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Abstract

Since the end of the Cold War there has been a change in what is considered a security issue and a focus on 'softer security' issues, such as migration. As argued by researchers, the media has been a site for anti-illegal migration discourse which has been consistent with an increased politicization of migration starting from the 1970's. This paper examines British media discourse surrounding the Calais crisis, as it has been commonly referred to, and analyses how migration is discursively connected to security. The theoretical framework of securitization theory developed by The Copenhagen School will be employed and a discourse analysis of the chosen articles will be carried out. The principal goal is to see how the media portrays the situation in Calais and whether it reproduces the current political narrative, which can be considered to be largely driven by a security and anti-immigration discourse. The study, through employing Norman Fairclough’s three-dimensional model of analysis, finds that the articles reaffirm existing unequal power relations between migrants and political actors in the EU. This is achieved both at the textual level as well as discursively. The thesis concludes by discussing the role of media and journalism, as well as the applicability of securitization theory. As a final remark, regarding the case of Calais, the study calls for a broader and more nuanced portrayal of migrants and refugees in the media.
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1. Introduction

The current 'refugee crisis', as it has been described for example by the European Commission (2016), along with its vast media coverage makes it very relevant and interesting to explore how the media portrays migrants. The mass media has a huge influence on society, as emphasized by researchers such as Fairclough (1995), highlighting the importance of studying how issues are framed in it. A particular case which has been prominent in the media lately is the situation in Calais, referring to the big refugee encampment in northern France. Since 1999 there have been many camps around Calais which have been repeatedly closed down by the authorities, causing migrants to move to other locations (BBC, 2015a). The camp just outside of Calais hosted about 7 000 migrants, who have now been moved to various reception centres following the dismantlement of the camp (BBC, 2016a). Many were trying to enter the United Kingdom via the port or the Eurotunnel.

What is of particular interest in this thesis is examining how migration, in the case of Calais, is discursively connected to security in the British media and analysing the broader social context where this occurs. To do this, a discourse analysis will be conducted on a selection of articles from three British newspapers; The Guardian, The Telegraph and The Daily Mail. This is to allow for a variety both in political orientation and type of newspaper. The UK has a central role in the crisis in Calais, which is reflected in the choice of media for the study. Security is a central concept used in media discourse and as Humphrey (2013) discusses, following the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001 migration has more and more been framed as a security issue in the West. Therefore, it is relevant to examine in what ways this is done and in which social setting it occurs. Whilst the study focuses on the case of Calais, it is also highly relevant on a global scale as migration and security are concepts used everywhere in the world today.

There has been quite extensive research conducted regarding how migrants are presented in the media in terms of security. Scholars such as Guild (2009) have discussed the issue of inclusion and exclusion and the relationship between security and people who are not seen as being part of the 'collectivity', for example refugees or migrants. Moreover, many studies have examined how refugees are presented in different media outlets in various countries, for example Parker (2015, p.1), who explored how asylum seekers were presented as 'unwanted invaders' in newspapers in the UK and Australia. However, no existing research could be found regarding the Calais case. This study aims to fill that gap by using a
contemporary and highly relevant case to analyse how migration is presented in terms of security.

The key concept, which will be used in this study, is that of securitization connected to the Copenhagen School, in particular Ole Wæver and Barry Buzan. According to them, securitization is a successful 'speech act' (Buzan et al., 1998, p.26) referring to the idea that saying something is the act itself; something happens in the process. However, quite a lot of criticism has been extended to the concept of securitization as merely a speech act and this will be discussed later in the theory chapter. Previous studies have examined how migration has become securitized, among them Huysmans (2000), who reflected on how the securitization of migration should be analysed in the context of other factors of a political, social and economic nature. Karyotis (2012, p. 405), examining the securitization of migration in Greece, supports this view in his conclusion that securitization theory has to be expanded beyond the concepts of speech acts and linguistic representations. This will be considered in the study as well.

The study is structured as follows: first the purpose of the thesis and research questions are presented, as well as the material. Limitations of the study are also discussed. This is followed by the method chapter which presents Critical discourse analysis; the chosen method for the paper. The third chapter gives some background regarding migration to Europe as well as the situation in Calais. It also briefly discusses the key concepts used in the study. The following chapter present the chosen theoretical framework; securitization theory. Chapter five present previous research regarding the securitization of migration. The next chapter, chapter six, is the main contribution of the study and presents the results and analyses them. Chapter seven consists of a discussion of the results and is followed by a final concluding chapter.

1.1 Purpose and research question

The main aim of the thesis is to uncover how migrants, within the frame of the Calais crisis, are discursively constructed as a threat to security and what role the media has in either reproducing or challenging existing discourses. The study, whilst applying The Copenhagen School's theory of securitization in its analysis, also aims to question or develop this theory through seeing what its application to a particular case reveals about it. This will be done through analysing the discourse surrounding the Calais migrant crisis in British media, using the theoretical framework of securitization. The study asks the following overarching research question:
How has migration been securitized in the Calais crisis in British media discourse?

In analysing the articles, the following sub-questions will help guide the analysis:

- How strongly are migrants connected to the issue of security through the choice of vocabulary and how actors and processes are described?
- What discourses can be found in the articles and is there a dominant one?
- What is the broader societal context? Do the discourses in the texts reaffirm or challenge existing power relations?

1.2 Material and limitations

The reasoning behind choosing British print media for the study is based on the central role the United Kingdom plays in the Calais crisis. This is illustrated by many migrants' wish to go to the UK and the cooperation between the English and French authorities on the matter (BBC, 2016b). Moreover, the easy access to British media online combined with the high number of English speakers in the world illustrate its importance and influence. The fact that it does not need to be translated for this study is also an advantage as translation may entail some difficulties with regard to conducting discourse analysis. The study will analyse articles from three different British newspapers with different political stances. The Guardian was chosen because of its reputation as a 'broadsheet' paper (Carvalho & Burgess, 2005, p. 1460), the same applying to The Telegraph. Politically they have very different orientations, as the Guardian is generally seen as adopting a liberal stance whereas The Telegraph is considered more conservative in its nature. The study will also look at a tabloid/mid-market newspaper; The Daily Mail, to allow for a wide spectrum in the selection of newspapers. Broadsheet newspapers generally use less emotive and more moderate language than tabloid newspapers (Martín-Rojo, 1995, cited in Richardson, 2004, p. 53). This makes conducting a discourse analysis perhaps more challenging as the underlying structures in the text are not as clear as in tabloid newspaper articles. This difference and contrast between the different newspapers allows for an interesting comparison, which makes the results of the analysis richer. Regarding the online newspaper articles, photographs which are included will not be subject to analysis. Images do play an important role in conveying a message to the
reader in the ways they interact with the actual text. However, for this study including pictures in the analysis would require another method in addition to critical discourse analysis and is therefore not considered feasible. Considering the limitations of the thesis, this would provide too much material and the pictures could in fact be analysed on their own in a separate paper. Comments from readers are not going to be part of the analysis either as that would be too extensive, while bringing up potentially complicated issues of privacy.

2. Method

2.1 Critical discourse analysis

Discourse analysis is how we look at language and the meanings and social reality that are constructed by that discourse. It is a tool for analysing texts to identify power relations and injustices through deconstruction (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). As the thesis aims to explore how migrants are presented in media with regard to security and uncover what meanings are given to these concepts, discourse analysis is appropriate for the study.

There are many different approaches to conducting a discourse analysis, one of the most prominent being Critical Discourse Analysis (henceforth referred to as CDA), with roots in linguistics, philosophy and anthropology among other disciplines (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, p. 1). According to CDA, language is a ‘social practice’ (Fairclough and Wodak, 1997), meaning that context is crucial and that the text cannot be analysed in isolation from its social context. Moreover, according to CDA, discourse is both shaped by the social as well as shaping it. Accordingly, in line with its name, CDA aims to critique and challenge the current social order and existing inequalities, instead of merely understanding or explaining them (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, p. 6). As the name implies, CDA requires the researcher to be critical and self-reflective and apply a multidisciplinary approach to the research. As Wodak and Meyer (2009, p. 2) discuss, any social phenomenon lends itself to CDA; as long as the aim is to challenge it and not take for granted what it is conveying. One might ask how it is possible for the researcher to examine and deconstruct a discourse when he or she is also part of the social system which both shapes and is shaped by the discourse. The key is recognizing that one is part of the social system and being aware of what this means for the research and one’s own position (ibid). An important aspect of CDA also involves the researcher being transparent in the research process, which is considered in the study.
CDA has been subjected to some criticism, which is worth mentioning at this point. This concerns, among other things, the normative nature of CDA as it involves the researcher judging what something should be like instead of just understanding and describing it. This leads to questions concerning how the researcher is able to determine 'what should be' and if this truly means that he or she is critical. Another criticism involves how CDA has produced a body of work which is largely negative; as the researcher looks for a social wrong and hegemonic ideology in the discourse, he or she might make unfounded assumptions. This negative determinism has been criticised and critics have highlighted the need for more positive-oriented approaches to CDA (Breeze, 2011). Furthermore, CDA has been criticised for usually only offering one interpretation which Widdowson (2004) claims is a flaw as different people, with different values and ideas, interpret texts in different ways. Nonetheless, as the study aims to identify hidden ideologies and power relations in the articles as well as consider the role of social context in shaping the discourse, CDA is an appropriate choice for the study. In addition, as argued by Chouliaraki and Fairclough (1999), CDA is a good method for analysing the mass media as they argue that it is often a site of power where language appears to be transparent. However, according to them this is not the case and so language used in mass media needs to be examined and deconstructed in order to find any latent ideologies. The study will use Fairclough's three-dimensional model of CDA which will be presented next.

2.1.1 Fairclough’s three-dimensional model

CDA is quite a broad area of studies, involving different researchers with different approaches and theoretical backgrounds. The study employs Norman Fairclough’s dialectical model of CDA as a method and securitization theory as the theoretical framework. Together they provide a good framework for analysis as both are constructivist in nature and concerned with how language contributes to shaping our perceptions of social reality. In addition to Fairclough's three-dimensional model there are other approaches to CDA, which include the 'sociocognitive model' associated with Van Dijk and the 'discourse historical school' developed by Wodak (Wodak and Meyer, 2009). With his approach, Fairclough emphasizes the importance of analysing everyday social interactions, for example the mass media (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). The idea is quite simple; newspapers are produced by specific people who are part of a specific social context and the news, in turn, have an effect on society. Hence, the model is suitable for this study analysing the British mass media.
The first dimension refers to language as a social practice and involves examining the structure of the text and its linguistic features. This is based on Halliday's functional grammar approach, which will be explained a bit later. This social practice is referred to as ‘structure’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999) and deals with description (Fairclough, 1992). The second dimension, which Fairclough and Chouliaraki (1999) call ‘practice,’ is concerned with interpretation of the text (Fairclough, 1992). It refers to discursive practice, which involves examining the production and consumption of the text (Jorgensen and Phillips, 2002). This involves identifying different discourse strands; so-called interdiscursivity, as well as what existing discourses and genres the author draws on. This is called intertextuality. The study will consider both interdiscursivity and intertextuality as well as the role of the audience, referring to the consumption aspect of the second dimension of Fairclough's model. The third dimension, ‘events’ (Chouliaraki and Fairclough, 1999), focuses on social practice; relating the discourse to its broader social context. This aims to explain the relationship between discourse practice and wider social context.

The discursive practice acts as a link between the text and the social practice as it is through this that texts shape and are shaped by social practice (ibid). The study aims to conduct a discourse analysis following Fairclough’s three-dimensional model, taking into account not only the linguistic features of the text but also the discursive practices and social context, which both form and are formed by the discourse. However, the study will place a bit more emphasis on text analysis, as the theoretical framework is securitization theory, which focuses on security as a speech act and as something which is discursively constructed.

There are three important concepts which will be used in the thesis as part of the CDA; discourse, power and ideology. These are explained in the following part and will be employed later in the analysis chapter.

2.1.1.1 Discourse, power and ideology in Fairclough’s model
As mentioned previously, Fairclough (1989, p.22) views language as a form of ‘social practice’. What this means, he argues, is that language is part of society and not outside of it. Secondly, it means that language is a ‘social process’ (ibid) and thirdly that language is a ‘socially conditioned process’ (ibid). These ideas will now be explained in a bit more detail. According to Fairclough (1989, p.23) there is not an external relationship between language and society as it is often argued, but rather they are internally connected with each other. This is what he calls a dialectical relationship. Fairclough views language as a type of social phenomenon and vice versa, social phenomena as a sort of linguistic phenomena. He
argues that the way people read, write and speak are socially determined, while also having social effects. Furthermore, he argues that language is not just a result of social processes but that it is part of them and shapes them. Hence, language is a part of society and should not be treated as external to it.

The second point, referring to language as a social process, is explained by the difference between text and discourse. According to Fairclough (1989, p.24) text is merely a product of the process of producing it. In contrast, Fairclough (ibid) defines discourse as ‘the whole process of social interaction of which a text is just a part’. This process includes in addition to the text the process of production, of which the text is a product, and the process of interpretation, for which the text is a resource. This means that language and discourse can be seen as social processes. The third view of language as socially conditioned refers to so called ‘members’ resources’ (ibid), which are ideas, beliefs and assumptions people use when they produce and interpret texts. These are in turn shaped by social conditions, referring to the social environment in which the discourse takes place as well as society as a whole. This means that language is shaped by other parts of society and the ideas and values people have based on the social context.

Fairclough (1989, p.43) views discourse as a site of struggle where relations of power are exercised, distinguishing between power in discourse and power behind discourse. CDA is a method for examining how power is exercised and enacted through language. Fairclough (1989) views power as a commodity, which can be won and exercised, but also lost in social struggles. Therefore, as he states, ‘power relations are always relations of struggle’ (Fairclough,1989, p.34). Accordingly, power does not belong to one person or social group permanently, as they must constantly reassert their power in order to keep it as others can try and gain power from them.

Power in discourse refers to ‘powerful participants controlling and constraining the contributions of non-powerful participants’ (Fairclough,1989, p.46). The constraints refer to content; what is said or done, the social relations of participants in discourse and thirdly, what subject positions people can occupy (ibid). This will be looked at more closely in the analysis chapter in relation to the articles chosen for the study. One form of power in discourse, which Fairclough highlights, is hidden power. This can usually be found in mass media as the relations of power are generally not very clear (Fairclough, 1989, p.49), making the mass media an interesting subject to study. However, the question of who actually exercises power in the case of media discourse can be discussed, as it could be the journalist or the editor, or perhaps the people quoted in the article, for example politicians.
Power behind discourse is concerned with the organisation of institutions and the effect of different, hidden power relations on language (Fairclough, 1989, p.56). Power is closely linked to ideology, which will be discussed briefly before moving onto the next part.

Ideology according to Fairclough (1989) are things which are presented as common sense in discourse and contribute to maintaining existing relations of power. It is when a discourse becomes naturalized that it becomes viewed as so called common sense and becomes ideological. However this can be a bit hard to grasp as Fairclough (1989, p.107) discusses. According to him when ideology becomes common sense, it appears to no longer be ideological. However, this is in itself an ideological effect because ‘ideology is truly effective only when it is disguised’ (ibid, p.107). The relationship between power and ideology comes from the fact that what becomes viewed as common sense is to a large extent determined by those who exercise power. Hence, ideology can be seen as a carrier of power.

2.1.1.2 Text analysis in Fairclough’s model: Halliday's functional grammar

Fairclough’s dialectical approach to CDA uses Halliday’s multi-functional linguistic theory (Halliday, 1985) as a basis for the text analysis; the descriptive element of the social process. The study makes use of four elements from Halliday’s theory to examine how migration is connected to security in the text itself. These are: lexicalisation or naming, nominalisation, modality, and transitivity. These will be explained briefly to make understanding the results and analysis chapter easier.

Lexicalisation or naming is usually a site where ideological expression can be found. When writing an article, the author usually has several choices when referring to the same person, social group, social relations or issues. What choice is made depends on many contexts such as personal, social and socio-cultural context which are usually ideologically based (Van Dijk,1995). An example Van Dijk (1995, p. 258) uses to illustrate this is the choice between ‘terrorist’ and ‘freedom fighter’. Hence, examining how the texts refer to the same people, social groups and relations with different words is important in uncovering if the text reproduces existing relations of power.

Nominalisation is the process of turning a verb into a noun, for example using the word ‘failure’ instead of ‘fail’. It usually means all sense of agency is removed from the sentence, which may be an intentional choice by the author (Machin and Mayr, 2012, p.138). There are
a few different effects nominalisation can have. The first concerns the removal of an agent as discussed, which essentially makes it appear like events just happen. Secondly, not only the agent is removed but usually the affected too. Thirdly, because verbs become a noun; a thing, it can be described and classified, for example ‘there were two precision strikes’ (Machin and Mayr, 2012, p.142). Nominalisations can also become stable entities which are commonly used; for example the word ‘globalization’ (Machin and Mayr, 2012, p.143).

Modality refers to people’s commitment to what they say as well as reflecting their opinion on an issue. According to Fairclough (1992) modality is anything which conveys the author’s personal views or commitment to what they say. There is high and low modality; high modality is exemplified by the modal verb ‘will’, whereas low modality can be expressed through the modal verb ‘may’ (Machin and Mayr, 2012, p.187). The examples demonstrate ‘epistemic modality’ which concerns how certain one is about an issue. A second type of modality, which is important in the study, is ‘deontic modality’ which is about influencing or persuading people. Examples of this are words like ‘must’ and ‘should’ (ibid). Other verbs can also be used to express a degree of certainty, for example ‘believe’, ‘think’ and ‘appear’.

The final aspect, which will be analysed in the texts, is transitivity. It refers to how people are described as doing something; who does what to whom, and how it is done (ibid, p.104). Therefore, things to look at are participants, processes, which are represented by verbs, and circumstances. There are four main processes which will be considered in the study; material, mental, relational and verbal processes. Material processes are concerned with action and mental processes with sensing which allows the reader an insight into a participant’s mind. Relational processes are processes that ascribe meaning to participants. They are usually expressed by ‘be’ or ‘have’. Finally, verbal processes are expressed by the verb ‘to say’ and similar verbs such as ‘state’, ‘claim’ and so on (ibid).

Modality and transitivity are common things to examine when conducting a critical discourse analysis as a lot can be deduced in terms of the author’s standpoint from looking at these elements. Along with lexicalisation and nominalisation, they help deconstruct the text and uncover latent ideologies and power relations, which is the aim of the thesis. Of course, many other linguistic features can be analysed but it would be too much considering the limitations of the study. Hence, four elements, believed to be the most suitable for the purpose of the thesis, were chosen.
2.2 Implementation

For the study six articles from three different newspapers; The Guardian, The Telegraph and The Daily Mail were selected; making the sample a total of 18 articles of varying lengths. The average length of one article is around 800 words. The selection was made in order to generate a broad selection of articles to analyse, while still restricting the amount of material to allow for a deep analysis of the texts. For critical discourse analysis, it is vital not to draw any conclusions based on separate sentences or single articles, but rather analyse a collection of texts and based on observed patterns draw conclusions on what is found (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, p.) Simultaneously, it is important not to choose a sample which is too broad and large and which, considering the limitations of this study, would not allow for a deep enough analysis. As the aim of the thesis is to uncover hidden ideologies in the articles, a deep examination is needed in order to deconstruct the texts enough to locate these. The articles were selected from the newspapers' homepages so they were all in digital format. For the selection of articles the chosen time span was from May 2015 to September 2016. This was to allow a long enough time to examine if there was a change in discourse in the articles and to allow for different events to be depicted in the articles. The closure of the camp took place later in the fall of 2016 so this was not included in the analysis. Pictures and captions belonging to them were not chosen for the analysis due to limitations. As mentioned, reader comments were not included either in the analysis for ethical and privacy reasons.

The selection was made through using four key search words when searching for online articles. These are: 'Calais', 'migrant', 'refugee' and 'security'. One thing, which the researcher has to be wary of when selecting articles for a discourse analysis, is so-called 'cherry picking' (Wodak and Meyer, 2009, p.11). This involves only choosing material that fits his or hers own pre-existing hypothesis or idea. As discussed by Jackson (2015, p.34), for something to be securitized the word 'security' does not necessarily need to be used as it can be conveyed through other words or metaphors. However, by using the word 'security' as a search word the aim was to best locate articles which were suitable for the study, as the chosen theoretical framework is securitization theory.

In terms of conducting the text analysis part of CDA, as mentioned four linguistic elements were identified in the texts; lexicalisation, nominalisation, modality and transitivity. The coding was performed manually by using different colours for each element. In terms of lexicalisation and coding the articles, special attention was given to how the authors refer to the migrants; for example by referring to them as refugees, economic migrants or illegal
migrants. In addition, the coding aimed to identify any particularly strong wording and metaphorical expressions. Nominalisation identified all verbs which were expressed as nouns and modality all expressions of degrees of certainty or persuasion, such as words like ‘will’, ‘might’, ‘may’, ‘should’ and ‘must’. Modal verbs such as ‘think’ and ‘believe’ were also coded for. In terms of transitivity, it was the element which was the most laborious to code because it involved identifying all noun phrases. In each one it was identified what sort of process it involved; either material, verbal, relational or mental. The results were then combined for all articles and compared in order to identify any patterns. These will be presented in the results and analysis chapter.

Chapter 3: Background

3.1 Migration and Europe

As argued by Marozzi (2016) among others, immigration to Europe has increased significantly since the 20th century. Generally, globalization has played an important role in increasing both the scale and speed of migration worldwide. In contrast to earlier migration patterns leading up to the 1980s, the new migration is characterized by people going to countries with which they in many cases have little or no historical connections (ibid). The term 'super-diversity' (Vertovec, 2007) has been used to describe the phenomenon of new migration characterized by large variation in ethnicity, age, gender and immigration status. Large scale migration is quite a new phenomenon for the majority of European countries, especially compared to countries like the US and Australia. However, the history of migration in Europe is a varied one, with different trends over time.

Following the end of the second world war, large scale migration took place both between different European countries as well as into Europe. A second significant migration wave started in the beginning of the 1950’s and was characterised mainly by movement from Southern Europe, non-European Mediterranean countries and former colonies, to Northern and Western European countries. At this time many European countries experienced huge economic growth and large labour shortages. This in combination with the de-colonization of former colonial powers explained the large movement of people. This also meant that many different ethnic groups entered European countries, which previously had been quite homogenous in terms of ethnicity (Dustmann and Frattini, 2011). However, during this time immigration was generally encouraged and welcomed as countries needed more labour in a
time of economic expansion. Hence, migration was not really viewed as a matter of public concern or debate (Boswell, 2003, p.9). The first oil crisis of 1973 brought an end to the second big wave of migration, but the period between 1973 and 1985 still saw migration into Europe, mostly in the form of family reunification. As Boswell (ibid) argues, in the 1970’s the question of migration started to become politicized, accompanied by an increasingly restrictive migration policy. In the public debate migration was associated with various societal issues such as unemployment, welfare and issues about identity. As argued by Marozzi (2016), migration has been juxtaposed with the global recession and associated austerity measures, leading to a debate surrounding migration and whether it should be viewed as a threat or an opportunity to host countries. The next wave came after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 in the form of large displacements of civil populations. In addition, the Balkan wars led to large movements of refugees in the 1990’s.

3.1.1 The case of Calais: a short overview

In order to understand the analysis of the articles concerning how migrants are connected to security, it is useful to have some background knowledge about the situation in Calais. It can be seen as part of a wider migration crisis, as it is widely referred to in Europe, which is the result of the displacement of people from war-torn countries such as Syria, and Afghanistan as well as North Africa. Even though the clear majority of refugees have fled to neighbouring countries such as Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey, the increase in migration to Europe has sparked a debate regarding security and integration of migrants into host societies. It has also led to some countries, such as Sweden and Denmark, to set up border controls and others, such as Hungary, to close their border completely (BBC, 2015b).

As Marozzi (2016) discusses, many researchers have found that there is more negative prejudice against Muslim immigrants than other immigrants. In recent times, this has been exacerbated by terrorist attacks in Europe, such as in Paris and Brussels. This is also a relevant question in terms of the Calais situation and whether the media reproduces the existing political narrative of migrants and refugees as a security threat or also as a potential resource.

Even though it may seem like the situation in Calais is a new issue this is not really the case, even if the number of attempts to reach Britain in the past year has been unprecedented. The first refugee camp, named the Sangatte camp, was opened in Calais in 1999 and quickly attracted thousands of migrants and refugees as well as people smugglers. It closed in 2001 and again in 2002, leading to riots and protests. Since then migrants and refugees have continued to arrive in Calais and set up camps near the port (BBC, 2015a). The camps, at
the outskirts of Calais, are frequently referred to as 'the jungle' in the media, with migrants living in horrific conditions in makeshift tents with poor hygiene and lacking access to clean water and food. The term 'the jungle' will be discussed later in the thesis in terms of the implications of calling the camps by that name. The situation in Calais has gained vast media attention in the past few years due to many migrants trying to reach the UK through the Eurotunnel and the Channel. This has sparked a political discussion, especially between France and Britain, with Britain putting in extra security, including fencing and CCTV, in Calais. In 2015, the UK also announced a further investment of £2m for a new secure zone at Calais for lorries going to the UK (BBC, 2015a). The demolition of the camp started in October last year, lasting about one month. As part of the evacuation of the camps migrants were sent to different refugee centres around France. However, there have been reports of some migrants returning to Calais following the demolition and building small, hidden camps in the woods. According to aid groups, as of April 2017, several hundred migrants and refugees had arrived to Calais, around half of them unaccompanied minors (The Guardian, 2017). Hence, the situation does not seem to have been fully resolved and further attention should be given to the situation in Calais and the migrants and refugees who are still living there in poor conditions.

3.2 Central concepts
Some key terms which are used extensively in the study are migrant, refugee, and security. Before moving onto the theory chapter, these concepts will be briefly explained to allow for a better understanding of how they are used within the frame of the study.

3.2.1. Migrant and Refugee
Some sources, such as the media, seem to use the terms interchangeably, however there is a distinction to be made between the two terms. The media uses both terms but seems to prefer the term 'migrant', which is used far more frequently than 'refugee'.

The Oxford English Dictionary defines migrant as "one who moves, either temporarily or permanently, from one place, area, or country of residence to another" (BBC, 2015c). In some way the term implies a voluntary action taken by the individual.

A refugee on the other hand, according to the 1951 Refugee Convention, "is any person who, owing to a well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his/her nationality and is unable, or owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself/herself
of the protection of that country" (BBC, 2015c). This has been further extended by the Cartagena Declaration from 1984, which is more extensive, defining refugees as "persons who have fled their country because their lives, security or freedom have been threatened by generalized violence, foreign aggression, internal conflicts, massive violation of human rights or other circumstances which have seriously disturbed public order" (UNHCR, 2013). Hence, the term refugee indicates a clear involuntary action as opposed to the term migrant. The study mainly employs the use of the term 'migrant' when referring to the people in the Calais camps, as a kind of umbrella term, which can include both migrants and refugees. However, this term can be questioned in terms of its neutrality and this will be discussed later in the analysis chapter.

3.2.2. Security

Security is quite a complex and dynamic concept, as discussed by Williams (2013). According to Williams (2013, p. 1) security is quite an elusive term in the way that it is difficult to define as it can mean different things to different people. Generally, it can be thought of as the mitigation of threats to values in society (ibid). Nonetheless, security cannot be seen as solely a term used in academia as it is central in real life, reflected in attempts to achieve security. This makes it a powerful tool often used by politicians in achieving different objectives (ibid). This view of security not being just one thing, which can be easily defined, is supported by Valverde (2011). She discusses the difficulties in theorizing security and seeing it as an entity, which is needed to be understood. Instead she emphasizes the importance of examining how security is being done or performed in practise through different security projects. This view is in line with this study's view on security as something which is complex and needs to be considered from different perspectives.

This study will make use of Buzan's framework of five different forms of security (as discussed in Williams, 2013, p. 4). These include military, environmental, societal, economic and political security. The study will consider which type of security is being threatened and how this is communicated through the articles. Moreover, the study will use a constructivist approach to security as presented by Williams (2013), involving seeing security not as a state-centric concept, as assumed by realists, but rather as socially constructed and context-specific (ibid, p. 65).
4. Theoretical framework

4.1 Securitization theory

The study employs securitization theory as its theoretical framework; a central contribution of the so-called Copenhagen School. It can be viewed as an extreme form of politicization involving an issue being moved outside the normal political framework (Buzan et al., 1998, p. 23). According to Buzan et al. (1998) any issue can either be non-politicized, meaning it is not part of the public debate and the state does not get involved with it, or politicized, meaning the government is required to deal with it and it is part of public policy.

Securitization can thus be seen as a special form of politics. As Boswell (2003) discusses, migration is constantly part of politics and public debate today. Hence, one can say it has clearly been politicised but the question if it has been securitized can be discussed. Different issues are securitized in different countries and contexts, in this study the context is Britain and on a larger scale the EU. Securitization involves a certain issue being declared a threat to a certain object, for example society, validating that extraordinary measures are taken immediately to respond to that threat (Stritzel, 2007). Therefore, the question is not if there is an actual real existential threat but that such a threat is created through presenting it as such (Buzan et al., 1998, p.24). This is referred to as a ‘speech act’ (Buzan et al., 1998). Ibrahim (2005) emphasizes that the creation of knowledge or a ‘truth’ through discourse is ‘an exercise of power’ (p. 164). Therefore, the securitization of migration can be considered as a discourse involving the exercise and exertion of power, and government policies a result of the discourse.

However, securitization as solely a speech act has been criticised by other scholars such as Stritzel (2007) and Karyotis (2012) who see it as being too narrow of an approach to explain what happens in the real world. Karyotis (2007) argues that limiting the construction and designation of something as solely a verbal act, is not enough to explain the whole process of securitization and that other factors are to be considered as well. They suggest a reconceptualization of the concept, which allows one to also consider the context and actors involved. This thesis focuses on securitization as a speech act, whilst being aware of and reflecting on limitations of this approach. The concept of securitization as a speech act and hence being socially constructed is in line with the constructivist nature of discourse analysis, making it an appropriate choice for the study. However, by conducting a critical discourse analysis on the chosen articles, the thesis aims to add some robustness to the securitization theory, as social context is also considered and not only the linguistic features of the articles.
Central concepts used in securitization theory are referent object, securitizing actor, and functional actors (Buzan et al., 1998, p.36). In addition, the terms referent subject, securitizing move and securitizing act are central concepts. The referent object is what is being threatened and the referent subject or external threat is what is threatening it (ibid). In this case, the referent subject is migration and the referent object is Britain. Traditionally the referent object has been the state, however this does not always have to be the case (Buzan et al., 1998).

The question of who the securitizing actor is can essentially have two answers. One the one hand, the media can be considered as the securitizing actor, performing the securitization move for the audience, meaning the readers. On the other hand, the government and politicians who are frequently quoted and referred to in the articles, can be seen as the securitizing actors and the media as the audience. The message is then further communicated to the readers. This will be further discussed later in the study. Criticism has involved securitizing actors who, according to Charrett (2009, p.27), often are state elites who can manipulate and monopolize security discourse to produce threats and reinforce and maintain negative images. This is done to reinforce their position as the security provider. This raises the question if securitization only takes place when there is a securitizing actor who has the legitimacy and power to gain the acceptance of the audience.

Functional actors are actors who have an important role in the sector and affect the dynamics of it, without being the referent object or the securitizing actor. In this case the people smugglers, who are referred to quite frequently in the articles, could be considered as functional actors. Their role will be examined later in the analysis chapter.

The securitization move refers to something being presented as a security issue or threat and the emergency measures adopted as a consequence are called security act (Buzan et al. 1998, p.26). As Buzan et al. (1998, p. 25) point out, securitization can be considered to have taken place even if emergency measures are not adopted. They state that it is enough that a platform has been created through the securitization move, which can be used to validate the use of extraordinary measures (ibid). However, the study also examines the security acts described in the articles to see how they are discursively constructed to appear legitimate.

An important aspect highlighted by Buzan et al (1998) and simultaneously a target of criticism, is the difference between securitization move and successful securitization. A securitization move involves the securitizing actor presenting and framing an issue as a
security threat, however it is only after the audience has accepted it as such that it can be referred to as a successful securitization. However, The Copenhagen School’s securitization theory has been criticised for being too vague and imprecise regarding the role of the audience. The first question, which arises, is who the audience is and if this is always easy to determine. As discussed by Collins (2005) even if the public rejects a securitization move, the securitization move can still be successful when accepted by a smaller audience, if they have the power to do so. Moreover, according to Balzacq (2005), there can be more than one audience and the securitization moves can be targeted at different audiences. In that case, the success of the securitization move is reliant on the right audience accepting it. Léonard & Kaunert (2011, p.61) found that securitization moves can be targeted at either general or elite audiences.

Secondly there is the issue of how one can determine if the audience really has accepted the securitization move. According to Balzacq (2005) the securitization move can gain both moral and formal support, the first of which may be hard to detect or measure. As mentioned, the media can be seen as the audience if the political actors are considered as the ones performing the securitization move. In that case, it could be considered as a successful securitization move if the media presents the securitization move without challenging it, as it implies an acceptance of the securitization move. However, if the other perspective is taken that the media is the securitizing actor, then the question of who the audience actually is and how acceptance can be measured is quite complicated. Hence, this study does not attempt to prove audience acceptance from the latter perspective of the readers being the audience. This is due to the fact that it is very difficult to do so for example through opinion polls or similar things, and because it is not feasible due to the limitations of the study. Therefore, when referring to the securitization move being successful, the study employs the view of the media as the audience, accepting the securitization move.

5. Literature review

Many different perspectives on migration as a security issue can be identified in the literature. A general view is that migration has been increasingly framed as a security threat since the end of the Cold War, as discussed for example by Huysmans and Squire (2009) and Ibrahim (2005). Many authors such as Humphrey (2013) have also highlighted the significance of the terror attack in New York on 11 September 2001, as leading to the increased securitization of migration. As Huysmans and Squire (2009) argue, migration has
shifted from being an issue mainly studied in disciplines such as historical-sociology and anthropology, to an issue studied in security studies as well as being a recurrent theme in political debates globally. They discuss two different approaches to the migration-security nexus; the strategic and the humanitarian approach. The strategic one is the traditional approach which focuses on national security and how migration patterns affect security questions of the state, and vice versa. As a contrast, the humanitarian approach focuses on the security of the individual, referring to individuals in the receiving country as well as the migrants themselves. This reflects the effects of globalization on migration, as it can now be seen increasingly as an issue, which has moved beyond the borders of the state and into a global, transnational arena. However, Huysmans and Squire (2009) point out that the strategic approach is still the dominant one, but that both approaches have their weaknesses. The strategic view is too state-centric, ignoring the effects of securitizing migration which come in the form of violence and inequalities. By doing this, it does not encapsulate the complexities of migration as it focuses on the strategic interaction between states. The humanitarian view on the other hand, whilst taking a more normative approach, does not go far enough in considering the relationship between national and human security and does not manage to truly re-frame migration.

Ibrahim (2005) goes a lot further in criticising the human security approach. She also discusses human security and the shift from national security, which was dominant during the Cold War especially, to the human centric view on security. This involves considering security more in terms of the individual than the state and encompasses a broader range of issues such as migration, environmental degradation, trafficking and international terrorism. Factors such as food and water scarcity, environmental factors and migration are also described as 'soft security' issues (Ibrahim, 2005, p. 169), having been added to the security agenda following the end of the Cold War. However, there is a paradox that arises with the people-centered approach to security. This is due to the fact that from the point of view of migration, migrants themselves are seen as the ones being threatened and at risk. Conversely, approaching this through a human security lens, migrants are the ones threatening the population in the receiving country due to the increased instability. The question that needs to be answered then is whose human security is to be prioritized; the migrant’s or the citizen's? Ultimately, Ibrahim (2005) argues that the human security approach disfavours migrants and legitimizes 'new racist fears' (2005, p. 169). This will be examined later in the analysis chapter.

There have been many studies conducted regarding the securitization of migration, in various countries and contexts. Karyotis (2012) analyses how migration has been securitized
in Greece and what the implications of this process are. He brings out three aspects of the state that migration can be considered a threat to; the economic, the public order, and thirdly the societal or cultural aspect. He argues that the first two are highly contested and that the third one, the societal axis, is the most important one in the migration-security nexus. The societal axis refers to the homogeneity of the host society and the cultural, religious and linguistic aspects of it, that migration can seem to pose a threat to. Karyotis (2012) argues that the securitization of migration is not the result of an objective truth or any pre-existent judgements, but rather the result of the creation and dissemination of the discourse of migration as a security threat within certain structures. Hence, he argues that securitization of migration in Greece was not an inevitable thing which could be explained by the economic crisis, but an intentional strategy by political elites of presenting migrants as the 'Other' threatening societal and public order. A central idea in his study is that securitization of migration cannot be understood solely as a speech act and something which happens discursively, but that it happens in a context which has to be analysed in itself. Historical, institutional and societal factors need to be considered as well, for a more complete and multi-faceted view of the securitization process.

Huysmans (2000) analyses the securitization of migration on a broader scale; within the EU. According to him migration has been directly securitized through the incorporation of migration policy into an internal security framework. In addition, Huysmans argues that the EU has indirectly sustained the securitization of migration through restrictive migration policy and policies which, usually indirectly, promote and sustain the idea of cultural homogeneity being a stabilizing factor. This sustains the image of migrants as a negative presence, disrupting societal harmony and order. He argues that this securitization of migration and the negative portrayal of migrants at the EU level, makes it more likely that similar portrayals will be created within member countries. Overall, the construction of destabilizing factors in the discourse of migration makes including migrants and refugees in host societies more challenging, as well as affecting issues such as solidarity and integration in member countries.

Ibrahim (2005) goes a step further, arguing that the constant association of migrants with security issues and dangers, is the most modern form of racism. She argues that the discourse in the media, international organizations, and academics, has resulted in migration being equated with threat. According to her, this leads to the normalization of the image of migration as a security risk. She examines Canada's immigration policy as an example, specifically a new immigration legislation. According to her study, the immigration legislation is a result of the discursive practices connecting migration to security issues and threat. She
highlights the shift that has taken place in the discourse of migration, particularly following 911. As she discusses, migration has not always been connected to security and threat, but rather has been constructed as a positive aspect for society in satisfying the demand for labour and capitalist expansion.

As a final example, Ibrahim (2005) uses the case of the 'Chinese Boat People' to illustrate how migrants have been constructed as a threat to governance and human security. This example refers to four boats carrying 599 migrants from China arriving to the Canadian coast in the summer of 1999. In her analysis, Ibrahim depicts how the media managed to create a link between these 'illegal' immigrants and security, leading to criticism of Canada's immigration policy and transforming the issue into a crisis. The media thus created a framework for the securitization of migrants through the dichotomous view of 'Us' versus 'Them'. Ibrahim (2005) discusses how the perceived threat to cultural identity which was created through media discourse, was a pivotal part of the securitization process. This is similar to the findings of Karyotis (2012) in his study of the securitization of migration in Greece.

Through examining Canadian media discourse, Ibrahim found that the most dominant threats that the migrants were perceived to pose on Canadian citizens' human security, were increased criminality, health risks and weakening the welfare system. A reaction to this discourse was the creation of the new Immigration and Refugee Protection Act in 2002. Ibrahim discusses how the new legislation, through categorizing migrants as 'useful' or 'harmful' (2005, p.180), is repressive in its nature. This is because it may prioritize the inclusion of migrants who are seen as useful to the Canada's development and growth, rather than the ones who have right to claim asylum.

An overview of the previous research, which has been conducted regarding the securitization of migration, illustrates how the securitization process can be linked to real life actions and consequences. Both the securitization process and corresponding security measures described in the discourse will be analysed in this study. Moreover, the research discusses how securitization leads to negative portrayals of migrants as threats to different forms of security such as cultural and social security. This will also be considered later in the discussion part. As mentioned previously, no research involving a discourse analysis of the Calais migrant situation could be identified. Therefore, this study, applying securitization theory to the example of the Calais migrant crisis, aims to contribute to the body of research regarding the securitization of migration with a new case.
6. Results and Analysis

In this chapter Fairclough’s three-dimensional model will be employed to analyse the articles gathered from the three newspapers and present the findings. Each dimension will be examined, starting with the textual analysis. The newspapers are analysed separately and the two steps of the securitization process are examined in turn. In each part the articles will be analysed using the framework of securitization theory to examine how migration is securitized both at the text level as well as on the discursive and social level. The following chapter will further discuss and reflect on the findings, as well as discussing further research that could be conducted. This will be followed by some concluding remarks.

6.1 Text analysis

The first part of the analysis chapter will discuss the results of the text analysis; the first dimension of Fairclough’s three-dimensional model focusing on description. The newspapers are analysed separately, starting with the Guardian. The four linguistic elements based on multi-functional linguistic theory (Halliday, 1985); modality, transitivity, nominalisation, and lexicalisation are all considered in how migration is discursively connected to security.

6.1.1 The Guardian: threat construction

As discussed by Buzan et al. (1998) the securitization process involves something, an existential threat, being constructed as a security issue and emergency measures being adopted; the security act. First the study will look at the different ways in which the articles in The Guardian present migration as a security threat as part of a security discourse. This will be followed by how the security act is presented in the articles.

6.1.1.1. Migrants as causing disruption and chaos

In The Guardian, a discourse depicting migrants as causing a lot of chaos through their actions was identified. It also involves the discourse of danger to some extent, even if migrants are not portrayed as violent. One example is the following headline:

‘Calais: man killed as migrants make 1,500 attempts to enter Eurotunnel site’.
It is followed by the preamble:

‘UK home secretary to chair Cobra emergency meeting after body of Sudanese man found amid latest mass attempt to cross Channel to England’.

The headline conveys a danger through mentioning the death of a man as the result of the migrants trying to reach Britain through the Eurotunnel. Here both the referent subject or existential threat; the migrants, and referent object; Britain can be identified. It can be seen as a securitization move as it depicts an image of migrants as a security threat, especially combined with the preamble. Here a security act can be seen, illustrated by the ‘Cobra emergency meeting’, which illustrates that extraordinary measures are taken. Hence, migrants are connected to the issue of security and depicted as a threat which needs a quick response. The nominalisations used in the sentence as well as the material processes add to the threat construction. The fact that the nominalisation ‘attempts’ is used with a quantifier; 1500, makes the extent of the attempts to reach Britain clearer for the reader. This, in combination with the nominalisation ‘mass attempts’ used in the preamble, confirms that there are numerous attempts and implies that something needs to be done about the situation. If one looks at transitivity, the migrants are involved in a material process in the sentence, which presents the image of them as very active in their efforts to reach the UK.

In terms of naming the term ‘migrant’ is used. The articles from The Guardian, The Telegraph and The Daily Mail use various words for the people at the Calais camps, but the most common word used in all articles is simply ‘migrant’. The use of the word migrant can be discussed in terms of how neutral it can be considered. It has been argued that it has gone from a neutral concept to a concept which implies that the person is not a refugee (BBC, 2015c). It has also been used as an umbrella term by many media organisation such as the BBC (2015), to include both economic migrants and refugees. Nonetheless, it can be questioned if also applying it to people who are fleeing war and persecution is appropriate and if the term ‘refugee’ should be used instead. In the articles the use of the word migrant is much more prominent than the use of the term refugee. This could be viewed as reaffirming existing power relations, something which will be discussed later in the analysis chapter.

Two other examples reflecting the image of migrants as disruptive are the following:

‘Eurotunnel says the situation at the terminal outside Calais has become unmanageable as migrants make repeated attempts to break into the compound and on to lorries and trains.’
"This is an issue that is really for the government to sort out. We need them to stop the migrant flow from Calais, but it appears to be too much for them to handle."

Here the use of the adjective ‘unmanageable’ creates a sense of urgency and adds to the construction of migrants as a threat, along with the mentioning of ‘repeated attempts’. The image is strengthened again by the use of the nominalisation ‘migrant flow’ which makes it into a concept; linking the words migrant and flow directly to each other. The use of the word flow creates quite a strong imagery of migrants pouring out of Calais uncontrollably, adding to the threat construction. This rhetoric portrays migrants as a force or a phenomenon, dehumanizing them in the process. In the second quote by a spokesperson for Eurotunnel, there is high deontic modality in the part "We need them to stop the migrant flow from Calais". The use of the word ‘need’ implies a sense of desperation and pleading by the spokesperson, portraying the situation as urgent and in need of a response.

6.1.1.2 Migrants as desperate and determined

There is quite a strong discourse of migrants as desperate and very determined in their efforts to get to Britain. This is connected to the previous discourse, however here the focus is even stronger on describing the actions taken by migrants. Two examples can be seen below:

‘At least nine people are known to have died trying to make the journey into Britain since June, and at the height of the crisis in late July an estimated 2,000 attempts to break into the port terminal were said to have been made on two successive nights.’

‘The UK prime minister described the “totally unacceptable scenes” after migrants took the opportunity of a strike by French ferry workers to try to board lorries bound for the UK.’

In the first example, the desperation of the migrants is reflected in the mention of at least nine people dying in attempting to reach Britain. The use of low modality in the expression ‘are known to have died’ could be seen as implying that more people may have died. The desperation could be thought to evoke feelings of empathy in the readers, but also a sense of fear as migrants are depicted as ready to go to great lengths to get to the UK. Their determination is illustrated by the nominalisation ‘attempts’ again accompanied by a quantifier, clarifying the gravity of the situation for the reader and feeding into the
securitization move. It is also mentioned that the attempts were made on ‘two successive nights’, conveying the image that it is a fast-moving situation and implying that a quick response is needed. The migrants are also described as quite strategic in their behaviour with the phrase ‘migrants took the opportunity of a strike by French ferry workers to try to board lorries bound for the UK’. In terms of transitivity, the migrants are involved in material processes and the sense of action emphasizes that they are active and determined. The most common processes used to portray migrants are material, which can be seen as adding to the threat construction and presenting them as a security issue. They are also directed at objects, such as lorries or the port terminal, which are connected to Britain; the referent object. In contrast, in the second example the prime minister ‘described the “totally unacceptable scenes”’; a verbal process. This creates a contrast between the actions taken by migrants and him describing them. The fact that the word ‘described’ is used also presents it as a truth that the situation is in fact unacceptable, as he is simply describing it and not for example stating anything.

A third example of the discourse depicting migrants as determined and desperate to reach Britain is the following:

‘Agius said migrants have “one idea in their heads and that is to cross the 30km to Dover for a better life in the UK”. He said the UK “needs to stop ignoring that reality and take responsibility.”

Here, the use of a mental process; that the only thing migrants want is to go to Britain, along with the material process illustrate the determination of the migrants. The quite high deontic modality of ‘needs to stop ignoring that reality’ also aims to persuade the reader of the gravity of the situation.

The use of verbal processes is quite rare when it comes to migrants as they are not really given a voice in the security discourse, this is mainly given to political actors. However, there are a few instances when migrants are quoted or paraphrased. These firstly illustrate their determination to get to Britain, which could be seen as part of the securitization move. Examples include the headline:

‘Fences won’t put anyone off: migrants dismiss new Calais security crackdown’

This is followed by the preamble:
‘People in New Jungle camp say Theresa May’s attempts to tackle crisis at French port will not deter those fleeing war from trying to reach UK’.

Here the strong epistemic modality expressed in the phrases ‘won’t put anyone off’, ‘will not deter’ and ‘dismiss’, in combination with the negation, conveys the image of determined migrants who will not give up. Here migrants are also referred to by themselves as ‘those fleeing war’. This can be seen as being part of a humanitarian discourse where migrants are portrayed more as individuals and that legitimizes their attempts to reach Britain. This additional discourse will be examined later in the study. Next the paper will examine how the security act is presented in The Guardian, before moving onto the next newspaper.

6.1.2 The Guardian: Security act

As mentioned, the security act includes the measures that are a response to an issue being securitized. These are described in various ways in the articles. They are part of a political discourse, which focuses on border protection, political actors and their responses to the Calais situation. The situation is referred to quite frequently as a ‘crisis’, validating the emergency measures taken as part of the security act. Within the political discourse there are many quotations by politicians, emphasizing the urgency and gravity of the situation and the importance of protecting the UK from migration, the referent subject. This is reflected in the example of a quote by David Cameron:

‘Last weekend, Cameron intensified his language by stating that many migrants attempting to get into Britain were doing so for economic reasons, and that he was determined to make sure the border was secure. “They are economic migrants and they want to enter Britain illegally, and the British people and I want to make sure our borders are secure and you can’t break into Britain without permission,” he said.’

Here the relational process stating that migrants are ‘economic migrants’ wanting to ‘enter Britain illegally’ serves to legitimize the security act of protecting Britain. Here the securitization of migration is accompanied by a criminalization of migration, enhancing the threat construction. The use of a mental process, describing Cameron as determined also conveys the idea that measures will definitely be taken, along with the material and verbal processes. There is also a strong division created between Cameron along with the ‘British people’, and the migrants. The use of the term ‘the British people’ also serves to legitimize the security act, as it is presented that all of the population is behind Cameron, even if this is not the case necessarily.
In addition, the situation in Calais is referred to as a ‘civil emergency’ by Nigel Farage in one of the articles, hence adding to the securitization of migration in Calais.

The nominalisation ‘security’ itself is used very frequently within the discourse in ‘improving security’ and can be seen as a nominalisation which has become a commonly used concept, similarly to globalisation. Hence, it is portrayed as a fairly unproblematic and simple concept. However, as researchers such as Williams (2013) have discussed, security is not a simple concept as it does not mean the same thing for everyone. In the articles, ‘improving security’ refers to protecting Britain, the referent object, from migration. As the term security is used so frequently in the discourse, it becomes a key term, driving the discourse and the questions of who needs to be secured, why and with what consequences are not discussed.

There is a strong occurrence of material processes in terms of the articles describing the security measures as well as high modality. The example below illustrates this.

‘A joint statement issued by the home secretary, Amber Rudd, and her French counterpart, Bernard Cazeneuve, says they will work together to strengthen security around the “shared border” in Calais and “strongly diminish” the migratory pressures that have attracted 7,000 migrants to the Channel tunnel port.’

Here material processes are represented by ‘work together’, ‘strengthen security’ and ‘strongly diminish’, illustrating the determination of the actors in solving the situation. However, the process is not directly directed at the migrants but rather the ‘migratory pressures’. This is different from the material processes involving migrants where there is usually an object, adding to the construction of migration as a threat to the referent object. The use of ‘will’, with a high degree of certainty, conveys a strong sense of commitment as well. In addition, the mention that the two home secretaries ‘will work together’ to improve security ‘around the shared border’ creates a sense of unity between them. It also creates a division between them and the migrants as ‘us’ and ‘them’. This discourse is quite prominent as reflected in the following example

‘Asked what the UK was planning to do about the crisis, Cameron said Britain must work more closely with the French’ and ‘additional work, including by Britain, to protect the shared border will “reflect the outcome of the UK/France security reviews and the steps that need to be taken to continue to manage the common border effectively”.’
Here the material processes once again emphasize the action taken by the authorities, which is again not directly aimed at the migrants but instead aimed to protect ‘the common border’. Verbal processes are also frequent, illustrating the voice that politicians and other powerful actors are given in the discourse. In addition, the high deontic modality of ‘must’ and ‘need’ persuades the reader of the need for security measures. A pattern can be observed in terms of material processes involving actors who perform the security act; they are not directed at migrants as there is usually not a recipient. This makes them appear as legitimate and not that harsh as they do not directly target migrants. Another pattern is the use of accompanying sentences, which legitimize the security acts. Two examples are seen below.

‘The British government has already pledged £22m aimed at improving security at Calais, where thousands of migrants have attempted to stow away on vehicles waiting to cross the Channel or on trains passing through the Channel tunnel.’

‘The proposed deal will focus on improving security at the port, where thousands of migrants have attempted to stow away on vehicles waiting to cross the Channel or on trains passing through the Channel tunnel.’

In the examples, both security acts are validated by the same material processes involving migrants trying to reach Britain. This makes them seem as a legitimate response to deal with what is happening.

6.1.3 The Telegraph: Threat construction

The discourses in The Telegraph differ somewhat from the ones in The Guardian. Three security discourses were identified which will be analysed; migrants as violent actors, migrants as desperate and determined and migrants connected to terrorism.

6.1.3.1 Migrants as violent actors

In The Telegraph there is a stronger association between migrants and violence which legitimizes the use of extraordinary measures. In terms of lexicalisation, migrants are quite frequently referred to as ‘clandestines’ and ‘stowaways’, which dehumanizes them. In contrast, in The Guardian there are examples of migrants described as ‘stowing away’ but it is described as an action and not nominalised as is the case in The Telegraph.

‘Clandestines’ also has a negative connotation of secrecy and deceit. There are a number of material processes used which describe migrants as quite violent. Examples include the following two examples seen below:
‘Some drivers have reported being threatened by stowaways wielding knives, while witnesses saw clandestines climb on top of trucks and cut their way through the canvas to climb inside.’

‘James Brokenshire, the Immigration Minister, told the Telegraph he was taking action after a surge in the number of “clandestines” storming the border in the Calais area last week’

Material processes are involved in all examples, which add to the threat construction as migrants are presented as very active in their attempts to reach the UK. The danger is conveyed through material processes such as ‘wielding knives’ and ‘storming the border’. The material processes are directly aimed at objects, such as the border or lorries, which emphasize the threat construction. This is similar to what was observed in The Guardian. The terms ‘clandestines’ and ‘stowaways’ are used which, as mentioned, have a dehumanizing effect on the portrayal of the migrants. The nominalisation ‘surge’ also indicates that it is a fast-changing situation in need of a response.

A third example, illustrating the portrayal of migrants as violent, is the following:

‘Sixteen police officers were injured overnight in “unprecedented” clashes with migrants in Calais taking increasingly desperate measures to reach Britain.’

Here, the threat is depicted through the mention of ‘unprecedented’ clashes and migrants taking ‘increasingly desperate measures to reach Britain’. Both convey a sense of a changing situation which is becoming more serious; indicating that extraordinary measures are needed. The following sentence in the article involves a material process, again directed at an object:

‘Around 200 migrants hurled “various objects” at police near the main camp outside the northern French town known as the “new jungle”.

This sentence adds to the threat construction; portraying migrants as violent and desperate. The reference to the camps as the ‘new jungle’ and its implications will be discussed later.
6.1.3.2 Migrants as desperate and determined

Similarly to The Guardian, in The Telegraph there is also a security discourse depicting migrants as very determined in their efforts to reach Britain. This is also depicted through material processes with migrants described as attempting to break into lorries or managing to get through fences, as illustrated in the examples below.

‘...hundreds of illegal migrants tried to break through controls at Calais and Coquelles last week. A strike by French ferry workers caused mayhem in the area, bringing traffic to a standstill and allowing hundreds of migrants to try to break into vehicles.’

‘Calais migrants find the door to Britain wide open’

‘Dozens of migrants in Calais have unlocked a supposedly secure door into the Eurotunnel complex, making a mockery of new security measures’

In the first example migrants are described as ‘illegal’, which is a way for the security discourse to validate extraordinary measures as part of the securitization process. As mentioned, the criminalization of migration, which occurs through referring to them as ‘illegal’, goes hand in hand with the securitization process. The term and its implications will be discussed in more detail in the analysis concerning social practice, the third dimension of Fairclough’s model. The material processes of migrants breaking through controls and into lorries are associated with violence and criminality, further securitizing migration in the case of Calais. In the second example the referent object, Britain, is portrayed as an easy target for the migrants, emphasizing the threat and implying that something needs to be done to stop it. The use of quantifiers, ‘hundreds’ and ‘dozens’, have a similar effect. Another example of a securitization move connecting migrants to security can be seen in the example below.

‘Migrants prevented from crossing the Channel by tighter security in Calais are flooding into a string of other French ports, prompting a desperate appeal by mayors for urgent action by the government.’

The use of the verb ‘flooding’, similarly to the use of the nominalisation ‘flow’ in The Guardian, depicts migrants as an uncontrollably phenomenon or force which is consistent with the securitization move. As has been observed previously, the material process is directed at an object, French ports, and the security measures are portrayed as a response to this. The use of the adjective ‘urgent’ is in line with the securitization theory stating that
when an issue is securitized an immediate response is needed. The following sentence in the article refers to an ‘unprecedented influx’ which conveys the idea that the situation is extraordinary, in turn validating the need for extraordinary measures to be adopted.

Migrants are also portrayed as quite strategic in their attempts to get to Britain, illustrated by the material processes ‘move around’ and ‘scout’ in the sentence ‘**Migrants move around as they scout for opportunities to reach Britain.**’ This is similar to the discourse in The Guardian, emphasizing that migrants are active and strategic in their attempts to get to the UK. Similarly to The Guardian, migrants are mainly portrayed through material processes.

### 6.1.3.3 Migrants and terrorism

A third discourse in The Telegraph was identified which connects migrants to terrorism. It is not recurrent, as it was only found in one of the articles, however there was no such discourse identified in The Guardian. The most connections between migrants and terrorism were made in The Daily Mail, something which will be analysed later. The three examples below illustrate the discourse connecting migration to terrorism.

‘**Speaking on Saturday, as the scale of the Tunisia beach massacre became clear, he warned there was a risk that foreign jihadists could try to enter Britain with some of the 3,000 migrants at Calais.**’

‘**Mr Brokenshire accepted that there was a risk that extremists could try to gain entry to Britain through the camp of 3,000 migrants gathered at Calais.**’

‘**Asked if he could guarantee that the border checks at Calais would stop jihadists coming into Britain, he said: “There has never been such a thing as absolute security. But the public can be assured that it is the government’s highest priority to protect Britain from attack”, he said.**’

The use of the verbal process ‘warned’ adds to the threat construction, especially as it follows a reference to the beach massacre in Tunisia. Through referring to this event, an association between migration and terrorism is created as part of the securitization move. Even with the use of the word ‘could’ with low modality, a sense of threat posed by the migrants is created. This is strengthened by the mention of Mr Brokenshire accepting that there is a risk of extremists trying to get to the UK through Calais. Moreover, the fact that it is
mentioned that there are about 3000 migrants in Calais further enhance this threat construction as it makes it easier to visualize ‘jihadists’ or ‘extremists’ hiding in a big group of people.

The security act is communicated in the last phrase through the relational process stating that the government’s ‘highest priority is to protect Britain from attack’.

6.1.4 The Telegraph: Security act
Having looked at the securitization move in the articles, the security act will now be analysed. It is portrayed in a similar way as in The Guardian. Below are three examples which exemplify the security act depicted in the articles.

‘Calais migrants: Britain to build huge fence at Channel Tunnel port in France
James Brokenshire, the Immigration Minister, tells the Telegraph he is holding urgent talks with hauliers to improve security on foreign lorries and sending two miles of security fencing to tackle the migrant crisis.’

‘Britain has committed £19 million extra in funding for fences, CCTV and other security measures at Calais since the crisis erupted in June.’

‘Work to begin on 'big wall' at Calais to block migrants.’

As was the case in The Guardian, the security act involves both verbal and material processes, conveying a sense of determination to resolve the issue. The political actors are generally the ones given a voice in the discourse whereas migrants are not involved in almost any verbal processes. In addition, the material processes are more concrete than in The Guardian, reflected by the reference to Britain building a ‘huge fence’/’big wall’ in Calais. This creates a strong image of protection for Britain against migration. In contrast to The Guardian, the security act is directed more clearly at the migrants, illustrated by the phrases ‘to block migrants’ and ‘to tackle the migrant crisis’. This creates a stronger image of the security act, which could be interpreted as either validating it or not. This could depend on the audience and how they interpret the security act. Moreover, the situation is referred to as a crisis and is described to have 'erupted' which, similarly to 'flooding', conveys an image of an uncontrollable force or phenomenon.

As was identified in The Guardian, the security act is frequently depicted as a response to the actions taken by migrants. This can be seen as validating the extraordinary security
measures for the audience, which in this case would be the readers. An example is seen below.

‘The UK pumped £7 million into security at the Channel Tunnel in the wake of mass migrant break-ins over the summer.’

In the example, the security act is portrayed as a response to the 'mass migrant break-ins'. This nominalisation, again accompanied by a quantifier, is part of the securitization move and tells the reader about the extent of the 'crisis'. The use of a material process of the UK having 'pumped £7 million into security' conveys a sense of action and determination in protecting the UK from migrants.

6.1.5 The Daily Mail: Threat construction

The last newspaper to be analysed is The Daily Mail. The discourses, which were identified, were the same as in The Telegraph, however the connections that were made in the articles between migrants and violence, desperation, and terrorism were stronger than in the articles included in The Telegraph. This was expected to some extent since tabloid papers are usually considered to use stronger and more emotive language than broadsheet ones.

6.1.5.1 Migrants as violent actors

As mentioned, compared to The Guardian and The Telegraph, there is a much stronger association between migrants and violence in The Daily Mail. This is communicated through material processes where migrants are the actors whose actions are directly aimed at objects or other actors. The examples below illustrate this.

‘...migrants who have used rocks, chainsaws, shopping trolleys and tree trunks to try to halt trucks.’

‘Migrants and people-smuggling gangs are becoming increasingly violent in a bid to board UK-bound trucks. In the summer, holidaymakers were warned to avoid Calais after motorists were targeted by gangs with chainsaws and metal bars near the Jungle migrant camp.’

Here the material processes are more detailed, it is mentioned that migrants use rocks and chainsaws to try and stop trucks and target motorists with chainsaws and metal bars. This
creates a very vivid image of the action taken by the migrants and portrays them as violent and unpredictable. The threat construction is particularly evident in the second example, where the threat is emphasized through the relational process of migrants and smugglers becoming 'increasingly violent' in their efforts to reach the UK, hence calling for a response to the increased violence. However, in the following sentence it is not clear if the gangs that targeted the motorists were in fact migrants or people-smuggling gangs. The use of the word 'gang', through its connotation to criminality and violence, also links migrants to criminality in addition to depicting them as violent and unpredictable. This makes the threat construction that more effective.

6.1.5.2 Migrants as desperate and determined

Similarly to The Guardian and The Telegraph, there is a strong occurrence of material processes, which depict the determination of migrants to get to Britain. In The Daily Mail the verb ‘sneak’ is used extensively to describe how migrants attempt to reach the UK. It has very negative connotations of deceit, which add to the construction of migrants as a threat. In addition, it is also used within the discourse connecting migration to terrorism, for example in the sentence ‘Syrian ISIS suspect is sleeping rough in Calais refugee camps in the hope of sneaking into the UK to wage terror’. Because both discourses use the verb ‘sneak’ to describe both migrants and possible terrorists, a link is created indirectly between them, which can be seen as part of the securitization move. Another example of the material process ‘to sneak’ is seen in the sentence below.

‘In July official figures showed that one migrant is caught trying to sneak into the UK every six minutes – with 84,088 detentions at our borders last year. Most were caught at the ‘juxtaposed controls’ in Calais – effectively Britain’s border.’

In the example the threat is constructed through the emphasis on the referent object, Britain, as illustrated by the mention of ‘our border’ and ‘Britain’s border’. This creates a sense of ‘us’ versus ‘them’ regarding migrants and the British people. The threat is also created through the mention of one migrant being caught ‘trying to sneak into the UK every six minutes’, illustrating the determination of the migrants.

Two examples, which further reflect the discourse of migrants as desperate and determined to reach Britain, are seen below.

‘The migrant community are increasingly desperate to cross the border and will undoubtedly find a way past it, pushing the death toll even higher in the process.’
‘The number of British-bound migrants in the notorious Jungle camp in Calais has doubled to 9,000 in the past six months and now become a ‘major health and security risk’, police have revealed.’

In the first example the migrants are depicted as one entity, ‘the migrant community’, which has a dehumanizing effect on them as they are not portrayed as individuals. Similarly to the discourse presenting migrants as violent, the word ‘increasingly’ is used again which add to the threat construction. The high modality expressed in ‘will undoubtedly’ has a similar effect. In the second example the migrants are referred to as ‘British-bound migrants’, which is part of the securitization move through the reference to the referent object. The threat is further communicated through the mention of the number of migrants having doubled and the statement from an authoritative source, the police, referring to the situation in Calais as a big security risk. Furthermore, the fact that the ‘British-bound migrants’ come from the ‘notorious Jungle camp’ creates an image of them as dangerous to some extent and uncivilised. The choice of referring to the Calais camps as a ‘jungle’ and its implications will be discussed a bit later.

Similarly to The Guardian and The Telegraph, migrants are also presented as strategic in some instances in The Daily Mail, illustrated by the sentence:

‘Living in ramshackle shelters in the area that has become known as the ‘Jungle’, thousands of migrants from the likes of Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan are biding their time before seeking a route across the English Channel.’

The use of the material process, describing migrants as ‘biding their time’, conveys a sense of strategic behaviour. This, in combination with the description of migrants living in the ‘Jungle’ in poor conditions, can be seen as part of the securitization move.

6.1.5.3 Migrants and terrorism

A discourse connecting migration to terrorism was identified in The Daily Mail which was more frequent than in The Telegraph. In both cases migration is connected to terrorism though a discourse about possible terrorists hiding in Calais. The first example illustrates this.

‘There has long been concern that IS jihadists might attempt to smuggle themselves into
Britain through Calais to launch atrocities.’

It is stated that the possibility that IS jihadists might try to get to Britain through Calais has been a concern for a long time, however there is no mention of who has articulated this. This example of intertextuality; the text building on previous texts, therefore presents this as a ‘truth’ and creates a sense of threat. The referent object, Britain, is included in the sentence and the use of the word ‘might, although it has quite low epistemic modality, adds to the sense of threat directed at Britain. Another two examples, illustrating the discourse of migration and terrorism with regard to Calais, are seen below.

‘A frantic manhunt is underway for a suspected Islamic State jihadi hiding in Calais and plotting to sneak into Britain to launch a terrorist attack.’

‘Ukip defence spokesman Mike Hookem said news of the manhunt should act as a warning. He said: "IS themselves warned in March that they would “flood” Europe with fighters posing as migrants and the open border policy is a gift to these terrorists who would destroy our way of life.”

As can be seen from the first example, the suspected jihadi is said to be ‘hiding in Calais and plotting to sneak into Britain to launch a terrorist attack’. As mentioned previously, the same verb, ‘sneak’, is used to describe the actions of both migrants and suspected jihadists. This can be seen as a way of linking migration to terrorism indirectly and enhancing the threat construction. The material processes in the sentence concerning the suspected jihadi adds to the creation of threat and the use of the adjective ‘frantic’ regarding the manhunt emphasizes the gravity and urgency of the situation. The second quote, using the persuasive word ‘should’, creates a strong link between migrants and terrorism. By referring to that fighters would ‘flood’ Europe posing as migrants, it constructs migration as a threat as migrants could in fact be jihadists. The last part referring to terrorists destroying ‘our way of life’ also effectively conveys the gravity of the situation.

Another quote by Hookem confirms the gravity of the situation and the need for emergency measures: ‘I hope this is a wake-up call and we can now start acting to stop this huge security threat.’ It is consistent with securitization theory, which states that an issue has been securitized when extraordinary measures need to be adopted before it is too late. The situation is referred to as a 'huge security threat', which is a stronger word than 'crisis'; the most common term used to describe the situation in Calais.
A final example, which is a quote by a police spokesman, is perhaps the most extreme form of threat construction:

‘It’s impossible to know if, for example, a jihadist from Belgium is hiding in there. This camp is a blind spot for national security in the middle of the state of emergency.’

The threat construction is illustrated by the use of the strong modal verb, ‘impossible’, as well as the claim that the camp is a ‘blind spot for national security in the middle of the state of emergency.’ Hence, the sentence is part of the discourse connecting migration to terrorism and a part of the securitization move.

6.1.6 The Daily Mail: Security act

The final part of the text analysis will examine how the security act is presented in The Daily Mail. The discourse is centered around the building of a wall to prevent migrants from getting to Britain. The wall is referred to as ‘The Great Wall of Calais’ with quotation marks and it is said that it has been dubbed that, however it is not clear by whom. Nonetheless, the reference to China conveys a strong image to the reader of a huge, strong wall, which will protect Britain from migrants. There is also a reference to fencing which ‘has failed to stop stowaways targeting lorries’, implying that more extreme measures are needed. The following example illustrates the security act depicted in The Daily Mail.

‘Britain to build the ‘Great Wall of Calais’: Taxpayers will pay £2million for 13ft high, one-mile long concrete barrier along motorway to stop migrants sneaking across the Channel.’

There is quite high modality expressed in the material processes ‘to build’ and ‘will pay’, emphasizing the security act. Like in The Guardian and The Telegraph the action is a response to migrants trying to get to the UK, validating their use. The verb ‘sneak’ is used, which as mentioned has a negative connotation.

The need for extraordinary measures is communicated mainly through references to migrants trying to reach Britain and not giving up, as well as quotes by political figures, such as the one below.

‘Tory MP Charlie Elphicke, who represents Dover, said: It is essential to do everything we can to secure the borders of the UK.’
The use of the modal verb, ‘essential’, has a persuasive tone and it is conveyed that the referent object, Britain, must be protected at any cost. There is a strong discourse in the Daily Mail of protecting the British border, which is part of the security act. This will be discussed later with regard to the social context of the discourse.

6.2 Discursive practice: Production and consumption of texts

This part focuses on the second dimension of Fairclough’s model; the discursive practice. As discussed previously, this focuses on text production and interpretation. The focus will be on the role of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, however the role of journalism as well as the audience will also be examined briefly.

6.2.1. Role of journalism and media

Because the study uses newspaper articles as its material, it is important to briefly consider what the role of media and journalism is. Depending on which role it is thought to have it has different implications of how we interpret the discourse in the media. As discussed by Richardson (2007, p.6) there are different views regarding what journalism is for. One view is that it exists to entertain the public. However, according to Richardson (ibid) this view is too simplistic as the media is often a site where powerful actors struggle for control, implying that it has another function than to simply entertain us. Consequently, another view is that journalism exists to disseminate the opinions of powerful actors. However, Richardson (ibid) does not fully agree with this either as he argues that journalism should be distinguished from propaganda even if it often is shaped by the ‘agenda of such propagandists’ (ibid, p.7). Thirdly, it has been argued that journalism is a business which sole aim is to make a profit. Richardson (ibid) argues that while this point is true, it does not say much about the differences between different newspapers regarding focus and scope. He argues that the main reason journalism exists is to ‘enable citizens to better understand their lives and their position(s) in the world’. Hence, the other functions of journalism; to entertain, disseminate the opinions of the powerful and make a profit, should be secondary to the main idea of helping people understand their lives and positions. Otherwise, Richardson (bid, p.8) argues, it is not journalism. The different functions of journalism will be considered in the analysis of social practice in the next chapter. The central question is whether the media simply reaffirms and reproduces dominant views and discourses concerning migration and security or if it challenges them in some way.
6.2.2 Intertextuality and interdiscursivity

The articles from the three newspapers share similar discourses, as the textual analysis demonstrated. A discourse depicting migrants as desperate and determined was present in all newspapers, whereas the others differed somewhat between the newspapers. Nonetheless, the discourses presenting migrants as determined, violent, causing chaos, or connected to terrorism, can all be seen as part of a wider security discourse. This security discourse constructs migrants as a security threat to the referent object, Britain, validating the need for extraordinary measures, which would not be possible without the securitization. This security act is also part of the security discourse in the newspapers. The security discourse is characterised by the term 'crisis', which is the most common word used to describe the situation in Calais. The word has a very strong negative connotation of something which needs to be dealt with urgently; fitting into the securitization theory’s threat construction. It is also referred to as ‘migrant crisis’ and ‘Calais migrant crisis’, which links together the referent subject; the threat, to the word crisis. This creates an even stronger image of migrants as a security issue. The articles also use the much more neutral term 'situation' to refer to Calais. However, in all sentences where a security act is presented, the situation is referred to as a crisis; legitimizing the emergency measures taken by actors.

There is another discourse which was identified in some of the articles that creates a contrast to the security discourse. In the study this discourse is referred to as the 'humanitarian discourse' and focuses on the protection of migrants from people smugglers, the functional actors, which are presented as taking advantage of the desperate migrants wanting to cross the Channel to Britain. In addition, it involves depicting migrants in a more personable way, which tells the reader more about their background and reasons for wanting to go to the UK. Two examples of this are seen below.

“Before the war in Syria, you could have given me half of England, I would not have taken it, I would have stayed in my country, with my job, my family. But there’s a war on in my country. That’s my reason for trying to get across.”

‘Orphan Youseff, 14, from Aleppo, said he is focused on crossing from Calais after making a perilous month-long journey from Syria without any relatives. Speaking through a translator, he said: “I want to get to the UK for protection, education, freedom - and a good life.”

The examples illustrate how the migrants within the humanitarian discourse are portrayed as victims and not as a security threat. This is reflected in the reference to the war and the predicational strategy of referring to Youseff as an orphan, instead of simply 'migrant'. There
is still a reference to the migrants trying to get to Britain but it is not the focus of the sentences. In addition, by including their reasons for wanting to go to the UK, it serves to validate their attempts to get there, whereas the security discourse does the opposite.

The other discourse focuses on the human smugglers and the need for migrants to be protected from them. However, this discourse is mainly present in The Guardian and to a smaller extent in The Telegraph. It was not found in the articles from The Daily Mail. The presence of more than one discourse in a text as well as different texts sharing the same discourse is called interdiscursivity. As mentioned, the analysis has demonstrated that the articles all include a security discourse, which is constructed in slightly different ways. There is also a humanitarian discourse as mentioned, illustrating the interdiscursive nature of the texts.

As mentioned earlier, the smugglers can be considered as the functional actors within the securitization theory, as they are actors who affect the dynamics of the situation and in many cases can be seen as opposite to the securitizing actor. The authorities are described in the articles as very decisive in their attempts to deal with the smugglers and protecting migrants in the process. This is conveyed mainly through a strong occurrence of material processes, illustrated by phrases such as "British police will be deployed in Calais to target people-smuggling gangs". The use of 'will' also conveys a high degree of epistemic modality. The use of the verb 'tackle' is also used frequently with reference to the authorities' response to smuggling gangs. The examples below reflect how migrants are depicted within the frame of the humanitarian discourse. The first example is from The Telegraph.

'Organised criminal gangs are exploiting migrants who want to get to Britain, some of whom have “no consideration as to whether they live or die” and are adopting risky tactics when stowing away.'

In the example the migrants are simultaneously portrayed as the victims and the threat. Through the material process of 'gangs exploiting migrants' the migrants are presented as the victim and the 'organised criminal gangs' as the perpetrators or the threat. At the same time, through the mention of the referent object, Britain, and the desperation of the migrants, the migrants could also be seen as the threat in the sentence. However, it does appear like the victimization of the migrants is stronger in this case than the securitization of migrants. There are similar examples from The Guardian which, although part of a more humanitarian discourse, also include a securitization move depicting migrants as a threat to a certain extent. Two examples are the following:
‘The proposed deal will focus on improving security at the port, where thousands of migrants have attempted to stow away on vehicles waiting to cross the Channel or on trains passing through the Channel tunnel. It will contain measures to deal with human smugglers behind the migrants’ journeys, and commitments to boost humanitarian support for the most vulnerable.’

‘ Asked what the UK was planning to do about the crisis, Cameron said Britain must work more closely with the French, tackle the people-smuggling gangs in North Africa and do more to make Britain a less attractive place for migrants.’

The first example, referring to a deal between Britain and France, first refers to migrants as a threat through the mention of ‘thousands of migrants’ trying to get on vehicles or trains going to the UK. Following that it refers to the human smugglers and the need to deal with them, as well as ‘commitments to boost humanitarian support for the most vulnerable.’ Here the migrants are portrayed as vulnerable, even though there is an implied distinction that there are various degrees of vulnerability, with the most vulnerable receiving support. In the second example there is a discourse of the UK and France targeting smuggling gangs as a united front but also a security discourse regarding migration. The deontic modality of ‘must’ aims to persuade the reader of the necessity of the measures, making it easier for them to accept the securitization. The security discourse is illustrated by the last part concerning the need to make Britain ‘a less attractive place for migrants’. This refers to protecting the referent object, Britain, from the threat of migration. The examples show that the security discourse is the dominant discourse in the texts, which is contrasted with a humanitarian discourse but not overshadowed by it.

There are also instances where migrants are solely depicted as the victims, however only a few cases could be identified. One example is the one below which is a quote by Theresa May.

"We are both clear that we need to ensure we are dealing with the terrible criminal gangs, the people smugglers, who are making a profit out of the human misery of many people."

Here ‘many people’ refers to migrants which means they are portrayed as the victims of smuggling gangs and in need of protection. The use of the modal verb 'need' conveys a persuasive tone to the reader and the material processes of ‘ensure’ and ‘dealing with’ illustrate the need for action to protect migrants. Therefore, it may not be completely
apparent who or what is the threat in the securitization process and the examples from the humanitarian discourse demonstrate this. However, one could interpret the humanitarian discourse as legitimizing the securitization move to some extent. Through the humanitarian discourse of authorities from the UK targeting smugglers to protect migrants, they appear as the ‘saviours’, which makes the security measures appear less harsh. If the argument is made that security measures are adopted to save migrants' lives, it could be seen as making it easier for the audience to accept the securitization move. This is also illustrated by the mention of several migrants dying during their attempts and the need for intervention to improve 'security' and stop more from dying in the process.

Another aspect, which illustrates how the texts have been produced, is intertextuality. Richardson (2007) distinguishes between intertextuality and internal intertextuality. I will focus on the latter, as it is prominent in the articles. Internal intertextuality includes reported speech and quotations, which are very common in news articles (ibid, p.102). This is true in this case as well and the quotes in the articles are as mentioned mainly by politicians and authoritative figures. This was also the basis for the argument that these actors could be seen as the ones performing the securitization move, which is then communicated by the media to the audience. Examples of quotation from different actors have been seen previously in the analysis. They all illustrate the fact that in the texts, especially within the security discourse, actors such as politicians are given a voice but not the migrants. This can be seen as ideological and an exercise of power. In terms of reported speech, in many cases the verbal process of 'warn' is used, especially in The Daily Mail. This can be seen as adding to the threat construction of migrants and the securitization move.

6.2.3 Audience
As mentioned, a key part of the securitization process is that the audience accepts the securitization move, otherwise it cannot be called a successful securitization (Buzan et al., 1998). According to Richardson (2007, p.77) the role of the audience can be viewed in many ways. He focuses on two; the audience as a consumer and as a commodity. The view of the audience as a consumer means that ‘news is a product’ (ibid) which must appeal to the target audience. The second view of the audience as a commodity refers to the newspapers producing audiences, which are sold to advertisers. The view adopted in the study is the first one, focusing on how the target audience effects the discourse in the articles, as well as being shaped by it. According to Richardson (ibid, p.80) research has found that broadsheet newspapers tend to target and sell more within the elite and upper middle class, whereas tabloids tend to sell more within the middle, lower middle class and working class. According
to him The Daily Mail is a mid-market newspaper, which tends to sell more to the middle and lower middle class and The Guardian and The Telegraph tend to sell more within the elite and upper class.

The audience is referred to in different ways in the articles, ranging from ‘the public’, to ‘the British people’, to ‘British taxpayers’. The last term ‘taxpayers’ is the most frequent one, especially in the Daily Mail where it appeared six times. In contrast, in the six newspapers selected from The Guardian the term appeared once and twice in The Telegraph. Considering the research regarding the target audience of The Daily Mail as middle and lower middle class, the use of the term ‘taxpayers’ in the security discourse is consistent with the audience. It can be seen as appealing particularly to the middle and lower classes with the reference to taxpayers having to pay for the increased security in Calais. There is also a discourse in the articles describing the migrants as economic migrants, which similarly to referring to the audience as taxpayers, presents migrants as an economic threat to the British people. This illustrates how newspapers appeal to their target audiences in terms of lexicalisation and in this case, how they can get the audience to accept the securitization speech act. The implication of this will be discussed in the following chapter.

### 6.3 Social practice

The final part of the analysis will focus on the third dimension of Fairclough’s model; social practice. Here the focus is on how wider social relations shape and are shaped by the discourse and looking at whether the discourses identified in the articles challenge existing unequal power relations or reproduce them.

Placing the discourse in a wider social context is crucial because as Fairclough (1995) discusses, the discourse both shapes and is shaped by the social. The first and arguably the most important context, which should be considered is that of the UK, as the newspapers are British. Here it is important to examine the history of migration to Britain and the multicultural society, which has been formed due to its history as a colonial power. As stated by Castles and Miller (1999, p.44), British multicultural society can be seen as ‘a political community...with the possibility of admitting newcomers, who may maintain cultural difference and form ethnic communities’. Hence, as discussed by Boswell (2003) the British model is considered a multicultural one which accepts different ethnic communities and groups as being part of society. This comes from the UK having been the destination for
intra-European migration for a long time as well as receiving large amounts of migrants of different ethnicities in the post-war period (Dustmann and Preston, 2007, p.9).

However, as argued by Dustmann and Preston (2007) economic conditions play a big part in peoples’ attitudes towards migration. In their study, they found that concerns for the British labour market and welfare system played a big part in forming peoples’ attitudes to migration. In addition, they found that for groups of migrants which were ‘ethnically most distant from the respondent population’ (ibid, p.20), racial and cultural prejudice appeared to play a big role in forming attitudes towards migrants. Boswell discusses how anti-immigration discourse increased in political debate starting from the 1970’s. She illustrates this with a quote by Margaret Thatcher, which was included in a speech she made in 1978, regarding concerns that Britain is being ‘swamped by people with a different culture’ (Boswell, 2003, p.16). However, Boswell argues that starting from the recession in the 70’s, the Conservative Party in Britain has cultivated a discourse of migrants and asylum-seekers as an economic burden and issue in the British society. This, she argues, is done in order to not go against the image of Britain as a multicultural society accepting of different ethnicities. Thus, by portraying migrants and refugees as a threat, not because of their race or ethnicity, but due to the increased burden on the British welfare system, validates more restrictive migration policies and security measures. Examples include the 1996 Asylum and Immigration Act which limited the benefits of asylum-seekers who were awaiting an appeal decision, as well as withdrawing benefits from those who claimed asylum in-country as opposed to at the port of entry (Boswell, 2003, p.58).

In the texts the portrayal of migrants as an economic threat can be identified through a discourse in which the migrants are referred to as economic migrants. This is evident in a quote by David Cameron which appears in three articles in the Guardian, stating “They are economic migrants and they want to enter Britain illegally, and the British people and I want to make sure our borders are secure”. Whereas The Guardian employs internal intertextuality in the form of quotes and paraphrasing, in The Daily Mail it is stated in the text that ‘Many are fleeing humanitarian disasters but often they are economic migrants attracted by jobs, lavish benefits and free accommodation in the UK.’ Both examples illustrate how migration is presented as an economic threat to the British welfare system and labour market and migrants as a burden to the British system. The threat construction is emphasized in the first quote where migrants are not only portrayed as economic migrants, but as economic migrants wanting to ‘enter Britain illegally’. In the second example the first part regarding many migrants fleeing humanitarian disasters is undermined by the following part of them ‘often’ being economic migrants. The use of the word lavish benefits is particularly strong in
conveying the image of migrants as a burden to the British welfare system. Therefore, through referring to migrants as economic migrants, the discourse in the articles, particularly in The Daily Mail, reaffirms and reproduces the political discourse of the Conservative government. This can be seen as reproducing unequal power relation between migrants and political actors in Europe and Britain in particular.

Another aspect, which is important to consider regarding Britain, is its reliance on its border as the main form of controlling migration (Boswell, 2003, p.64). This is due to geographical reasons as well as a reluctance to carry out internal controls on residents. Therefore, as argued by Boswell (2003, p.65) even a relatively small number of migrants crossing the border 'illegally' in the 1970's lead to a discourse of migrants and asylum-seekers 'flooding' Britain. In the chosen articles, particularly in The Daily Mail, within the security discourse there are many references to protecting 'our border', illustrating the importance of border protection for the UK. This also validates the securitization move and reproduces the discourse of exclusion of migrants which, in turn, highlights inclusion.

Having considered the social context in Britain, it is also important to examine the broader context of Europe. As mentioned in the beginning of the thesis, researchers have argued that following the September 11 attacks migration has increasingly been linked to security. Hence, one can argue that following the terror attacks that took place in Paris, Brussels and Nice among others, the discourse regarding migration and security, terrorism in particular, has increased in the media and in public debate. As was shown in the analysis part, the articles, particularly in The Daily Mail, contain a discourse connecting migrants to terrorism. This can be considered a securitization move, which reproduces existing discourses of migration and terrorism. This can also be seen through the rise in popularity of many far-right populist parties in Europe, which have expressed views which are clearly anti-immigration oriented.

Having looked at how the articles reproduce existing discourses within the context of Britain's multicultural society as well as the wider context of an increased focus on security in political discourse, the final thing which will be considered is whether the articles reproduce existing power relations. There are two ways in which the study argues that the media sustains existing unequal power relations between migrants and political actors within the EU.

The first concerns the naming of migrants in the security discourse in the articles. As was discussed, through referring to migrants as economic migrants the articles reproduce existing discourses and do not challenge existing power relations. The fact that the term 'migrant' is
used, particularly within the security discourse, and not the term 'refugee' could also be seen as an ideological choice, reaffirming existing inequalities between refugees and political actors. Of course, it can also be viewed as a neutral and convenient umbrella term, but it still serves to validate the securitization move as using the term 'refugee' would imply more of an obligation to help and include, rather than exclude. Migrants are also referred to as 'illegal' quite frequently within the security discourse. According to Boswell (2003, p.1) there has been an anti-illegal migration discourse in the media and public debate over the past decade. This term has been questioned and criticised by researchers such as De Genova (2002) who claim that the term has been naturalized in discourse. However, as he states it is not only the 'product of immigration laws' (De Genova, 2002, p.439) but also a historical process of inclusion through 'illegalization' (ibid). Hence, naming migrants economic migrants or illegals categorizes them into one group and does not consider different legal statuses such as refugees or asylum-seekers. Moreover, the term 'undocumented', which is a more neutral term, could be used in the articles. However, it does not appear at all in the articles.

The second way which the texts reproduce existing inequalities is through referring to the camps in Calais as 'the jungle' or 'new jungle'. This is done extensively in the articles and the term appears both with and without quotation marks. Referring to the camps as the jungle, without quotation marks, can be considered ideological as it is naturalized in the discourse. Therefore, it reproduces existing inequalities between migrants and other actors in Europe through creating an image of the uncivilised and savage jungle on one corner and the civilised West on the other. Even when the concept appears with quotation marks, or in the phrase 'known as the jungle' it still reproduces existing discourses of migrants as a security issue. The question of how and why it is known as 'the jungle' is not clear, which again makes it seem like a natural term that is part of media discourse.

7. Discussion

Having analysed how the articles link migration to security textually and discursively and the social context within which this occurs, it is important to discuss some implications of the results. Examining how migration is discursively constructed as a security threat leads to the question of the role of media. The question was posed earlier whether the media simply reproduces existing discourses or if it challenges them in some way through contrasting discourses or ideas. As has been discussed, all newspapers do reproduce existing political
discourses of migration as a threat. The humanitarian discourse identified in the newspapers provides a contrast to the security discourse through challenging the view of migrants as solely a threat to the referent object; Britain. However, as discussed, the security discourse portraying migrants as desperate, determined and violent is the dominant discourse in the articles and is strengthened by the discourse connecting migrants to terrorism. In addition, the internal intertextuality mainly gives political actors a voice in the discourse, which strengthens the threat construction and validates the securitization act. Hence, the media conveys quite a limited image of the situation which is characterised by a focus on security and border protection. It is difficult to infer if it is the media's purpose to disseminate the views of the powerful, or if this occurs because the journalists are part of the social context that they also help to shape. However, the results of the analysis illustrate that the media is involved in the dissemination of the views of powerful actors, who in accordance to Fairclough's view of power have to reassert their power in order not to lose it. Of course, the purpose of the media could also be to entertain the audience and make them understand their position in the world, or a combination of all three. Nonetheless, it can be stated that media and journalism cannot be seen as an independent entity which is outside the social system, as they are very much part of it through being shaped and helping to shape it.

As mentioned, one aim of the paper was to see what the application of securitization theory to the case of Calais, could reveal about the theory and its potential weaknesses. Generally, it can be said that it was a suitable theoretical framework for the study, however conducting the analysis did lead to some questions regarding the theory. As was shown, within the humanitarian discourse migrants were portrayed as both the threat and the referent object, or solely as the victims. This can question securitization theory in terms of the referent subject and whether it can adapt different roles and be both the threat and victim within different discourses. Furthermore, as discussed, defining the audience who needs to accept the securitization move, is not necessarily that straightforward as suggested by securitization theory. The results illustrate this as both the media and the readers or the public could be considered as the audience. The same is true for the securitizing actor, which could either be the political actors or the media. Hence, the perspective that is taken may have different implications for the results.

These considerations indicate that while securitization theory was suitable for the study, the different concepts within the theory can and should be questioned. In addition, the study agrees with previous research stating that securitization theory, viewing security as a 'speech act', is not sufficient in itself. By also considering the social context in addition to the linguistic
features of the articles, a broader view of how migration has been securitized can be achieved.

8. Conclusion

The study used Fairclough's three-dimensional model to examine how migration has been securitized in the case of Calais, based on securitization theory. This was done in order to examine securitization not just as a speech act and as linguistically constructed, but as a process taking place in a certain social context at a specific time. The history of the social system also plays a role as argued in the paper. The articles were found to portray migration as a security issue, mainly in terms of economic security. This was done both on the textual and discursive level. Through linguistic strategies such as modality and transitivity, migrants were found to be mainly presented as the threat to the referent object but also victimised to some extent within the humanitarian discourse. However, the humanitarian discourse could also be seen as validating the securitization act as discussed. Constructing migration as a threat validates the use of extraordinary measures, which would not be possible without the securitization move.

On the discursive level the security discourse was identified as the dominant discourse which was then placed within a social context of Britain's multicultural society and a broader context of Europe. It was found that the media reproduces a discourse of migration as an economic threat within the context of the UK and a discourse linking migration to the threat of terrorism. These discourses were particularly strong in The Daily Mail. The discourses, along with lexical choices such as referring to the camps as 'the jungle' and referring to migrants as 'illegal', help foster existing inequalities and power relations between migrants and political actors and highlights a discourse of exclusion and inclusion.

The study has given rise to some questions which future research could help address. As explained in the beginning of the study, photographs which are included in articles are very important in how issues are portrayed to readers. This is especially true in a fast-moving world where people want to access news quickly which can be done through looking at pictures in an article. However, due to limitations they were not included in this study but would certainly provide an interesting object to study in future research. Further research could focus on photographs on their own or in combination with the texts, to see whether internal contradictions can be identified and what implications this could have.
Another aspect which could be further analysed is audience acceptance, taking the perspective of the readers or the public as the audience. This is not explicitly examined in the study due to limitations and could be further elaborated on in further research. Furthermore, the role and identity of the audience could be further analysed and questioned. If the perspective of the public as the audience is taken, then this study does not arrive at a definite conclusion of whether or not migration has been successfully securitized, as audience acceptance is not explicitly examined. However, one can refer to a successful securitization based on the view of the media as the audience, as it was found to mainly reproduce existing discourses of migration as a security threat.

As a conclusion, the study calls for a broader, more multifaceted view of the situation in Calais, which would allow for different narratives to be presented as well as the voices of the migrants to be heard more clearly.
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