine a clear interplay of semantic preference of (il)legality and WFMEs; assuming *prebežnik* is more strongly semantically marked with illegality than *migrant* (as suggested by the reference corpus data), one would expect that the nonmetaphorical *prihod migrantov* (*migrant arrival*) would be at least as common as its metaphorical counterpart *val migrantov* (*wave of migrants*), which was not the case.

Table 11: Occurrence of combinations by semantic preference (*illegal*) and the presence of WFMEs.

	Semantic preference: illegal - no (<i>begunec</i>)	Semantic preference: illegal - partly (<i>migrant</i>)	Semantic preference: illegal - yes (<i>prebežnik</i>)
Metaphorical noun (<i>wave, flow</i>)	72	24	40
Non-metaphorical noun (<i>arrival</i>)	23	0	33
Total:	95	24	73

Table 12: Occurrence of combinations by semantic preference (*economic*) and the presence of WFMEs.

	Semantic preference: economic - yes (<i>migrant</i>)	Semantic preference: economic - no (<i>begunec</i> & <i>prebežnik</i>)
Metaphorical noun (<i>wave, flow</i>)	24	112
Non-metaphorical noun (<i>arrival</i>)	0	56
Total:	24	168

However, the interplay between semantic preference for *ekonomski* (*economic*) and WFMEs indicates that while *migrant waves* did occur, *migrant arrival* never did. This may be explained by the lower frequency of *migrant* in general, as any possible collocation with a low-frequency word is less likely. On the other hand, the corpus covered all of the migration-related online news of a widely viewed news platform and can thus be considered representative of the language used to report on migration during the surveyed time period.

6 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we have presented an approach to the analysis of metaphorical expressions of water flow in migration discourse from a theoretical framework of cognitive and corpus linguistics, as well as critical discourse analysis. We analysed a corpus of 215 articles between August and December 2015 from the MMC RTV Slovenia news portal on the topic of refugee arrivals. The research presented in this chapter complements previous studies with the use of corpora and quantitative measures, which can aid qualitative analysis by enabling concordancing through the texts for key words, as well as comparative analysis between sources (e.g. comparison of key words used in different sources relative to a reference).

We found that metaphorical expressions of water flow were used almost exclusively in a metaphorical sense, in line with the conceptual metaphor theory (Lakoff 1993), which puts metaphors from the position of mere linguistic ornaments into the position of a fundamental cognitive mechanism to organize experiences. We observed that the frequency of metaphorical expressions of water flow increased over the examined time period and the metaphorical expressions were identified in 45% of the analysed articles. Previous discourse analyses of the same period in Slovenia pointed to the use of *refugee waves* in the framing of refugees as a threat (Pajnik 2016), as well as a way to define the related recipients of harm

(Tumas 2017). Furthermore, in a response elicitation study, Boroditsky and Thibodeau (2011) report that single metaphorical expressions at the beginning of a text affected the readers' immediate preferences for the responses to criminality. It is also conceivable that the actual policies enacted through the lens of securitization further reinforce the discourse that enabled them in the first place. As Tumas (2017, 37) writes: "The presence of the army and erection of a fence made that need for control given."

The next set of findings from this chapter reveals more on the role MMC RTV Slovenia played in the migration discourse in the period. All the journalists appeared to use the metaphorical expressions consistently. Metaphorical expressions of water flow were used primarily in the reported statements from various sources, such as politicians and officials. Only 26.4% of all metaphorical expressions of water flow could be unambiguously attributed directly to the journalists. This finding ties into the analysis of mediatization of the events during the period described by Pajnik (2016); if the metaphor in this context was indeed used to frame migration as a security crisis, the journalists reproduced it nevertheless using their own voice as well as when reporting statements by sources. It seems appropriate to label this as a naturalization and successful resignification of migrations as a threat over the period (to the extent it was not the case prior) in the discursive arena of power relations, ideologies, social roles and knowledge systems in the sense proposed by Fairclough (2010).

Lastly, while looking at the interaction between the naming of those arriving and water flow metaphorical expressions, we did not find a clear connection between the connotation (*illegal* and *economic*) of various ways of referring to the people arriving to Slovenia and the frequency of their co-occurrence with water flow expressions. However, we did find that the phrase *arrival of migrants* never occurred in the corpus.

While examining the terms used for people migrating, we found that the occurrence of *illegalni prebežniki* (*illegal refugees*) in the reference corpus peaked in 2001, accounting for around 40% of all occurrences of the phrase in the entire reference corpus. This raises interesting methodological questions about the notion of the point of reference, the importance of sampling criteria for reference corpus construction and the implications these two factors have on a common claim that corpora reduce researcher bias (cf. Baker 2006). If a word used for people fleeing was strongly connected to illegality within a single year, then corpora will also reflect that, as many reference corpora strongly draw on newspaper texts. The presence of such biases in language technologies is not a new finding (Caliskan et al. 2017), yet there are two important implications for further research using corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis in particular. Firstly, comparative corpus analysis may only succeed in quantifying the differences between two text collections, but cannot account for pre-existing bias within a chosen

reference corpus. It is, for instance, conceivable that a keyword analysis comparing mainstream sources reporting on migration with a collection of texts from anti-immigration sources would render the inherent biases in mainstream sources invisible. Secondly, it does not seem likely this limitation can be addressed by merely increasing the scale of the text collection, which is one of the most promising features of corpus-based approaches.

This chapter also raises new research questions. One line of further work could assess the impact of metaphorical framing in experimental contexts for water flow metaphors, similar to Thibodeau and Boroditsky (2011) and Marshall and Shapiro (2018). Secondly, the metaphorical expressions we examined in this chapter were used to securitize migration, yet it is conceivable they might also have been subject to subversive resignification as a form of counter-speech against securitization. Was there such use, by whom, and did such use circumvent the destructive and arguably dehumanizing frame that *refugee waves* entails? Thirdly, the research presented in this chapter could be further expanded in scope in various ways, from incorporating other news websites, other genres, and social media texts, to extending the analysis to visual materials and speech. Last but not least, studies similar to our work in this chapter have already been performed across a variety of EU national contexts in response to the 2015 events (for a collection of examples, see Krzyżanowski, Triandafyllidou and Wodak 2018), yet valuable research could be done in synthesis and comparison of research within and across countries. In addition to providing insights on the various methodologies used, cross-lingual studies could compare the discourse on migration in destination countries compared to transit countries (e. g. Slovenia as a transit country never had a discursive struggle over the maximum number of arrivals, a central topic in Austria, a neighbouring destination country). In conclusion, such work could further articulate how and why the events in 2015 shifted speech and action about those migrating into the territory of security, and better understand under which conditions the discourse will contain narratives of people, not natural disasters.

Acknowledgements

The work described in this chapter was funded by the Slovenian Research Agency within the national basic research project “Resources, methods, and tools for the understanding, identification, and classification of various forms of socially unacceptable discourse in the information society” (J7-8280, 2017–2020) and the Slovenian-Flemish bilateral basic research project “Linguistic landscape of hate speech on social media” (N06-0099, 2019–2023).

References

- Anthony, L. (2014): AntConc: Version 3.4.4. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available at: <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software> (10 July 2017).
- Austin, J. (1962): *How to do things with words*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baker, P. (2006): *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London: Continuum.
- Baker, P., and McEnery, T. (2005): A corpus-based approach to discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in UN and newspaper texts. *Journal of Language and Politics*, 4 (2): 197–226. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.4.2.04bak>.
- Buzan, B., Wæver, O., and Wilde, J. (1998): *Security: A new framework for analysis*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Caliskan, A., Bryson, J., and Narayanan, A. (2017): Semantics derived automatically from language corpora contain human-like biases. *Science*, 356 (6334): 183–186. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1126/science.aal4230>.
- Fairclough, N. (1995): *Media discourse* (1st ed.). London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Fairclough, N. (2010): *Critical Discourse Analysis, The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). Edinbrugh: Pearson.
- Gigafida. Available at: <http://www.gigafida.net> (20 August 2017).
- Kilgarrieff, A., Baisa, V., Bušta, J., Jakubiček, M., Kovář, V., Michelfeit, J., Rychlý, P., and Suchomel, V. (2014): The Sketch Engine: ten years on. *Lexicography*, 1 (1): 7–36. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1007/s40607-014-0009-9>.
- Kogovšek Šalomon, N., and Bajt, V. (2016): Legal Implications of the “Humanitarian Corridor”. In N. Kogovšek Šalomon and V. Bajt (eds.): *RAZOR-WIRED, Reflections on Migration Movements through Slovenia in 2015*: 39–49. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Available at: http://www.mirovni-institut.si/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Razor_wired_publikacija_web.pdf (31 January 2020).
- Kövecses, Z. (2007): *Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Krek, S., and Kilgarrieff, A. (2006): Slovene Word Sketches. In T. Erjavec and J. Žganec Gros (eds.): *Proceedings of the 5th Slovenian/First International Languages Technology 2006 Conference: IS-LTC'06*: 62–67. Ljubljana: Institut Jožef Stefan. Available at: http://nl.ijs.si/is-ltc06/proc/12_Krek.pdf (31 January 2020).
- Krzyżanowski, M., Triandafyllidou, A., and Wodak, R. (2018): The Mediatization and the Politicization of the “Refugee Crisis” in Europe. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16 (1–2): 1–14. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1353189>.
- Ladić, M., and Vučko, K. (2016): Slovenia’s Response to Increased Arrivals of Refugees: We Don’t Want Them, But We Also Don’t Understand Why They Don’t Want to Stay. In N. Kogovšek Šalomon and V. Bajt (eds.): *RAZOR-WIRED, Reflections on Migration Movements through Slovenia in 2015*: 15–29. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Available at: http://www.mirovni-institut.si/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Razor_wired_publikacija_web.pdf (31 January 2020).

- Lakoff, G. (1993): The contemporary theory of metaphor. In A. Ortony (ed.): *Metaphor and Thought*: 202–251. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173865.013>.
- Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. (1999): *Philosophy in the flesh: The embodied mind and its challenge to Western thought*. New York: Basic Books.
- Levinson, S. (1983): *Pragmatics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Logar Berginc, N., Grčar, M., Brakus, M., Erjavec, T., Arhar Holdt, Š., and Krek, S. (2012): *Korpusi slovenskega jezika Gigafida, KRES, ccGigafida in ccKRES: gradnja, vsebina, uporaba*. Ljubljana: Trojina, zavod za uporabno slovenistiko; Fakulteta za družbene vede.
- Marshall, S., and Shapiro, J. (2018): When “Scurry” vs. “Hurry” Makes the Difference: Vermin Metaphors, Disgust, and Anti-Immigrant Attitudes. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74 (4): 774–789. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12298>.
- Mazzoleni, G., and Schulz, W. (1999): “Mediatization” of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy?. *Political Communication*, 16 (3): 247–261. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1080/105846099198613>.
- McEnery, T., and Wilson, A. (1996): *Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- O’Brien, G. (2003): Indigestible Food, Conquering Hordes, and Waste Materials: Metaphors of Immigrants and the Early Immigration Restriction Debate in the United States. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 18 (1): 33–47. Available at: http://doi.org/10.1207/s15327868ms1801_3.
- Pajnik, M. (2016): Migration in the Mirror of Mediatized Anti-politics. In N. Kogovšek Šalamon and V. Bajt (eds.): *RAZOR-WIRED, Reflections on Migration Movements through Slovenia in 2015*: 63–70. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut. Available at: http://www.mirovni-institut.si/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Razor_wired_publikacija_web.pdf (31 January 2020).
- Pajnik, M., Lesjak-Tušek, P., and Gregorčič, M. (2001): *Prebežniki, kdo ste?*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
- Pajnik, M., Lesjak-Tušek, P., Gregorčič, M., and Vuković, O. (2002): *Immigrants, who are you?*. Ljubljana: Mirovni inštitut.
- Šaina, V.-F. (2016): *Metafore »begunske« krize: kritična analiza diskurza v Večernjem listu*. Bachelor’s thesis, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Available at: http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/diplomska_dela_1/pdfs/mb11_saina-veronika-foska.pdf (31 January 2020).
- Salahshour, N. (2016): Liquid metaphors as positive evaluations: A corpus-assisted discourse analysis of the representation of migrants in a daily New Zealand newspaper. *Discourse, Context & Media*, 13: 73–81. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2016.07.002>.
- Santa Ana, O. (1999): “Like an Animal I was Treated”: Anti-Immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse. *Discourse & Society*, 10 (2): 191–224. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1177/0957926599010002004>.

- Semino, E., Demjén, Z., Demmen, J., Koller, V., Payne, S., Hardie, A., and Rayson, P. (2017): The online use of Violence and Journey metaphors by patients with cancer, as compared with health professionals: a mixed methods study. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care*, 7 (1): 60–66. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1136/bmjspcare-2014-000785>.
- Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika (1970–1991/web version: 2000). Ljubljana: ZRC SAZU. Available at: <http://bos.zrc-sazu.si/sskj.html> (20 January 2019).
- Steen, G. J., Cameron, L. J., Cienki, A. J., Crisp, P., Deignan, A., Gibbs, R. W., Grady, Z., Kövecses, Z., Low, G. D., and Semino, E. (2007): MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol*, 22 (1): 1–39. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752>.
- Thibodeau, P., and Boroditsky, L. (2011): Metaphors We Think with: The Role of Metaphor in Reasoning. *PLOS One*, 6 (2). Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016782>.
- Tumas, J. L. (2017): *Prisons and the border: Foucault's heterotopia in the context of two national crises*. Master's thesis, University of Ljubljana, Slovenia. Available at: http://dk.fdv.uni-lj.si/magistrska_dela_2/pdfs/mb22_tumas-jenny.pdf (31 January 2020).
- van der Valk, I. (2003): Right-Wing Parliamentary Discourse on Immigration in France. *Discourse & Society*, 14 (3): 309–348. Available at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42888571>.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1993): Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis. *Discourse & Society*, 4 (2): 249–283. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/02F0957926593004002006>.
- Vezovnik, A. (2017): Securitizing Migration in Slovenia: A Discourse Analysis of the Slovenian Refugee Situation. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16 (1–2): 39–56. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1282576>.