Tampere University

Sonja Torppa

DISCOURSES OF DISPLACEMENT
A Comparative Corpus-Driven Discourse Analysis of British House of Commons Debates on the Displaced Populations of Syria and Ukraine

ABSTRACT

This paper uses a combined methodology of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis to analyze and compare the linguistic representations of displaced populations of Syria and Ukraine in the debates of the British House of Commons. The Syrian and Ukrainian conflicts resulted in various parliamentary debates, which discussed those displaced populations without their presence or input. Therefore, the critical examination of the language used to represent them is crucial in identifying potentially othering discourses about vulnerable populations and in investigating the relationship between language and political power.

To investigate the representational patterns, keyword lists and their respective collocates from both corpora were extracted and thematically coded into topoi, analyzed and compared with corpus analysis and additionally examined using a critical discourse analysis framework to look for emergent ideological discourses. The analysis showed clear differences in representations between displaced Syrians and Ukrainians, as well as in the ways Britain represents itself in the two contexts. The study concluded that a Eurocentric view of displacement emerged from the debate data, which represented Syrians most often through the status of refugees, victimhood and mass but Ukrainians primarily through nationality, similar values and bravery, with the UK positioning itself as politically more passive in the Syria context but considerably more active in the Ukraine context.

The originality of this thesis has been checked using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

Contents

iv

Glossary

Term	Definition
DP	Displaced population
Syria keyword list	Keyword list extracted using Syria debate corpus as target corpus and Ukraine debate corpus as reference corpus, used to compare DP representations in specific contexts
Ukraine keyword list	Keyword list extracted using Ukraine debate corpus as target corpus and Syria debate corpus as reference corpus, used to compare DP representations in specific contexts
ORTOLANG keywords (Syria and Ukraine)	Keywords extracted using ORTOLANG as reference corpus, these keyword lists were the base for thematical coding in table 2 and the node words for the collocates in table 3

1. INTRODUCTION

The inspiration for this thesis emerged from the current political discourse being had in the British parliament regarding the war in Ukraine. The invasion in 2022 marked the start of the largest armed conflict in Europe since the second World War, and the political discussions that followed presented an active opportunity to analyze and compare discourses about people fleeing conflict from countries in and outside Europe and examine if their country of origin has any effect on their representations in political discussions.

The representation of vulnerable populations through discourse has long been a prominent field of study in linguistics but is especially focused on in the critical discourse studies (CDS) that often aim to examine the "discursive reproduction of elite power", "perpetuated and legitimized by text and talk" (Van Dijk 2008: vii). Van Dijk characterizes these different powerful groups in society with the term "symbolic elites", who have "special access to public discourse", such as teachers, professors, writers and politicians (2008: 14). This thesis studies the ways politicians use text and talk to create and reproduce discourses and exert their political power and influence.

The linguistic legitimization of the US war on terror by the Bush administration (Cap 2006), the legitimization of the Crimean annexation by the presidential address of Vladimir Putin (Filipescu 2022) and the significant increasing of US military presence in Afghanistan, achieved by the rhetorical strategies of Barack Obama (Reyes, 2011) are just some of the examples where political elites reproduce their political power through language. All of these actions have created or contributed to creating displaced populations. The displaced do not have an opportunity to directly affect the western world's parliamentary debates had about them, which makes the critical examination of these discussions and representations crucial in highlighting and preventing possible

power abuse. The political discussions and debates about crisis situations such as the Syrian civil war or the war in Ukraine have a direct impact on the societal access of the displaced, but they are had without the contributions of the people in question.

The analysis of debate data will show that there were recurring topoi and patterns of DP representation in both corpora, but even with overlapping topoi, the representational patterns of the DPs created two very different images. The Syrian DPs are represented mainly through a pattern of identity application, where the symbolic elites label them most often as refugees. They are additionally represented prominently through an emphasis on their numeral mass and through their vulnerability and victimhood. In contrast, The Ukrainian DPs are represented primarily through their nationality, as opposed to the applied identity of refugee, in spite of the Ukrainian DPs being displaced by armed conflict similarly to the Syrian DPs. The Ukrainian debates showed an additional representation pattern where Ukrainians were referred to as defenders of western democratic values. The Ukrainian DPs are not represented primarily through their victimhood, as are the Syrian DPs. The corpus analysis discovered a strong emphasis on the aggressors of the war in Ukraine, which often exceeds the representation of Ukrainian DPs in frequency. The analysis showed additionally, how the structuring and naming of Government schemes affects the DP representations in parliament, and that there is a discourse of differentiation between refugees and migration in the British parliament.

This thesis studies these representations of Syrian and Ukrainian displaced populations (DPs) in debates held in the British House of Commons through the analysis of keywords and collocations, as well as through critical discourse analysis of ideological reproduction. To achieve this, I formulated four research questions to structure and guide this thesis:

> RQ1. Can any lexical patterns, such as single-word formulas or collocate patterns, be detected in the debates on displaced Syrian and Ukrainian populations in the British House of Commons?

RQ2. What are the most common patterns of representation of the Syrian displaced populations?

RQ3. What are the most common patterns of representation of the Ukrainian displaced populations?

RQ4. Are there any differences in the most common patterns of representation between the two groups, lexically or in discourse?

The analysis that will answer these questions is divided into five parts. Following this introduction, section 2 reviews relevant literature on combining corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis, the critical discourse studies done on British political language, introduces and overviews a cross-theoretical genre framework, outlines the critical analysis framework and concludes with a focus on essential concepts of critical political language analysis and the specifics of parliament debate language. Section 3 presents the data, the corpora and their collection process, with overviews of the program and metrics used in the corpus analysis, the specifics of keywords and collocations and the dimensions of the CDA ideological square model used in the analysis, ending with the topoi codebooks of keywords and collocates. After the analysis steps and analysis metrics overviewed in section 4, the results of the corpus analysis of keyword lists and their collocates, as well as the results of the critical discourse analysis are presented in section 5, ending with a discussion of the findings. The thesis ends with conclusion in section 6, where the findings are brought together to answer the four research questions and the overview of the analysis limitations and possible future research avenues is discussed.

In the following review of literature I will situate the study in a larger context, outline relevant concepts and provide a theoretical basis for the analysis framework used.

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1 Introduction

Some key concepts and a theoretical framework are introduced in section 2.2, which will present the case for a combined research methodology of a corpus analysis base with the addition of a specific critical discourse analysis framework. Section 2.3 explores genre theory in the context of political language, focusing on the language use of the British parliamentary debate. It also looks at how genre as a definition works to define political language use as a force to enact action, and how Systemic Functional Linguistics presents a cross-theoretical view of language as social action. The section ends with a list of parliamentary language conventions and a small sample of studies using the British Hansard.

2.2 Corpus Linguistics and Discourse Analysis

2.2.1 Analysis of Corpora: With Discourse Analysis, Towards Reduced Bias

The qualitative study of political language has attracted linguists' interest widely, and a strong theoretical foundation has thus been built, on which this thesis draws. One of the more recent developments in the study of language and discourse has been the rising number of applications of corpus analysis methods in addition to the discourse analysis framework, especially in the context of representation of migration. In research articles such as the study of the methodological synergy that combines critical discourse analysis (CDA) and corpus linguistics (CL) Baker et al. (2008), found how the application of CL methods to the CDA framework in the context of press discourse on migration yielded a result which strengthened both methodologies, as it provided a corpus linguistic foundation, on which the critical discourse analysis was built. Baker did also find the boundaries in the definitions of CDA as a qualitative methodology and CL as a quantitative methodology to be fuzzy. Marchi and Taylor (2009) do differentiate the methodologies similarly with Baker in their experiment into methodological triangulation but highlight "quantitative techniques" of CL (2009: 4), name both CL and CDA as "approaches" and include the terms quantitative and qualitative in a table titled "some popular claims on CL and CDA" (2009: 2-4). This representation of the definitions fall in line with Baker, in how the definitions of the nature of CL and CDA have some flexibility. For

a more recent look on this well-established theoretical route, Islentyeva (2020) similarly raises the issue of fuzzy boundaries between the branding of CL as a quantitative methodology and CDA as a qualitative methodology. Islentyeva points out that while the boundaries of the nature of these methodologies is not clear, the conclusion is that the combing of the two can be "complementary" (2020: 48.) Marchi and Taylor (2009), agree with Baker on the risks of over-reliance on both methodologies, such as viewing the corpus selection process as unbiased or using CDA to purely find what we expect to find, while also acknowledging the complementary nature of the methodologies even when it is not a perfect solution to the problem of objectivity (2009: 3-4). While Islentyeva argues that utilizing corpus methodology can somewhat reduce different forms of bias, even with the problems in corpora selection process (2020: 48-49), Baker points out how in studying language we cannot completely erase bias, as "it could be argued that bias is unavoidable when conducting social research, and the aim for neutral objectivity is in itself a 'stance", and how critical discourse analysts have seen the political stance or "explicit position" of the researcher traditionally as an analytical strength (2012: 255).

Methodologically similarly with this study of the representation of refugees with a corpus linguistic methodology aided by discourse analysis, Taylor (2014) studied the representation of migration cross-linguistically in both Italian and British press. Taylor found that there indeed was extensive negative representation of some outlined groups of displaced people but did not find a continuous moral panic concerning any of the investigated nationalities. The implementation of corpus methodology, however, gave a strong basis for a replicable study, while the addition of discourse analysis broadened the results to include relevant context outside the corpus.

Many of the linguistic studies done in the context of migration that combine corpus analysis methods with discourse analysis have thus studied the news media. However, this thesis intends to follow a similarly well-documented tradition of investigating parliamentary language use in the context of refugee representation.

As demonstrated, combining corpus analysis methods with specifically a critical discourse analysis framework provides both an increase in objectivity and the inclusion of relevant context outside the corpus data for an enriched analysis. The use of corpus data analyzed with a computational model, such as the extraction of keywords and collocations will present a more objective, bottom-up starting point for a supplementary CDA analysis. The qualitative analysis of a CDA framework will enrich the corpus findings by providing light to the relevant social processes and power relations, investigating for example how and what ideologies are being reproduced in the discussions about groups of displaced people.

2.2.2 Critical Discourse Analysis & Applications in Recent Research on British Political Language

As a theoretical framework, CDA has proved to be a fruitful methodology to apply in the study of political language. Recently, studies such as Parnell (2022) applied a critical discourse approach to the corpus-assisted diachronic analysis of Britain's national identity construction and its international relations through British government documents about Brexit. The study revealed a discursive move towards an antagonistic and uncertain view of the UK-European Union (EU) relationship post-Brexit, away from a previous, more positive view of an equal, transactional relationship between the two. This type of analysis of identity and ideology construction through government data mirrors the aims of this study. Hart and Winter (2022) did a more focalized study on the use of multimodal critical discourse analysis on gestures and legitimation of British politician Nigel Farage's anti-immigration discourse. The study concluded that gestures are an important part of political discourse in furthering legitimation of discriminatory action and should be studied more extensively. Using the same source for parliamentary debate data as this study, the Hansard, Riihimäki (2019) conducted a diachronic, corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis on the discursive construction of British national identity in relation to the EU. This study unearthed two competitive identity constructions of the United Kingdom (UK), one where the UK is a leader in the EU, and a competing construction of the UK being an outsider, with insecurities as to their role in the EU. The

current British opposition parties have been studied in this context as well, most recently in the critical analysis of populist, affective-discursive strategies of UKIP and Labour by Breeze (2019). She found that UKIP generally accepted anger and fear as appropriate reactions to issues such as migration, whereas Labour operated on a more muted emotional range, both negatively and positively, as UKIP also showed stronger positive emotions. The British political landscape has thus been proven to be a rich source for linguistic studies, especially in studying how constructions of national identity are being created in the parliamentary context. However, not much has yet been said on the issue of British political debates being an arena for the construction of representations of refugee groups coming to Britain, and if there are any discernible differences between those groups and how they are being discussed.

2.2.3 Ideology in the Context of Political Discourse

With his seminal work in CDA, namely the discourse-cognitive approach, Van Dijk describes ideologies as "systems of ideas" which are "sociocognitively defined as shared representations of social groups, and more specifically as the 'axiomatic' principles of such representations" (2006: 115). As the purpose of this study is to examine the ways minority groups are being represented in parliamentary discourse, it is essential to investigate what, if any, discernible ideologies can be detected from the debate data. As Van Dijk (1998: 293) points out, the consequences of "public discourse", such as in the political sphere, are much more significant than for instance in interpersonal dialogues. Van Dijk's ideological square model thus offers a beneficial qualitative analysis tool in carrying out an investigation into the ideological (re)productions that might be at play.

As characterized by Van Dijk, the ideological square model investigates the reproduction of ideologies by the means of four moves:

1. Express/emphasize information that is positive about Us.
2. Express/emphasize information that is negative about Them.
3. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is positive about Them.
4. Suppress/de-emphasize information that is negative about Us (1998: 294).

Van Dijk goes on to point out how this ideological square model works in identifying hidden ideologies primarily in the actions of group members, instead of the traditional focus on participants as individuals making discursive moves (1998: 294). Thus the use of this model works in the context of investigating the representation of displaced populations in parliamentary discourse, as the focus of this study will not be on individuals.

Parallel to Van Dijk's characterization of the Us and Them in ideology (re)production, studies such as Edwards, G. O. (2012) looked at the ways in which representation of the in-group, in this case the far-right British National Party, has changed in their manifestos over time. Similar to the ideological square model and its' potential to uncover hidden ideologies, Edwards used a CDA approach to ascertain in which ways the BNP represented themselves, explaining how the "focus is the way in which 'in-group' categories such as nationhood are invoked to imply inclusivity, yet on closer inspection are racially defined" (2012: 245). Other, more recent studies have applied a framework in a similar vein: with an addition of systemic functional linguistics, such as Li & Zhu (2020), the researchers used Van Dijk's ideological square model in addition to a Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) model of appraisal to study how China represents self and others in Chinese political discourse. The study found that most of Van Dijk's Ideological Square model's aspects could be found. China evaluates their behavior positively, but evaluates their things negatively, whereas when looking at the out-group, China evaluates other's behavior more negatively than their things. China thus places more emphasis on the values and behaviors of self and others, emphasizing Chinas good behavior and emphasizing the others' bad behavior. The model thus works in this analysis but unearths a more complicated national identity than previously thought. Other research in the context of political discourse and ideology has focused on the ways of uncovering antagonistic ideology through a synergy method of critical discourse analysis and corpus analysis of collocations such as Salama (2011) in the context of clashing ideologies on Wahhabism post-9/11. This study found that different collocations can recontextualize social realities, and the focus on collocations can unearth

the writer's attitude towards Wahhabism: pacifist or alarmist. Thus, it is clear that the in-depth study of political language can reveal a multitude of ideologies and group representations, and some of the results might reveal more complicated representations of national identities, groups of people and political parties than anticipated.

2.2.4 Power & Control

Research and critical analysis of political landscapes and their language use would produce rather insufficient results if the concepts of power and control were not seen as an integral part of the use and effect of political language. Charteris-Black (2018) illustrates how one of the central areas of interest in a CDA framework is the use and abuse of power, here understood as discourse by a "particular social group that is able to enforce their will over other social groups" (2018: 88). Framed in this way, the notion of power and its abuse thus includes the ability to control others, which is further elaborated by Van Dijk's characterization of control and power abuse:

> Traditionally, control is defined as control over the actions of others. If such control is also in the interest of those who exercise such power, and against the interest of those who are controlled, we may speak of power abuse. (2008: 9)

As mentioned in the previous chapter, "public discourses" such as the political debates in this study have a wider reach and influence than interpersonal discourses, and thus are more powerful as tools to reproduce narratives to the masses listening. In this context, studies have been done to highlight the ways politicians use language as a power to drive actual disruptions of peace.

The study of Filipescu (2022) focused on the discursive strategies of Vladimir Putin in the legitimization of the Crimean annexation in his 2014 presidential address. Her study showed a pattern of successful legitimization of the Crimean annexation. A strategy of synthetic personalization found by analyzing an excerpt of the 2014 presidential address created three defined discourses of religious, military and heterogenous unity (2022: 452). As an example of presupposed heterogenous unity between the people of Russia and Crimea, Filipescu mentions line 11 of the 2014 address:

> Russians and Ukrainians, Crimean Tatars and representatives of other peoples lived and worked next to each other on Crimea's soil, retained their self-identity and traditions, language and faith (2022: 450).

For an example of a military unity discourse, Filipescu presents for example line 5 of the address:

> In Crimea are the graves of Russian soldiers, through the courage of whom Crimea in 1783 was taken under the Russian [great power] state (2022: 448).

The purpose of those discourses was to diminish the distance between Russia and Crimea, and thus create a case for unification. In connection with using discourse to drive political change as well as military action, Reyes (2011) looked at the different discursive legitimization strategies of Barack Obama and George W. Bush on the justification of using armed forces in the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The study concluded that there are many discursive constructions that can legitimize military action, such as appealing to listener's emotions, especially fear, creating a hypothetical future, appealing to rationality, presenting as voices of expertise and a focus on altruism. The successful use of these legitimization strategies can thus drive real, political action that has expansive consequences.

However, not many studies have focused on how politicians exert their power in their representation of minority groups, such as refugees, in the parliamentary space, and if those representations differ between refugee populations. My study intends to build on the existing theoretical framework on political language, power and control, to illuminate how the construction of narratives on minority populations happens on the parliamentary level. This area of study is relevant within CDA, as the refugee groups in question are not present to affect these representations when they are happening, and thus the power to create these representations is not in their hands and should be subject to critical examination.

2.2.5 Summary

In this chapter on corpus linguistics and discourse analysis, first an overview on the "methodological synergy" of critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics as a combined research

methodology was done in section 2.2.1. After the advantages of such a methodological choice in reducing different forms of cognitive bias were represented, a look into the current research on political language and critical discourse studies in the context of Britain followed in section 2.2.2. After the introduction and previous applications of the CDA framework of Van Dijk's ideological square, which is applied in this study in section 2.2.3, a conceptualization of power and control in the context of political language use was done in section 2.2.4, to tie the aims of this study to the principals of critical discourse analysis further.

2.3 Parliamentary Debate as a Political Genre

2.3.1 Defining Genre

Genre in the context of my study has two dimensions. The first describes the process of the analyst choosing specific data sets, i.e. the knowledge of where the borders of the genre are. The second describes genre in its relation to the outside world, as in looking at the sociocultural significance and effect of the chosen genre to the world around it. Cap and Okulska (2013) offer a multitheoretical definition of genre for the first dimension as a discourse which contains the conventional use of "stable utterance groups which follow recognizable patterns that suit the accomplishment of certain social goals" (2013: 1). This definition is well suited with the parliamentary debate sphere, which is based on agreed upon rules of conduct and address in the House of Commons. The sittings are structured similarly, the manner in which a member of the House requests a turn to speak as well as the language used and the way other members and the Speaker are spoken to in a debate are specified in the Standing Orders, a rulebook of conduct and customs issued by the House, and in an additional guide issued by the Speaker of the House (UK Parliament, 2022a). With regards to accomplishing certain social goals, parliamentary debates are in place to further political decision making, which can be seen as accomplishing a social goal. In debates, a member has moved a motion and put forward a proposal for debate on such issues as House consideration on specific investment options, the question is then debated and voted on (UK Parliament, 2022a).

In the context of political communication, parliamentary debates have been widely studied as a relatively stable genre. In the context of British House of Commons debates, Shaw (2000) studied the adversarial nature of British parliamentary debates through the analysis of floor participation affected by the gender of the speaker. The study found that an overwhelming majority of attendees that violated the Debate rules of conduct to attain the floor for themselves were men, and Shaw recognized that the Chair intervention was practically nonexistent in these instances, and thus concluded that, although equal on the surface, the rules of conduct in reality were different for men and women in parliament.

Cheng (2015) studied the parliamentary debate discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the Minaret ban in Switzerland. The study found, that in the debates the discourse that was relied upon most heavily, was the "slippery slope"-fallacy, i.e. accusing Muslims and Islam of transgressions against Swiss society that had not been realized. Thus, it is possible to create falsely negative representations of groups of populations in the parliamentary space. In connection with the representations of populations in the debate context, Augoustinos and Every (2007) looked at the constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates. The study identified four constructions of racism on debates on immigrants and asylum seekers: categorical generalizations, unequal treatment of asylum seekers in conjunction with other categories of "illegal" immigrants, talk about the nation, and talk about cultural differences. The study demonstrated that these constructions were applied carefully and knowingly. It is clear, that as a genre definition, the "parliamentary debate" has been well-defined and researched as a political communicative event in the area of linguistic discourse studies.

The second dimension of genre in relation to debates as political communicative events, is the notion of genre as a social activity. Conceptualizing genre in this way follows the genre definition of Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL). With the words of Martin (1985) genre is characterized as a process of "how things get done" by utilizing language as a tool and underlining

how genre is a realization of social and cultural phenomena, exemplified by recipes and manuals as well as traditionally literary genres such as poems and narratives (cited in Muntigl and Gruber 2005: 250).

This SFL definition of genre as a social activity emphasizes the effectiveness of political communicative events in shaping social reality and the conceptualizations of different issues in the minds of listeners that are handled in the parliamentary space. The political decision making that happens in the House of Commons is especially interesting as conceptualized in this SFL definition, as the Commons members are publicly elected, the party with the most votes garnered forms the UK Government, and they are responsible, among other issues, for the overview of taxation. As such, the House of Commons is effectively in control of Government funding (UK Parliament, 2022b). With such an overarching influence, the debates and decisions made in the House of Commons have a real impact on the social realities of the country, and the politicians elected by the public reflect the larger attitudes of the nation. Even though the analysis conducted in this study does not intend to focus on the genre features of the chosen debates, the characterization of genre in the context of political language is a helpful way to delimit the data sets used and show the potential societal influence of political debates.

2.3.2 Systemic Functional Linguistics

Systemic functional linguistics (SFL) presents in parts a similar view of language and its' relationship to the world as does critical discourse analysis. In looking at parliamentary language and its' representational patterns of refugees, the SFL approach is useful, as it views language as a mapping of meanings that come from speech encounters, where "people create meaning by exchanging symbols in shared contexts of situation" (Halliday 1984, cited in Halliday, Webster & Webster 2009: 7). This characterization is well suited in recognizing the ways language works as a social and interpersonal tool in political interactions, and the "shared contexts of situation" further delineates a contextually appropriate viewpoint when looking at parliamentary debate situations. The

SFL approach, similar to the CDA approach, thus investigates the realizations of (social) meanings in linguistic contexts. The issue of genre, mentioned previously, and register in the SFL context ties the SFL definition of language's types of meaning in social contexts into a 3-dimensional model: interpersonal, ideational and textual. Martin (2009) writes how field, tenor and mode, respectively, become the contextual variables of those three types of meaning, field being the "systems of activity, including descriptions of participants, processes and circumstances these activities involve", tenor being "social relations, as these are enacted through the dimensions of power and solidarity" and mode "is concerned with semiotic distance" (2009: 159). Martin continues, how

> an additional level of context, above and beyond tenor, field and mode has been deployed – referred to as genre. This level is concerned with systems of social processes, where the principles for relating social processes to each other have to do with texture – the ways in which field, mode and tenor variables are phased together in a text. (Ibid: 159)

Here we can see how the previously mentioned characterization of genre relates to the social meaning-making of language.

Thus, in its' relation to CDA, SFL views language similarly in three aspects, highlighted by Young & Harrison (2004): Firstly SFL and CDA both view language as a social construct, as they look at the two-directional way society impacts language use and how language constructs society.

Secondly, stemming from the first commonality, they view language dialectically, and study the manner this view is realized in societal language use.

Finally, they both emphasize the historical and cultural dimensions of language. (2004: 1)

These similarities highlight the ways SFL and CDA both work well in the context of representational patterns in parliamentary language use, as they both emphasize the social impact of language, which is one of the most important functions of political language use. This does not, however, mean that they are identical as theoretical constructs. SFL differs from the CDA approach most significantly in that CDA is an approach to language analysis – not a theory or a method. CDA is thus an overarching

attitude to research and analysis that turns a critical and evaluative eye towards social issues without a specific research method or theory construction. SFL, in contrast, has an integrated grammatical structure and application method called Systemic Functional Grammar, which is a grammatical research realization of the SFL view of language functionality, i.e. "the examination of 'real' language events to understand the purposes language serves – and to understand the way language itself functions". (2004: 1)

SFL thus has a similar view of language as CDA but has also created a research methodology integral to the theory. Although I do not intend to apply Systemic Functional Grammar in this thesis, it is only one part of the SFL theory, and the SFL view of language presents a cross-theoretical foundation to the viewpoint from which I intend to investigate parliamentary language use and the representation of displaced people.

2.3.3 Parliamentary Debate Language: A Distinctive System of Address & Communication

Unlike most everyday language use situations, British parliamentary language use follows a system of pre-written rules, which dictate the way parliament members use language in debate situations. For example, in the "Rules of Behaviour and Courtesies in the House of Commons", a rulebook issued by the Speaker and deputy Speakers of the House of Commons, a section on parliamentary language describes how "Members must always address the House through the Chair. It is wrong to address another Member as 'you'." (2021: 10) This is done to preserve a civil tone and objectivity in the House, and to deter personal attacks towards other Members.

The rules go on to instruct that the second person singular "You" is reserved to the reference of the HOC Chair (the Speaker or Deputy Speaker), and in referencing another member, they should be referred to as

- 'the honourable Member for [constituency] (for a Member on the opposite benches)'
- 'my honourable friend (for a Member on your side of the House)'
- or perhaps 'the honourable Member opposite'

(where the context makes clear to whom you
are referring) (UK Parliament 2021: 10).

In addition to these conventions of address, Privy Counsellors are "right honourable" and ministers are referred to by office or "the minister" (UK Parliament 2021: 10). These rules of address are still in use, according to the rules, as "It is essential in maintaining the civil tone and objectivity of debate. It also avoids personal attacks as opposed to political criticism". (Ibid: 10)

These specific conventions of address are apparent in the collected debate data and outlining their reasons of use and meaning will clarify what presents itself as the essential meaning of the chosen debates. In addition to making the address rules explicit for the analysis, it is important to understand that conventions that are in place to preserve the civility and objectivity of the debate do not necessarily prevent one-sided representations of vulnerable people from emerging in parliament. Critical examination is crucial in all levels of language use, especially when the subjects of the debates cannot be present to offer their point of view.

2.3.4 UK Parliamentary Debates: Studies Using the British Hansard

The now-online British Hansard is a valuable tool for corpus linguists to conduct studies in the context of political language use in Britain (UK Parliament, 2022c). The user interface permits the researcher to search for debates and sittings by topics, houses and dates, and it has proven to be a relatively straightforward method of obtaining specific data of parliamentary debates. In addition to the search method, the texts are part of the public record, and thus obtaining them does not require permits.

A small sample of studies presented here using the Hansard have looked at the use and reshaping of innovation in UK parliamentary discourse (Perren and Sapsed 2013), investigated colloquialization in the British parliamentary record, (Hiltunen et. al, 2020), mapped the diachronic variation of the concept of "uncivility" as well as Britain's self-representation in parliamentary

language (Alexander and Struan, 2022), and studied the differences of the process of colloquialization and register change in British and Australian parliament language use (Kruger et. al, 2019).

2.3.5 Summary

These sections have presented a definition of genre following the SFL characterization, which focuses on genre as primarily social action, followed by a short overview of the similarities and differences of SFL and CDA to highlight the genre definition applicability to this study. An overview of characteristics of parliamentary debate language conventions followed and the section concludes with a short description of Hansard as a data obtaining interface and a small sample of linguistic studies using Hansard.

3. DATA & METHODS

3.1. Data selection and collection

The research questions that I will answer in this thesis are

> RQ1. Can any lexical patterns, such as single-word formulas or collocate patterns, be detected in the debates on displaced Syrian and Ukrainian populations in the British House of Commons?
>
> RQ2. What are the most common patterns of representation of the Syrian displaced populations?
>
> RQ3. What are the most common patterns of representation of the Ukrainian displaced populations?
>
> RQ4. Are there any differences in the most common patterns of representation between the two groups, lexically or in discourse?

To answer the research questions about the representation of displaced people in this thesis, the compilation of three separate corpora was necessary. First, I collected the debates on Syrian refugees from the House of Commons Hansard's debate section. I used the search interface of the Hansard corpus and searched for debates using the key phrase "Syrian refugees". I chose the term "refugee" as it is the most comprehensive term to describe the displaced populations this thesis studies, and I

chose the plural form, as my study focuses on the representation of groups of people, not individuals. The UN describes refugees as

> persons who are outside their country of origin for reasons of feared persecution, conflict, generalized violence, or other circumstances that have seriously disturbed public order and, as a result, require international protection. (UN High Commissioner for Refugees, 2022)

I also chose the window of time to span from 2011, the start of the Syrian civil war, to July 2022 when I conducted the data selection. The search yielded 18 debate results, which I went through manually to ensure the headers of the debates reflected the contents and were thus appropriate sources of data for this study. I then extracted each of the debates from the Hansard website as a .txt-file and compiled them into a corpus. The Syria Debate corpus thus consisted of 18 debates, with 93 501 tokens.

Then, the same process took place with the compilation of the debates on Ukrainian refugees. An interesting issue, however, arose when searching for the Ukrainian debates. When searching with the same key phrase structure of "Ukrainian refugees" the search yielded only two debate results. This did not seem accurate, considering the amount of time the war in Ukraine had been at the forefront of political discussion. I tried multiple different variations of the key words and phrases, but eventually I decided on a manual collection of relevant debates by simply searching "Ukraine" in the interface and setting the window of time to begin before the February 24th, 2022, invasion, and to end in July 2022. I then got dozens of results and went through the debates manually to extract the debates that focused on Ukrainian refugees. The end result was 19 debates of a combined 199 166 tokens, that I then downloaded in the same manner than the Syrian debates and compiled them into their own corpus. The debate corpus on Syrian refugees will be referred to as the Syria Debate Corpus (SDC) and the corpus on Ukrainian refugees as the Ukraine Debate Corpus (UDC), for convenience and clarity.

The third corpus mentioned was the reference corpus. For the extraction of keywords from the target corpora, a reference corpus must be chosen. To ensure that the keyword results are as

accurate as possible, the reference corpus needed to reflect parliamentary language use. In order to prevent words such as "speaker" showing as key when comparing to a "regular" British text corpus such as the BNC, and thus not reflecting the aboutness of the debates of the target corpora, one debate on the subject of Europe from the House of Commons from years 1998 to 2015 was used as the reference corpus, with a combined 181 708 tokens. The use of this corpus ensures that the customs, such as the rules of address of British parliamentary debate remain as a backdrop, instead of erroneously presenting as the aboutness of the debates. The UK Parliament Hansard does not allow the entirety of the debates to be downloaded as .txt-files at once, so I accessed the Hansard corpus in ORTOLANG (Truan, 2019) and downloaded it to serve as the reference corpus. The reference corpus is a parliamentary debate corpus, compiled by Naomi Truan as part of her PHD project, and contains "One parliamentary debate per year held in the British national parliament about a major European Council meeting" between the years 1998 and 2005 (Truan, 2019). This corpus is used to find the keywords and collocates that will be thematically coded from the Ukraine and Syria corpora, as the reference corpus uses British parliamentary language but the debates do not discuss displaced populations. The Parliamentary Debate Corpus will be referred to as PDC. After the download of the PDC reference corpus, I converted the XML-files to -.txt-files. After converting, due to a system error, there were duplicate files of all the debate files in the PDC corpus, so I went through the files manually and deleted the duplicates. The corpus sizes and names are presented in table 1.

Table 1. Corpora Overview

Corpus Title	Files	Tokens	Types
Syria Debate Corpus (SDC)	18	93 501	5613
Ukraine Debate Corpus (UDC)	19	199 166	9252

Reference Corpus Title	*Files*	*Tokens*	*Types*
Parliamentary Debate Corpus (PDC)	17	199 405	9253

From an ethical and legal standpoint, the UK Parliament Hansard presented no issues, as all of the debates are part of public record and are freely accessible and downloadable to anyone online without registration.

The thematically coded ORTOLANG keywords and collocates from both corpora are presented next in tables 2 and 3.

Table 2. Keyword Codebook

Code label/Topos	Description	SDC Keywords	UDC Keywords	Text Examples
Nationality/Nation/Area	Referencing either nationality of a group of people, a nation or an area	Syrian, region, Lebanon, Jordan, Syrians, local, neighbouring, in, Lebanese, country	Ukraine, Ukrainian, Russian, Ukrainians, Russia, local, Poland, Moldova, Polish, Crimea	"…to have the opportunity to highlight the situation of **Syrian** refugees in **Jordan** and **Lebanon**." "...the number of **Ukrainian** refugees who have been approved to come..."
Identity Application	An outside-assigned label for referencing groups of people, not self-assigned	refugees, refugee, Syrian, children, people, those, family, persons, their, communities, women, unaccompanied, families, individuals, seekers, child, groups, victims, parents, young, smugglers, cases, asylum	Ukrainian, refugees, Ukrainians, children, people, family, they, their, families, refugee, them, women, individuals, Russians, communities, those, unaccompanied, parents, child, mother, oligarchs	"…£500 million has already been allocated to support **refugees** and the internally displaced." "The UK has a long, proud history of welcoming **refugees**..."
Aid/Protection	Referencing to the acts and willingness to help and protect the displaced populations, by Britain, other nations and/or organizations	humanitarian, aid, provide, assistance, help, asylum, support, response, access, helping, food, medical, doing, sanctuary, refuge, funding, host, school, provided, education, safe, accommodation, unicef, care, ensure, supporting, working, protection, water, housing, charities	support, humanitarian, sponsorship, accommodation, response, provide, sponsors, help, sanctions, food, generosity, housing, sponsor, safeguarding, safe, generous, sanctuary, ensure, providing, safety, online, access, matching, routes, host, offer, supply, aid, get, refuge, tank, under	"…the scheme would **provide assistance** to several hundred people over three years…" "…the wider **sponsorship** route will **provide** many other opportunities for people to come to the UK."
Unrest/Victimization	Violence targeted towards the displaced populations, dangerous situations, results of victimization	vulnerable, crisis, conflict, most, violence, displaced, plight, suffering, sexual, persecution, victims, torture, vulnerability	war, invasion, vulnerable, aggression, missiles, weapons, conflict, old	"…identify the most **vulnerable** cases **displaced** by the **conflict** in Syria and to relocate them to the UK." "President Putin's **invasion** of Ukraine is a barbaric and unprovoked attack…"

Forced Movement/Relocation	The acts and results of movement under necessity, away from the country of origin	resettlement, camps, relocation, camp, fleeing, fled, resettled, routes,	fleeing, come, travel, arriving, travelling, flee, coming	"…more than 2 million refugees have **fled** Syria into neighbouring countries…" "…the Ukrainian refugees **coming** to the UK will be some of the most vulnerable…"
British Bureaucracy	Government programs, systems and processes that institutionalize parts of the forced relocation of people	scheme, home, programme, she, her, communities, government, secretary, authorities, legal, debate, quota, organisations, cases	scheme, visa, home, homes, office, visas, checks, secretary, applications, department, government, system, working, constituents, constituent, cases, authorities, levelling, biometrics, schemes, waiting, passport, application, biometric, up, passports, centres, bureaucracy, centre, online, granted, still, route, documents, border, state, wait	"The vulnerable persons relocation **scheme** is precisely to provide such assistance…" "More than 500 Ukrainian children are stuck **waiting** for a decision on their **visas**."
Mass	The reference to large amounts of people or money	million, number, thousands, hundreds, numbers, many, hundred, largest	many, thousands	"…the contribution the UK has made to the region: £700 **million** in aid, the vulnerable persons relocation scheme and the asylum claims we are accepting here." "…**thousands** of Ukrainians are at the border of their country, trying to escape..."
International Aid/Cooperation	References to international programmes, organizations and cooperation in providing aid	UNHCR, UN, international, Geneva		"…this programme will run in parallel with the **UNHCR**'s Syria humanitarian admission programme…"
Level	The specificity in representations of people & situations	she, her, particularly	Putin, she, her, Zelensky, Vladimir	"**She** proudly says that she has made a friend and learned how to write "dog" and "cat"."

				"**She** has had no contact with her mother for almost a week."
Ingroup Reference	Reference to Britain, the British people, the parliament	here	we, here, across, constituent, constituency	"…safe and legal routes for tens of thousands of people to start a new life **here** in the UK." "Hon. Members **across** the House have rightly raised the subject of Moldova…"
Miscellaneous/Other	Category for Parliament formalities, names of individual members and some function words	are, and, to, lab, con, have, I, mrs, proud, Brokenshire, s, been, Harper, lady, Cooper, Yvette, ld, pavilion, Whately, Kent, Brighton, welcome, Gray	are, and, to, have, con, as, lab, I, Foster, SNP, for, Kevin, need, can, this, Patel, Priti, day, Gove, already, Elizabeth, my, lady, but, Truss, seen, McDonald, as, look, know, from, hear, seeing, has, chair, am, Eddie, do, Cleverly, quickly, speak, member, dame	"I warmly **welcome** the Home Secretary's announcement today." "**I** am sure that the Minister will confirm that…"

Table 3. Collocate Codebook

Code Label/Topos	Description	SDC Collocates	UDC Collocates	Text Example
Nationality/Nation/Area	Referencing either nationality of a group of people, a nation or an area	Syrian, Palestinian, nationals, in, inside, from, neighbouring, within, outside, in, countries, Syria, Jordan, Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon, outside, pontefract, Castleford, north, into, east, Zaatari, Nizip, Syrians, local, UK, Scottish, region	nationals, Ukraine, Ukrainian, Afghan, British, China, Commonwealth, Russia, UK, here, Scottish, this, local, country, Russian, in, Hungary, borders, such, from, Europe, Ukrainians, Polish, Scotland, across, Romania, which, is, at	"…there are problems with accessing medical aid in **Syria** and in the **neighbouring countries**..." "I see no reason why many thousands of **Ukrainians** who are here on time-limited visas should be excluded from bringing relatives in on the family scheme…"
Identity Application	An outside-assigned label for referencing groups of people, not self-assigned	refugees, refugee, unaccompanied, women, persons, people, smugglers, those, who, seekers, seeker, parents, children, men, girls, individuals, their, families, asylum, other	refugees, people, forces, families, friends, family, women, unaccompanied, young, members, loved, mothers, ones, people, them, allies, they, children, girls, men, others, the, minors, those	"There are now nearly 2.5 million **refugees**, and the UNHCR states that they are at significant risk of sexual and gender-based violence." "Britain is on the side of the **people** in Syria about whom we have talked today." "…the one thing that we all want is for more Ukrainian **people** who are fleeing from the terrible atrocities and war in their country to be able to come here."
Aid/Protection	Referencing to the acts and willingness to help and protect the displaced populations,	education, save, aid, intend, willing, assistance, response, doing, humanitarian, proper, support, help, sanctuary, provide, providing, need,	sponsorship, welcome, determined, sponsoring, supplying, help, freedom, security, contribute, get, enable, facilitate, opened,	"The UK Government are rightly praised for their leadership in **providing humanitarian aid** to countries affected by the Syrian conflict."

	by Britain, other nations and organisations	granted, financial, reunion, reunification, homes, open, host, education, services, sanctuary, water, shelter, medical, consultations, care, food, helping, work, communities, generous, being, access, routes, safe, protection, health, services, child, charities, organisations, donor	granted, hearts, lives, provide, humanitarian, forward, economic, stepped, overwhelmed, inundated, aid, corridors, housing, support, community, temporary, hotel, offers, offer, assistance, sanctuary, super, act, be, assure, offers, defend, asylum, economic, security, water, sanctioned, to, keep, routes, passage, anti, starstreak, aircraft, air, safe, sponsored, benefits, education, free, full, families, generous, accommodation, food, off, lethal, military, people, forward, anti, weapons, generation, light	"The response of the British public has been overwhelming. More than 100,000 people have expressed interest in **sponsoring**, and that number is going up all the time." "I, too, start by thanking people across the UK who have come forward with incredibly **generous offers** of **accommodation** and **support** for Ukrainians."
Unrest/Victimization	Violence targeted towards the displaced populations, dangerous situations, results of victimization	vulnerable, conflict, crisis, living, violence, torture, displaced, humanitarian, persecution, suffered, suffering, died, lives, sexual, emergency, killed, need, regime, victims, survivors, loss, war	invasion, regime, prices, war, facing, forces, aggression, against, crimes, cold, machine, displaced, nowhere, hour, persecution, illegal, crisis, barbaric, appalling, nuclear, chemical, use, annexation	"…particularly **vulnerable displaced** Syrians, including women and girls at risk, **survivors** of **torture** and **violence**, and children at risk or in need of medical care." "Putin's **illegal invasion** of Ukraine is a grave attack not only on the Ukrainian people, but on sovereignty, democracy, freedom and the rule of law."

				"…Russian forces have now regrouped in the south-west of the country and have begun bombing entire towns and cities from afar, carrying out **barbaric war crimes** to gain territory…"
Forced movement/Relocation	The acts and results of movement under necessity, away from the country of origin	camps, camp, relocate, resettlement, fleeing, internally, displaced, arrive, get, come	from, fleeing, returning, return, arrived, fled, come, get, coming, en-, resettlement, forced	"…we fulfilled our commitment to resettle 20,000 refugees **fleeing** the conflict in Syria under the vulnerable persons **resettlement** scheme…" "…some 2.8 million Ukrainian refugees have already **fled** the horrors of war…" "That means that this 15-year-old girl faces two options: sheltering at a refugee camp or **returning** to the warzone."
British Bureaucracy	Government programs, systems and processes that institutionalize parts of the forced relocation of people	resettlement, relocation, scheme, visas, programme, registered, status, council, agencies, secretary, foreign, office, affairs, contribute, sign, authorities, authority, councils, communities, claim, claims, rules, members, speech, vulnerable, displaced, home, state, the, statement, legal, under, routes, asylum, on, governmental	homes, scheme, for, Ukraine, application, centre, centres, requirements, office, secretary, department, both, under, two, these, taking, state, reviewing, eligible, applying, communities, housing, set, levelling, up, report, surged, opened, received, issued, security, safeguarding, biometric,	"Admitting people through the **vulnerable persons relocation scheme** is the right thing to do." "…since the **Home Office** opened and expanded the **Ukrainian family scheme** and my **Department** launched the **Homes for Ukraine scheme** with our **Home Office** colleagues…" "…nearly 90,000 **visas** have been **granted** and we are seeing thousands more **granted** every day."

			authority, authorities, government, councils, association, steps, processed, submitted, visa, rural, environment, approved, anti, system, begin, debate, immigration, asylum, organisations, checks, need, legal, false, permission, processes, policy, process, capacity, home, fully, visas, waiting, still, for, having, to, weeks, review, parliamentary	
Mass	The reference to quantifiable amounts of people or money	more, thousands, scale, number, million, largest, second, donor, hundreds, tens, significant, million, several, most, half, few, over	how, many, million, number, nearly, hundreds, tens	"We are providing more than £300 **million** in aid assistance outside Syria…" "…it is better to help **tens** of **thousands** and **hundreds** of **thousands** of people in the region…" "Despite the Prime Minister last week offering **hundreds** of **thousands** of Ukrainians sanctuary in the UK, the Government were shamefully forced to admit that only 1,000 people have been admitted and given refuge on our shores."

International aid/cooperation	References to international programmes, organizations and cooperation in providing aid	with, overseas, UN, UNHCR, gateway, council, programme, hand, development, community, department, process, ii, rest	organisations, values, partners, authorities, community, border, government	"I have no objection to playing our full part in the **UNHCR**'s call for countries to take a number of refugees." "We will also work closely with international **partners** to ensure that displaced Ukrainians forced to flee their homes are supported to apply."
Level	The specificity in representations of people & situations	his, though, tell, does, told, sister, parents, school, homes, lives, her, their, have, girl, who, a	president, Vladimir, Putin, number, sister, daughter, mother, wife, parents, Nataliia, old, every, day, each, night, individual, some, these, which, her, their, a, her, two, bring, she, year, girl	"**Her parents** only wish that **her sister** could be at **school**, too, but **her sister** died last year in a refugee camp of a lung infection." "Mariia, a 13-**year-old girl** who was forced to return to Ukraine after having **her** application refused, despite travelling with **her** 18-**year-old sister**."
Call to Action	The demanding of steps taken to provide necessary support to DPs	enable, contribute, expand, must, forget, bring, sign, respond, end, need	deserve, owe, must, continue, beg, urge, deal, everything, want, swift, tougher, possible, soon, quickly, speed, more	"…our first priority **must** be to try to ensure that there is a political resolution and a smooth transition in the government of Syria. Our second priority **must** be to help those who are "in region" …" "We **must** ensure that people are welcomed in the right way, so that they can be settled and their needs met as **soon** as they come to our country."

Ingroup Reference	Reference to Britain, the British people, the parliament	our, we, donor, constituents, bilateral, parts	British, their, hearts, who, our, we, families, my	"**We** have also heard that **our** aid contribution is second only to that of the United States." "Obviously, we should open **our hearts** and homes to the people of Ukraine, who share **our** values."
DPs as Agents	Displaced populations represented as taking action	return	defend, made, into, seeking, apply, begin, crossed, trying, love, deter, bring, get	"Most of those who are displaced want to **return** home as soon as it is safe to do so…" "I turn now to the day-to-day misery and chaos that Ukrainians **seeking** sanctuary in our country are experiencing." "…Ukrainians do not want to be refugees. They want to **get** home and back to the country that they **love** and are defending with such passion."
Miscellaneous/Other	Category for Parliament formalities, names of individual members, abbreviations for parties and some function words/words with no	create, congratulate, am, I, to, for, are, miss, sorry, shall, reiterate, am, pleased, glad, happy, delighted, commend, grateful, thank, endorse, hope, myself, and, of, such, as, that, member, hon, development,	the, for, to, afraid, am, emphasise, glad, suspect, sorry, delighted, congratulate, grateful, confused, commend, hope, pleased, echo, wonder, thank, happy, appreciate,	"It is a great **pleasure to serve** under **your chairmanship**, Mr Gray. **I congratulate** the **hon**. **Member** for Faversham and Mid Kent (Helen Whately) on securing the debate."

| | clear leaning to any category | state, pavilion, brighton, pleasure, serve, your, chairmanship, says, does, agree, said, of, and, by, an, | agree, member, friend, hon, can, confirm, possibly, tell, morning, afternoon, stage, on, have, than, and, are, future, certainly, still, then, are, a, not, already, at, forward, I, that, how, do, learn, remove, different, caused, considered, happened, gone, been, changed, shown, suggested, anything, thing, not, think, want, understand, with, are, closely, hard, ways | "…As was **touched** on in the previous urgent question…"

"…can she **confirm** that that discussion is under way?"

"Will he **confirm** that that is his position and that of his party?" |
|---|---|---|---|---|

3.2 Method

The method for analysis is a combined corpus analysis of keywords and collocates, followed by an additional critical discourse analysis to find possible ideological codings and emergent discourses from the data. When moving from corpus linguistic analysis to critical discourse analysis using the ideological square model (ISM), the analysis framework is used to methodologically triangulate the corpus analysis findings. This use of the ISM framework provides a slight shift in focus, which clarifies and enriches the representational patterns present in the keywords and collocates. Further, the ISM is used to reveal and critically analyze additional emergent ideological discourses.

To begin the corpus analysis, I will extract keyword lists from both corpora using ORTOLANG as a reference corpus and include 50% of those keywords in the topoi analysis. After the keyword extractions, I will use those keywords as node words to extract their collocates. 20% of the top collocates of each keyword will be included in the analysis. To compare keywords and collocates in their specific contexts of Syria and Ukraine, I will extract keyword lists using SDC and UDC as each other's reference corpora, and again include the top 50% of those keywords in the analysis. Next, I will carry out an inductive thematical coding of the keywords and collocates and create codebooks for both. To conclude the analysis, I will conduct a critical discourse analysis of the keywords and collocations based on the coded topoi. The CDA analysis framework is based on a modified version of Van Dijk's (2006) Ideological Square model.

3.2.1 AntConc

For the corpus linguistic part of the analysis, I am using the corpus analysis software AntConc. AntConc is a software used for concordance and text analysis, and is free to download from (Anthony, 2022). The user can either use built in corpora databases for text analysis, or as in this thesis, download their own corpora as raw .txt-files. AntConc has different options for corpus analysis, such

as the keyword in context or KWIC-option, collocate calculation tool, word and keyword list extraction, as well as cluster and N-Gram analysis tools. The statistical measuring parameters that are used in keyword and collocate extraction can be customized as well as the collocate range surrounding the node word and the minimum frequency and range of collocation. For the statistical calculations, I will be using the default Log-Likelihood (LL) and the Mutual Information (MI) scores for keywords and collocations. The analysis tools I will be using are the keyword extraction tool, the collocate extraction tool and the KWIC for checking concordance lines when necessary.

3.2.2 Keywords

The main part of the data analysis in this thesis consists of the thematic analysis of keywords and their respective collocates. Keywords are words that appear in a corpus with a frequency that is statistically significant, i.e., keywords are the result when you "compare any two sets of data to establish which words occur with a statistically higher frequency in one set (A) as compared to the other (B)" (Charteris-Black 2012: 147). For example if we wanted a Syria keyword list, in this thesis set A would be the Syria debate (target) corpus and set B would be the Ukraine debate (reference) corpus. Thus, when comparing these two corpora in AntConc and using the LL-score, the words that are statistically most significant in the SDC are arranged in a keyword list. The list is arranged in a declining ranking of keyness. The Log-Likelihood measure presents the keyness or content representative importance of the word when compared to the reference corpus, and the resulting p-value from the LL measure represents the chance of the word appearing accidentally (Biber, Connor & Thomas: 138). In this thesis the LL measure is set at 3.84, thus the resulting p-value is <0.05 which is regarded as statistically significant.

3.2.3 Collocations

Collocation is the statistically significant co-occurrence of two (or more) words in a corpus. Baker explains that

> If two words collocate with each other, then they cooccur (appearing next to or reasonably near one another) in some way, usually more often than would be expected if all of the words in a corpus were presented in random order. (2016: 140)

Thus, collocation is the whole grouping of the node word and the collocates appearing near or next to it. In this thesis, I will use the SDC and UDC keywords as the node words and manually extract each of their respective collocates. I will use the LL-score to measure the frequency of collocation and the MI-score to measure the collocation strength, which are among the statistical measures in AntConc. Together with the thematical analysis of the keywords, the collocation analysis will further illuminate representational patterns and their possible differences in the debate data.

3.2.3.1 Collocate metrics: MI-score

When extracting collocations automatically through a program such as AntConc, certain statistical calculations or association measures (AMs) are used to calculate and extract collocates. One of these AMs is the mutual information or MI-score (Church & Hanks 1990), which "compares the probability of finding two items together to the probabilities of finding each item on its own" (Baker, Hardie & McEnery 2006: 120). The MI-score is therefore used to measure the strength of collocation through effect measure to ascertain "how much does observed co-occurrence frequency exceed expected frequency" (Deng & Liu 2022: 194).

In this thesis, I chose to use the MI-score together with the LL-measure of 3.84 with the Bonferroni correction for likelihood, due to the MI-score results being less dependent on corpus size than when using for example the t-score (Gablazova, Brezina & McEnery 2017: 169). This suits the corpus data used in this thesis, as the corpus sizes vary quite significantly.

3.2.4 The Ideological Square Model

The critical discourse analysis portion of the thesis will concentrate on the ideological patterns that might emerge from the representations of different groups in the data. According to Van Dijk, ideological discourse is realized generally by a strategy of "positive self-representation (boasting) and negative other-representation (derogation)" (Van Dijk 2006: 126), and the ideological square model seeks to uncover this strategy in different linguistic structures. For the purposes of this study, the ideological square model (ISM) needs to be modified in its scope. Considering the scope of a master's thesis, I will be applying only parts of Van Dijk's (2006) ISM's taxonomy of suggested expressions of ideology in discourse.

Van Dijk points out that if polarized ingroup and outgroup representation, such as the "Us vs Them" narrative organizes ideological discourse strategies, then the same polarization and ideological meaning can be coded in other language structures as well, depending on context (2006: 126). There are other ways that ideology and ingroup-outgroup narratives can be coded, other than the plural pronouns *us* & *them* that show the ingroup being *us* and the outgroup being *them,* thus creating a polarization between the two. Van Dijk presents multiple linguistic structures that can code ideology, such as context, text, topics, local meanings of level and modality, and lexicon (Modified from Van Dijk 2006: 125). These structures will be the focus of the CDA of this thesis, and their meanings are illustrated in the following subsections.

3.2.4.1 Context

Context is important data in the analysis of ideological discourse, and Van Dijk characterizes context to be "defined in terms of participants' mental models of communicative events" and goes on to specify context models as "subjective and evaluative representations of self and other participants" (2008: 176). Thus, context are not merely outside realizations of events, but a mental model of all the discourse participants that affects the way participants view and represent other groups, as well as themselves. Therefore, including context will bring the critical analysis of ideology closer to the

actual discourse production events. Some of the contextual categories to include in CDA of political (and ideological) discourse, according to Van Dijk, are

- overall domain (e.g., politics)
- overall societal action (e.g., legislation)
- current setting (time, location)
- current circumstances (bill to be discussed)
- current interaction (political debate)
- current discourse genre (speech)
- the various types of role of participants (speaker, MP, member of the Conservative party)
- the cognitions of the participants (goals, knowledge, beliefs, etc.) (modified from Van Dijk 2008: 176)

For example, the context models that organize political discourse in the data of this thesis might need to include the domain of politics, the societal action of government funding and programs to aid displaced populations, the time and location of UK House of Commons between 2012-2022, the current circumstances of deciding what action to take in the two crises, the current interaction of political debate, the discourse genre of speech, the roles of participants such as Member of Parliament or Prime Minister, and the cognitions of the participants such as their beliefs of what should be done to better the situations.

3.2.4.2 Text

A level lower from context, at textual level, the ISM looks at strategies that are used when talking as a representative of an ingroup or talking about outgroups. In this thesis, the ingroups are for example the parliament and government of the UK, local and foreign authorities, charities and UK communities. The outgroups are, among others, the displaced populations of Syria and Ukraine, as well as other DPs such as Palestinians and Afghans. Van Dijk describes how studying the overall presentations and actions of the in- and outgroups, whether they are presented as positive or negative in the text, can reveal ideological codings (2006: 125).

3.2.4.3 Topics

Moving further down a level, the critical analysis of topics and their connotations chosen when discussing ingroups and outgroups can reveal further ideological codings in the data (Van Dijk 2006: 125). The topoi analysis of the keywords and collocations has revealed multiple topoi concerning ingroups and outgroups, and the critical analysis with the ISM will further reveal whether the topoi are generally negative or positive when representing the ingroups and especially the outgroups in the data. The topoi categories can be found in tables 2 and 3.

3.2.4.4 Lexicon

The final level of analysis in this thesis is of the lexicon. By analyzing and comparing the terms that are chosen when referencing the ingroups and outgroups, the possible positive and negative connotations of the terms can reveal ideologically coded representations of both (Van Dijk 2006: 125). Although there is evidence of differing lexical representations of ingroups and outgroups, Van Dijk's more drastic examples of "terrorist vs.. freedom fighter" (2006: 125) do not appear in the data. There are, however, differences in the terminology. The keyword *communities* indexes British host communities for displaced populations in the Syria keywords, whereas outside of the country, *camp* and *camps* are emphasized when talking about the outgroup settlements. In the Ukraine keywords, *communities* similarly refer to British host communities, but *camp* or *camps* do not appear in the keywords at all.

Based on this framework, I will be analyzing the immediate and broader contexts of the keywords and collocations that are indexing groups by using the concordance line feature of AntConc, illustrated in the example. The group-indexing keyword is bolded.

(1) Data example of keyword concordance

this crisis, this Government have highlighted the plight of vulnerable **children** and focused on ensuring that they have the basics

To supplement the immediate context, I will include relevant broader context to the analysis where applicable, using longer excerpts of debate speeches. I will analyze and compare the topoi according

to positive/negative connotations in context and analyze the lexicon used when talking about these groups, whether the lexical items chosen are more positive or negative.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1 Keyword lists

To answer the research questions we need to be able to see what the statistically most salient words of the two debate corpora were. For the purpose of thematical, general analysis of discourse about displaced people I extracted the ORTOLANG keywords for Syria form the SDC by using ORTOLANG as a reference corpus, and then switched the target corpus to UDC to get the ORTOLANG Ukraine keywords.

The ORTOLANG keyword lists for the SDC and UDC produced 301 and 339 keywords respectively. As the lists were that long, I needed to decide on a cutoff point for the range of analysis. Due to the relatively small size of the corpora, I decided that a cutoff point of 50 % for the keywords included would be a good portion to analyze without being too overwhelming in terms of scope. This cut the ORTOLANG keyword lists down to 151 and 170 words for Syria and Ukraine, respectively.

To see what, if any, differences in representations there are in the specific contexts of Syria and Ukraine, I needed to find the keywords that emerge when comparing the corpora against each other. For that purpose I extracted keyword lists from SDC and UDC corpora separately, first using the Syria debate corpus as the target corpus and Ukraine debate corpus as reference, and vice versa. As the lists for the SDC and UDC were 161 words and 97 words respectively, the previously defined cutoff point of 50% left me with 81 keywords from the SDC and 49 keywords from the UDC. Using the log-likelihood (LL) test (Dunning, 1993) in AntConc with the default value for keyword calculation set at 3.84, the resulting keywords appeared in a declining order of likelihood.

After the extraction of the Syria and Ukraine keyword lists and their collocates, I will compare the keyword lists to see if they are similar regarding content and themes.

To see if any recurring linguistic patterns can be detected from the keyword lists, I did a topoi analysis or thematic coding of the ORTOLANG keyword lists. Using inductive coding, I went through the keywords to see the emergence of themes and grouped the words into topoi listed in table 2. All of the topoi listed were visible in both of the keyword lists. To make sure that the keywords were grouped contextually appropriately, I manually checked the concordance lines of each of the keywords by using the Keyword in Context-tool (KWIC) in AntConc. To make sure that the analysis is as analytically sound as possible, a second coder reviewed the coding and unclear codings were discussed until one code was agreed upon through inter-coder agreement.

4.2 Collocations

After the extraction of keyword lists from both corpora, I extracted collocates using AntConc. I used the set parameters of 3.84 LL and the mutual information (MI) score as the effect measure for collocation strength.

First, I only set the frequency of collocation at minimum 2, which meant that the collocate needed to appear with the node keyword only twice to be included, and I set the range at minimum 1, meaning the collocation only needed to appear in 1 file to be included. After extracting the collocates and looking at the results more closely, I realized the range and frequency were far too low to produce reliable or representative results. I increased the frequency to minimum 5 and the range to minimum 2, as the files of the debates usually contain multiple people talking, so the range could be lower than when looking at for example interview data. With the increased frequency and range, I re-extracted the collocates of the keywords. I performed the same, thematic topoi analysis for the collocates utilizing the keyword topoi as a starting point and added categories inductively when necessary. This analysis required a cutoff-point as well, and I decided on 20% of the top collocates to be included in the analysis. However, many of the keywords produced very few collocates, between 0 and 7 words. In these instances I would include up to 5 collocates in the analysis, if the 20% of the

results would fall below 5. Naturally, all the collocate results that were below 5 words were included in their entirety.

While conducting the topoi analysis, I manually checked the concordance lines of the collocates in the KWIC tool of AntConc to make sure the topoi were grouped accurately then as well. The topoi are presented in table 3. To make sure that the analysis is as analytically sound as possible, a second coder has reviewed the coding, and in cases of disagreement, unclear codings were discussed until one code was agreed upon through inter-coder agreement.

After this, I will analyze the collocates by theme to find meaningful patterns and compare those themed collocates between the two corpora to see if any differences emerge.

4.3 Ideological Square, Modified: Ingroup & Outgroup representation

After the topoi analysis and comparison of the keywords and their respective collocates, I shift focus by using the ideological square model, and start to analyze the patterns that denoted ingroup and outgroup representation. In this study I will be focusing on mainly content words, especially in the keyword sections. In the parliamentary data from the two corpora I found that the key content words indexing group representations of displaced populations and the ingroups, such as Britain and the government, have a higher frequency and likelihood than, for example, the classic polarization narrative indexed most evidently by deictic plural pronouns such as *us* and *them*. The representations of ingroup actions are more clearly shown in the keyword data through verbs, which were statistically more salient and thus included in the keyword lists. This does not mean that plural verbs indexing ingroups were not present in the data, they were visible in the collocates, merely that verbs were a clearer indication of ingroup representation statistically in the keyword lists. This is exemplified with the most frequent concordance lines of the progressive verb *providing* in the SDC, in figure 1, where a majority of the most frequent concordances were indexing the ingroup as the performer of the verb: Britain, the government, the British organizations, and so on.

Figure 1. Concordance of "providing" in the SDC

	File	Left Context	Hit	Right Context
1	Syria...	efforts". I think that what matters is whether we are	providing	help and support for vulnerable refugees in Syria. We
2	UN ...	keep this matter under review. I know that they are	providing	help and support where they can as well. Mrs
3	UN ...	to think again. Mr Harper As I said, we are	providing	help and support to tens of thousands of Syrian
4	Rese...	should be proud of the role it is playing in	providing	help and assistance to those most in need. This
5	Syria...	over the Government's resistance last week. Britain is rightly	providing	help and assistance to the majority of refugees that
6	UN ...	to it in order to promote stability. We are also	providing	help to make sure it can deliver the support
7	UN ...	million, most of which has already been distributed, and is	providing	help to the region. Last week, the Secretary of
8	UN ...	best solution to a settlement in Syria, and we are	providing	help to the 2.4 million refugees and the 6.5 million internally
9	UN ...	people and provide the help they need, as well as	providing	help to those in the neighbouring countries. Barry Gardiner (
10	UN ...	Zaatari refugee camp, as well as a number of organisations	providing	help for refugees living in host communities. I was
11	UN ...	refugees, we are of course making sure that we are	providing	support to it in order to promote stability. We
12	Syria...	We are the second largest donor to the refugee programmes	providing	support to the neighbouring countries in the region that
13	Leba...	large numbers of Syrians coming into their area. We are	providing	support to the Jordanian towns in the area as

The plural verbs visible in the collocates are not included in the corpus analysis, as they showed prominent high negative effect. However, as the ISM is based on ingroup-outgroup division that is most clearly shown through the plural pronouns, they will be overviewed in context briefly in the CDA section together with the Context level of the ISM. The analysis continues with comparing textual strategies, topics and lexicon used in representing the displaced populations in the debate data, concluding with a discussion of results.

5. RESULTS

5.1 Keyword lists

5.1.1 Keywords: Overview

To begin to answer the research question about patterns of representation of Syrian DPs and Ukrainian DPs and their possible differences, I needed to extract keyword lists from both of the corpora. First, by using the Syria debate corpus as a reference corpus, I extracted a keyword list from the Ukraine target corpus, and then swapped the corpora and extracted a keyword list from the Syria target corpus with Ukraine debate corpus as reference. I have decided to look for meaningful patterns by looking at the top 50% of keywords. I extracted 161 keywords from the SDC & 97 keywords from the UDC. The keywords are organized in a declining rank of keyness. In multiple studies the top 20 or top 30

of highest ranked keywords were used in text instead of the entirety of analyzed keywords for brevity and clarity, therefore only the top 30 highest ranking keywords of both corpora are included in table 4.

Table 4. The 30 top keywords from SDC & UDC[1]

SDC Keyword	UDC Keyword	Rank
syrian	ukraine	1
syria	ukrainian	2
refugees	putin	3
unhcr	russian	4
lebanon	visa	5
programme	ukrainians	6
jordan	russia	7
region	nato	8
camps	war	9
vulnerable	sanctions	10
syrians	visas	11
un	defence	12
aid	checks	13
crisis	invasion	14
relocation	application	15
asylum	kevin	16
turkey	foster	17
mrs	office	18
assistance	homes	19
resettlement	poland	20
most	safeguarding	21
camp	military	22
million	russians	23
providing	sponsors	24

---

[1] For the sake of brevity and to avoid inundating the thesis with appendices, not all of the keywords included in analysis are visible in text, but I am happy to provide additional materials upon request.

refugee	applications	25
persons	aggression	26
countries	forces	27
humanitarian	system	28
brokenshire	patel	29
mr	priti	30

5.1.2 Nationality: Keywords of origin and adversaries

Even without more contextual cues, based on just the top keywords, some overarching themes can be found in the keyword lists. The overlapping themes index, unsurprisingly, words that reference nationality. Words such as *Syrian, Syrians, Ukrainian, Ukrainians* are frequent in both of the corpora. This can be explained by the nature of parliamentary debates, which are "local manifestations of the global political acts of legislation, governing and control of government" and contain speeches of members of the government that aim to present, legitimize, support or oppose government decisions and policies (Van Dijk 2008: 187). Therefore, the nature of these debates usually requires some form of generalization in the speeches, as these decisions and policies will affect large amounts of people. Furthermore, the nature of the unrests affect certain nationalities the most, thus it is natural that these would appear as key.

There was one clear difference between the keyword lists in this theme. There were nationality indexing keywords close or at the top of the list that were referencing the opposing forces in the conflict, *Russian* or *Russians* in the UDC keyword list. Comparing to the SDC, reference to any opposing forces were close to the end of the list, exemplified by *Assad* being the 148th of the 161 keywords included in the analysis. This might be partly due to the nature of the conflict being a civil war in Syria. Still, the difference in prominence is notable. *Russian* and *Russians* were both most frequently used in contexts of referencing the war in Ukraine:

(1) Example concordance of "Russian"

now, possibly, in the north and east of Ukraine—as	**Russian**	forces have retreated. My plea was then, as it

All of the most frequent concordances refer to the Russian troops or their misconduct, as well as to the steps that are being taken in repelling their advance in Ukraine. These traces of discourse are absent from the top of the SDC keyword list, which is further evidenced by the naming of the Syria and Ukraine debates outlined in chapter 5.1.3. A possible reason for this difference in the debate focus might be that the data was collected from debates discussing displaced populations, and there were more discussions of military action in the UDC debates along the discussions of Ukrainian DPs, whereas the SDC focused almost exclusively on the Syrian and other DPs.

5.1.3 Keywords of applied identity

Another notable difference in the keyword lists appears in the identity application theme. In the SDC keywords the theme is prominent, whereas in the UDC keywords the only words representing the displaced populations are the Ukrainian nationality indexing keywords presented in the previous chapter.

In the Syria keyword list, words such as *refugees*, *children*, *migrants* and *victims* appear in the top 50% of the keywords. As mentioned in the preceding chapter, political debates require some form of generalization in their representational patterns. It is thus unsurprising that some form of identity application would be present in the data. The plural noun *refugees* appears in the SDC most often in contexts of mass, provision of aid and discussions of bad conditions that the identified groups are facing.

(1) Example concordance of "refugees"

Britain should play its part. There are now nearly 2.5 million	**refugees,**	and the UNHCR states that they are at significant

The plural noun *victims* appears in both the identity application category, as well as the victimization category. In the SDC, *victims* as well appears most often in the context of emphasizing the vulnerability of these DPs, an established strategy of representation.

(2) Example concordance of "victims" in the SDC

most vulnerable caught up in the war, including children and	**victims**	of torture and sexual violence. The only real way,

The representational pattern is thus to remind the listeners of the realities of the DPs, in order to garner support for them and to make the government act in assistance. This pattern of emphasis is prominent in the debate data on the Syrian DPs.

In the UDC keywords, identity indexing keyword *Ukrainians* shows an interesting pattern of criticism towards the UK government, instead of an emphasis of vulnerability. The focus is on the bureaucratic processes aimed at delivering aid to the DPs, and the criticism of those processes being too slow or inadequate, evidenced here

(3) Example concordance of "Ukrainians" in the UDC

levelled directly at this Government who have utterly failed the	**Ukrainians**	who are fleeing the horrors of war. If Ministers

Further evidence of this focus will be overviewed in the British Bureaucracy section 5.1.5.

In addition to the absence of corresponding identity application terms for Ukrainian DPs, more evidence of a difference of representation concerning *refugees* can be found in the naming of the debates themselves. As I mentioned in the data & methods section, "Ukrainian refugees" as a search term yielded only two results, while the term "Syrian refugees" yielded 18 results. By adapting the search terms, I found 19 debates on Ukrainian DPs in total. This in mind, I looked at the .txt-files that I extracted from Hansard, and the difference in the names of the debates was quite drastic. The word *refugees* was in all of the 18 debate headings concerning Syrian DPs, but *refugee* or *refugees* were only in 5 of the 19 Ukraine debate headings. Concerning Ukrainian DPs, the other debate

headings had titles such as "Homes for Ukraine Scheme", "Ukraine Humanitarian Crisis", "Ukraine Impact on Students", "Support for People Fleeing War in Ukraine", "Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme" or simply "Ukraine". This further demonstrates that there is a difference in the frequency of these identity application indexing words such as *refugee* between the two corpora.

The plural noun migrants is the first identity application word in the Syria debates keyword list that shows a negative connotation when viewed in context. The noun is used often in contexts of emphasizing the difference between "genuine refugees" and "economic migrants":

(4) Example concordances of "migrants" in the SDC

another Cologne. It is important that we differentiate between economic	**migrants**	and asylum seekers. We have to help as best
economic migrants. We have to recognise that some are economic	**migrants**	and some are genuine refugees. I want to put
as part of the movement of people were indeed economic	**migrants.**	We have to recognise that some are economic migrants

It is important to note, however, that all of the speeches that differentiate between "genuine" and "economic" migrants are from the Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), which is a right-wing unionist party in Northern Ireland that is mostly socially conservative (Arthur & Cowell-Meyers: 2022), opposing abortion (McCormack 2021) and same-sex marriage (Hewitt 2019) based on the party's religious views. It is thus not an accurate representation of a larger pattern, but it is important in showcasing the connotational difference between *refugees* and *migrants*.

Although this right-wing rhetoric on economic migration is condensed, it is clear that *migrants* as an identity application term attracts more negative representation than *refugees*, and the absence of it in the UDC keywords shows a slight representational difference between the corpora. One of the possible factors in the negative connotations of *migrants* or migration as a whole might be explained by semantic prosody (Louw, 1993), which is characterized aptly by Partington as "the spreading of connotational colouring beyond single word boundaries" (1998: 68). Semantic prosody can show additional connotations of seemingly neutral words, and the term *migrant* could be an

example of negative semantic prosody, as is referenced in the announcement by news organization Al Jazeera to stop using *migrant* to describe refugees, as "it has evolved from its dictionary definitions into a tool that dehumanises and distances, a blunt pejorative" (Malone, 20th Aug. 2015).

5.1.4 Keywords of unrest & victimization

This is the second category after nationality indexing that has multiple keywords from both the SDC and UDC. There are, however, slight differences in the referents of the words between the two lists.

In the SDC keywords, most of the words either describe the unrest more generally with nouns like *crisis*, *violence* and *conflict*, or emphasize the results of it for the DPs, with words such as *suffered*, *torture*, *victims*, *displaced* and *vulnerable*. In the UDC, the words focus mostly in representing the unrest as an armed conflict, with words such as *war*, *invasion*, *military*, *attack*, *missiles*, *weapons*, and *nuclear*. An emphasis on the results of war on the DPs is not prominent in the Ukraine keywords.

This shows a representational pattern of emphasis on the vulnerability and plight of the Syrian DPs in their keywords, whereas in the Ukraine DPs keywords the emphasis is on the unrest itself, which is notable considering the differences between corpus sizes: The UDC is twice as large as the SDC, but the debates are still focusing on displaced people in both.

5.1.5 British Bureaucracy: Keywords on the political process

Due to the data source being parliamentary texts, the theme of British bureaucracy is naturally very present in both of the keyword lists. When studying political language on the topic of migration, one crucial component to critically inspect is the language illustrating (proposed) political action: the bureaucratic schemes and systems intended to institutionalize parts of the displacement process.

In the Syria keywords, words such as *vulnerable*, *persons*, *relocation*, *resettlement*, *programme* and *quota* are most often used when discussing political action and resources towards

DPs. In the Ukraine keywords, words such as *homes*, *Ukraine*, *visa*, *visas*, *application*, *applications*, *safeguarding*, *sponsors*, and *sponsorship* all appear often in the contexts of bureaucracy.

A majority of those terms in both of the lists can be attributed to the naming of different UK programs directed at DPs. In the case of Syrian DPs, the most notable is a program titled "Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme" (VPRS) (UK Government 2021). It is also referred to in the debate data as "(Syrian) Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme". It is a government program launched in 2014, aimed at providing displaced populations "a direct safe and legal route to the UK" when their "particular needs can only be met in other countries, such as the UK" (UK Government 2021). The program works with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to identify the displaced populations in need of resettlement (UK Government, 2021). Due to the established nature of this scheme at the time of the debate data used, at least between the years 2014-2016, the scheme was heavily referred to in almost every debate concerning Syrian DPs.

When it comes to Ukrainian DPs, the structuring and naming of the schemes is somewhat different. Most Syrian DPs apply for resettlement to the UK under the VPRS after an initial granted asylum in Turkey, Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq or Egypt (UK Government 2021) or some through the UK standard asylum system on arrival, peaking at 7% of all asylum applicants in 2015 (Migration Observatory 2022). In the case of the Ukrainian DPs, however, the UK requires the DPs to have either UK family connections or a sponsor to be eligible for protection, and a granted visa before entering the UK in the schemes specifically catered to Ukrainian DPs. If eligible to be granted a visa, the Ukrainian DPs are granted a different temporary status from asylum seeker or refugee, and are granted the right to work, unlike asylum claimants waiting for application decisions (Walsh & Sumption 2022). The schemes are named the Ukraine Extension scheme, the Ukraine Family Scheme and the Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme, also known as the Homes for Ukraine Scheme (Walsh & Sumption 2022: Q&A: The UK and the Ukraine refugee situation). This structuring is different from the VPRS, as it focuses on displaced people themselves acquiring visas instead of an organization like the

UNHCR identifying DPs in need of asylum. This might be one of the reasons *homes*, *visa*, *visas*, *sponsor*, *sponsorship*, *application* and *applications* are high in the Ukraine keyword list but are absent from the Syria keyword list, due to the heavy focus on the visas required to enter the UK and the nature of community sponsorship schemes.

An interesting pattern arises with the noun *quota* in the SDC bureaucracy theme. The first reaction when coming across *quota* in the context of bureaucracy and displaced populations might be to anticipate restricting discourse about the numbers of DPs accepted into the receiving countries, i.e. to have quotas on them. In these cases, however, it is important not to draw immediate conclusions from these biased expectations. To make sure that my analysis does not rely too heavily on the face value of keywords, I manually checked the concordances here as well. Indeed, the contexts of *quota* in the SDC show the opposite of this general expectation: *quota* in the data is used to emphasize that the government does not have a quota scheme:

Figure 2. 5 top concordances of "quota" in the SDC

said that she did not intend to subscribe to a	**quota**	scheme. However, the UN programme is not a quota
vulnerable people, we do not intend to subscribe to a	**quota**	scheme. I want to make it clear to the
vulnerable people, we do not intend to subscribe to a	**quota**	scheme. Instead, our programme will run in parallel with
that the Government do not intend to subscribe to a	**quota**	scheme. Will she therefore confirm that there are no
operate in the UN Syria programme and has set no	**quota.**	It has set no specific number and has said

This keyword and concordance is evidence to the hazards of surface level corpus and keyword analysis, and how it is crucial to keep checking the contexts in which the keywords appear.

5.1.6 Summary

Although the Keyword lists show strong similarity in the nationality indexing theme, the identity application theme is entirely absent from the Ukraine keyword list. In the Syria keywords, identity application indexing keywords were used to emphasize the difficult conditions of the Syrian DPs, whereas in the Ukraine keyword list the only group representation of the DPs focused on the

nationality indexing keywords. It is interesting that general descriptors of suffering and vulnerability of displaced populations are not appearing highly key in the Ukraine debate data but are one of the most prominent representational strategy in the Syria debates. The situations in Syria and Ukraine are represented very differently in the unrest and victimization theme as well, emphasizing a clear aggressor *Putin* and the resulting *war* and *invasion* in the UDC, whereas in the SDC the focus is almost exclusively on the resulting victimization of the unrest, such as *torture* and *victims*. The situation in Syria is referred to mostly in the broader terms of *conflict* and *crisis* instead of a civil war.

5.2 Collocation

Another aspect of pattern recognition and analysis is studying collocation. As was evidenced by the noun *quota* and it's concordances in chapter 5.1.5 of the bureaucracy theme, not all concrete meanings of keywords or meaningful patterns can be gleaned superficially, without surrounding context. That is why analyzing collocation is a valuable tool in seeing what words appear together with other words at statistically significant frequencies, allowing us to see the most frequent surrounding contexts more. These collocations show the most frequent words with which the keyword is used, and the surprising result with *quota* can consequently be seen in its collocates:

Table 5. Top collocates for "quota"

Node word	Collocates
quota	*a, set, no, scheme, not*

The most frequent words that appear with *quota* are the determiners *no* and *not*, which are used to indicate negation, as was shown with the concordances (see figure 2.) Other collocates support this finding, as *a*, *set*, and *scheme* were also shown to be used in the most frequent concordances, in the context of emphasizing that there is no set quota scheme.

5.2.1 Top Keywords & their Collocates by Corpus

Taking the same approach as with the keywords, I started to go through the top 20% of both of the corpora's keyword collocates, i.e., I extracted the collocates of all of the keywords from the SDC and UDC. I chose a span of 3L to 3R due to it showing most often content words or collocates with high effect as prominent. A narrow span worked best with this data set, possibly due to the prepared and formal nature of the speeches. For the collocation metrics, I continued with the 3.84 LL cutoff with the Bonferroni correction and chose the MI score to measure collocation strength. The top 30 node words from Syria and Ukraine keyword lists are illustrated in table 6 for brevity. To see all of the top 20% collocates of the ORTOLANG keywords thematically coded, see table 3, collocate codebook.

Table 6. SDC & UDC: Top 30 Keywords' Collocates[2]

Node keyword	Top Collocates in SDC	Node keyword	Top Collocates in UDC
Syrian	*refugees, resettlement, conflict, refugee, nationals*	Ukraine	*homes, scheme, in, for, invasion, s, from, fleeing*
Syria	*in, inside, from, neighbouring, within, outside*	Ukrainian	*refugees, people, forces, families, friends, nationals, the*
refugees	*Syrian, vulnerable, Palestinian, commissioner, of, high, for*	Putin	*s, president, Vladimir, invasion, regime, war*
UNHCR	*with, the, programme, s, hand*	Russian	*forces, aggression, gas, oil, economy*
Lebanon	*Jordan, Turkey, in, Iraq, and*	visa	*application, centre, centres, requirements, a, waive*
programme	*un, resettlement, unhcr, the, gateway*	Ukrainians	*who, fleeing, displaced, help, defend*
Jordan	*Lebanon, Turkey, Iraq, and, in*	Russia	*China, report, economic, its, invasion*

---

[2] For the sake of brevity and to avoid inundating the thesis with appendices, not all of the node keywords included in analysis are visible in text, but I am happy to provide additional materials upon request.

region	*in, the, countries, Syria, people*	NATO	*allies, flank, join, eastern, g*
camps	*in, refugee, outside, the, are*	war	*crimes, fleeing, this, cold, machine, Putin*
vulnerable	*most, persons, relocation, scheme, refugees*	sanctions	*economic, on, tougher, regime, impact*
Syrians	*displaced, million, than, more, over*	visas	*issued, granted, nearly, for, been*
UN	*programme, the, security, council, asked*	defence	*spending, ministry, secretary, procurement, self*
aid	*humanitarian, through, agencies, our, overseas, getting*	checks	*security, safeguarding, biometric, done, basic*
crisis	*humanitarian, refugee, the, this, began*	invasion	*s, illegal, Putin, Ukraine, of, barbaric*
relocation	*persons, scheme, vulnerable, the, programme*	application	*visa, centres, centre, process, capacity*
asylum	*seekers, claim, seeker, granted, claims*	Kevin	Only address terms
Turkey	*Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Egypt, and*	Foster	Only address terms
mrs	Only addressing formalities	office	*home, the, commonwealth, foreign, officials*
assistance	*humanitarian, provide, providing, our, need*	homes	*scheme, Ukraine, for, their, hearts*
resettlement	*programme, scheme, Syrian, the, vulnerable*	Poland	*in, Hungary, borders, such, from*
most	*vulnerable, the, refugees, who, some*	safeguarding	*checks, children, and, are*
camp	*refugee, Zaatari, visited, Nizip, in*	military	*support, economic, aid, equipment, assistance*
million	*than, displaced, internally, more, refugees*	Russians	*the*

providing	*support, are, assistance, help, we*	sponsors	*super, act, refugees, be, who*
refugee	*crisis, camps, camp, status, council*	applications	*processed, submitted, visa, being, made*
persons	*relocation, scheme, vulnerable, under, displaced*	aggression	*Russian, against, appalling, s, Putin*
countries	*neighbouring, other, European, those, such*	forces	*armed, Russian, Ukrainian, our, s*
humanitarian	*crisis, aid, assistance, response, visas*	system	*immigration, swift (SWIFT), the, asylum, visa*
Brokenshire	Only address terms	Patel	Only address terms
mr	Only address terms	Priti	Only address terms

5.2.2 Comparison of Collocation: Nationality & Nation Indexing

I noted a slight difference in the collocates of the nationality indexing keywords. As mentioned in chapter 5.1.2, both of the corpora had nationality indexing keywords close to the top of the keyword lists. However, when analyzing the collocates, there was a slight difference in context as well as the most frequent collocates.

In the SDC, the top collocates of the keyword *Syrian* are *refugees, resettlement, conflict, refugee,* and *nationals*. As highlighted in chapter 5.1.5, *resettlement* is referring to the VPRS, whose goal was the resettlement of Syrian DPs to the UK. Other collocates follow the patterns already established, where *refugee* and *refugees* are prominent terms when representing Syrian DPs (see section 5.1.3), and *conflict* is a frequent term describing the situation in the SDC (see section 5.1.4). In the UDC, keyword *Ukrainian* produces top collocates *refugees, people, forces, families, friends, nationals,* and *the*. The collocation *Ukrainian refugees* differs in context from its SDC equivalent, as the top concordances of collocation *Syrian refugees* discuss the DPs in other countries, whereas *Ukrainian refugees* are discussed as either en route to the UK or already residing there.

(1) Example concordances of "Syrian + refugees" in SDC & "Ukrainian + refugees" in UDC

| to move, That this House has considered the situation of | **Syrian refugees** | in Jordan and Lebanon. It is a pleasure |
| Foreign Secretary gave us the figure for the number of | **Ukrainian refugees** | who have been approved to come to the |

A possible reason for this discrepancy is the fact that Syrian DPs have fled largely to neighboring Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey, where there are large refugee camps (thus *camps, Jordan, Turkey & Lebanon* in the SDC keyword list) and the UK has provided large humanitarian aid packages straight to those regions and Syria, totaling at 3.8 billion pounds (UK FDCO 2023: Syria crisis response summary, February 2023). More evidence for this different areal focus can be found in the collocates of SDC keyword *region*, where the preposition *in* is the top collocate.

Contrastively, the Ukrainian DPs are most often discussed in the context of residing in the UK, to highlight their courage or in the contexts of criticism against the government's insufficient action in helping them to navigate the systems.

The more apparent difference between the collocates is in the collocates themselves. The keyword *Ukrainian* has 5 top collocates that are not in the corresponding *Syrian* keyword collocates: *people*, *forces*, *families*, *friends* and *the*. In the SDC, most of the collocates have been shown to refer to government schemes, descriptors of unrest or the status of the DPs. The five UDC top collocates carry different connotations. In context, collocation *Ukrainian + people* is used to emphasize the urgency in delivering aid and protection, and collocation *Ukrainian + forces* is used to similarly call for more aid, but in the UDC the aid is primarily military. There is also emphasis on the bravery and agency of the Ukrainian people, as well as the military:

(2) Example concordances of "Ukrainian + people" and "Ukrainian + forces" in the UDC

| in wanting to do the right thing for the Ukrainian | **people** | who are fleeing in fear of their lives, and |
| to the heroic men and women of the Ukrainian armed | **forces** | and to all the people of Ukraine, whose grit, |

It is a different representative pattern than in the SDC, where calls for government aid were mostly argued by using terms from the victimization theme to describe the DPs, such as *victims, vulnerable*

and *torture* (see sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4). The representational patterns of Ukrainian DPs, even in the contexts of describing the atrocities of war, mostly focus on their nationality as the most prominent identifier, as both in chapter 5.1.4 concordances of *Ukrainian* and in the collocation *Ukrainian + people*. The traces of discourse of providing military aid are entirely absent from the SDC which is evidence to the different political strategy and position of the UK in the two crises. The strategy of prominent DP agency is also missing from the SDC.

The collocations *Ukrainian + families* and *Ukrainian + friends* do not have corresponding collocates in the SDC either. This is a drastic difference in the representational patterns between Syrian and Ukrainian DPs. The emphasis on family sponsorship in UK communities was touched on in chapter 5.1.5, but generally the Ukrainian DPs are directed to apply in visa schemes, where the Homes for Ukraine scheme focused on UK communities, among others, volunteering to host Ukrainian DPs in their homes. This approach did not exist at the time of the SDC debates. At the time of the debates on Syria, between 2012 and 2015, the schemes catering to Syrian DPs did not have a sponsorship system where the DPs would directly acquire a sponsor in the destination community, but "the first 12 months of a refugee's resettlement costs are fully funded by central government using the overseas aid budget" and going forward "for years 2-5 of the scheme there is £129m of funding available to assist with costs incurred by local authorities providing support to refugees under the VPRS" (UK Home Office July 2017, Questions). There are mentions of local organizations' and community sponsor groups' essential role in the resettlement of the Syrian DPs under the VPRS (UK Government 2021), but a direct community sponsor scheme was still, at that time, absent. With the closure of the VPRS in 2021, the UK Resettlement Scheme (UKRS) consolidated multiple schemes aimed at Syrian DPs among others, and in 2016, the Government's Community Sponsorship program was implemented to provide similar, direct community sponsors to DPs before Ukraine (UNHCR 2021). The sponsorship scheme therefore is not present in the SDC,

as the latest debate included is from 2015. Praise for these volunteering sponsor communities is prominent in the UDC, as well as praise for other kinds of aid.

The more distinct collocation is the *Ukrainian + friends*. It is not very frequent, with 16 hits, but has a range of 7 files and is thus used somewhat widely in the UDC debates. It is most often used to emphasize the strong relationship between the UK and Ukraine, and connotates a more equal relationship between the two countries. In the SDC, the role of Britain was to be the provider of aid and the recipient and supporter of Syrian DPs, often argued with monetary and humanitarian contributions (see chapter 5.1.3), but there was no distinct representational pattern of equality between the two nations similar to the contexts *Ukrainian + friends*. This, together with the calls and contributions of military support for Ukraine, as well as the praise for the Ukrainian people's bravery is indicative of a pattern where the UK sees Ukraine as an equal and an ally, but Syria as mostly a vulnerable recipient, in need of humanitarian support.

The collocates of *Syrians & Ukrainians* have some differences as well. The keyword *Syrians* has top collocates *displaced*, *million*, *than*, *more*, and *over*. The keyword *Ukrainians* has top collocates *who*, *fleeing*, *displaced*, *help*, and *defend*. Some themes emerge even before checking concordances, for example in the Syrians collocates there are multiple words referring to mass, such as *million*, *more* and possibly *over*. When checking the concordances, this theme becomes evident:

(3) Example concordances of "Syrians + million", "Syrians + more" & "Syrians + over" in the SDC

Syrians need help, of whom 6.5 million are internally displaced, and 4.2	**million**	Syrians have fled abroad, mostly to neighbouring countries in
of innocent people have fled their homes. There are now	**more**	than 11 million Syrians in desperate need, including 6.5 million people
were relocated to the UK under the scheme. In addition,	**over 3,400**	Syrians and their dependants have been granted asylum or

In these contexts, the emphasis on mass is used to argue for more efficient and substantial aid from the government, and criticism of the inadequate action is also levelled similar to the UDC concordances of *Ukrainian* in section 5.1.4. The strategy is different, however. In the SDC collocates,

the emphasis on the large amounts of people is prominent, whereas in the UDC a similar pattern of numerical representation of DPs is infrequent, and the focus is more on their nationality. This is further evidenced with both the discrepancy of collocate numbers, where SDC has 17 collocates and UDC has 7 collocates under the Mass-category (see codebook in methods). After checking the concordances of the rest of the collocates for *Syrians*, a similar pattern continues, where numeral mass is used consistently with references to Syrian DPs.

Considering the previously mentioned codebook theme discrepancies and how all of the collocates for *Syrians* attract traces of discourse on numeral mass, it is evident that this representational pattern is far more prominent in the SDC than in the UDC.

The collocates for *Ukrainians* reinforce this difference. The top collocates *who*, *fleeing*, and *displaced* do not show repeated references to numeral mass

(4) Example of concordance for "Ukrainians + who"

spirit of this country will be felt by the Ukrainians	**who**	are fleeing persecution and attack from Vladimir Putin. As

The only instance in the top concordances that show reference to numerical mass is when referring to the amount of visas issued. Otherwise, the same criticisms of government inadequacy in their response are repeated that were also on in chapter 5.1.4 and show in comments such as "Are the Government seriously suggesting that Ukrainians fleeing the horrors of war should advertise themselves on social media…". There are promises of aid and support for the DPs to get to the UK as well. This is a divergence from the most frequent contexts with the collocates of *Syrians*, where the focus was on providing aid and support in region, when discussing aid outside the VPRS. The two *Ukrainians* collocates left, *help* and *defend* evidence a further move away from the SDC traces of discourse:

Figure 3. 2 top concordances of "Ukrainians + help" and "Ukrainians + defend" in the UDC

the defensive weapon support that we have provided, is to	**help**	the Ukrainians to defend themselves against the attacks of

but at the moment our priority, quite rightly, is to	**help**	the Ukrainians to defend themselves against Putin's attack.
our priority, quite rightly, is to help the Ukrainians to	**defend**	themselves against Putin's attack. Dr Julian Lewis (New
I assure him that we will help the Ukrainians to	**defend**	themselves against attacks from the air. The donor community

There is some overlap in concordance due to their close proximity in collocate values. It is still clearly visible that these concordances continue the calls for and presentations of aid, but this time they are for military aid. This is further evidence of the more prominent position the UK has taken in the Ukraine situation as opposed to the Syria situation and to the more equal view the UK has of Ukrainians (see also p. 55, paragraph on *Ukrainians + friends*). The repeated calls to "…help Ukrainians defend themselves…" give Ukrainians far more agency than is reserved for the Syrians, who are most often presented as being part of a large mass of people in desperate need of help in the SDC.

The nation indexing keywords' collocates are further evidence of the different focus of aid. *Syria* has top collocates of *in*, *inside*, *from*, *neighbouring*, *within*, and *outside*, which almost all focus on Syria and its surrounding regions. The only possible outlier is the collocate *from*, whose top concordances show more of a focus on Syrian DPs in the UK or other countries. There is, however, mention of aid in region, as well as further evidence for the numerical or other mass representation of people:

(5) Example concordances of "Syria + from" in the SDC

| a leading role in providing aid and support to refugees | **from** | Syria in a variety of ways. We just do |
| and Iraq in providing for the huge exodus of refugees | **from** | Syria is extraordinary—staggering—especially when one considers the |

Even with the preposition *from* which signals movement from the point of origin, *Syria*, the focus is on the aid already provided to DPs. The use of emphasis on masses of people is also evident in the concordances, with comments such as "…the huge exodus of refugees from Syria…".

The collocates for *Ukraine* show a different focus. The top collocates are *homes*, *scheme*, *in*, *for*, *invasion*, *s*, *from*, and *fleeing*. The Homes for Ukraine Scheme mostly accounts for

at least two of the top collocates, *homes*, and *scheme*. The collocate *s* refers to the possessive form 's.

Invasion is the first big difference between collocates, and is most often used in contexts of describing

the actions of the aggressor or the atrocities of war:

Figure 4. 2 top concordances of "Ukraine + invasion" in the UDC

| attend a long-standing constituency engagement online. Vladimir Putin's | **invasion** | of Ukraine is an unprovoked and unjustified outrage—a |
| support they have given the Ukrainian army. Putin's illegal | **invasion** | of Ukraine is a grave attack not only on |

In addition to the focus on the clear aggressor Putin, the possessive form 's further highlights the

discourse pattern that this war is generated by one man. This is additional evidence of the different

views of the crises, where one is more general and has more sides and the other is very clear, almost

black and white in describing the aggressor and the victims. The collocates *from* and *fleeing* show

calls for aid, and *from* also shows a call for "humanity":

(6) Example concordances of "Ukraine + from" in the UDC

| to fix the mess of her Department, and refugees arriving | **from** | Ukraine and their hosts and sponsors have had to |
| not only efficiency, but humanity when processing applications of refugees | **from** | Ukraine and we should warmly welcome those refugees to |

These concordances show that there are calls for government to "…fix the mess…" and to have

"…not only efficiency, but humanity when processing applications…". These are part of the same

traces of discourse that focus on criticism of the British bureaucratic processes for Ukrainian DPs and

are further evidence of how prominent this pattern is in the UDC. A corresponding pattern is not

present in the SDC. Continuing on this trace of discourse, an interesting aspect is how the comments

on Ukrainian DPs attract further criticism of the British system and its different attitudes to DPs as a

whole in the UDC, as in the comment of Labour member Clive Lewis and the response of another

Labour member, Diane Abbott:

Clive Lewis

Does my right hon. Friend have any idea why Conservative Members might want to have a different
approach to refugees fleeing Ukraine and refugees fleeing Afghanistan, Syria and other countries?

Ms Abbott

My hon. Friend tempts me; perhaps it is the case that it is easier to be humane with refugees who look like us (Lewis, C. & Abbott, D. 2022: column 815).

5.2.2.1 Summary

The nationality/nation indexing keywords' collocation provided a clearer view of the differences in representations between the SDC and UDC collocates. In the SDC, a prominent pattern was the representations of DPs by especially numerical mass, using it to emphasize the need of humanitarian aid or to present the amounts already provided to the DPs. Another pattern was in the areal focus when discussing aid, where Syria and its surrounding countries and regions were discussed and emphasized widely, and the aid and receiving of DPs in the UK was less present. One of the possible reasons for this is the fact that as mentioned before, the largest UK scheme for Syrian DPs is named the Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme, which does not name Syrian DPs in the title. This might be further evidence to the pattern of mainly representing Syrian DPs through their number and vulnerability, as opposed to their nationality.

Contrastively, the UDC collocates showed a pattern where nationality or nation were the main focal points in the description of DPs, their conditions and in the naming of the schemes provided for them, as in the Homes for Ukraine scheme. The pattern of representing Ukrainian DPs mainly through their nationality showed a focus on a nation and its people in need with collocates such as *people*, *families* and *displaced*, rather than on large masses of vulnerable people in need of humanitarian resources outside UK. Expanding the meaning of nationality focus instead of vulnerability, a pattern of equal stance between Ukraine and the UK was established, with collocates such as *help*, *defend*, and *friends*. Furthermore, the offers of military aid for Ukraine displays an active stance of the UK beside Ukraine with collocate *forces* in addition to *help* and *defend,* rather than as a mere humanitarian resource provider. The pattern of clear lines between aggressor and victims emerged as well, in addition to the strong pattern of criticism towards British governmental processes

and their inadequacy in responding to Ukrainian DPs needs. Traces of discourse on the calls to reform British processes often accompanied the criticisms.

5.2.3 Comparison of Collocation: Unrest/Victimization Indexing

A large discrepancy emerged in this theme between the corpora. There was further evidence of a pattern of victimization and vulnerability emphasis in the SDC collocates, whereas in the UDC the collocates focused mainly on the descriptions of unrest.

In the SDC, the collocates under the unrest/victimization theme included collocates such as *vulnerable*, *torture*, *victims*, *survivors*, *persecution*, *suffered* and *died* (for the complete list of the theme, see Collocate codebook in methods). The theme shows strong emphasis on the results of the situation in Syria on the DPs, as most of the collocates refer to them. the collocates that refer to unrest are mostly more general descriptors, such as *crisis* and *conflict*. The contexts mostly discuss the conditions of the Syrian DPs and use them either as arguments for precise aid by prioritizing the most vulnerable, or in presenting the aid already provided.

As already hinted at in the description of the Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme, the aim of vulnerability emphasis is to identify the most vulnerable people in the Syrian DPs and provide them the opportunity to resettle in the UK. The emphasis on the victimization collocates might be partly due to this structure of the UK VPRS scheme, where resettlement is prioritized for the most at-risk populations. By looking at just the collocates under this theme, a similar emphasis does not emerge in the UDC.

In the UDC collocates under this theme, a strong emphasis on the descriptors of unrest is apparent. Collocates such as *invasion*, *war*, *aggression*, *against*, and *crimes* show a focus on the unrest in Ukraine (for the complete list of the theme, see collocate codebook in methods), rather than on the characteristics of the DPs. The collocate *war* is also in the corresponding SDC collocates, but it has 49 hits in the SDC, whereas *war* has 439 hits in the UDC. With the evidence of the high

likelihood of unrest keywords (see UDC keyword list) it is evident that a pattern of focusing on the unrest rather than the DPs victimization emerges.

The collocate *against* is an example of showing reference to the DPs as well as to the unrest in the collocates, but even there, references to the aggressors are frequent, as exemplified in (1):

(1) Example concordance of "against" in the UDC

Mariupol, Bucha and beyond suggest clear evidence of war crimes	**against**	the Ukrainian people. As Putin's military aggression continues

In these contexts there are mention of the Ukrainian DPs, again with their nationality as the primary descriptor (see 5.2.2.1), but the comments mostly go on to focus back on the unrest, as with "…war crimes against the Ukrainian People. As Putin's military aggression continues…" and in another concordance "…invasion marked the start of a crime of aggression against the Ukrainian people, but it was also the beginning…", the latter continuing on to describe the war as "…an assault on the fundamental aims of post-war Europe: peace, freedom and national sovereignty" (Lammy, D. 2022: column 802). The contexts of the collocate *crimes* focus again on the specifics of the unrest as is shown in (1), most commonly on the war crimes documented in Ukraine.

The concordances further evidence the pattern that the aggressors are very specific in the UDC and the unrest is referred to more prominently than to the resulting DP victimization from it.

5.2.4 Comparison of Collocation: British Bureaucracy Indexing

The biggest difference in pure amount of specifically themed collocates was under this theme. The collocates in this theme totaled 36 in the SDC compared to the 72 collocates in the UDC. In addition to the difference in amount, there were differences in the collocates themselves.

In the SDC, following the previously described government programs and the asylum process, collocates such as *resettlement*, *relocation*, *vulnerable*, *scheme*, *persons*, *claim*, *claims*, and

asylum were among the collocates in the SDC bureaucracy theme (for all the collocates, see collocate codebook in methods). Other collocates reference different government departments or positions, such as *home*, *office*, *secretary*, *state*, *department*, and *council*, or the parliament debates or members themselves, with collocates *statement*, *members*, and *speech*. The SDC collocates therefore further show, how the naming and structuring of government programs affect the traces of discourse present in the data.

The concordances are further evidence that the bureaucratic processes aimed at Syrian DPs prioritize the most vulnerable, a categorization strategy that is not present in the UDC collocates.

The UDC collocates have similarly the biggest surface difference in the collocates referring government aid programs, with collocates such as *homes*, *scheme*, *for*, and *Ukraine*. Another difference is the presence of multiple, tangible bureaucratic steps that the DPs can take themselves and that are directed towards them, such as *visas*, *processed*, *submitted*, *applying*, and *process*. This is the largest difference between the collocates in this theme. As hinted previously in the overview of the Ukrainian visa schemes, the Ukrainian DPs applying have definite agency to choose which program to apply for, whereas in the SDC, the VPRS used an outside authority to supply them with categorization lists of the most vulnerable DPs eligible for residence in the UK. There is not a corresponding bureaucratic prioritization based on vulnerability in the UDC collocates. This is therefore further evidence that the representation of Ukrainian DPs has a pattern that emphasizes the nation and nationality as a whole, whereas the Syrian DPs are most often represented through their at-risk characteristics. Another difference is the criticism towards government in the UDC collocates. Collocates under this theme such as *waiting*, *still*, *weeks*, *having*, and *system* are most often used to highlight the slow process of gaining necessary documents and more permanent housing, as well as highlighting the general issues of the immigration system:

(1) Example concordances of "waiting" and "having" in the UDC

| from its figures the thousands of people who are still | **waiting** | for a visa centre appointment. That is not good |

minutes to print a visa, why on earth are people	**having**	to wait for so long? As one Ukrainian refugee

These criticisms towards the inadequate speed of government bureaucracy are the most notable difference in the collocations and they provide further evidence of this pattern previously hinted at in section 5.1.4. It shows how there is a prominent pattern of calls to better the British immigration system to serve Ukrainian DPs more efficiently, but a similar, prominent pattern of criticism is absent from the SDC bureaucracy collocates as well as largely from the rest of SDC data.

5.2.4.1 Summary

The British bureaucracy theme shows the most notable difference in the amounts of collocates between the corpora, as well as a difference between the government system structures and DP agency. The difference in number alone indicates a possible pattern of a more effective creation of actual government resources offered to the Ukrainian DPs compared to the Syrian DPs, especially as the SDC has a longer timespan for data (2012-2015) than the UDC, where all the debates are from 2022. It is therefore notable that the bureaucratic terms are far more numerous just in 2022 than in the 4-year span of the SDC data.

The SDC bureaucracy collocates continue to show a pattern of DP priority categorization based on emphasized vulnerability as evidenced by the structure of the VPRS, whereas in the UDC the DPs have more agency, and are referred to mostly by their nationality, in part due to the structuring of the visa schemes. The SDC collocates do not show a pattern of prominent criticism towards government processes, but the UDC collocates refer heavily to the inadequacy and tardiness of the UK bureaucracy.

5.3 Ideological Discourse: Keywords & Collocates

Shifting gears for the final part of the analysis, I will use the ideological square model (ISM) to analyze the keywords & collocates more critically, including more context and focusing on the

representations of displaced populations as the outgroups and the UK, British people and their Government & parliament as the ingroup. The basis of the analysis are the same, the keywords and collocates, but the focus is shifted, more towards ideological codings and emergent discourses.

I will use the ISM categories of context, text, topics and lexicon with the topoi previously presented to structure the analysis into sections. I'm starting with the overview of contexts of the Syria and Ukraine debates, and from there I will analyze and compare the text and topoi in the SDC and UDC keywords and collocates, following with comparison analysis of representational lexicon. After this, I will summarize the findings.

5.3.1 Context: Syria Keywords & Collocates

The contexts for the Syria Keywords and collocations have been touched upon previously in this thesis, but I will compile a more comprehensive overview of the surrounding contexts that might affect and reproduce the possible ideological codings.

- *Overall domain*: Politics
- *Overall societal action*: Legislation, funding, humanitarian aid, international cooperation
- *Current setting*: The UK House of Commons, between 2012 and 2015
- *Current circumstances*: Debates on structures of legislation concerning Syrian DPs, reviews and questions of the range of humanitarian aid provided to DPs, reviews and comments on schemes being implemented, overviews of unrest in the Syrian region, overviews of the inhumane conditions of the DPs
- *Current interaction*: Political debates
- *Current discourse genre*: Speech
- *Roles of the participants*: People who oppose or support the Government's approach to DP programs and provision of aid.
- *Cognitions of the participants*: UK seen as a prominent provider of humanitarian aid, protector of the most vulnerable

The civil war in Syria has resulted in the displacement of over 12 million people, of which 5.5 million have fled outside Syria and 6.8 million are internally displaced (Reid, 2023). The UK government has since backed the Geneva process as a diplomatic effort, provided large amounts of financial and

humanitarian aid (UK Government 2023: Our mission) and launched schemes to resettle Syrian DPs, such as the frequently referenced Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS). Considering this context, it is natural that the majority of debates are about the political and societal actions being made in response to the civil war and the displaced populations. The political decisions and discussions handle large amounts of money and other resources, and the frequent emphasis on the dire conditions of the DPs of Syria might be used as a mitigating argument on the impact of providing that aid.

The very structure of political debates on DPs in a country receiving and aiding them creates an ingroup-outgroup division. The ingroup is the socially and politically more powerful group, that has discussions on what and how much to do or not to do in assistance. The outgroup is the displaced populations that have no direct access to the discussions had about them, and who are in some instances even geographically the other or are represented as a distinctly separate group when inside the borders of the ingroup country. This is best demonstrated in the data with the classic, deictic plural, and possessive pronouns *we*, *our*, and *their*:

(1) Example concordances of "we", "our" and "their" in the SDC

case. Our country can be proud of the work that	**we**	are doing in providing this direct assistance under the
the hon. Lady has given the UK Government some credit.	**Our**	aid contribution and our leadership should be admired to
and we recognise the importance of supporting them to rebuild	**their**	lives and integrate into our diverse communities. Margaret Ferrier

With *we* and *our*, the surrounding context clearly demonstrates that the referents are of the ingroup, such as the UK Government and parliament. With the possessive deictic pronoun *their*, the referent changes to the outgroup, namely to the displaced populations of Syria. This shows the basis of critical analysis of ideology, the "us vs. them" division. In this case, however, the narrative is not to pit these groups against each other, but to create a differentiation more subtly between the provider of resources and the recipient of those resources. It is important to additionally point out that the inclusion of these plural pronouns are in the critical discourse analysis section but are not overviewed in the corpus

analysis sections, as they attracted high negative values for example in the collocate section. This is usually grounds for their exclusion in the analysis entirely, but due to the ISM ingroup-outgroup division being based on plural pronouns most clearly, their analysis is included in this section. It is a working reminder that there are some pitfalls when combining CDA and corpus analysis that need to be addressed when deciding the scope and specifics of analysis.

5.3.2 Context: Ukraine Keywords & Collocates

As in the previous section, here I will expand and specify the already touched upon contexts of the Ukraine keywords and collocates.

- *Overall domain*: Politics
- *Overall societal action*: Legislation, funding, humanitarian aid, military aid
- *Current setting*: The UK House of Commons, throughout 2022
- *Current circumstances*: Debates on structures of legislation concerning Ukrainian DPs, reviews and questions of the range of humanitarian and military aid provided to DPs, reviews and comments on schemes being implemented, overviews of unrest in the Ukrainian region, overviews and critiques of the bureaucratic processes of accepting Ukrainian DPs
- *Current interaction*: Political debates
- *Current discourse genre*: Speech
- *Roles of the participants*: People who oppose or support the Government's approach to DP programs and the provision of aid.
- *Cognitions of the participants*: UK seen as an ally to Ukraine, actively standing alongside them against the aggression, supporting the defense of mutual values of freedom and democracy

The conflict in Ukraine that the UDC debate data focuses on started with Russia launching a military operation and attacking Ukraine on the 24th of February 2022, to which Ukraine has answered by defending its territories with a Western military assisted counteroffensive (Walker, N. 24th Feb 2023: Current conflict). The war has displaced more than 8 million people that have fled outside Ukraine, and further 17.6 million people are displaced internally (UNHCR 2023: Ukraine emergency). The UK Government has provided large amounts of financial and humanitarian aid (Loft & Brien 2023: Ukraine: UK aid and humanitarian situation 2022-23), as well as significant amounts of military aid

and has also cooperated with other countries in training Ukrainian military personnel since the war started (Mills 2023: Military assistance to Ukraine since the Russian invasion).

As touched on in the previous section, this structuring of UK being the provider of aid and resources and the Ukrainian DPs being the groups receiving it without access to discussions about themselves creates an ingroup-outgroup division. However, possibly due to the clearer emergence of a single aggressor, Putin, the military cooperation with Ukraine and the structuring of the schemes, there is less definite division and distancing from the Ukrainian DPs than there was from the Syrian DPs. The plural pronouns *we*, and *our*, are nevertheless present in the UDC keywords and collocations, and demonstrate the ideological ingrouping:

(2) Example concordances of "we" and "our" in the UDC

are prepared to stand up for the sovereignty of Ukraine.	**We**	are working with partners to reduce the economic dependency
As a Parliament, we must do much more to improve	**our**	own national food security, and also recognise that Ukraine'

What is interesting, however, are the concordances in the plural pronoun *their* of the UDC keywords and collocates. It is the same plural possessive pronoun that referenced almost exclusively the outgroup in the SDC, but in the UDC, *their* references mostly the ingroup:

(3) Example concordance of "their" in the UDC

also pay tribute to the British public, who have opened	**their**	homes and their hearts to those fleeing the conflict.

The discourse emerging emphasizes the generosity of the ingroup in accepting Ukrainian DPs to their "…homes and their hearts". There are concordances of *their* that reference the Ukrainian DPs as an outgroup, but emerge only in the 6th concordance line, and again further, down in the 20th concordance line, and so on. Most of the other concordances are ingroup references. This is further evidence of a less prominent division between the ingroup and outgroup in the UDC than there is in the SDC, as the us vs. them division is not correspondingly prominent in the Ukraine debate data.

5.3.3 Text & Topics: Syria and Ukraine Keywords & Collocates

The debate system in the UK parliament is set up for the members to exercise their political power publicly. Political debates are structured in sequences of speeches respectively by government and opposition, in a "largely argumentative and rhetorical" manner (Van Dijk 2008: 117). This exercise of power through rhetoric and argumentation is done by either making clear the members' or their party's stance on a current issue, law or policy, questioning the actions or stances of other members or parties on government policies and legislation, and finally by voting on to either accept or reject a law, proposition or opinion (UK Parliament 2023: Debating).

By looking at the strategies of representation that come through in the topoi, I can look for meaningful ideological and representational patterns more widely than looking at single speeches in parliamentary debates. The exercise of political power especially considering legislation and policies relies on the majority of parliament opinion. This reproduces larger ideologies, and thus the decisions and strategies that most effect the displaced populations can be effectively analyzed by looking at the broader rhetorical strategies of debates. The emergent discourses in the SDC for the outgroup are *Syrian DPs as passive victims*, and *Syrian DPs as monumental crisis*. For the ingroups, the emergent discourses are *the UK as significant humanitarian* and the *UK as provider for most vulnerable*. In the UDC, the outgroup emergent discourses are *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* and *Ukrainian DPs as democracy under attack*. For the ingroup, discourses of *the UK as military provider*, *the UK as proud ally*, *the UK as open community* and *the UK bureaucracy as stagnant* emerge from the data. I will use extracts from speeches as examples to highlight the topos in question or exemplify a textual level strategy.

5.3.3.1 The Nationality, Identity Application and Mass Topoi Comparison

As emphasized previously in this thesis, it is crucial to critically analyze the textual strategies of the most powerful when they are discussing displaced populations incapable of affecting their representations in these discussions, especially as these discussions will have a direct effect on the

resources available for the DPs. The topoi in this chapter appeared often in conjunction in the data and are therefore presented together.

The textual argumentation strategies that showcase the ideological reproductions at play were prominent in the discussions on the focus of humanitarian aid and the representations of the DPs. Both of those topics came through in the nationality, nation & region topos of the keywords and collocates in the Syria debates. In the SDC keywords, close to the top were unsurprisingly words such as *Syrians* and *Syria*, but there were also words such as *Lebanon*, *Jordan*, *Turkey* and *region*. When looking closer at the surrounding textual strategies where these words were prominent, it became clear that a large part of the political discussion revolved around humanitarian aid and resources to be provided outside the UK, to these seriously affected areas. This strategy of specifically focusing on the need of humanitarian aid in these contexts shows an ideology where the Syrian DPs are seen to be powerless and desperate, living in conditions that are very removed from the ingroups, waiting for aid to be delivered. This ideology of help removed from ingroups is illustrated by the previous secretary of state for the Home Department, Conservative Theresa May. She emphasized help in-region even in prefacing the introduction of VPRS, which aims to bring DPs into the UK:

> The greatest need is in the region and it is there that the United Kingdom can make the largest impact. The Prime Minister made it clear last week that our country has a proud tradition of providing protection to those in need, and where there are particularly difficult cases of vulnerable refugees who are at grave risk, we are ready to look at those cases. Following consultations with the London office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in recent days, I can tell the House that the Government will be launching a new programme to provide emergency sanctuary in the UK for displaced Syrians who are particularly vulnerable (May, T. 2014: column 864).

Together with the emphasis on in-region help, May refers to the UK's "proud tradition of providing protection to those in need", which is reproducing the ideology and representation of UK, the ingroup, being a long-standing protector of the displaced and vulnerable. The cognition of May shows that in her mind, the ingroup has a strong history as a provider for the needy, illustrating the discourse of *UK*

as provider for most vulnerable. It also positions the ingroup as a political power, with the introduction of the VPRS and with the introduction of aid prioritization by risk status, where the UNHCR has authority to decide who gets included and who does not. This strategy of presenting the ingroup as both morally righteous while limiting the intake of DPs through vulnerability requirements shows an emphasis on ingroup positives while pointing out outgroup shortcomings which illustrates the *UK as significant humanitarian* discourse. This does not paint the Syrian DPs as adversaries but it does create a power imbalance. While Syrian DPs are not represented as enemies, they are not represented as equals either. This emergent discourse will be referred to as *Syrian DPs as passive victims*.

In the Ukraine debates, the nationality/nation/region topos showed very different results. Instead of a strong focus on humanitarian aid in-region and emphasis on the vulnerability of DPs, the UDC showed a clear focus of UK military aid, illustrating the *UK as military provider* discourse, and representing Ukrainian DPs through their nationality (see sections 5.2.2, 5.2.2.1). Among the collocates of nationality indexing keywords, the majority referenced Ukrainian DPs with something else than refugees, or they referenced the Ukraine military. *Refugees* were among the top collocates for keyword *Ukrainian*, but it is notable that refugees are not in the UDC keyword list. This, together with the absence of Ukrainian DPs in the identity application keywords and the difference in naming the debates (see section 5.1.3), it is clear that Ukrainian DPs are represented as Ukrainian most prominently, instead of refugees, illustrating the *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* discourse. In the UDC debates, one of the examples of this representation is in this opening speech from the Conservative Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC), and Minister for Intergovernmental Relations:

> This Government and this House—indeed, everyone in the UK—continue to be in awe of the bravery of the people of Ukraine. They are victims of savage, indiscriminate, unprovoked aggression. Their courage under fire and determination to resist inspires our total admiration. -- The United Kingdom stands with the Ukrainian people (Cove, M., 13th Mar. 2022: column 620).

The strategy differs from the SDC nationality topos in that Ukrainians are not being presented primarily through their victimhood or number. They are named as victims in Cove's speech but are also awarded agency by emphasizing their "…courage under fire and determination to resist…". The UK is positioned as standing with Ukrainian people instead of mainly an aid provider to the vulnerable, presenting *the UK as proud ally* discourse. Michael Cove's position as both the Secretary of State and Minister for Intergovernmental Relations in the DLUHC grants him the political power to present governmental schemes, such as the Ukraine Sponsorship Scheme (or Homes for Ukraine scheme) discussed in this debate. This strategy of representing Ukrainian people as brave freedom fighters instead of humanitarian status references shows two emergent discourses: *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* and *Ukrainian DPs as a democracy under attack*.

Another notable aspect of the nationality topos is the strong inclusion of *Russian* and *Russians*. As noted in chapter 5.1.2, there is not a similarly prominent representation of the aggressors in the SDC keywords, possibly in part due to the clearer lines between aggressors and victims in the UDC (see section 5.1.4) and the stronger focus on the unrest in the UDC than the resulting victimization from it (see section 5.1.4). This aspect supports the discourse of *Ukrainian DPs as a democracy under attack* by emphasizing the clear aggressor even in DP discussions, as well as emergences of the *UK as military provider* and *proud ally* discourses.

As we have seen, aid provision and nationality topoi can be textual stages for ideology reproduction. Keeping this in mind, the topos of identity application follows. The displaced populations are perhaps most affected by this topos, as the applied identities by the dominant ingroup can affect how the DPs are being received in the host countries and what resources are provided for them. The identities applied color the expectations of the ingroup populations even before any outgroup members have an opportunity to interact with the ingroup.

In the Ukraine debates, the identity application theme marked a distinct shift in the representation of DPs. As evidenced by the keyword lists, the naming of the debates and the overview earlier in this chapter, Ukrainian DPs are not being represented primarily as refugees when compared to the SDC. This strategy is particularly noticeable and shows an ideological reproduction where the Ukrainians are seen as a nation of people deserving of admiration for their sacrifices, instead of through their legal humanitarian status, furthering the discourse of *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals*. In addition to the minimal reference to Ukrainian DPs as refugees, there is no prominent representation of them through their numeral mass as presented previously (see keyword and collocate codebooks under mass topos). This presents the Ukrainian DPs with more individualistic representation, as they are not represented through a discourse such as the *Syrian DPs as monumental crisis* that focuses on the extensiveness of the crisis through mass emphasis.

Contrarily, the use of *refugee* or *refugees* is the most prominent identity application term in the Syria debates. This creates a textual level strategy where the outgroup is being labeled as needing first and foremost humanitarian resources and protection, reproducing the *Syrian DPs as passive victims* ideological discourse. This strategy on its surface does not seem to be particularly divisive but becomes notable when that strategy is absent from the UDC and is replaced with the ideological discourses of *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* or *as democracy under attack*. In the SDC, *refugee* or *refugees* attract most often representational strategies that emphasize the conditions they are living in, and those conditions are then used as arguments either to highlight the scope of aid already provided, or to get more aid delivered.

This strategy positions the ingroups as authorities in deciding who gets the most urgent aid and protection, and the outgroups as people waiting on those decisions, furthering the reproduction of *Syrian DPs as passive victims* discourse. This being the most prominent strategy and ideological reproduction takes away the agency of Syrian DPs. The actions of the ingroup are

presented in a positive light, emphasizing the large amounts of aid already provided, which will be overviewed further in the aid/assistance topos.

There is no similar, prominent strategy of emphasizing vulnerability status in the UDC. This has an effect on the discourse had about the DPs, where their identity is not formed through their trauma but through their nationality and culture, which is exemplified by the comment of the Minister for Defence Procurement, Conservative Jeremy Quin:

> We must therefore continue to stand by our Ukrainian friends for the long term. They are fighting not just for their survival but for the values of freedom, democracy and justice that are the essence of our society. That is why they must succeed, and this House can rest assured that the United Kingdom will continue to do everything in its power to make sure that outcome is achieved (25th May 2022: column 352).

This ideological reproduction where the Ukrainians are seeing to be fighting for the western world's values of "…freedom, democracy and justice…" provides the Ukrainians with both agency and a closer proximity to the ingroup. This is evidently in part due to the structure of the unrest in Ukraine where a lot of the population has stayed to fight. However, with the nationality focus evidenced earlier, this representation stretches to include the fleeing populations as well and is used to urge the ingroup to continue standing beside them. The effect of this minimizing distance between the ingroup and outgroup creates more opportunities for the Ukrainian DPs to be seen as fellow citizens, instead of claimants of national resources. This strategy is entirely absent from the SDC, where the DPs are seen primarily through their significant need for humanitarian aid and are not positioned to be beside the UK. One of the reasons for this representational pattern could be that the ingroup feels ideologically closer to the Ukrainian DPs than the Syrian DPs, evidenced by the emphasis on their shared values, which suggest a Eurocentric view. This is further supported by the constant distancing of the outgroup in the SDC data by a focus on outside the UK, and by the victimhood emphasis of the Syrian DPs.

The identity application topos in the Syria debates differs from the UDC with other representation as well. As was pointed out previously, words such as *migrants* and *migration* are the only ones having a clear, negative connotation in their most frequent concordances in the SDC. As noted in chapter 5.1.3, most of these clear, negative speeches were given by members of the right-wing party DUP, and thus do not illuminate a larger strategy of dividing "economic migrants" from "genuine refugees". However, migrants showing as key in the SDC and not in the UDC shows a representational pattern where it is more frequent to apply the identity of *migrants* in contexts of Syrian DPs. This pattern reinforces the ideological discourse where the ingroup must focus their aid towards the most at-risk populations and uses the identity application terms to categorize the DPs accordingly. The negative speeches attached to the term *migrants* seem to show, that in the case of SDC data, the instances where DPs seem to have more agency in their decision to leave, for example to reach better economical situations, those are the cases where they cease to be categorized as "genuine refugees". Even with this discourse being in the minority, together with the constant pattern of emphasizing the vulnerability and victimization of the Syrian DPs in order to prioritize urgent aid for some DPs over others creates a distinctive ideology: The outgroup needs to have tangible evidence of their trauma and victimhood or to belong in a traditionally vulnerable group (women and children) in order to be recognized as DPs and qualify for urgent aid from the ingroups, especially resettlement opportunities. Therefore, this *UK as defender of most vulnerable* discourse illustrates how the UK Government ideology of aid is conditional. A corresponding ideology does not emerge from the UDC.

The topos of mass coincides with the identity application and nationality topoi quite frequently in the SDC. As noted in section 5.2.2, the collocates of *Syrian* and *Syrians* most often reference mass, showing a pattern of emphasis on the vast amounts of people in need. This emphasis can be seen in the speech of then Secretary of State for the Home Department, Conservative Theresa May:

> The whole House will join me in deploring the appalling scenes of violence and suffering that we have witnessed in Syria. More than 100,000 people have been killed, and the credible reports of systematic use of torture and starvation are simply sickening. Millions of innocent people have fled their homes. There are now more than 11 million Syrians in desperate need, including 6.5 million people displaced inside Syria and more than 2.3 million refugees in neighbouring countries, at least half of whom are children. The numbers are staggering and the scale of the crisis is immense. The Prime Minister has rightly called it the greatest refugee crisis of our time (29th Jan. 2014: column 863).

The representation of Syrian DPs through their vulnerability and numeral mass continues here, as May prefaces the introduction of the VPRS to the House of Commons, exemplifying the discourse of *Syrian DPs as monumental crisis*. A similar representational strategy is not prevalent in the UDC.

5.3.3.2 The Unrest/Victimization, Aid/Assistance, and Ingroup Reference Topoi Comparison

The textual level strategies of ideology reproduction show a similar representational pattern continuing in these three topoi. In addition to the strong emphasis of prioritizing aid based on victimization status in the SDC and a pattern of prioritizing military aid in the UDC, a strategy of strong emphasis on the ingroup positive actions emerges from these topoi's keywords and collocates in both corpora.

The positive ingroup representation is prominent in the UDC as well, but the unrest/victimization and aid/assistance topoi differ significantly from the SDC. In the UDC, a strategy of presenting and calling for more military assistance is one of the most prominent ones in the unrest/victimization topos, and those discussions are being had together with the discussions on Ukrainian DPs. The discourse of aid provision mostly focuses on the military aid being provided and promoting the visa schemes put in place for the DPs. The criticism towards the governmental processes is strong in the UDC, where the schemes are often criticized for their unnecessary bureaucracy and inadequacy. Instead of an aid system where the UK works together with international agencies to recognize at-risk populations, the aid is focused through these visa schemes for sanctuary in the UK and through military and humanitarian aid packages to Ukraine. The focus in the

unrest/victimization topos is not on the displaced populations as in the SDC, but on the aggressors and the unrest, which are being unilaterally and continuously condemned.

Contrastively, in the SDC the unrest/victimization topos has shown traces of discourse of focusing more on the results of the unrest than the continuing specifics of it (see sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4, 5.2.4), and this includes the strategy of categorizing DPs based on their vulnerability status. This focus might explain the small number of unrest indexing keywords and collocates. *Crisis* and *conflict* are the only keywords specifically addressing the unrest in Syria, and the collocates show the same words in reference to the unrest. The collocate *war* is in under the unrest topoi but refers to the second world war in the context of comparing the scale of the consequences of the Syria situation to be the "…worst global refugee crisis since the second world war" (Lucas, C. 2016: column 328WH). The clearest references to the unrest are therefore more general descriptors than in the unrest topoi of the UDC and show a pattern of representation that positions the ingroup, the UK government, in a less active role towards the unrest and primarily in a role of a humanitarian aid provider. This strategy is exemplified by the concluding remarks of one debate, made by then Conservative, Secretary of State for International Development:

> I think that, ultimately, we all recognise that Syria needs a political solution to end the fighting --. In the meantime, as we all have hopes for the Geneva II process but retain a heavy sense of the level of the challenges that remain, the British people can be proud of the role that Britain is playing in conveying humanitarian assistance to those who need it. As we have already heard today, not only is that the right thing to do, but ending the conflict and bringing stability to the region is in Britain's national interest. Britain is on the side of the people in Syria about whom we have talked today. We will do everything that we can to achieve a political solution, but during that process we will continue to be at the forefront of the humanitarian response (Greening, J. 2014: column 920).

As the then head of the Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office FCDO (then Department for International Development), Greening has standing to present a representative overview of the UK strategy towards the unrest in Syria: FCDO is a ministerial, government department that works to "unite development and diplomacy" and "demonstrates the UK acting as a force for good in the world" (FDCO 2023: Responsibilities). Notable here is also the way in which the ingroup is

positioned, the UK is "…on the side of the people in Syria", as opposed to standing with the people of Ukraine against the aggressors, as in the UDC data. As further demonstrated by the collocation comparison in section 5.2.3, the UK has taken a much more distant role in the unrest in Syria from the point of view of political or military intervention than they have in the UDC. The UK focuses on humanitarian aid contribution boasting instead, reproducing the ideology of *UK as significant humanitarian*.

An almost reversed emphasis happens in the UDC unrest/victimization topos. The clear focus is on the unrest and aggressors themselves, as noted in sections 5.1.4 and 5.2.2. The victimization of Ukrainian DPs is not the most prominent representation pattern, as was further evidenced by the identity application topos discrepancy in collocates (see section 5.3.3.1). This representational pattern of conflict and aggressor over the displaced is seen for example in the opening speech of the Secretary of State for Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Affairs:

> Putin's unprovoked, illegal war has now entered its third month. Russian forces failed in their initial war aims—they failed to take Kyiv and they have suffered heavy losses—but Ukraine now faces a renewed offensive in the east and south, and we are seeing appalling atrocities in Mariupol, Odesa and beyond. We must double down in our response (Truss, L., 26th Apr. 2022: column 660).

This opening statement is made in the same debate where for example the majority of petitions discussed are on the Ukrainian DPs, either to waive their visa requirements, offer fast-track asylum or to ask for specifics on humanitarian aid (UK Government 26th Apr. 2022: Relevant documents, column 660). Only one petition calls for the pledge of any necessary military support for Ukraine, but over 40 of the speeches and more than half of the allotted time was used in discussing military aid provision to Ukraine. This focus on the unrest is prominent in the rest of the UDC as well and shows a more active and aggressive ingroup and outgroup role in the conflict. This focus shows an ideological reproduction where the UK is an active political power as defender of western values together with the outgroup, as opposed to a primary humanitarian operator in support of peace

negotiations (see Cooper, Y., p. 78). There is not a strong emphasis on victimization of the Ukrainian DPs under this topos, as it mostly comes through in the collocates of nationality indexing keywords (see section 5.2.2).

The victimization side of the topos is in contrast one of the most prominent in the SDC, both in keywords and in collocates. However, the already overviewed strategy of prioritizing aid is not limited to the UK parliament discourse. In a speech that responds to the introduction of the VPRS, an opposition party member from Labour, says that the United Nations (UN) appealed to the international community to prioritize the most vulnerable and the government was originally against this approach:

> Compassion and common sense have prevailed over the Government's resistance last week. Britain is rightly providing help and assistance to the majority of refugees that have claimed sanctuary in the neighbouring countries—Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey—and is rightly leading international efforts, but the Opposition and many others have argued for some time that a minority of refugees are too vulnerable to cope or survive in the camps: the abandoned children, torture victims, women who have been abused and those who need medical help. We have all heard the heart-rending stories of children burnt by chemicals, families torn apart, fathers executed and mothers raped, so when the UN asked us and other countries across the world to provide sanctuary to the most vulnerable refugees and 18 other countries stepped forward to help it was simply wrong of Britain to refuse. It is a tribute to the support of Members from all parties in this House, to the charities that have campaigned on the subject and to the UN that the Home Secretary has bowed to the pressure before the Opposition day debate this afternoon. It is a reversal of her position last week, but she is right to have listened and I am glad that she has done so (Cooper, Y. Jan. 29th 2014: column 865).

It is thus clear that the previous UK government strategy was to not prioritize people for resettlement based on their risk status, but to trust that humanitarian aid in-region and the normal asylum processes would be sufficient to aid displaced populations in Syria. The ideology that most urgent aid in the form of resettlement opportunities should be focused to the most vulnerable that cannot journey to seek asylum is thus not shared only by the UK government after previous resistance, but by the international community lead by the United Nations. The political power the parliament majority and the international community has leveraged has therefore had a large role in the creation of the bespoke

DP scheme for displaced Syrians, and directly affected the discourse of *Syrian DPs as passive victims*. This is further evidence of the comprehensiveness of Eurocentrism, which is visible in both governmental data and in international aid agency statements.

The aid/assistance topos in the UDC is vastly different to the SDC topos as well. Both of the corpora have significant positive self-representation of the ingroup in this topos, but otherwise they are in stark contrast. In the UDC the most prominent strategy of aid provision is to focus on the sponsoring of Ukrainian DPs through the sponsorship scheme (overview in section 5.1.5). The structuring of the schemes directs the discourse on the aid and assistance towards the host communities, and a majority of the ingroup boasting narratives include commendations of the hospitability of the British people, illustrating the *UK as open community* discourse:

> I, too, start by thanking people across the UK who have come forward with incredibly generous offers of accommodation and support for Ukrainians. Of course, we will do what we can to support the initiative. We regret, however, that this is only phase one; things are still not going fast enough. We will continue to argue that the best response available to the Government is to stop asking Ukrainians to apply for visas altogether. On that point, why will people accepted on to the scheme have to apply for a visa as well? Of course, some of them may be able to apply online, but an online process is not necessarily fast (McDonald, S. C., 14th Mar. 2022: column 624).

As has been hinted at in the British bureaucracy keywords, strong criticism towards the government processes emerges from the UDC, producing the *UK bureaucracy as stagnant* discourse.

Moreover, the SDC aid/assistance topos has no keywords nor collocates referencing military aid, while the UDC has several in both, such as the keywords *tank*, *missiles,* and *weapons*, and collocates such as *aircraft*, *lethal* and *starstreak*. This shows an ideology reproduction of the ingroup being an active military force in addition to a humanitarian aid provider with the *UK as military provider* discourse, which has a goal of presenting a united western political front against Russian aggression, evidenced further by the discourses of *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* and *Ukrainian DPs as democracy under attack*.

Positive self-representation of the ingroup has been a commonly running ideology in the SDC data similarly in almost all of the topoi already mentioned but it is perhaps most prevalent in the aid/assistance topos. The role of the *UK as an aid provider* is brought forth in most of the speeches held in the debates, and the ingroup reference topos follows parallel to those positive self-representations. Following Van Dijk's characterization of parliamentary debate speeches on minorities, he describes how they "may begin with long sections of positive self-presentation in the form of nationalist glorification of 'long tradition of tolerance' or 'hospitality for the oppressed'" (2008: 117). Contrary to the rest of the characterization, this data does not support a dominant discourse of opposing displaced populations or accepting them into the UK. Apart from the few negative speeches attached to *migrants* and *migration*, a vast majority of the SDC data discourse posits the UK as one of the largest contributors of humanitarian aid, as exemplified by the comment of then Minister for Security and Immigration, Conservative James Brokenshire:

> The UK has committed £700 million in response to the humanitarian crisis. This significant contribution makes us the second largest bilateral donor after the United States. The UK's support is helping hundreds of thousands of refugees across the region to access vital food, water, medical care and essential supplies that are so desperately needed. UK aid has provided water for up to 1.5 million people per month and supported over 600,000 medical consultations. Last year, we funded 5.2 million monthly food rations (10th Dec. 2014: column 878).

And contrary to the populist strategies that sometimes follow this boasting, such as appealing to the "will of the people" to enter disclaimers of immigration restrictions (Van Dijk 2008: 117), similar strategies do not emerge as major discourses on the DPs. On the contrary, boasting is most often used to put pressure on the government to provide more aid or make government contributions more effective. This is sometimes accompanied by references to the British values, to emphasize that more needs to be done:

> The British Government have, rightly, committed £700 million to help those affected by the Syrian conflict, and the UK's largest ever humanitarian crisis response reflects the values of the British people. I applaud the Government's efforts, but the scale of the response is also a reflection of the horrific nature of this war. Ten million people

need help and thousands are displaced every day. This is a war seemingly without end and with no limits to its inhumanity. -- This is the worst refugee crisis since the second world war. It took weeks of pressure from the House before the Home Secretary set up the vulnerable persons relocation scheme in January. Even then, she still refused to be part of the United Nations programme. She did say that she would help several hundred people, but a year later only 90 of those vulnerable refugees have been helped. That is not good enough (Cooper, Y., 10th Dec. 2014: column 879).

This speech from opposition MP for Labour, Yvette Cooper, is a direct response to the Immigration Minister's speech quoted above it. The strategy uses the positive self-representation of the ingroup as a reminder of the standards they should strive to uphold, and how they are currently falling short. Here there is indeed a disclaimer strategy, where boasting precedes negative commentary, but the recipient of the criticism is not the minority groups being discussed. One of the possible reasons for the almost complete absence of calls to restrict the amount of refugees can be seen in another part of Cooper's speech, where she criticizes the Government's decision to include refugees in the net migration figures and calls for them to be removed:

> "… will they take refugees out of the net migration target immediately? The Government are under pressure over immigration, where stronger controls are needed, but asylum is different from immigration. They must not allow the debate about immigration to cloud their conscience over helping refugees" (10th Dec. 2014: column 879).

This strategy of separating refugees from immigrants and migration, combined with the emphasis on helping the most vulnerable because it represents the UK's values offers the political elites a kind of plausible deniability. By emphasizing the large contributions of aid and repeatedly reminding the audiences of the plight of displaced people and how the UK has a responsibility and moral obligation to help, there is little room left to criticize them for their discourse strategies on DPs superficially. However, the previously mentioned prerequisite of particular vulnerability together with *migrants* and *migration* being the only terms to attract negative connotations creates an ideological hierarchy of the outgroups, especially as those terms are absent as high-ranking keywords in the UDC. The UK positions themselves as an authority together with the international aid agencies to decide who comes

first, and the people who are not deemed to be in enough need are the ones attracting the calls for "stronger controls". This creates a parliamentary discourse where the ingroup can decide the best course of action without hearing the groups affected or having to hear criticism of their attitude towards minorities.

5.3.3.3 British Bureaucracy topos Comparison

The bureaucracy topos had some of the most interesting findings in this data. As noted in section 5.1.5, a majority of the bureaucracy indexing keywords could be attributed to the discussions on government schemes and processes, of which the most prominent ones are structured differently between the SDC and the UDC. In the SDC, the bureaucracy theme mostly included terms that referenced the Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme VPRS, the asylum process and providing safe and legal routes to the UK. This is unsurprising, considering the findings on aid focus and government contributions already overviewed in this thesis.

What is surprising, however, is the severe and continuous criticism over the inadequacy and lack of speed of Government programs in the Ukraine debates, illustrated by the *UK bureaucracy as stagnant* discourse. This was evident in the numerous demands to waive visa requirements for Ukrainian DPs or to provide additional emergency application routes, as well as in critiques of the introduced visa schemes, exemplified by two opposition speeches:

> The Government have made shamefully slow progress in providing sanctuary for Ukrainian refugees. The reality is that an already stretched Home Office needs to go further, but going further means removing the impediments, bureaucracy and delay in what is happening. Our members of staff are not just spending hours on the phone to the Home Office trying to get answers; we can now see them queuing around Portcullis House on the parliamentary estate. Each member of staff waiting there represents one, two or three Ukrainian families—perhaps more—and it is a visible reminder of the failure of the Home Office to get to grips with this situation. It should not take Members of Parliament to raise issues for a system to work properly, and I encourage the Government to look again at this, because our values are at stake here (Pollard, L., 26th Apr. 2022: column 703)

> We are seeing the biggest movement of refugees across Europe since the second world war, and the Home Secretary's response is to erect a massive wall of

> bureaucracy and red tape. That bureaucracy is causing totally avoidable misery for the Ukrainians fleeing war, and anger and frustration for generous hosts right across the UK. We on the SNP Benches have said it before and I will say it again: let us just scrap these visa requirements now (McDonald S. C., 28th Apr. 2022: column 875).

These strong textual strategies position the UK government as acting against their values and directly causing avoidable obstacles for the DPs as well as anger in the British ingroup communities. By using these strategies, the opposition leverages the often-appearing national glorification statements against the sitting Government. It is notable that these statements come only two months after the 2022 Ukraine unrest started, and less than two months after the introduction of the Ukraine sponsorship scheme and the simultaneous extension of visa applications to be fully online (cf. Gove, M., 14th Mar. 2022: column 620). Taking into consideration the time it took to expand only the VPRS from its January 2014 introduction and "…216 cases resettled as of June 2015…" to the 20 000 Syrians to be resettled in the next years (UK Home Office July 2017, General background), the amount of critique the Government faced for tardiness during the first two months of the 2022 Ukraine conflict seems notable. Specifically, as the SDC does not show a similar, prominent discourse of pressure towards the timetables of any of their Government schemes.

These calls to waive visa requirements, criticism towards the sponsorship program nor towards the immigration system have corresponding, strong discourses in the SDC, after the Government introduced the VPRS after pressure from organizations and the opposition. There is no ongoing questioning of the UNHCR criteria's validity or to waive restrictions on refugee applications, the only calls even remotely close to this discourse after the start of 2014 are the questions of why the UK has not joined the UNHCR's own resettlement program (cf. Clwyd, A., 29th Jan. 2014: column 869), but those questions are often answered with a reminder that the UK has the support, co-operation and blessing of the UNHCR for their own scheme (May, T., 29th Jan. 2014: column 873). There is no widespread condemning of government programs or the immigration system for lack of speed in the SDC. This discrepancy seems to indeed suggest an ideology where there are, or have been, different

ideological models for government urgency between different displaced populations, and the evidence of Eurocentrism might explain why.

5.3.4 Lexicon Comparison: Syria and Ukraine Keywords & Collocates

The terms chosen to represent the displaced population are an important indication of the representation they receive from the more powerful. In the SDC, most of the terms appearing as key highlight the negative results of the Syrian conflict on the DPs. Most of the identity application and unrest/victimization topoi keywords represent the DPs through their vulnerability (see sections 5.1.3, 5.1.4), and the collocates show a similar emphasis, naming specific types of victimization (see collocate codebook, unrest/victimization topos). As overviewed previously in this thesis, one of the major reasons for this representation strategy might be the structuring of the bespoke Vulnerable Persons Relocation scheme (VPRS). It is clear, however, that the terms chosen to represent the Syrian DPs are not largely positive. This does not mean that the choosing of these terms is done as a strategy to derogate the outgroup, the strategy of representing the DPs as extremely vulnerable is used to garner support for helping them. This does, however, represent the DPs through a lens of simplification. As illustrated previously (see sections 5.1.3, 5.3.3.1), the Syrian DPs are not provided with much agency. The ideological reproduction of representing vulnerable populations primarily through the atrocities done to them limits them to their trauma. A similar representational pattern is not present in the Ukraine debates. Considering that the DPs get the most focus in the Syria debates unlike in the Ukraine debates where a lot of the lexicon focuses on the war, aggressors, and military support, it is notable that their representation results in such a homogenous image of suffering.

In the UDC, the lexicon representing the DPs shows a more positive representational pattern. The Ukrainian DPs are represented mainly through their nationality, and their humanitarian status is given less focus. They are represented as being undeserving victims of aggression and in need of humanitarian support and sanctuary regularly but are also afforded more agency through

descriptions such as *our Ukrainian friends* and through a focus on the Ukrainian people and military fighting against Russian aggression. The Ukrainian DPs, due to their nationality being the most prominent identity marker in the data, are included in comments on Ukrainians defending the "…values that we in Britain hold dear: democracy, liberty and self-determination" (Kinnock, S., 28th Apr. 2022: column 874). Even in the government program names and Ukraine debate titles, as seen in sections 5.1.5 and 5.1.3, the emphasis is on their nationality or education status as opposed to their legal humanitarian status. This creates a representational pattern in the UDC that affords the Ukrainian DPs a more diverse identity and more agency than the Syrian DPs have in the SDC.

5.4 Discussion

These findings showed how the representational patterns of displaced people in political debates differ drastically between nationalities, and how the powerful (re)create different ideological discourses of the displaced and themselves, depending on the political situation.

The Syrian DPs were represented primarily through their refugee status even with nationality premodifiers, and their vulnerability and victimhood were continuously emphasized, resulting in an ideological discourse of *Syrian DPs as passive victims*. They were represented throughout the data with an emphasis on their large, numeral mass, to emphasize the scope of the crisis, producing an ideological discourse of *Syrian DPs as monumental crisis*. The governmental processes to aid Syrian DPs had a focus of in-region humanitarian assistance over UK resettlement, and the introduction, structure and naming of the bespoke British resettlement scheme prioritizing at-risk Syrians intensified the already widely spread discourse of representing Syrian DPs through their trauma and victimhood. The Syrian DPs were not represented as having agency in the data, which was reinforced by the positioning of UNHCR as an authority to define which Syrians were most at-risk and therefore chosen for UK resettlement. The data did not show consistent critique and pressure to change government systems, but a pattern of ideological differentiation between (im)migration and refugees emerged, which aimed to distance the DP discussions from recent calls for immigration

restrictions. The most prominent representational patterns of Syrian DPs in the UK parliament created a one-dimensional, homogenous image of large-scale victimization and misery. The UK positioned themselves continuously as having a moral obligation to provide humanitarian aid to the Syrian DPs but did not present themselves as having an active political role in the conflict in Syria itself, creating discourses of *UK as significant humanitarian* and *UK as provider for most vulnerable*.

The most prominent representations of Ukrainian DPs were much more diverse and positive. The most notable difference was that the Ukrainian DPs were not applied the identity of refugee in the debate data. Even with twice the amount of tokens compared to the Syria debate corpus, there was no representational pattern primarily through refugee status. Rather, the Ukrainian DPs were most often represented through their nationality, illustrated by the *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals* discourse. This focus on nationality included representations of Ukrainian armed forces and were often referred as being a nation fighting to defend western democracy and freedom. Often accompanying this was an ideological discourse of Ukrainians standing together with the British against the Russian aggression, presenting as the *UK as proud ally* and *Ukrainian DPs as a democracy under attack* discourses. This suggests a Eurocentric ideology, where a European country and population is represented more positively, even when the discussions are about displaced people in need of protection. The UK government scheme structures provided the DPs with more agency, as they could apply for visas through different application routes rather than having to wait to be chosen, furthering the discourse of *Ukrainian DPs as nation of equals*. Even so, from the very beginning of the Ukraine war these schemes and the UK system as a whole showed an emergence of a strong and continuous discourse of criticism from the parliament opposition, which condemned the schemes and processes as needlessly bureaucratic and unacceptably slow, illustrated by the *UK bureaucracy as stagnant* discourse. There was no corresponding discourse of intense scrutiny on UK systems or calls for immediate action visible in the Syria debates, despite the longer timespan between debates (2012-2015 in SDC, inside 2022 in SDC). The UK positioned themselves as standing beside Ukraine against

Vladimir Putin's aggression and presented themselves as an active military resource provider in the conflict itself, with strong discourse of condemnations of the invasion, presented in the *UK as military provider* and *UK as proud ally* discourses.

The findings in this thesis are relevant in the critical study of political language use, as not all discriminatory policy and representation is immediately apparent or admitted, especially in parliamentary language. As Van Dijk characterizes, "…there is no property more characteristic of elite racism than its denial" (2008: viii). The findings of this thesis provide a current look into the differences of discourses on displaced people and provide an opportunity to focus on how Eurocentrism can emerge in the representations of the displaced. The linguistic study of discriminatory elite discourses on minorities is prominent, but this thesis provides concrete evidence of different ideologies, instead of the hypothetical "what would they say if this happened closer to home?".

The findings from this thesis can be applied in addition to critical representational discourse analysis as primary indicators, to the study of policy creation through the ideological reproductions of the ingroup. The findings of this thesis are very limited due to the scope of a MA thesis but show that significant differences in discursive representations of people can be found even within a smaller timespan than for example in a discourse-historical approach.

6. CONCLUSION

The purpose of this study was to analyze and compare the representations of Syrian and Ukrainian displaced populations in the British House of Commons debates, to see if any lexical differences or similarities emerged from the keywords and collocates of the two corpora.

The analysis found that there were indeed recurrent topoi as well as patterns of representation of the displaced populations in both corpora, but the most prominent representational patterns differed significantly between the Syrian and Ukrainian DPs. The topoi analysis revealed 11

topoi in the keywords and 13 topoi in the collocates, of which the topoi of identity application, nationality, mass, unrest/victimization, and British bureaucracy proved to be the most productive in showing meaningful representational patterns of DPs. The keywords and collocates of both corpora were analyzed and compared, and the analysis was concluded with a critical analysis of the ideological discourses and reproductions emerging from the corpus data.

The findings showed that the British parliament represented Syrian DPs primarily through their humanitarian status as refugees, in addition to representational patterns of numeral mass focus and strong emphasis on vulnerability and victimhood, whereas the British parliament representations of Ukrainian DPs showed a strong, primary focus on their nationality as Ukrainians. The Ukrainian DPs were not represented through the identity of refugees, nor were they represented through an emphasis on vulnerability or mass. The Ukrainian DPs were represented with agency in their UK resettlement processes, whereas the Syrian DPs that were represented as candidates for resettlement needed the UNHCR to choose them based on their risk status, and this resulted in part in a strong discursive emphasis on the vulnerability of Syrian DPs. In addition to this, the findings showed that the UK positioned themselves as more politically passive in the Syria debates than they did in the Ukraine debates, where they emphasized their role as standing beside Ukraine in their fight for freedom by providing military aid and resources.

These discourses evident in the Syria debates promote preconceptions of homogenous refugee populations suffering in the Global South, dependent on the aid of the more powerful, developed nations. These Eurocentric representations, in their effort to emphasize genuine need, often result in generalizing and dehumanizing nations and cultures, reducing them to their trauma and dependency on the west. Without additional emphasis on their individuality, ability, intrinsic value, or culture, these displaced populations may not be seen as equals, but through "terms of cultural differences, deviance or competition", therefore reproducing largely negative representations despite the general norms of tolerance and acceptance of these societies (Van Dijk 2008: 153). This strategy

reinforces Britain's position as a dominant political power. With the addition of positive self-representation and positioning of themselves as intrinsically interested in humanitarian aid, this discourse becomes a part of a political strategy to preserve power relations and hegemony (Lauren 1988, cited in Van Dijk 2008: 132).

The more positive representation of the displaced populations of Ukraine further evidence this Eurocentric view, where the DPs are not seen primarily as the Other, but as friends, partners and allies. This is an opposite strategy to the othering visible in the SDC and promotes a more equal view of Ukrainian DPs. Together with Britain's more active political stance, this representation reproduces Eurocentric unity, as the discourses position Britain and Ukraine as equal defenders of shared values. This reinforces Britain's position as a political power in another way, through prominent discourse of being a military aid provider, and therefore positioning the country's political interest in line with the defense of Ukraine.

My aim for this thesis was to contribute to the critical analysis of political language, especially in situations where the people being discussed cannot contribute to the discourses created about them. I wanted to present a clear image of the effects that the country of origin might have on political discourse of displaced people, as well as to show how the types of resources being provided by the ingroup country contribute to the discourses had about the receivers of those resources. The effect of these different discourses base largely on the reproduction of the us vs. them ideology, prevalent in both European identity and displacement discussions, which "unifies the members of the European Union or the residents of Europe and excludes the 'Others', those outside of Europe's boundaries" (Wodak & Boukala 2015: 89). This division promotes the othering of some nationalities and therefore creates discourses that prevent equal treatment of displaced populations.

However, this study has many limitations. Due to the scope of an MA thesis, the amount of data can only be regarded as representative of the time periods in which the debates were had, and only in the UK. Any further studies of larger political discourses spanning more countries and longer

time periods would perhaps gain a more comprehensive image through the discourse-historical approach, and need a longer time allotted to data collection and classification. Another notable aspect is the fluidity of representations through time, any stable representations of either DP groups cannot be made based on these findings, as we do not know if and how their representations in their host countries will change over time.

The specificity of British parliament language conventions are another aspect to consider. Cross-cultural and cross-linguistic research into political representations in parliamentary debates would provide interesting and more comprehensive results of larger trends in minority representations but would most likely require a linguistically diverse research team with enough resources and time to produce applicable results.

Another aspect to consider is that the discourse analysis of keywords and collocates, especially in small, specialized and researcher-compiled corpora has a danger of showing relevance and high frequency where there in actuality might be none. The possible reference corpora need to be chosen with the specific aims of the study in mind. Additionally, with the corpus analysis method of looking at the highest ranked keywords and collocates applied in this thesis, the ranking criterion of keywords and collocates becomes highly important. Gabrielatos and Marchi (2012) have raised issues in the use of Log-likelihood as a keyness calculation metric when analyzing keywords by ranking, so the analysis metrics need further testing with the specific future corpora that might be used. Those tests were unfortunately outside the scope and timetable of this thesis.

However, there are many avenues for potential future research on this topic with a similar combined methodology. A diachronic study of the possible changes in different displaced populations' representation in parliament discourse would be useful, to see if the Eurocentrism visible in this thesis would continue in, for example, Ukrainian DPs' representations, or would the representations start to follow other DP representations more closely.

Another possible avenue of research could be to look further into the usage of different DP descriptors through the lens of semantic prosody and see what kinds of discourses and representations different descriptors attract in parliamentary language, possibly with a corpus comparison with press discourses of the same descriptors to see what, if any parallel trends can be observed.

References

Alexander, M. & Struan, A. (2022) "In barbarous times and in uncivilized countries": two centuries of the evolving uncivil in the Hansard Corpus. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 27*(4), 480-505. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.22016.ale

Anthony, L. (2022). AntConc (Version 4.0.11) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/

Arthur, P. & Cowell-Meyers, K. (22nd February 2023). *Democratic Unionist Party - political party, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom*. https://www.britannica.com/topic/Democratic-Unionist-Party Accessed on 20th March 2023.

Baker, P., Hardie, A., & McEnery, T. (2006). *A glossary of corpus linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9780748626908

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 & Society, 19*(3), 273–306. DOI: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0957926508088962

Baker, P. (2010). *Sociolinguistics and Corpus Linguistics*. Edinburgh University Press. http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=e000xww&AN=324962&site=ehost-live&scope=site&ebv=EB&ppid=pp_123

Baker, P. (2012). Acceptable bias? Using corpus linguistics methods with critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies, 9*(3), 247-256. DOI:10.1080/17405904.2012.688297 http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=hlh&AN=77384575&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Baker, P. (2016). The Shapes of Collocation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 21*(2), 139–164. https://doi-org.libproxy.tuni.fi/10.1075/ijcl.21.2.01bak

Biber, D., Connor, U., & Upton, T. A. (2007). Discourse on the Move: Using Corpus Analysis to Describe Discourse Structure. John Benjamins Publishing Co. http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=e000xww&AN=229741&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Breeze, R. (2019). Emotion in politics: Affective-discursive practices in UKIP and Labour. *Discourse & Society, 30*(1), 24-43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926518801074

Cap, P. & Okulska, U. (2013). *Analyzing Genres in Political Communication: Theory and Practice.* John Benjamins Publishing Company. DOI: http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=e000xww&AN=605122&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Charteris-Black, J. (2012). Comparative Keyword Analysis and Leadership Communication: Tony Blair – A Study of Rhetorical Style. In Helms, L. (Ed.). (2012). *Comparative political leadership*. Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://andor.tuni.fi/permalink/358FIN_TAMPO/176jdvt/cdi_proquest_ebookcentralchapters_9901 12_16_159

Charteris-Black, J. (2018). *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor.* Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. DOI: http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=6234815

Cheng, J. (2015). Islamophobia, Muslimophobia or racism? Parliamentary discourses on Islam and Muslims in debates on the minaret ban in Switzerland. *Discourse & Society, 26*(5), 562-586. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926515581157

Church, K. W. & Hanks, P. (1990). Word Association Norms, Mutual Information, and Lexicography. *Computational Linguistics, 16*(1), 22-29. https://aclanthology.org/J90-1003.pdf

Deng, Y., & Liu, D. (2022). A Multi-Dimensional Comparison of the Effectiveness and Efficiency of Association Measures in Collocation Extraction. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics,*

27(2), 191–219. http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=mlf&AN=202227099709&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Dunning, T. (1993). Accurate methods for the statistics of surprise and coincidence. *Computational Linguistics 19*(1): 61–74. https://aclanthology.org/J93-1003.pdf

Edwards, G. O. (2012). A comparative discourse analysis of the construction of 'in-groups' in the 2005 and 2010 manifestos of the British National Party. *Discourse & Society, 23*(3), 245-258. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926511433477

Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2007). Constructions of racism in the Australian parliamentary debates on asylum seekers. *Discourse & Society, 18*(4), 411-436. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926507077427

Filipescu, C. (2022). Synthetic personalization and the legitimization of the Crimean annexation: A discourse analysis of Vladimir Putin's March 2014 presidential address. *Discourse & Society, 33*(4), 441-455. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265221088135

Gablasova, D., Brezina, V., & McEnery, T. (2017). Collocations in Corpus-Based Language Learning Research: Identifying, Comparing, and Interpreting the Evidence. *Language Learning: A Journal of Research in Language Studies*, *67*(1 [Supplement]), 155–179. https://doi-org.libproxy.tuni.fi/10.1111/lang.12225

Halliday, M. A. K., Webster, J. J., & Webster, J. J. (Eds.). (2009). *Bloomsbury Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=601605

Hart, C., & Winter, B. (2022). Gesture and legitimation in the anti-immigration discourse of Nigel Farage. *Discourse & Society, 33*(1), 34-55. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265211048560

Hewitt, R. (23rd October 2019). DUP wants religious protections over same sex marriage written into law. *Belfast Telegraph.* https://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/northern-ireland/dup-wants-

religious-protections-over-same-sex-marriage-written-into-law/38621812.html Accessed on 20th March 2023.

Hiltunen, T., Räikkönen, J., Tyrkkö, T. (2020). Investigating colloquialization in the British parliamentary record in the late 19th and early 20th century. *Language Sciences, 79,* 101-270. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2020.101270

Islentyeva, A. (2020). *Corpus-Based Analysis of Ideological Bias: Migration in the British Press.* Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9780429263064 https://andor.tuni.fi/permalink/358FIN_TAMPO/1j3mh4m/alma9911346316605973

Kruger, H., van Rooy, B. & Smith, A. (2019). Register Change in the British and Australian Hansard (1901-2015). *Journal of English Linguistics, 47*(3), 183-220. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0075424219857114

Li, T. & Zhu, Y. (2020). How does China appraise self and others? A corpus-based analysis of Chinese political discourse. *Discourse & Society, 31*(2), 153-171. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519880036

Loft, P. & Brien, P. (2023, February 9th). *Ukraine: UK aid and humanitarian situation 2022-23.* Research briefing. UK Parliament. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9467/ Accessed May 2, 2023.

Louw, B. (1993) Irony in the Text or Insincerity in the Writer? The Diagnostic Potential of Semantic Prosodies. In Baker, M., Francis, G. & Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds) *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. Philadelphia/Amsterdam: John Benjamins. pp. 157–76.

Malone, B. (2015, August 20th). Why Al Jazeera will not say Mediterranean 'migrants'. *Al Jazeera*. https://www.aljazeera.com/features/2015/8/20/why-al-jazeera-will-not-say-mediterranean-migrants Accessed on May 2nd 2023.

Marchi, A. and Taylor, C. (2009). If on a Winter's Night Two Researchers... A Challenge to Assumptions of Soundness of Interpretation. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines, 3*(1), 1-20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.5209/CLAC.53494

McCormack, J. (16th February 2021). Northern Ireland abortion law changes proposed by the DUP. *BBC News*. https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-northern-ireland-politics-56041850 Accessed on 20th March 2023.

Martin, J.R. (2009). Discourse Studies. In Halliday, M. A. K., Webster, J. J., & Webster, J. J. (Eds.) *Bloomsbury Companion to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. (pp. 154-165). Bloomsbury Publishing Ltd.

http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=e000xww&AN=344130&site=ehost-live&scope=site&ebv=EB&ppid=pp_iii

Migration Observatory. (2022, August 19th). *Asylum and refugee resettlement in the UK*. https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/migration-to-the-uk-asylum/ Accessed on 28th February 2023.

Mills, C. (2023, March 30th). *Military assistance to Ukraine since the Russian invasion*. Research briefing. UK Parliament. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9477/ Accessed May 2, 2023.

Muntigl, P., & Gruber, H. (2005). Approaches to Genre. *Folia Linguistica: Acta Societatis Linguisticae Europaeae, 39*(1-2), 1-212. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1515/flin.2005.39.1-2.1

Parnell, T. (2022). Unravelling the Global Britain vision? International relationships and national identity in UK Government documents about Brexit, 2016–2019. *Discourse & Society, 33*(3), 391-410. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/09579265221076588

Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and Meanings: Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://web-p-ebscohost-

com.libproxy.tuni.fi/ehost/detail/detail?vid=0&sid=a123e690-6978-4835-9aa2-
4eb1df4f9f34%40redis&bdata=JkF1dGhUeXBlPWNvb2tpZSxpcCx1aWQmc2l0ZT1laG9zdC1saX
ZlJnNjb3BlPXNpdGU%3d#AN=253520&db=e000xww

Perren, L., & Sapsed, J. (2013). Innovation as politics: The rise and reshaping of innovation in UK parliamentary discourse 1960–2005. *Research Policy, 42*(10), 1815-1828. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2013.08.012

Reid, K. (2023, March 16th). Syrian refugee crisis: Facts, FAQs, and how to help. *World Vision*. https://www.worldvision.org/refugees-news-stories/syrian-refugee-crisis-facts

Reyes, A. (2011). Strategies of legitimization in political discourse: From words to actions. *Discourse & Society, 22*(6), 781-807. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926511419927

Riihimäki, J. (2019). At the heart and in the margins: Discursive construction of British national identity in relation to the EU in British parliamentary debates from 1973 to 2015. *Discourse & Society, 30*(4), 412-431. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926519837394

Salama, A.H.Y. (2011). Ideological collocation and the recontextualization of Wahhabi-Saudi Islam post-9/11: A synergy of corpus linguistics and critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society, 22*(3), 315-342. DOI: http://www.jstor.org/stable/42889747

Shaw, S. (2000). Language, Gender and Floor Apportionment in Political Debates. *Discourse & Society, 11*(3), 401-418. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926500011003006

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

http://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&AuthType=cookie,ip,uid&db=mlf&AN=2014303441&site=ehost-live&scope=site

Truan, N. (2019). *Parliamentary Debates on Europe at the House of Commons (1998-2015)* [Corpus]. ORTOLANG (Open Resources and TOols for LANGuage) - www.ortolang.fr, v1, https://hdl.handle.net/11403/uk-parl/v1

UK Government. (2013, October 21st). *UK support for Palestinians made refugees twice over by Syria crisis.* https://www.gov.uk/government/news/uk-support-for-palestinians-made-refugees-twice-over-by-syria Accessed March 1st, 2023

UK Government. (2021). *Vulnerable Persons and Vulnerable Children's Resettlement Schemes Factsheet, March 2021.* https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-resettlement-schemes-factsheet-march-2021/vulnerable-persons-and-vulnerable-childrens-resettlement-schemes-factsheet-march-2021 Accessed 24th February 2023.

UK Government Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office. (February 2023). *SYRIA CRISIS RESPONSE SUMMARY February 2023* [Fact sheet]. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1134337/UK_Syria_Crisis_Response_Summary__Feb_2023.pdf Accessed on 2nd April 2023.

UK Government. (2023). *Our mission.* https://www.gov.uk/world/syria/news Accessed on May 2nd 2023.

UK Home Office. (2017, July). *Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS), Guidance for local authorities and partners.* UK Government. https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/631369/170711_Syrian_Resettlement_Updated_Fact_Sheet_final.pdf Accessed on May 2, 2023.

UK Parliament (2022a, November 6th.). *Debates.* https://www.parliament.uk/about/how/business/debates/

UK Parliament (2022b, November 6th.) *The two-House System.* https://www.parliament.uk/about/how/role/system/

UK Parliament (2022c, November 6th). *Hansard: Find debates*. https://hansard.parliament.uk/search/Debates?house=commons

UK Parliament. (2023). *Debating*. https://www.parliament.uk/debating/ Accessed on April 3rd, 2023.

UK Parliament, House of Commons. (2021). *Rules of behaviour and courtesies in the House of Commons*. https://www.parliament.uk/globalassets/documents/rules-of-behaviour.pdf Accessed on May 2nd, 2023.

UNHCR. (2022). *Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees*. https://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10.html Accessed 26th March 2023.

UNHCR. (2023). *Ukraine emergency*. https://www.unhcr.org/emergencies/ukraine-emergency Accessed May 2, 2023.

UNHCR UK. (2021, March 23rd). *The UK's Syria Resettlement Progamme: Looking Back, and Ahead*. https://www.unhcr.org/uk/news/latest/2021/3/6059f1fd4/the-uks-syria-resettlement-progamme-looking-back-and-ahead.html Accessed March 1st, 2023.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2022, November 7th). *Refugees and Migrants: Definitions*. https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/definitions

Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. SAGE Publications Ltd. DOI: https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=1024022

Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Ideology and discourse analysis. *Journal of Political Ideologies, 11*(2), 115-140. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310600687908

Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse & Power*. Palgrave Macmillan Ltd.

Walker, N. (2023, February 24th). *Current conflict*. Research Briefing. UK Parliament. https://commonslibrary.parliament.uk/research-briefings/cbp-9476/ Accessed May 2, 2023.

Walsh, P. W. & Sumption, M. (2021, October 21st). *Afghan refugees in the UK*. https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/commentaries/afghan-refugees-in-the-uk/ Accessed March 1st, 2023.

Walsh, P. W. & Sumption, M. (2022, August 24th). *Q&A: The UK and the Ukraine refugee situation*. Migration Observatory. https://migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/resources/briefings/qa-the-uk-and-the-ukraine-refugee-situation/ Accessed February 28th, 2023.

Wodak, R., & Boukala, S. (2015). European identities and the revival of nationalism in the European Union: A discourse historical approach. *Journal of Language and Politics, 14*(1), 87-109. https://libproxy.tuni.fi/login?qurl=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.proquest.com%2Fscholarly-journals%2Feuropean-identities-revival-nationalism-union%2Fdocview%2F1738472277%2Fse-2%3Faccountid%3D14242 Accessed May 2, 2023.

Young, L., & Harrison, C. (Eds.). (2004). *Systemic Functional Linguistics and Critical Discourse Analysis: Studies in Social Change*. Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. https://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/tampere/detail.action?docID=444090