TAMSIN PARNELL

UNIVERSITY OF NOTTINGHAM

BOOK REVIEW: ISLENTYEVA, A. (2020) *CORPUS-BASED ANALYSIS OF IDEOLOGICAL BIAS. MIGRATION IN THE BRITISH PRESS.* ROUTLEDGE.

CONTACT

Tamsin Parnell, LG35, Trent Building, University of Nottingham, University Park, NG7 2QL, UK. tamsin.parnell@nottingham.ac.uk

ORCID

-

Book Review: Islentyeva, A. (2020) *Corpus-based analysis of ideological bias. Migration in the British press.* Routledge.

Tamsin Parnell

University of Nottingham

At once comprehensive and meticulous, this analysis of British newspaper constructions of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants (RASIM) achieves substantial depth and breadth through its mixed-method and diachronic analytical approach. Islentyeva offers a strong analysis of the production of media discourses about RASIM, setting the groundwork for future studies to examine the reception of media discourses among migrant groups and national readers more broadly.

In the Introduction, Islentyeva delineates three objectives. Her first goal is to trace the linguistic differences and similarities in the right-wing and left-wing coverage of RASIM prior to the 2016 British referendum on EU membership (Chapter 3). The second aim is to examine the transformation of migration discourses after the referendum, by analysing representations of European migrants in newspaper articles from 2016 to 2018 (Chapter 4). The third intention is to uncover the common metaphorical motifs employed in migration discourses (Chapters 5 and 6). Through her corpus-based critical discourse analysis of 1,000 articles from five British newspapers, the author successfully achieves these goals.

Chapter 1 introduces the central tenets of (critical) discourse analysis, providing robust definitions of discourse and power as well as overviews of the newspaper data interrogated in the chapters that follow. Readers learn that Islentyeva will analyse 500 articles from 2013-2015, and 500 from 2016-2018. These articles are from both right-wing outlets (*The Sun, The Telegraph, The Daily Mail*) and left-wing publications (*The Guardian and The Observer, The Mirror*), providing a balanced ideological view of discursive representations across the British press.

The early theoretical overview ties in neatly with Chapter 2, in which Islentyeva introduces corpus-based research. The author provides a detailed introduction to distinctive collexeme analysis (Gries & Stefanowitsch, 2004), a corpus linguistic method that has largely been absent in corpus-assisted discourse studies (CADS). Distinctive collexeme analysis investigates pairs of semantically similar grammatical constructions (such as migrant-immigrant) by comparing the frequency of all words occurring in one construction with frequencies in other comparable constructions (Stefanowitsch, 2006; Gries and Stefanowitsch, 2004). Throughout her analysis, Islentyeva reveals the usefulness of this method for analysing RASIM representations; it will undoubtedly become a popular tool in future CADS work. Impressively expansive, the two introductory chapters provide an

account of the principles of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis that would be accessible to lay readers and student linguists.

Islentyeva begins her analysis of the pre-referendum corpus in Chapter 3. She builds on a substantial body of existing research into representations of RASIM (e.g., Baker et al., 2008; Islentyeva, 2018; Taylor, 2014) by analysing key social actors in migration discourses. The chapter reveals that *migrant* is the most frequently employed term across the two groups of newspapers; migrants are often discursively constructed as a homogenous group in the right-wing press. Representations of migrants are framed through the domains of economy, employment and asylum seeking, with *migrant* appearing semantically close to *refugee* in some cases. In contrast, *immigrant(s)* are framed through domains of law and cultural identity, with a focus on integration, tradition and values. From the analysis, Islentyeva provides original definitions of the terms *migrant* and *immigrant*. An *immigrant*, according to the newspapers, is an "individual coming from a foreign country who is characterised by their social status in relation to the national political and legal institutions of the country they are entering" (p. 66). They are also individuals "coming from a foreign country who retain their cultural identity" although they might be integrated into their host country (p. 66). In contrast, a *migrant* could be either an individual coming from a foreign country "to seek better employment opportunities" or an "individual fleeing war, persecution or tyranny" (p. 66).

Chapter 4 focuses on the post-referendum corpus. As with the pre-referendum corpus, *migrant(s)* is the most frequently used RASIM term but appears less frequently overall due to a reduction in its use in the left-wing press. Instances of *refugee(s)*, in contrast, increase in articles by *The Sun* and *Daily Mail*. In this chapter, Islentyeva deftly locates what I would term a neoliberal construction of migrant acceptability, in which highly skilled workers are valued (both in the right- and left-wing press) while lower-skilled migrants are disparaged (in just the right-wing press). A consideration of how these findings intersect with existing British governmental discourses about neoliberal migrant integration, as revealed by Bennett (2018), would have been welcome in this section. Nevertheless, the finding that the left-wing press replaces *migrant(s)* with more neutral lexical choices, such as *citizen* and *national*, is perceptive.

The focus shifts from a corpus-based critical discourse analysis of RASIM representations in Chapters 3 and 4, to a close linguistic analysis of the English garden as a metaphor for English society in Chapter 5. This chapter provides the most novel findings of the book, demonstrating that discourses of national identity and immigration are inextricably linked. Islentyeva examines an editorial from *The Telegraph* in which Britain is constructed as a garden and immigrants are discursively represented as exotic, "alien" plants. She convincingly argues that this discursive construction constitutes a metaphor of MIGRANTS AS WEEDS. Beyond the metaphorical analysis, Islentyeva explores literary and cultural allusions that have historically constructed English society as a garden. She

goes on to cleverly compare the disparaging representation of migrants in the *Telegraph* with the ironic metaphor of the English garden used in *The Guardian* to show the different treatment of migrant representations across the left-right spectrum.

Chapter 6 continues the focus on metaphorical motifs by examining constructions of the metaphor POLITICS IS WAR across the newspapers. Through a quantitative analysis, Islentyeva finds that the war motif is common in her pre-referendum corpus across all five newspapers; she concludes that war constitutes "a systematic way of talking about politics" (p. 148). Surprisingly, left-wing newspapers are found to use military terms more frequently than their right-wing counterparts. Islentyeva accounts for this finding by explaining that the left-wing newspapers use military terms as part of their attempt to undermine the Conservative approach to EU migration and promote the opposition's (Labour). The analysis delves deeper into the left- and right-wing constructions of the POLITICS AS WAR motif through a close linguistic analysis. The author finds that the motif is applied to different political actors depending on the ideological bias of the newspapers. While the left-wing newspapers disparage Conservative politicians for unrealistic immigration targets, the right-wing newspapers blame the Liberal Democrat members of the coalition for undermining their Conservative colleagues. This evidence of ideological bias is illuminating and, I would argue, worthy of more sustained analysis across different metaphorical domains in the British press.

In the Conclusion, Islentyeva reviews the major findings and rightly points out their importance for future linguistic research. She emphasises the methodological innovation of her combination of conceptual metaphor theory and CDA, recognising that the two complement one another. Her illuminating book could be expanded to consider ideological biases across different metaphorical domains, both within the media and in governmental discourses. It could also be followed up by a study of migrants' *reception* of dominant media narratives about migration. I have no doubt that the methodological innovation and extensive findings will lead to a plethora of future studies in these areas.

References

Baker, P., Gabrielatos, C., Khosravinik, M., Krzyżanowski, M., McEnery, T. & Wodak, R. (2008). A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press. *Discourse and Society*, *19*(3), 273-306. doi:10.1177/0957926508088962

Bennett, S. (2018). *Constructions of migrant integration in British public discourse*. Bloomsbury.

Gries, S. T. & Stefanowitsch, A. (2004). Extending collostructional analysis: a corpus-based perspective on 'Alternations'. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, *9*(1), 97-129. doi:10.1075/ijcl.9.1.06gri

Islentyeva, A. (2018). The undesirable migrant in the British press: Creating bias through language. *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen, 119*(2), 419-442.

Stefanowitsch, A. (2006). Distinctive collexeme analysis and diachrony: a comment. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory, 2*(2), 257-262. doi:10.1515/CLLT.2006.013

Taylor, C. (2014). Investigating the representation of migrants in the UK and Italian press: a cross-linguistic corpus-assisted discourse analysis. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 19*(3), 368-400. doi:10.1075/ijcl.19.3.03tay