

# European Migration English: Naming People on the Move

*Kim Grego, Alessandra Vicentini\**

## *Abstract*

Today new global centripetal forces are pushing from without the borders of developed countries. This calls for a careful review of and reflection on the concepts of identity, citizenship and rights. This paper analyses how various terms are employed to indicate the different and/or similar statuses of people moving into or across national and supranational borders. Ten selected keywords were studied as used in the [europa.eu](http://europa.eu) portal as representative of institutional legal English. After reviewing the terms' etymology, historical development and current usage, this study analyses their discursive connotations with a critical discourse analysis approach. From a terminological viewpoint, two trends were identified: the emergence of new European Legal English collocations and the coexistence of native English collocations. From a critical discourse analysis perspective, high EU prescriptivism was found, as well as inclusiveness/exclusiveness collocations resulting from specific authority and power relations.

*Key-words:* European migration, terminology, critical discourse analysis.

## **1. Background**

In the wake of the post-World War II period, the Cold War years saw the rise of an interest in languages and, especially, in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) (Dudley-Evans and St John 1999). Law was one of the domains under scrutiny, with studies on legal English as a “sub-language with its own style, syntax and terminology”

---

\* Research for this paper was conducted jointly by the two authors. In particular, Kim Grego is responsible for Sections 1, 3 and 5.2; Alessandra Vicentini for Sections 2, 4, 5.1 and 6. Part of the research background on institutional web communication was funded through a 2014-2015 US-Italy Fulbright Commission Research Scholar Grant (grantee: K. Grego).

(Giannoni and Frade 2010: 8). The success of Applied Linguistics in the following couple of decades multiplied the studies in the field, adding novel perspectives such as text, genre and discourse analysis (e.g. Goodrich 1987; Bhatia 1994; Gibbons 1994). First with the creation of the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1958, and then of the European Union in 1993, English became one of its three working languages<sup>1</sup> and, informally, the main language of all institutional communication. This included the drafting of all the laws of the newborn entity, since “from the outset, these texts are normally drawn up in English” (Mattila 2006: 153). A ‘European Legal English’ thus began to develop, which was not, however, homogeneous, but suffered from difficulties due to the contributions it received from the languages and cultures of the many countries that made up and joined, over the time, the EU. These provided the normative and linguistic background to the creation of supranational terminology for the new legislative needs of the Union. The English legal terms thus created, in turn, re-entered the various Member States’ national legal systems and languages by means of translations. As a result, European Legal English terminology tended to be vague and inconsistent and therefore disputable (Šarčević 1997; 2010). This problem began to emerge as early as the formation of the EEC, but no sooner had the central governing bodies started to tackle the issue of terminological harmonisation (the Eurodicautom terminology database came into use in 1973 and was definitively replaced by the current IATE in 2007; cf. Bellino Machado 2015: 19), than the early 21<sup>st</sup>-century wave of globalisation compelled European countries to see themselves not only as part of a continental union but also in a global perspective. The still recent notion of European Legal English had to face the rise of what could be conceived as ‘Global Legal English’ to meet the definitory and regulatory needs of an interconnected world. These include the circulation of economic, technological and scientific tangible and intangible assets but also, more relevantly, that of people, with their own cultures, systems of reference and languages. Today, sixteen years from the turn of the century, new global centripetal forces (e.g. wars, economic crises, and political instability) are pushing from without the borders of

<sup>1</sup> “The European Commission conducts its internal business in three ‘procedural’ languages — English, French and German” (European Commission 2014).

developed countries. In particular, large numbers of individuals have been steadily moving – or would like to move – to the richest regions of the world, among which, the European Union (Eurostat 2015). This circumstance calls for a careful review of and reflection on legal concepts and terminology related to movements of people to newly define the identity of the actors associated with them.

## **2. European migration English: state-of-the-art and aims**

Within the field of legal English, previous studies have dealt with the specific EU discourse of migration. By way of example, Scarpa (2002) offered an English-Italian contrastive meta-reflection on the language used by academic publications specialising in migration. The linguistic representations of refugees, migrants, and aliens were described in EU charters (Catenaccio 2007) and in EU legislative texts (Polese and D'Avanzo 2010). Wodak (2008) looked at linguistic inclusion and exclusion in EU discourse.

This contribution builds on the above prior research and aims to further the investigation in the field by addressing the following research question: what and how terms are employed to indicate the *people moving* into or across EU national and supranational borders in *web-mediated institutional* discourse, namely in the *europa.eu* portal?

## **3. Corpus**

This study analyses two corpora of webpages collected from two official EU online resources:

- i. the 'Policies' section of the EU Directorate General for Migration and Home affairs at [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/index_en.htm) (Policies);
- ii. the EU Immigration Portal at <http://ec.europa.eu/immigration/> (Portal).

Policies is divided into twelve sections, all included in the corpus, i.e. Legal Migration, Irregular Migration & Return, Common European Asylum System, Schengen, Borders & Visas, Industry for Security, Organised Crime & Human Trafficking, Crisis & Terrorism, Police Cooperation, International Affairs, Europe for Citizens Programme, European Agenda on Migration,

European Agenda on Security. The Policies pages fall under the ‘What we do’ section of the Directorate General for Migration and Home Affairs (DGMH), whose very name indicates its purpose and intended audience: to let the public know about the DGMH’s role and activity. Because this is a freely accessible website, it is aimed at the widest audience possible, which is also assumed to be made of non-specialised users. Of course it could include legal experts, although these would most likely pursue specialised information through different – professional – channels. The Policies pages, therefore, represent an interface between the EU and its citizens, namely between the DGMH and Europeans looking for information on migration policies. This corpus was selected because it is an example of institutional discourse (the EU’s) in a specific sub-domain (migration law) aimed at disseminating specialised information to the general public (through the Internet), with the possibility of accessing the actual laws (through links to regulations and directives). Although anyone can access this website, its focus would mostly be EU citizens interested in knowing how their migration policy works.

The second corpus (Portal) is taken from the EU Immigration Portal (EUIP), a stand-alone resource entirely dedicated to immigrating to Europe that is cited under ‘Legal migration’ in the mentioned DGMH’s Policies subsection. The EUIP, which was “launched in November 2011 [and] provides hands-on information for foreign nationals interested in moving to the EU”, is “also directed at migrants who are already in the EU and would like to move from one EU State to another” providing “specific practical information about procedures in all 28 EU States for each category of migrants” (DGMH 2015). Three sections of the EUIP were considered for the second corpus:

- a. What do I need before leaving?
- b. What should I avoid?
- c. Who does what?<sup>2</sup>

In the case of the EUIP, although the institution responsible for it is the same as that of the DGMH’s Policies and the site

---

<sup>2</sup> The remaining two sections, “Need more advice?” and “Advanced search”, were excluded because they are merely search engine forms leading to external documents and resources.

is as freely accessible by anyone interested, it is clear that the intended audience is rather a person who would like to enter the EU and is looking for information on how that is legally done. The institutional nature of the texts is thus the same as in Policies, and so is the sub-domain of migration law; the focus, however, is mostly non-EU citizens.

For the purposes of this work, only the main text in the HTML pages was considered, excluding menus and any resources linked to that are: a) external to the DGMH and the EUIP, or b) in other formats (e.g. downloadable PDFs, video, audio, etc.). This selection was made because the corpora:

- a. focus on *EU institutional discourse* (which is guaranteed by the authority of the europa.eu umbrella);
- b. deal with the ‘migration law’ *specialised sub-domain* (thus the choice of the DGMH and EUIP);
- c. are aimed at a public, *non-specialised audience* (an intrinsic feature of the online medium);

thus, they represent a suitable source to investigate this paper’s research question.

As such, specialised texts (as, for instance, directives and regulations, often contained in the PDF documents linked to for reference in the various webpages considered) were excluded, as were audio, video and other multimodal formats that would have made the corpora inhomogeneous and hardly processable with the corpus linguistics tools employed (see Section 4).

TABLE 1  
Sums up the main features of the two corpora<sup>3</sup>

	<i>Policies corpus</i>	<i>Portal corpus</i>
No. of files (webpages)	107	636
Tokens	64,401	205,315
Tokens used for wordlists	62,881	202,700
Types	7,300	4,754
Type/token ratio (TTR)	11.61	2.35

<sup>3</sup> Last accessed on 17 July 2015.

#### 4. Methods

A hybrid framework and a mixed method were adopted, using lexicographic, lexicological and critical discourse analysis tools to investigate the corpora quantitatively and qualitatively.

A number of English monolingual glossaries (Table 2) on migration issues was scrutinised to identify a selection of keywords labelling people in movement across boundaries<sup>4</sup>.

TABLE 2  
Glossaries on migration scrutinised for keywords

<i>Publisher</i>	<i>Title</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Place</i>
International Organization for Migration (IOM)	Glossary on Migration	2004/ 2011	Geneva
BBC	Migration Glossary	2004	London
University of Oxford	The Migration Observatory Glossary	2011	Oxford
Institut Panos Europe	Media-friendly glossary on migration	2014	Marseilles
UNESCO	Glossary of Migration Related Terms	2015	Paris

In line with the aims of this study, which focuses on non-specialised institutional language and thus on maximum audience inclusiveness and sharedness, the search was for single-word *nomina agentis* lexemes, to include *broad* migration concepts, i.e. terms

- a. sharing common European cultural roots and, as such, with a history of usage and circulation within Europe, and
- b. excluding multi-word neologisms, often corresponding to specialised concepts.

<sup>4</sup> Glossaries authored directly by EU institutions had to be discarded to avoid self-referencing. Nonetheless, these publications are often thorough and interesting, and worth citing, e.g. the EU Immigration Portal Glossary, the DGMH's Glossary in the e-Library section, the European Commission's "Asylum and Migration 3.0", the IATE itself.

For instance, IMMIGRANT has been considered acceptable, but not ‘illegal immigrant’ (multi-word), ‘smuggled migrant’ (multi-word, specialised term), or ‘separated children’ and ‘seasonal worker’ (related to but not explicitly referring to a person in movement).

Of the resources in Table 2, the IOM glossary was deemed the most suitable for the extraction of keywords for its lexicographic approach based on the inclusion of word families starting from a free base morpheme representing the broadest concept. This broad approach best seems to meet the needs of a domain such as migration, “something”, in the IOM Editor’s words, “which has traditionally only been addressed at the national level; the result is that the usage of migration terms varies from country to country” and “there are no universally accepted definitions, [although] the potential exists for each group to decide, formally or informally, on its own definition, according to its perspective” (Perruchoud 2004: 3).

Ten keywords were thus identified for this study and classified into ‘in-process’ and ‘end-of-process’ terms, respectively referring to people still on the move and people who have completed the process of moving to another country:

TABLE 3

## Keywords

*In-process keywords**End-of-process keywords*

1. Alien
2. Foreigner
3. Immigrant
4. Migrant
5. Nomad
6. Refugee

7. Citizen
8. National
9. Resident
10. Settler

Each keyword was subsequently checked against the “Oxford English Dictionary Online” (2015<sup>5</sup>) for its etymology, historical development and relevant current definition.

<sup>5</sup>Only the entries MIGRANT, ‘national’ and ‘nomad’ have been recently updated. The others are still under revision (ALIEN, CITIZEN, REFUGEE, RESIDENT) or date back to either the 19th- (FOREIGNER 1897, IMMIGRANT 1899) or the 20th-century (SETTLER 1992) edition of the OED Online (2015).

Finally, corpus analysis software WordSmith Tools 6.0 was employed to obtain wordlists for both corpora and to look up concordances for the 10 keywords in each corpus. A critical discourse analysis approach was then adopted for qualitative data interpretation (Fairclough 1995; 2003; van Dijk 2008; Wodak 2013).

## 5. Findings

The quantitative results of the analysis carried out with WordSmith Tools 6.0 are listed in Table 4.

TABLE 4  
Quantitative results of corpus analysis

	<i>Policies</i>					<i>Portal</i>				
	Sing.	%	Plur.	%	<u>Total</u>	Sing.	%	Plur.	%	<u>Total</u>
Alien	0	0.00	0	0.00	<u>0</u>	6	0.00	81	0.04	<u>87</u>
Citizen	13	0.02	111	0.17	<u>124</u>	306	0.15	207	0.10	<u>513</u>
Foreigner	0	0.00	1	0.00	<u>1</u>	74	0.04	126	0.06	<u>200</u>
Immigrant	2	0.00	4	0.01	<u>6</u>	16	0.01	20	0.01	<u>36</u>
Migrant	26	0.04	62	0.10	<u>88</u>	32	0.01	80	0.04	<u>112</u>
National	6	0.01	47	0.07	<u>53</u>	69	0.03	129	0.06	<u>198</u>
Nomad	0	0.00	0	0.00	<u>0</u>	0	0.00	0	0.00	<u>0</u>
Refugee	10	0.01	20	0.03	<u>30</u>	24	0.01	12	0.00	<u>36</u>
Resident	4	0.01	11	0.02	<u>15</u>	167	0.08	18	0.01	<u>185</u>
Settler	0	0.00	0	0.00	<u>0</u>	0	0.00	0	0.00	<u>0</u>

### 5.1. Terminology

In the Policies corpus, the 3 most frequent terms are: CITIZEN\*, MIGRANT\*, and NATIONAL\*; no occurrences emerged for ALIEN\*, NOMAD\*, and SETTLER\*; only 1 occurrence of 'foreigners' was found. The 3 most frequent terms in the Portal corpus are CITIZEN\*, FOREIGNER\*, and NATIONAL\*. NOMAD\* and SETTLER\* were not found in this second corpus either. In both corpora, all the keywords show very low frequencies: in Policies, CITIZEN\* is 2.7 times less frequent than the most frequent term ('european', 0.51%); in Portal, CITIZEN\* is 6.6 times less frequent than the most frequent term ('residence',



1.66%). What emerges is that both corpora have CITIZEN\* and NATIONAL\* among their most frequent terms, both representing end-of-process concepts (see Section 4). Not only, the most frequent lexical words in each corpus in absolute terms ('european' and 'residence' respectively) are Europe-centred and not related to movement and, as expected, confirm that Policies is concerned with internal laws and policy-making ('european'), while Portal focuses on those outside the EU and the rules they should follow to become part of it ('residence').

A further quantitative analysis was also carried out, by looking at the most frequent left and right collocates of the 10 keywords considered. Qualitative considerations are as follows.

#### 5.1.1. European Legal English collocations

A first reflection is that the end-of-process keywords, especially CITIZEN\*, RESIDENT\* and NATIONAL\*, frequently collocate (L1) with adjectives of European nationality (e.g. 'spanish', 'luxembourgish') and supranationality ('european'). It is also true that in the case of 'eu', which is also a frequent left collocate of end-of-process keywords in both corpora, the negation 'non' is almost invariably attached to it as a pre-modifier. Therefore, if a quantitative analysis would have seemed to indicate that EU people were at stake, a qualitative analysis shows that the focus was on non-EU people instead, who were defined by negation ('non-eu').

Another reflection regards the presence, in Portal (but not in Policies), of terminological labels (rather than collocations) indicating bodies, agencies, entities, procedures etc. existing only at national level and in specific Member States. Examples are:

- |     |            |                    |   |
|-----|------------|--------------------|---|
| (1) | Border and | <i>Alien</i>       | Police (Slovakia)                             |
| (2) | District   | <i>Aliens</i>      | and Immigration Branch of the Police (Cyprus) |
| (3) | Provincial | <i>Aliens</i>      | Affairs Offices (Spain)                       |
| (4) |            | <i>Alien</i>       | Litigation Council (Belgium)                  |
| (5) | Electronic | <i>Foreigner</i>   | Card (Belgium)                                |
| (6) |            | <i>Foreigners</i>  | Authority (Germany)                           |
| (7) | Office for | <i>Foreigners</i>  | (Poland)                                      |
| (8) | Local      | <i>Immigration</i> | Councils (Greece)                             |

These new ‘national collocations’ offer interesting insights. Firstly, they result from the translation into English of the EU national terms indicating the specific bodies, agencies and procedures at issue. For instance, a check on “Alien and borders police” revealed that this label is the literal translation of the Czech ‘Služba cizinecké policie’, whose referent is a special branch of the Czech police. Indeed, the Služba cizinecké policie’s website has an English version in which they call themselves precisely the ‘Alien police’ (Policie České republiky 2015). Apparently, when the EU collected information from each Member State to create the Immigration Portal, this took the form of English translations of existing national texts. Thus, new legal English terms – suffering from technicality and artificiality as all ESPs do – entered and contributed to European Legal English terminology. Interestingly, they can now be said to rightfully belong to European Legal English, although they do not have European referents as such, but still indicate local national entities, e.g. an ‘Alien and border police’ does not exist at European level<sup>6</sup>. A final consideration is that this neology phenomenon does not appear in the Policies corpus, as this is entirely authored by an EU institution and does not draw on local texts about local issues – again, in line with its communicative purpose, focused on the EU itself.

### 5.1.2. Native English collocations

In order to make comparisons with native English terminology, a Portal sub-corpus was assembled, containing only those texts providing information about the three EU Member States with English as a first language: Ireland, Malta, and the UK. As expected, this sub-corpus too yielded, for the same ten keywords, ‘new national collocations’ labelling local entities, such as:

---

<sup>6</sup> The Europol assists “the European Union’s Member States in their fight against serious international crime and terrorism” (Europol 2015), but does not substitute national police corps.

- (9) *Immigrant* Investor Programme (Ireland)
- (10) Office of the *Refugee* Applications Commissioner (ORAC) (Ireland)
- (11) Office of the *Refugee* Appeals Tribunal (ORAT) (Ireland)

However, something else also emerged with reference to the UK. This country identifies four different categories of potential immigrant workers to the country: (a) general, (b) investor, (c) entrepreneur and (d) exceptional talent. Provided that these are local British labels as chosen by the British institutions behind these texts, they nonetheless can be said to correspond to similar categories of immigrant workers as specified in the EU Immigration Portal, based on the detailed descriptions provided in each document:

- (12) General *migrants* (UK) → Corresponding EUIP category/-ies: Employed workers
- (13) Investor *migrants* (UK) → Corresponding EUIP category/-ies: Highly-qualified workers / Self-employed workers
- (14) Entrepreneur *migrants* (UK) → Corresponding EUIP category/-ies: Highly-qualified workers / Self-employed workers
- (15) Exceptional talent *migrants* (UK) → Corresponding EUIP category/-ies: Highly-qualified workers / Researchers.

The question arises of why, in the presence of pre-existing native English terms identifying the same conceptual referents, the EUIP has created other definitions, in fact preferring the latter to the former to add to European Legal English terminology. As to the reasons behind these terminological choices, considerations on EU language policies need to be made, some of which are proposed in the next section.

## 5.2. Discourse



### 5.2.1. Prescriptive directions, descriptive considerations

EU institutions have clear and strict norms for linguistic – and especially terminological – harmonisation, which are freely available

as public guidelines for drafters and translators. Examples of such instructions can be found on the website of the European Commission, under Translation resources > English > Guidelines (European Commission 2015a), or on europa.eu under Publications Office > Style guide > Interinstitutional style guide (Europa 2015), and include resources of different kinds: from terminological databases, to various specialised glossaries, models, templates and stylesheets. Every document falling under the umbrella of the EU, particularly legislative texts, must comply with these norms. EU institutions, therefore, follow a very prescriptive approach as regards legal terminology. The texts in the Policies and Portal corpora are expected to meet these requirements.

Indeed, this happens for example with keywords such as IMMIGRANT\* and MIGRANT\*. Looking up IMMIGRANT\* in the IATE (selecting ‘law’ as the subject and ‘English’ as the language), usage labels are found under the entry ‘illegal immigrant’, clearly stating that ‘illegal’ and IMMIGRANT should not be used, with ‘illegal’ even being labelled as ‘deprecated’ (IATE, s.v. illegal immigrant):

FIGURE 1  
IATE, s.v. illegal immigrant

Migration, Offence [Council]		Full entry
	irregular immigrant (Preferred)	**** *@
EN	undocumented immigrant	**** *@ 
	illegal immigrant (Deprecated)	**** *@ 

Following the prescriptive and proscriptive EU approach, IATE provides a long and thorough explanation for this preference, and recommends substitutes: MIGRANT for IMMIGRANT and ‘irregular’ for ‘illegal’. In both the Policies and Portal corpora the EU recommendations are quantitatively met, with IMMIGRANT\* occurring 6 times as opposed to MIGRANT\* occurring 88 times in Policies, and 36 occurrences of IMMIGRANT\* versus 112 occurrences of MIGRANT\* in Portal. From a qualitative viewpoint, in Policies MIGRANT\* is associated with ‘irregular’ as an L1-collocate 17 times, but only once does it collocate with ‘illegal’:

- (16) The border guards apprehended 28 illegal *migrants* on 11 January 2015 close to the Hungarian-Serbian border on Hungarian territory

In Portal, IMMIGRANT\* collocates with ‘irregular’ 5/112 times but never with ‘illegal’. Neither in Policies, nor in Portal does IMMIGRANT\* collocate with ‘illegal’ or ‘irregular’. In this case, the EU prescriptions are met, as highlighted also by D’Avanzo (2009: 53) with reference to the noun ‘migration’ vs. ‘immigration’. Another case of compliance regards the keyword NATIONAL\*. This frequently collocates with ‘eu’ in both corpora but, as seen in 5.5.1, the full collocation is ‘non-eu national\*’. Clearly, this is a specialised term deliberately constructed and based on the classic ESP objectivity, technicality and artificiality criteria (Gotti 2011) to obtain non-ambiguity. Other LI collocates of NATIONAL\* are ‘third-country’ and other countries’ adjectives. All this seems to suggest that NATIONAL may be filling the space once occupied by IMMIGRANT, which should no longer be used according to EU recommendations. The fortunes of IMMIGRANT, as shown here, represents a case of recent and rapid obsolescence (‘deprecated’ since 2009 according to IATE, s.v. ‘illegal immigrant’) of a word that had been circulating in Europe since the age of classical Latin and, in English, since 1623 (OED, s.v. IMMIGRANT). Interestingly, the reference quoted by IATE as ‘banning’ the use of IMMIGRANT comes from a United Nations declaration<sup>7</sup>, thus testifying to the intricate relationship between European Legal English and Global Legal English as used, for example, in/by world-level institutions.

Other times, however, the corpora show results non-conforming to EU terminological indications (underlined in examples 17-25):

- (17) One of the means by which to do this is by better integrating legal migrants (Policies)
- (18) Return of illegal immigrants (Portal, Luxembourg)
- (19) Its functions include the promotion of the integration of legal immigrants into Irish society (Portal, Ireland)

<sup>7</sup> “She stressed that terms such as ‘illegal immigrants’ should be avoided and replaced by the internationally accepted definitions of ‘irregular’ or ‘undocumented’ migrants”, High Commissioner for Human Rights Navi Pillay, as reported in IATE IDEM, s.v. ‘illegal immigrant’.

While (18) is not justified under the EU rules on terminology, the use of ‘legal’ in (17) and (19) could be explained by the positive connotation of the L1 collocate, which could induce drafters to feel that its use may be condoned. In Policies, IMMIGRANT\* appears 6 times (where the expectation was 0), apparently against EU recommendations:

- (20) common basic principles for *immigrant* integration policy in the EU
- (21) The Common basic principles *immigrant* integration policy for
- (22) residence for certain categories *immigrants* of
- (23) residence for certain categories *immigrants* of
- (24) family life is impossible for some *immigrants*
- (25) as well as where *immigrants* are coming from.

By looking at the concordances, though, it would seem that the term is never used in official multi-word terms as defined in 5.1.1, but only to refer to concepts broadly (*certain* categories of immigrants, *some* immigrants), resulting in a vague and possibly less loaded usage (Endicott 2000; Bhatia *et al.* 2007; Poscher 2012), which could make the texts’ authors perceive it as acceptable under the circumstances.

### 5.2.2. Authority, identity and power relations

A few words may be spent on the relationship between terminology and power, and how this emerges from the corpora analysed here. Much has been written, including recently, about the construction of EU identity through language (see, for example, Wodak 2008; Caliendo and Piga 2014; Vihman and Praakli 2014). Whether this exists and what it is like is a bigger issue than can be addressed here. It is, however, possible to draw a few observations from the present terminological study.

A first reflection regards the ten keywords considered. The division outlined in Section 4 between in-process and end-of-process terms itself conveys an idea of identity, discriminating between those people on the move who are still struggling with the migration

process and those who have successfully completed it. Not only, the people on the move, i.e. those still in the process of migrating, can assume different identities based on the term by which they are defined. In the case of legal language, the terminology employed is fundamental because a specific lexical label corresponds to a specific legal status implying specific rights and duties. According to EU standards, *MIGRANT* is the preferred general term to refer to a person on the move, while *IMMIGRANT* should not be employed at all (see 5.2.1). Provided that no perfect synonyms exist, the feeling is that, while substituting the former for the latter may be a politically correct choice, it also creates terminological ambiguity. To start with, the prefix in *IMMIGRANT* conveys the idea of ‘coming into’ and ‘settling in’ which, from the perspective of an observer, might make them feel ‘invaded’. The choice of *MIGRANT*, on the other hand, obviously eliminates any idea of direction and arrival, while keeping the connotation of movement. Because this movement is indefinite, though, it appears as continuous, which makes the term less loaded and problematic, since it could imply that a person is only temporarily ‘coming into’ a specific country. In other words, the feeling might be that an immigrant is here to stay, while a migrant might move on. Indeed, this is the original meaning of *MIGRANT* as recorded by the OED (“A person who moves *temporarily* or *seasonally* from place to place”, s.v. *MIGRANT*<sup>8</sup>). An immigrant, instead, is “a person who migrates into a country as a settler” (OED, s.v. *IMMIGRANT*), where *SETTLER* is precisely an end-of-process term. The idea is that EU and other supranational institutions, by favouring the label *MIGRANT*, are on the one hand promoting acceptance by removing settlement implications but, on the other, are also trying to find the words to describe the current movements, increasingly heterogeneous and repeatable (Eurostat 2015).

In the two corpora analysed, people on the move are also defined by negating an end-of-process status: ‘non-eu citizen’, ‘non-eu national’, ‘non-eu resident’. This furthers the EU’s attempt to promote acceptance by eliminating any connotation of movement, though at the cost of dehumanising the person (Catenaccio 2007), with a commodification (Scarpa 2002) effect. In terms of identity,

---

<sup>8</sup> Emphasis is added in all examples.

these are definitions by negation, which in fact are non-definitions. By non-defining, the agent relinquishes responsibility, while the object never really acquires an identity. Ironically, EU identity may not be well defined yet, but what non-EU identity is seems to be quite clear. On the other hand, when end-of-process terms are used without the negation, i.e. CITIZEN\*, NATIONAL\*, RESIDENT\* as such, the trend in both corpora is that they are surrounded by positively connoted words (underlined in examples 26-29). For example, RESIDENT\* appears in:

- (26)                      *resident* Status
- (27)      a long-term *resident* enjoys equal treatment
- (28)      long-term    *resident*
- (29)      permanent   *resident*

Different identity problems are connected with the term FOREIGNER\*. A striking difference is that it only appears once in Policies, while it is the second most frequent keyword in Portal. In the first corpus, it is clearly used as a synonym of MIGRANT and its occurrence is not significant statistically:

- (30) EU states may also ask *foreigners* to comply with integration measures

In the second corpus, though, its high frequency is justified by the fact that most texts deal with local migration laws and, whenever individual Member States are at stake, their origin as independent countries surfaces in words such as FOREIGNER, which is historically used to indicate a citizen from any other European or non-European country, but in EU discourse should only refer to non-EU citizens. Hence, this creates ambiguity as to which identity to assign to foreigners: see examples (5)-(7) in Section 5.1.1 (new national collocations). Similar considerations can be made about ALIEN\*, though its lower frequency in Portal could be explained by its more learned etymology and usage, which make it less suitable for the texts' disseminating communicative purpose.

A final observation concerns the terms NOMAD\*, REFUGEE\* and SETTLER\*. Despite appearing in the glossaries on immigration consulted and meeting the requirements to be selected as keywords (Section 4), their frequency is either minimal or equal to zero (see



Table 4). This, again, can be explained in terms of identity. A *NOMAD* is defined as “[a] member of a people that travels from place to place to find fresh pasture for its animals, and has no permanent home” (OED, s.v. *NOMAD*). This makes him/her a perpetual migrant, and a willing one at that: someone who not only wishes to keep travelling, but also has no intention of changing his/her status either. Moreover, this status defines him/her linguistically and culturally. The term also identifies specific ethnic peoples such as the Roma, Gypsies, Travellers, Manouches, Ashkali, Sinti and Boyash (European Commission 2015b). The absence of the term *NOMAD*\* could thus be justified by their specific identity, which makes them the object of separate EU policies (e.g. EU and Roma, [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm)). *SETTLER*\* is also absent from both corpora. Two hypotheses can be made as to the reason why. The identity associated with the term is strongly connected to the European colonialism of centuries past: “[o]ne who settles in a new country; a colonist” (OED, s.v. *SETTLER*), with clear negative implications. Also, it is the only keyword with an Old English etymology and, as such, it might have been ‘cannibalised’ at the European level by its Latinate counterpart *RESIDENT*: “[a] person who resides permanently in a place; a permanent or *settled* inhabitant of a town, district, etc”. (OED, s.v. *RESIDENT*). Proof of this could be that the root *settl-* survives in the Portal corpus as a verb (to settle) or as a *nomen actionis* (settlement) almost exclusively in pages about countries where Germanic languages are spoken, i.e. Austria, Germany and the UK. *REFUGEE*\* has very few occurrences in both corpora. In Policies, there are two surprising L1 collocates: ‘european’ and ‘un’ (underlined in examples 31-32). A qualitative analysis, though, shows that there are no European or UN refugees, but the terms are part of multi-word names of entities:

- (31) financial assistance available through the European *Refugee* Fun
- (32) in cooperation with the International Organization for Migration and the UN *Refugee* Agency

These examples, however, do not justify its low frequency, which could find an explanation in the Portal occurrences instead. Here, the keyword also appears infrequently but, when it does, it tends to

be used in conjunction with positively connoted terms, underlined as in:

- (33) This covers *refugee* and immigration policy
- (34) granting *refugee status* and asylum
- (35) the management of the resettlement of *refugees* admitted
- (36) Reunification of Families of *Refugees*
- (37) *refugee status*
- (38) takes actions regarding *refugees*

The hypothesis is that a refugee, “a person who has been *forced* to leave his or her home and *seek refuge* elsewhere, esp. in a foreign country, from *war*, religious *persecution*, political *troubles*, the effects of a natural *disaster*, etc.” (OED, s.v. REFUGEE), migrates through no fault of his/her, because s/he has been compelled to as a victim of an uncontrollable event not depending on his/her will. As such, they are subjected to and the recipients of different EU policies (see for example the European Council on Refugees and Exiles, [www.ecre.org](http://www.ecre.org)), and are not the main intended target of the texts contained in Policies and Portal. This confirms a further understanding of identity based on voluntary or non-voluntary migration.

## 6. Conclusions

The World Wide Web is the medium that more than any other expresses the blurring of borders, the rapid exchange of information and the development and success of English as a Lingua Franca in the contemporary world. As such, studying how EU institutions use and shape it seemed relevant to shed light on migration terminology as employed not in specialised texts and settings, but to reach and address the general public. The terminological analysis carried out, combined with a critical discursive approach, has returned a few interesting results.

From a terminological point of view, two trends were identified. Firstly, new European Legal English collocations emerged as frequent expressions containing the ten keywords (Table 3) chosen to represent European migration. These, in fact, were found to be

the result of translating existing national labels into English for the purpose of providing information at EU level (examples 1-8). Thus, existing national concepts were and are being brought forth into the 'new' European Legal English, enlarging and enriching its lexicon as new Member States join the Union (see 5.1.1). Secondly, a review of the texts in the corpora coming from native English sources revealed that native English collocations – different from the new collocations mentioned above – are also used to refer to the same concepts (see 5.1.2). In this way, synonymic expressions exist in European Legal English – some in native English and some deriving from translations from other EU languages – indicating the same referents (examples 12-15). Their coexistence creates ambiguity and raises a debate, with the supporters of new collocations arguing in favour of supranational functionality (European Commission 2015), and EU language professionals, like Garner (2013: 4), appealing against the use of “a vocabulary that differs from that of any recognised form of English”.

From a discursive point of view, a high level of EU prescriptivism emerged from the analysis of the collocates of the ten selected keywords (see 5.2.1). This was confirmed by the official EU terminological resources consulted, such as those provided by the European Commission (2015) and the IATE. As a result, it appears that the identity of potential movers into the EU is shaped by EU institutions, even prior to their arrival, through the identifying and categorising terminology they impose on them (e.g. 'highly-skilled worker', 'non-EU citizen/national/resident', 'long-term resident', REFUGEE etc.). Also confirmed was the initial classification of keywords into 'in-process' and 'end-of-process': a critical discourse analysis of authority and power relations in the corpora revealed inclusiveness/exclusiveness collocations, expressing antithetic dichotomies such as 'in' vs. 'out', 'movement' vs. 'stability', 'legality' vs. 'illegality', 'welcome' vs. 'unwelcome', 'positive' vs. 'negative', 'voluntary' vs. 'non-voluntary' etc. (see 5.2.2). The analysis confirmed that the construction and definition of identity and the corresponding rights are made by those already inside and belonging to the EU, as represented by the institutions. Rights are thus granted and withdrawn by the party with the greater power of negotiation.

Migration terminology is multi-faceted and constantly developing, just like the phenomena it describes; the present results

are linked to a specific moment in time and are bound to change as migration to the EU evolves. Many aspects of the subject still remain to be investigated, such as the use of migration terminology in UN English and in popular sources.

### References

- BELLINO MACHADO, MARIA JOSÉ, 2015, *Directorate General for Translation, OmegaT 2014, its Project Wizard and DGT's CAT Environment. A Translator's Guide*, [http://ec.europa.eu/translation/portuguese/magazine/documents/folha45\\_omega-t\\_translator\\_guide\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/translation/portuguese/magazine/documents/folha45_omega-t_translator_guide_en.pdf).
- BHATIA, VIJAY K., 1994, *Cognitive Structuring in Legislative Provisions*, Longman, London.
- BHATIA, VIJAY, ENGBERG, JAN, GOTTI, MAURIZIO, HELLER, DOROTHEE (eds), 2007, *Vagueness in Normative Texts*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- CALIENDO, GIUDITTA, PIGA, ANTONIO, 2014, "Framing Identity through the Virtual Channels of EU Institutional Communication", in P. Evangelisti Allori (ed.), *Identities in and across Cultures*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 45-68.
- CATENACCIO, PAOLA, 2007, "De-humanizing the 'Alien': The Construction of Migrants' Rights in EU Legislation", in G. Garzone and S. Sarangi (eds), *Discourse, Ideology and Specialized Communication*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 355-377.
- D'AVANZO, STEFANIA, 2009, *EU Political and Legal Discourse on Immigration and Asylum*, Doctoral thesis, Federico II University of Naples, Naples.
- DG MIGRATION AND HOME AFFAIRS, 2015a, "Legal Migration", [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/legal-migration/index_en.htm).
- DG MIGRATION AND HOME AFFAIRS, 2015b, "Glossary", [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/glossary/index\\_a\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/e-library/glossary/index_a_en.htm).
- DUDLEY-EVANS TONY, ST. JOHN, MAGGIE JO, 1999, *Developments in English for Specific Purposes. A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- ENDICOTT, TIMOTHY, 2000, *Vagueness in Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- EU IMMIGRATION PORTAL, 2015, "Glossary", [http://ec.europa.eu/immigration/glossary\\_en](http://ec.europa.eu/immigration/glossary_en).
- EUROPA, 2015, *Interinstitutional Style Guide*, <http://publications.europa.eu/code/en/en-000100.htm>.
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2014, "Frequently Asked Questions on Languages in Europe", 26 September 2013, [http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release-MEMO-13-825\\_en.htm](http://europa.eu/rapid/press-release-MEMO-13-825_en.htm).

- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015, *Guidelines for Contractors Translating into English*, [http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/en\\_guidelines\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/en_guidelines_en.htm).
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015a, *Asylum and Migration 3.0*, [http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european\\_migration\\_network/docs/emn-glossary-en-version.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/networks/european_migration_network/docs/emn-glossary-en-version.pdf).
- EUROPEAN COMMISSION, 2015b, "EU and Roma", [http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index\\_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/discrimination/roma/index_en.htm).
- EUROPOL, 2015, "About us", <https://www.europol.europa.eu/content/page/about-us>.
- EUROSTAT, 2015, *Migration and Migrant Population Statistics*, [http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration\\_and\\_migrant\\_population\\_statistics](http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Migration_and_migrant_population_statistics).
- FAICLOUGH, NORMAN, 1995, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Longman, Harlow.
- FAIRCLOUGH, NORMAN, 2003, *Analysing Discourse: Textual analysis for social research*, Routledge, London/New York.
- GARNER, JEREMY, 2013, *Misused English Words and Expressions Used in EU Publications. European Court of Auditors*. [http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/misused\\_english\\_terminology\\_eu\\_publications\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/translation/english/guidelines/documents/misused_english_terminology_eu_publications_en.pdf).
- GIANNONI, DAVIDE SIMONE, FRADE, CELINA, 2010, "Introduction", in D.S. Giannoni and C. Frade (eds), *Researching Language and the Law. Textual Features and Translation Issues*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 7-16.
- GIBBONS, JOHN PETER (ed.), 2004, *Language and the Law*, Longman, London/New York.
- GOODRICH, PETER, 1987, *Legal Discourse. Studies in Linguistics, Rhetoric and Legal Analysis*, Macmillan, Basingstoke/London.
- GOTTI, MAURIZIO, 2011, *Investigating Specialized Discourse*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- INTERACTIVE TERMINOLOGY FOR EUROPE (IATE), version 1.8.8, <http://iate.europa.eu/SearchByQueryLoad.do;jsessionid=TGpcV3GWTRTQ5zMbsbF8WDzK9Rgoqrs53TdFdIJXy8P88LLInZJg!-1993963638?method=load>.
- MATTILA, HEIKKI E.S., 2006, *Comparative Legal Linguistics*, Ashgate, Aldershot/Burlington VT.
- OED ONLINE, 2015, *The Oxford English Dictionary*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- PERRUCHOUD RICHARD, (ed.), 2004, "Foreword", in *Glossary of Migration*, International Organization for Migration, Geneva, pp. 3-4.
- POLESE, VANDA, D'AVANZO, STEFANIA, 2010, "Linguistic and Legal Vagueness in EU Directives Harmonising Protection for Refugees and Displaced Persons", in D.S. Giannoni and C. Frade (eds), *Researching*

- Language and the Law: Textual Features and Translation Issues*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 89-111.
- POLICIE ČESKÉ REPUBLIKY, 2015, "Foreigners", [http:// www.policie.cz/docDetail.aspx?docid=21563997&doctype=ART](http://www.policie.cz/docDetail.aspx?docid=21563997&doctype=ART).
- POSCHER, RALF, 2012, "Ambiguity and Vagueness in Legal Interpretation", in P. M. Tiersma and L. Solan (eds), *The Oxford Handbook on Language and Law*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 128-144.
- ŠARČEVIĆ, SUSAN, 1997, *New Approach to Legal Translation*, Kluwer Law International, The Hague.
- ŠARČEVIĆ, SUSAN, 2010, "Creating a Pan-European Legal Language", in M. Gotti and C. Williams (eds), *Legal Discourse across Languages and Cultures*, Peter Lang, Bern, pp. 23-50.
- SCARPA, FEDERICA, 2002, "The language of Migration Studies in English and Italian", *Studi Emigrazione* 148(39), pp. 811-832.
- VAN DIJK, TEUN, 2008, *Discourse and Power*, Palgrave, Houndsmills.
- VIHMAN, VIRVE-ANNELI, PRAAKLI, KRISTINA (eds), 2014, *Negotiating Linguistic Identity*, Peter Lang, Bern.
- WODAK, RUTH, 2008 "‘Us and Them’: Inclusion and Exclusion – Discrimination via Discourse", in G. Delanty, R. Wodak, P. Jones (eds), *Identity Belonging and Migration*, Liverpool University Press, Liverpool, pp. 54-77.
- WODAK, RUTH (ed.), 2013, *Critical Discourse Analysis*, Sage, London.