Citizenship, community, and counter-terrorism: UK security discourse, 2001-2011

Malcolm N. MacDonald,[1] Duncan Hunter[2] and John P. O'Regan[3]

Centre for Applied Linguistics,

Social Sciences Building

University of Warwick,

Coventry,

CV4 7LA

+44(0)24-76-5-24250

m.n.macdonald@warwick.ac.uk

[1] University of Warwick

[2] University of St Mark & St John

[3] Institute of Education, University of London

Abstract

This paper analyses a corpus of UK policy documents which sets out national security policy as an exemplar of the contemporary discourse of counter-terrorism in Europe, the USA and worldwide. A corpus of 148 documents (c. 2.8 million words) was assembled to reflect the security discourse produced by the UK government before and after the 7/7 attacks on the London Transport system. To enable a chronological comparison, the two sub-corpora were defined: one relating to a discourse of citizenship and community cohesion (2001-2006); and one relating to the 'Preventing Violent Extremism' discourse (2007-2011). Wordsmith Tools (Scott 2008) was used to investigate keywords and patterns of collocation. The results present themes emerging from a comparative analysis of the 100 strongest keywords in each sub-corpus; as well as a qualitative analysis of related patterns of the collocation, focusing in particular on features of connotation and semantic prosody.

Keywords: security, counter-terrorism, citizenship, community, cohesion, corpus, Prevent, extremism.

Citizenship, community, and counter-terrorism: UK security discourse, 2001-2011

1. Introduction

In 2001 two events had a profound impact upon UK security policy: violent riots broke out in the North England towns of Oldham, Rochdale and Bradford, and an Al-Qaida cell attacked the US World Trade Centre ('9/11'). The subsequent invasion of Iraq by a US-led alliance was followed in turn by further Islamist attacks on the Madrid Cercanías network ('11-M'), the London Transport network ('7/7') and Glasgow Airport (30/6/2007). While the 7/7 perpetrators were citizens of Arab countries temporarily resident in the US, the UK attacks were carried out by British citizens. Given the longstanding debate over multiculturalism and citizenship in the UK, this gave rise to increased concerns about the sense of attachment of members of ethnic minority groups to their native country (Thomas 2011). And, in time, it gave rise to a strategic interface taking place between the policy discourse produced in response to the 2001 riots, and that produced in response to the 2005 terrorist attacks.

Informed by critical studies of political discourse (e.g. Fairclough 2000, Mulderigg 2011a, 2011b), and using the methodological tools of corpus linguistics (e.g. Baker 2006, 2010, Baker and McEnery 2005, Gabrielatos and Baker 2008), this paper aims to investigate the realization of security as discursive practice within the UK between 2001 and 2011. It particularly addresses the following two research questions: what changes take place in the language of UK security discourse between 2001 and 2011; how does language create, transmit and reproduce the values of UK security discourse before and after the 7/7 attacks?

2. Literature Review

The ideas of citizenship and community are fundamental to the European idea of liberal society (Staiger 2009: 1). For Osler and Starkey, citizenship has three dimensions: 'a status, a feeling and a practice' (2005: 9). Citizenship is most usually regarded as a relationship between an individual and the nation state, which accords the citizen a certain status. This is principally a legal construct, acknowledged by the right to carry a certain passport, to be protected through a legal system and by the police, and to benefit from education, health care and transport infrastructure. In return, a citizen is expected to perform certain acts of civic engagement, such as voting and paying taxes. However, citizens also possess a sense of belonging which is as much emotional as it is legal. This ranges from a 'shared national identity, which acts as the basis of mutual recognition' (Cole 2011: 1) to a sense of attachment to a region, town or more localised rural or urban space. Thirdly, citizenship involves the practice of engaging with others who co-exist within a locale, that is to say 'participating freely in society and combining with others for political, social, cultural or economic purposes' (Osler and Starkey 2005: 14). However, this participatory aspect of citizenship also suggests that boundaries exist around a particular physical space or social group in order to distinguish between 'members' and 'outsiders' (Cole 2011: 3). The issue of boundedness can become problematic with respect to members of minority groups, since a sense of exclusion can be seen as contributing to the development of extremist ideologies and potential engagement with terrorist activities.

If citizens are bonded to the state through their legal status, the community is what citizens feel they belong to and within which citizenship is performed as everyday practice (Osler and Starkey 2005: 80, Staiger 2009). In this respect, 'community' conventionally has two senses: a specific locale which the citizen inhabits, and a social group of which the citizen is a

member (Williams 1976). In both its spatial and social forms, a community is also seen as offering its members safety and security (Bauman 2001, Osler and Starkey 2005: 81). However, the sense of precisely which community a citizen belongs to has become increasingly complex as the ethnic constituency of the UK has diversified. Thus it has been proposed that Britain should become a 'community of communities', in which the diversity of the different social groups within a multicultural society is recognised (Osler and Starkey: 82, Parekh 2000, ix). However, the balance between some citizens' allegiance to the 'imagined community' of the nation state (Anderson 2006) and their affiliation to an often more immediate neighbourhood community has become increasingly contested (Thomas: 2011).

The idea of 'community cohesion' emerged as a response to the North of England riots (Cantle 2001: 68-69). While the earlier notion of 'multiculturalism' emphasised the tolerance of difference and separateness, 'community cohesion' foregrounds the need to identify commonalities between groups, and to promote inter-group interaction (iCoCo 2010, Thomas 2011). From 2001, this notion rapidly became ubiquitous in policy discourse concerned with relations between different religious and ethnic groups within British towns (Denham 2001, Cantle 2005, iCoCo 2010). In a subsequent government policy proposal, published shortly after the London bombings, community cohesion was presented as 'a growing part of the place-shaping agenda' (Home Office 2006: 151). However, this white paper also suggested that the aim of cohesion had now been made more difficult, 'because it has to be undertaken alongside the need to tackle extremism'. Thus the concept of community cohesion came to be deployed with increasing frequency as part of the response to terrorism. Central to this development was the first iteration of *Prevent* as one of the four 'workstreams' within the government's overall anti-terrorism strategy (Home Office: 2006). The link between *Prevent*

5

and the community cohesion agenda was formally acknowledged in a second, 'refreshed' version of the policy (LGA 2009: 4).

Thus far, we have drawn on a political and sociological literature concerned with the rights and responsibilities incurred by citizens of the nation state and the predication of internal security upon the positioning of ethnic minority groups within civic society. However, a complementary literature also analyses the discourse of counter-terrorism and security through focusing on US speeches and policy documents following the 9/11 attacks, in the run-up to the invasion of Iraq, and in particular upon those of George H.W. Bush's administration. For example, the US President deploys metaphor and metonymy to create a polarisation of *us* (the 'West' and/or the 'American people') vs. *them* (the 'terrorists' and/or 'Iraqis') (c.f. van Dijk 2001). According to this analysis, Bush's warrant for the 'war on terror' is grounded on a popular mythology of the American 'way of life', where Americans are portrayed as 'freedom-loving people'- rather than 'haters of freedom' - in opposition to an 'evil Other', 'evil people' and 'the evil ones' (Johnson 2002). This polarisation counterposes the figures of 'the American people' against 'the Iraqi people' (Meadows 2007), 'law' against 'lawlessness', 'civilization' against 'barbarism' and 'freedom' against 'tyranny' (Bhatia 2009). Saddam Hussein is also portrayed as a 'terrorist' (Meadows 2007, Bhatia 2009) as well as a 'madman' (Chang and Mehan 2008). Thus, the Bush administration's rhetoric has an 'elasticity' of definition that incorporates: "evil do-ers, terrorists, suicide bombers: 'barbaric', 'evil people' who 'burrow' their way in to society and 'lurk' in order to kill 'innocent people'" (Graham et al. 2004: 24).

The WTC, Madrid and London attacks also gave rise to a range of legal responses from the governments involved. Provisions were initiated in the UK through the Prevention of Terrorism Act (2005) and the Civil Contingencies Act (2004), and in the USA through the

Patriot Act (2001), for the temporary suspension of a range of citizenship rights (Preston 2009). In order to justify the Patriot Act, the US Department of Justice created a complementary website which contained a four-part syllogism arguing that 'the Act, as the symbol of security, enhances liberty' (Simone 2009: 5). Throughout the website this syllogism is used to justify the extension of national mechanisms of surveillance, as well as the suspension of the rights of habeas corpus for the first time in American history (Graham et al. 2004). Rhetorical strategies deployed in both Patriot Acts have also been investigated using a corpus-based approach. These include excessive use of the term 'terrorism', an insistence that 'terrorists' are 'fearsomely devious and dangerous', deployment of 'enemy combatant' as an 'extraordinary category', placing responsibility for terrorism on 'aliens' and equating protest or resistance with aid to terrorists (De Beaugrande 2004).

Most recently, four counter-terrorism documents produced by the UK New Labour government between 2005 and 2007 have been examined in order to consider what 'labels' were being used, with what frequency, and how these labels created 'categories of sameness' leading to alienation (Appleby 2010). There appeared to be a strong linkage of the label 'terrorist' to Islam, which is polarized against the categories 'British citizen', and 'within the UK'. More paradoxically in the light of the origins of the London attackers, while the label 'extremist' is once again linked to Islam, those labelled as 'extremist' are envisaged as living outside the boundaries of British society rather than within it. Finally, the documents create a homogenising label for a new, imaginary, social group: 'the Muslim community' (Appleby 2010: 427-430). The language used more broadly in the post-7/7 'Preventing Violent Extremism' (PVE) discourse has also been criticised for its avoidance of the term 'multiculturalism' and the singling out and referencing of Muslim groups in a negative light (Thomas 2011).

4. Methodology

In order to investigate the discursive realization of UK security between 2001 and 2011, this paper will adopt an 'eclectic approach' (after Baker et al 2008, Freake et al. 2011) broadly situated within the tradition of corpus-based discourse studies (CADS). Corpus-based techniques have been used in the investigation of various aspects of political discourse, e.g.: the New Labour administration (Fairclough 2000), educational governance (Mulderigg 2011a, 2011b), refugees and asylum seekers (Baker 2010, Baker and McEnery 2005, Baker et al. 2008, Gabrielatos and Baker 2008), US immigration legislation (Gales 2009), and bilingualism and national identity in Quebec (Freake et al. 2011). As well as using a corpus-based methodology, these studies engage in the critical analysis of documentary evidence without adhering strictly to any singular CDA framework (e.g. Fairclough 2000, Wodak et al 2009, Van Djik 2001). However of these, only the RASIM project (e.g. Baker and McEnery 2005, Baker et al. 2008, Gabrielatos and Baker 2008) and its later manifestations (e.g. Baker 2010) have assembled extensive sub-corpora of texts to reveal the unfolding of discursive practices over time.

Since our paper examines how the language of security discourse differs either side of a single historical event, we assembled two sub-corpora of texts produced before and after the 7/7 attacks. The first sub-corpus (n=36), Citizenship and Community Cohesion (CCC), was constructed from the early years of the UK New Labour Government (2001-2006), including the period up to the London attacks. The second sub-corpus (n=112), Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE) combines the later years of the UK New Labour Government (2007-2010) with a small number of documents from the early years of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition (2010-2011).

Previously, corpora have been assembled which comprise either the total population of a relatively restricted field of texts (e.g. Freake et al 2011, Mulderigg 2011a, 2011b), or which narrow down the total population of texts to those produced within a certain timeframe (e.g. Baker and McEnery 2005, Gales 2009). The design of our corpus most closely resembles that of Baker (2010), who not only defined a particular timeframe for a large corpus of newspaper articles (1999-2005) but also searched for texts through a wide-ranging search query (ibid, 315). We searched the websites of five UK government departments - the Cabinet Office, the Home Office, the Department of Education, the Department for Innovation, Universities, and Skills, and the Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) - for documents produced between January 2001 and December 2011 using the query: 'citizenship OR security OR terrorism OR radicalisation/radicalization'. These texts were then augmented by using links from the iCoCo website (iCoCo 2011). We then narrowed down our selection to those documents most relevant to the aims of our research. Relevance was ascertained by the prominence of key terms in the title and by a preliminary reading of electronic documents for the frequency and salience of the search terms. The final corpus comprised 148 documents, amounting to around 2.8 million words.

As with the most comparable studies above (e.g. Baker 2010, Freake et al 2011, Mulderigg 2011a, 2011b), a statistical analysis of lexical trends in each sub-corpus was carried out using the keywords programme in Wordsmith Tools (Scott, 2008). Thus, the frequency of words in the CCC ('test') sub-corpus was compared with that of the PVE ('reference') sub-corpus, and vice-versa. A statistical analysis was then carried out using the log-likelihood test (hereafter LL) in order to determine whether words appeared more or less often than might be expected by its observed frequency in one sub-corpus rather than the other ($p<0.000001$) (Baker, 2006). Following Baker (2010), we proceeded on the basis that the top 100 words

identified as statistically key in each sub-corpus should be investigated as 'candidates' for significance (Appendix 1), but that further quantitative checks and manual, context-sensitive qualitative assessment should also be carried out (after Baker and McEnery 2005, Baker 2010, Freake et al. 2011) to support claims of 'salience' (Baker 2006: 125). Firstly, we checked the senses and roles displayed by the keywords when checked in context via concordance. Secondly, we looked at statistical data relating to the collocation of keywords, or their tendency to appear in combination or in the company of other words. The collocation patterns of five words to the left and right of each term were also considered. Thirdly, we considered the clusters of words that regularly formed around the keywords within each sub-corpus, by default 'three words that occur in the same form and order at least five times in the corpus' (Freake et al 2011, 28). Finally, the linguistic data was grouped together under emergent themes relating to the research questions.

Several additional steps were taken to ensure the validity and reliability of the research design. Comparing keywords between the two sub-corpora improved the validity of results by comparing 'like with like' with regard to the effect of decisions regarding reference corpora on results (c.f. Scott and Tribble 2006). Despite the necessarily opportunistic nature of our sampling, systematic and principled criteria for corpus selection were applied to ensure a substantial, and potentially representative, sample of the documents produced by the UK government relating to security and counter-terrorism over the period under consideration. A possible limitation associated with this decision is that differences, rather than similarities between the periods were exposed for analysis. A further issue is that the sizes of the two sub-corpora are uneven. While this reflected the massive increase in the production of security documents by the UK government after the 7/7 attacks, where two corpora of different sizes are compared the derived keyword lists also differ in size (Baker 2005: 2).

Thus, fewer items are exposed for examination in the earlier period - a fact which may have impacted on the balance of evidence produced for each.

5. Results

Since two sub-corpora reflecting different time periods alternated as test and reference corpus, most of the strongest keywords in our corpus were lexical items. In the CCC discourse, a preliminary concordance and collocation analysis revealed that roughly a third of the top 100 keywords appeared to be candidates for analysis (Appendix 1, Table 1). Around half the top 100 keywords referred to different aspects of local government not directly related to the social cohesion agenda. These included the routine lexis of local government, e.g. *council, executive, housing* and *services*; place names unassociated with the 2001 riots, e.g. *Camden* and *Sunderland*; and a handful of acronyms, e.g. *LSPS* and *ODPM*. Of the remaining top 100 keywords, about a tenth related to education, e.g. *education* and *learning*; and another tenth were unclassifiable general lexis, e.g. *take* and *making*. By contrast, in the PVE discourse around two thirds of the top 100 keywords appeared to be candidates for analysis (Appendix 1, Table 2). The pronouns *we, I, our, who* and *those* were not analysed further since, unlike the 'call-to-arms speeches' reviewed above, first person pronouns were employed to personalise the authorship of policy documents; and about a tenth of the top keywords appeared to be associated with the register of the research report, e.g. *cent*, *likely* and *evidence*. The remaining candidate words which stood out from our keyword lists were then grouped around three themes in order to enable a comparison of the values of the CCC and the PVE discourse: responsibility and belonging, difference and recognition, antagonism and alterity.

5.1.   *Responsibility and belonging*

The language of the entire corpus realizes one set of values relating to a sense of belonging, interconnectedness and social engagement within British society. These values coalesce most powerfully within the single word 'community', the most frequently occurring word across the both sub-corpora (n=5971, n=13,862), e.g.:

(1) "...opportunity to co-opt up to three or four representatives from the local <u>community.</u>" (LGA 2005)

(2) "There are an enormous number of cultural and sporting delivery bodies, which are active in every <u>community</u> in the country." (Home Office 2009c)

The first example concurs with Osler and Starkey (2005) above, in as much as 'community' combines a sense of locale with the idea of a particular group of people; while in the second example, 'community' appears to be more synonymous with a specific place, such as a town or a city. In this way the polysemic potential of 'community' is realised to combine the notion of both sharing or commonality of feeling, and reference to 'a group of people who live in a particular area or are alike in some way' (Collins 2006).

Community occurs as a keyword in the CCC discourse (ranked 17th, LL 327). Here, three important collocates lend it positive semantic prosody: 'cohesion' (n=2,388), 'local' (n=534) and 'voluntary' (n=338). *Community* occurs regularly in combination with 'cohesion' both as a proper noun designating a particular government policy, and as a more general noun phrase, e.g.:

(3) "The importance of <u>Community Cohesion</u> was identified as being crucial to promoting greater knowledge, respect and contact between various cultures and to establish a greater sense of citizenship." (DCMS 2004)

(4) "…a number of actions that could be taken locally to ensure that communities were able to live and work harmoniously together. This harmony is summed up by the official term, '<u>community cohesion</u>'." (Community Cohesion Unit 2004)

The first example emphasises the social contribution of 'cohesion', suggesting that it leads to mutual 'knowledge' and 'contact' between members of different cultural groups. However, the term 'respect' goes further than this, suggesting that subjects develop a positive attitude towards each other. This positivity is realized even more powerfully in the second example which describes 'community cohesion' as being co-terminous with 'harmony', a value-laden word more often found in spiritual discourse. This (re)construction of 'community' also takes place 'at a local level', where 'local' combines the idea of strategic efficiency with positive values such as integrity and a certain 'groundedness', e.g.:

(5) "Authorities can collaborate with other organisations at the <u>local</u> level to enhance <u>community</u> engagement in a number of ways:…." (LGA 2005)

The third of these collocates, 'voluntary', is typically found in the phrase 'local authority and voluntary and community sector' to signify non-centralized government activity, e.g.:

(6) "Organizing the Pathfinder programme so that the Local Authority Partner takes on an 'enabling' role, with <u>voluntary and community sector</u> leading and delivering on the programme." (Vantagepoint 2003)

This example also suggests that the adjective can carry connotations of the idea of service (c.p. Williams 1976: 75-6).

Despite the ubiquity of the word *community* throughout the corpus, the two strongest keywords in the first sub-corpus relating to the idea of responsibility and social engagement are *citizenship* (ranked 1st, LL 1581) and *participation* (ranked 9th, LL 496). Citizenship is often referred to in pedagogical contexts; hence the words 'school(s)' and 'education' emerge as top collocates, e.g.:

(7) "The debate about values and identity is clearly linked to the concept of <u>citizenship</u>. The Government is to be commended for its efforts to date, in the form of …. the <u>citizenship</u> curriculum in <u>education</u>." (Community Cohesion Unit 2004)

Other top collocates of *citizenship* in the CCC policy documents are 'active', and 'learning'. Here, 'active citizenship' is seen as an outcome of a successful educational programme:

(8) "In <u>schools</u> where the curriculum for <u>citizenship</u> fulfils its intentions, a good balance has been achieved, with a core programme, some very strongly linked satellites…, and <u>active citizenship</u> for all pupils in the <u>school</u> and community." (Ofsted 2006)

While citizenship is often realized in the first sub-corpus as an abstraction, it is accorded human agency through the frequent occurrence as keywords in the CCC discourse of the nouns *citizen* (ranked 11th, LL 374) and *citizens* (ranked 31th, LL 235). A concord analysis reveals that the qualities attributed here to citizens convey a similar positive semantic prosody, in particular with the phrases 'active citizens' (n=43), 'local citizens' (n=22) and 'effective citizens' (n=13), e.g.:

(9) "Building the necessary trust and capacity for people to become <u>effective citizens</u> is a time-consuming process, and it is important to maintain the momentum once it has been developed." (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister 2006)

'Participation' also occurs as a top collocate of 'citizen', particularly in the phrase 'citizen participation' (n=37), reinforcing the idea of social engagement, Along with the related words *participatory* and *participate*, *participation* is also key in the first sub-corpus (ranked 9th, LL=496). In particular, positive semantic prosody is conveyed through its top collocates: 'local' (n= 148), 'public' (n=82), 'engagement' (n=63), 'tenant' (n=60), 'democracy' (n=57), 'community' (n=53), 'citizen' (n=38). These words all suggest the quality of interconnectedness with other members of society, with one's locale or with the state.

From the publication of the first *CONTEST* document in 2006, a shift takes place from language which entails a more localised sense of civic democracy, to language which suggests a rather less tangible set of bonds within British society, reimagined as a totality rather than Parekh's (2000) 'community of communities'. In the PVE discourse, *integration* now emerges as the strongest keyword relating to the theme of belonging (ranked 15th, LL

307), with *British, affiliation* and *shared* also in the top hundred keywords. In this second sub-corpus, 'cohesion' is repositioned as a top collocate of *integration*, almost exclusively in the phrase 'integration and cohesion' (n=1011). This phenomenon is explicitly addressed in at least one document:

> (10) "We argue that to build <u>integration and cohesion</u> properly, there needs to be a wider commitment to civil society, and respect for others." (Commission on Integration and Cohesion 2007a)

Here, 'integration and cohesion' is no longer contextualised within a local sense of community but within a broader 'civic society'. While 'integration and cohesion' are associated here with the positive value of 'respect', the 'others' to whom they are proffered appear detached from any sense of specific locale.

A realignment also takes place between the CCC discourse and the PVE discourse with respect to the relative prominence of the two words, 'community' and 'cohesion'. Despite its high frequency (n=13,862) *community* does not appear as a keyword in the PVE discourse, whereas *cohesion* does (ranked 69th, n=9718). In fact, latterly, this single lexical item appears to take on the meaning previously signified by the combination of both words. This suggests that the idea of 'community' has already become established in the CCC discourse and is therefore being able to be presupposed in the PVE discourse. It also confirms that in the wake of 7/7, the idea of (community) 'cohesion' became redeployed as a central plank of the UK government's strategy against the development of terrorist cells (iCoCo 2011, Thomas, 2011).

5.2 *Difference and recognition*

The events of 2001-11 gave rise to distinctive discursive strategies within the policy documents of each period, which had implications for the positioning of different social groups and their members. Thus, difference also emerges as a theme realized by language

throughout the entire corpus. In the CCC discourse, the terms *polarisation* and *segregation* suggest that the separation between different social groups in the UK is relatively irreconcilable; whereas the words *diversity* and *minority* imply that these barriers might be overcome if different social groups recognise and respect the differences between them (c.f. Kymlicka 1995, Taylor 1994). Here, an attempt is made to stabilize the meanings of the first pair of words within the CCC discourse:

> (11) "Segregation: the extent to which groups within society do not share physical and social space; the extent to which the lives of people from different groups overlap. Polarisation: a widening gap between individuals, households or groups of people in terms of their economic and social circumstances and opportunities." (Office for Public Management 2005)

In these definitions, 'segregation' is conceived of as being more static, whereas 'polarisation' emerges as more developmental. However, while the second clause in the definition of 'segregation' suggests a more positive interpretation, both words carry overwhelmingly negative connotations. The two words are also distributed rather differently in the first sub-corpus: *polarisation* appears as a strong keyword (ranked 15th, LL=342) occurring in only 7 texts; whereas *segregation* is less strong as keyword (ranked 40th, LL=196) but occurs more times (n=311), and across more texts (n=17). Despite this disparity, *polarisation* and *segregation* appear as mutual collocates. This is indicative of the semantic interdependency of the two terms, for example in the phrase 'future trends in segregation and polarisation' (n=18).

One approach to discursively managing the separation implied by this 'polarisation' and 'segregation' is to reimagine linguistic, religious and ethnic difference as *diversity* (ranked 57th, LL=159), e.g.:

> (12) "Community cohesion … has strong links to concepts of equality and diversity given that community cohesion can only grow when society as a whole recognises that individuals have the right to equality (of treatment, access to services etc.) and respects and appreciates the diverse nature of our communities." (Home Office 2005)

16

Here, 'diversity' positively complements 'cohesion' and appears linked to the positive civic value of 'equality', which features as its top collocate throughout the CCC discourse (n=101). If 'equality' is used here to signal parity between different social groups through the redistribution of material resources, 'diversity' is used to signal parity through the redirection of ideological resources, realized here by the mental process types 'respect' and 'appreciate'.

The term that is often used in the CCC discourse to refer to social groups that have a distinctive identity within UK society is the keyword, *minority* (ranked 88th, LL 109). In the following example, the negative outcomes of 'polarisation' and 'segregation' are contrasted positively with the notion of 'greater integration of minority ethnic communities'.

> (13) "Problems of polarisation seem more likely to arise where there is a concentration of one particular ethnic group….Segregation reduces opportunities for understanding between faiths and cultures and for the development of tolerance….The enlightened use of regeneration budgets provide opportunities to encourage greater integration of minority ethnic communities as well as to improve the physical environment."

Here the ideological intent of the terms 'understanding' and 'tolerance' is fused with the proposed allocation of resources realized in the phrase 'improve the physical environment'. The contiguous occurrence of 'minority' with 'ethnic' exemplified here also occurs frequently throughout these documents (n=891), and elsewhere the phrase co-occurs with the plural form 'communities' (n=172) to describe not just relations between 'minority ethnic' social groups and an implied, majority white-British social group, but also to relations between different 'minority ethnic communities'. Crucially, however, the most common marker of ethnicity in this constitution of 'minority' emerges as 'black' (n=241), realized particularly in the cluster 'black and minority' (n=205), whereas the word 'Muslim' rarely occurs in the CCC discourse. This indicates how dramatically the purview of the state can refocus from one ethnic group to another in the wake of a single historical event.

The theme of difference is realized dissimilarly, however, in the PVE discourse. In the wake of the moral panic over ethnic identity that occurred in the wake of 7/7, the word *Muslim* appears as statistically very much more significant in the later sub-corpus (ranked 2nd, LL 941). *Muslim* often occurs as a component of the phrase 'Muslim community'/'Muslim communities' with 'community' and 'communities' emerging as its top collocates. These expressions are sometimes used to refer to the whole, worldwide 'community of Islam', e.g.: '...the Muslim Ummah – the international Muslim community...' (Warraich 2008). More often, they describe Muslims as a distinctive social and religious group within the nation state. There are two observable tendencies in the way language is used here. First, the 'Muslim community' is often depicted as a homogenous group which shares a common identity, e.g.:

(14) "It is imperative that local and central Government departments work closely with the British Muslim community to identify effective and successful good practices wherever they exist and make a concerted effort to seek ways of transferring these to target groups." (Warraich 2008)

The second is that the separateness of Muslims, as a hypostatised 'other' community within the nation state, is sometimes signalled contrastively:

(15) "...all of whom brought an exceptional degree of expertise and insights to the challenges that confront the Muslim and non-Muslim Community alike." (House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee 2010)

Both these usages point to a process of demarcation, in which the co-occurrence of the word *Muslim* with *community* marks out one particular social group as distinctive. At best this results in the discursive constitution of an 'othering' effect on members of the social groups concerned (Appleby 2010, Thomas 2011); at worst it leads to alienation and disaffection.

Given the historical convergence between the policies of social cohesion and counter-terrorism, we might expect *Muslim* to carry negative semantic prosody. Yet our evidence suggests that formulations based on this term have been carefully deployed to avoid such

connotations. For example in the 2007-11 data, 'fundamentalist' does not appear as a significant collocate of 'Muslim' at all, the formulaic expression 'Muslim fundamentalist' does not occur in any of the 112 documents, and the phrase 'Muslim extremism' occurs on only ten occasions. On several occasions expressions which carry unfavourable connotations are also explicitly proscribed. For example, in the PVE discourse 'Islamic extremism' appears only 13 times; and most instances can be accounted for by passages condemning its usage, e.g.:

> (16) "The phrase '<u>Islamic extremism</u>' is offensive – there may be a very small fringe element who claim to follow <u>Islam</u> but that does not make Islam as a whole, a religion followed by over a billion people, an <u>extremist</u> religion." (Warraich 2008)

Considerable effort is also expended even to ensure that the term 'Islamist' is extricated from any association with 'terrorists' or 'militants', as the 'scare' quotes in the second example suggest:

> (17) "Some other fundamentalist groups, sometimes referred to as <u>'Islamist'</u>, also oppose 'Western' values, seek strict adherence to Islamic law, and share the political aim of the restoration of the Caliphate. However, they do not agree that there is religious justification for the use of violence to achieve these aims." (Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills 2009a)

However, by pursuing an implicit language policy to accommodate the label 'Islamist', despite its frequent negative associations, an attempt also seems to be being made to normalise it.

The theme of difference is also realized through the usage of the word *radicalisation*, which emerges as another strong keyword in the PVE discourse (ranked 11th, LL 391). Top lexical collocates are 'violent' (n=187), 'extremism' (n=85) and 'risk' (n= 67). While 'violent' occurs as a collocate 187 times across 113 texts, a concord analysis reveals that it occurs 141 times alone in the phrase 'violent extremism', but within only 3 texts. *Radicalisation* also appears yoked together with 'extremism', particularly in the cluster 'extremism and

radicalisation' (n=54); and the phrase 'tackling extremism and radicalisation' appears as distinctive in the PVE discourse, with the metaphorical usage of 'tackling' suggesting that these problems can be resolved in a functional and matter-of-fact way.

5.3 Antagonism and alterity

Given the events of 7/7, it is unsurprising that the language of the PVE discourse appears to constitute antagonistic relations towards some other hypostatized social group (Appendix 1, Table 2). By contrast, the CCC discourse displays no language relating to the theme of antagonism that could confidently be included for further analysis (Appendix 1, Table 1). Since the attacks on the London transport system were carried out by UK citizens, extensive discursive energy appears to be expended in working out who might carry out future attacks on the UK and how they can be stopped.

The related concept of alterity also emerges from the language of the PVE discourse. In relation to this theme, we will explore the ten strongest keywords in the later sub-corpus: *prevent, violent, terrorism, extremism, security, counter, terrorist, contest, preventing* and *resilience.* In the discursive response to the 7/7 attacks, the words 'contest' and 'prevent' become appropriated as proper nouns for the titles of the two flagship policy documents. These serve different purposes: 'CONTEST' (2006, 2009a, 2011a) is the superordinate document setting out government policy, in particular its four 'strands' - Pursue, Prevent, Protect, Prepare. 'Prevent' (2003, 2009b, 2009c, 2011b) is the subordinate strand of 'Contest' whose specific purpose is to set out government policy for agencies, community groups and the public to put into action. *Prevent* also frequently co-occurs as a noun with its top collocates 'strategy'(n=542), 'agenda' (n=361), 'work' (n=356) and 'programme' (n=278).

As a verb its most frequently occurring object is 'violent extremism' (n=67), with 'extremism' also featuring as a top collocate (n=170). Thus, *Prevent* emerges as the strongest keyword in the second sub-corpus (LL 1715) and, as the most statistically significant word which constitutes an antagonistic stance towards potential terrorists and terrorist groups, comes to typify the later sub-corpus.

Terrorism (ranked 7th, LL 777) and *extremism* (ranked 8th, LL 776) are both keywords which also convey a powerful sense of antagonism and alterity, often occurring in a mutually defining semantic relationship. The top collocate of *terrorism* is 'counter' (n=848), with the noun phrase 'counter(-)terrorism' occurring regularly in both its hyphenated and unhyphenated forms, e.g.:

> (18) "... effective propagandists against Al Qaeda may often be subject to critique from the press and from government sources as well as being potential targets of 'counter terrorism activity' from other policing colleagues;" (Hammonds 2008)

> (19) "… enhance our strategic counter-terrorism relationships, including by sharing access to key capabilities to enable better border security, transport security, further improving watch list data sharing for aviation security." (Cameron and Clegg 2010)

The top collocate of *extremism* is 'violent' (n=2,033), occurring almost always contiguously in the phrase 'violent extremism'. The frequency of this phrase is due in part to its being headlined in policy titles such as 'PREVENTING VIOLENT EXTREMISM: NEXT STEPS FOR COMMUNITIES'. However, it also occurs as a lexical phrase, which is often deployed to distinguish 'extremism' from 'terrorism'. Thus 'terrorism' is also a top collocate of *extremism* (n=153), but they often co-occur in order to problematize the relationship between the two concepts, e.g.:

> (20) "The relationship between terrorism and extremism is therefore complicated and directly relevant to the aim and objectives of Prevent. It will not always be possible or desirable to draw clear lines between policies in each of these areas. But the lines can be clearer than they have been hitherto. That will also bring greater clarity to the Prevent strategy." (Home Office 2011b)

If *terrorism* is a word that positions potential adversaries as being 'international' and exterior to the nation state; then *extremism* positions potential adversaries as being 'in the community' and internal to the nation state. Thus, 'communities' (n=186), 'community' (n=147) and 'local' (n=110) are all top collocates of *extremism*, along with 'resilience' (n=102). The frequent co-occurrence of 'local' also confirms that extremism is being constituted as being very much a phenomenon which occurs in 'communities'. One of the most regular patterns is the expression 'increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism', e.g.:

> (21) "… it was apparent that more work has been undertaken to <u>increase the resilience of communities to violent extremism</u> and challenge the violent extremist ideology and support mainstream voices than, to disrupt those who promote violent extremism and those who support the institutions where they are active." (Kellard et al. 2008)

The repetitious way in which this phrase is used throughout the PVE discourse suggests that the linguistic patterning of these documents arises not just from the selection and combination of individual words but also from the selection of larger 'frames', or chunks of text.

However, the phrase 'violent extremism' is also deployed purposively to distinguish between normative forms of Islam - which might include radical Islamist strands which nevertheless are not perceived as constituting a threat to national security - and Islamist groups who are actually prepared to carry out acts of aggression against the state (iCoCo 2011), e.g.:

> (22) "The Government has a 'Prevent' strategy as part of its overall approach to countering terrorism with the aim of preventing people becoming terrorists or supporting <u>violent extremism</u>. The Prevent strategy has five strands designed to address the factors that research suggests can cause people to become involved in <u>Al-Qaida associated violent extremism</u>." (Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills 2009)

Here, efforts are made to distinguish 'violent extremism', signalled by the extra qualifier 'Al-Qaida associated', from a hypostatised 'mainstream' Islam as being non-typical. Similar

rhetorical strategies are also deployed through the PVE discourse to avoid labelling any one particular ethnic minority group.

Security also appears as one of the strongest keywords in the PVE discourse (ranked 5th, LL 422). However, compared with words in the CCC discourse such as 'polarisation', 'segregation' and 'diversity', which refer to substantive social phenomena, in the PVE discourse 'security' appears as curiously self-referential. A concord analysis indicates that by far and away its top lexical collocate is 'national' (n=598), with the cluster 'the national security' occurring 173 times. A further cluster analysis suggests that the strength of this keyword emerges largely from its incorporation into names: of policies, especially the 'National Security Strategy' (n=97) and the 'Strategic Defence and Security Review' (n=76); of agencies, especially the 'security and intelligence agencies' (n=97); and committees, especially the 'National Security Council' (n=88). Surprisingly, *security* is rarely realized in this strand of discourse as the object of a 'threat' or 'risk', although it does occur as such in the most recent iteration of "Prevent":

> (23) "In line with CONTEST, the previous Prevent strategy focused on the most significant risks to national security, namely the threat from terrorism associated with and influenced by Al Qa'ida." (Home Office 2011a)

This late articulation seems to be steering the focus of security policy away from focusing on internal ethnic minority groups to those with external origins, in particular those 'associated with…Al Qai'da'.

6. Discussion

The analysis above has revealed how language was used between 2001 and 2011 to create, transmit and reproduce certain values in UK security discourse, and particularly the changes

that took place in this language before and after the 7/7 attacks. A statistical analysis of the language deployed over this period revealed three thematic groupings of keywords: responsibility and belonging, difference and recognition, antagonism and alterity. While the first two themes were constituted somewhat differently in our two sub-corpora, the third theme was specific to the post-7/7, PVE discourse.

The theme of responsibility and belonging, maintained across the entire corpus, suggests how the UK government's problematization of citizenship changed through the decade. These documents appeared not so much to contest the legal relationship of the individual citizen to the state (Staiger 2009 1), but rather the ways in which citizenship is felt and practised (c.f. Osler and Starkey 2005). This emerged especially from the frequent occurrence throughout the entire corpus of the value-laden notions of c*ommunity* and *cohesion*. In particular, the yoking together of the separate terms *community* and *cohesion* into the singular, nominalised form 'community cohesion' undergoes a two stage transformation over the period investigated. First, the phrase undergoes a process of 'reification' (Lukacs 1923/1967) as the concept becomes displaced from its original context in order to become an 'objectified' signifier no longer amenable to examination or critique. Despite its recent coinage, the term is assigned a pseudo-history and etymology, e.g.: 'the term "community cohesion" has been around for centuries in the writings of political theorists' (Lawrence 2008: 26). In the second stage of this transformation (2007-2011), 'cohesion' becomes used more often as a single word, to signify synecdochally the meaning previously conveyed by the two-word phrase.

Community is also constituted differently in each sub-corpus as the milieu for each citizen's sense of belonging and civic participation. The CCC discourse creates a more powerful sense of belonging to multiple locales and social groups within the UK, perhaps realizing Parekh's 'community of communities' as discursive practice (2000). By contrast, analysis of the use of

community in the PVE discourse indicates that the word has been deployed more recently with a more homogenous sense of the 'national imaginary' (after Anderson 2006). Thus our analysis of the later sub-corpus appears to support the sociological argument (Cooper 2008, McGhee 2008) that the PVE discourse constructs a more unified acculturated identity for UK citizens of every ethnicity, in order to imbue a sense of unified belonging and attachment to the values of nation state.

The second theme which emerges from the distribution of keywords between the two sub-corpora relates to difference and recognition. Here, key signifiers from the discourse of multiculturalism - *polarisation*, *segregation*, *diversity*, and *minority* - do not appear as key at all in the PVE discourse; whereas certain words which are uniquely key in the PVE discourse - *Muslim*, *Islam*, *Islamic* - relate controversially to one particular ethnic minority group. Thus far, our findings relating to the PVE discourse appear to be in keeping with the sociological literature (Appleby 2010, Cooper 2008, McGhee 2008, Thomas 2011). However, a qualitative analysis of the language surrounding these words reveals a more nuanced position. Contra Appleby's finding that New Labour counter-terrorism documents dichotomised members of different ethnic groups, our analysis suggests that the PVE discourse tries to do exactly the opposite, striving self-consciously not to stigmatize members of any particular cultural group. In our analysis, language is often used explicitly to be 'inclusive' in the government's attempt to reimagine a unified national identity. However, it may be that, paradoxically, it is precisely this drive towards inclusivity that continues to mark certain ethnic minority groups. Moreover, despite the intentions of policy writers recorded above, the phrase 'violent extremism' seems never to have been entirely able to shake off its association with the 'Muslim community' (iCoCo 2011).

The discursive realization of the two themes of responsibility and belonging, difference and recognition modulates between the CCC discourse and the PVE discourse. However, unsurprisingly in the wake of the 7/7 attacks, a group of strong keywords also emerges uniquely from the PVE discourse to constitute our third theme of antagonism and alterity. Here the appropriation and recontextualisation of the headline words *CONTEST* and *Prevent* serve to impute to UK government departments a powerful sense of agency and active engagement with the hypostatised enemy in the 'war on terror'. By contrast, although more abstract expressions of alterity such as *extremism* and *terrorism* are widely dispersed, we could find no explicit identification of any social group or sub-culture to which these tendencies are attributed. This distinguishes our UK discourse of security and counter-terrorism from the predominantly US corpora of speeches and documents leading up to the invasion of Iraq, which do engage in a classic discursive positioning of *us* vs. *them* (e.g. Johnson 2002, Graham et al. 2004, Meadows 2007, Chang and Mehan 2008, Bhatia 2009). This may be because it is the function of our corpus's *intra*-national policy documents to be ameliorative and reconciliatory rather than aggressive and antagonistic; whereas it is consistent with the more combative *inter*-national 'call-to-arms' speech to personify the figure of the 'extremist' or the 'terrorist'.

In conclusion, the discourse of security and counter-terrorism produced by UK government departments as a response to the 7/7 attacks does not appear entirely to supersede the discourse of social cohesion produced as a response to the 2001 riots in the North of England. Rather, the words 'citizenship', 'community' and 'cohesion' become recontextualised within the later documents, thereby changing the constitution of values within the discourse. While the CCC discourse still holds out the hope of a multiplicity of communities within the nation state, each having their own identity, the PVE discourse creates a set of values which support

a totalizing, singular, community of the nation state. The PVE discourse also appears to consciously avoid any explicit stigmatisation of any particular ethnic group, although there remains an implicit attempt at constituting a normalised form of Muslim affiliation. In this respect, it is still possible to view the later documents as manifesting a more subtle form of coercion towards some normative form of Britishness on the part of a particular ethnic group. For us, this latest modality of the discursive constitution of shared social values is in keeping with Bauman's premonitions about the 'liquid modernity' of post-industrial societies, where "community of common understanding ...will...stay fragile and vulnerable, forever in need of fortification, vigilance and defence" (2001: 14).

References

Anderson, Brendan R. O'G. 2006. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Appleby, Nick. 2010. Labelling the innocent: how government counter-terrorism advice creates labels that contribute to the problem. *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 3(3), 421-436.

Baker, Paul, Costas Gabrielatos, Majid Khosravinik, Michal Krzyzanowski, Tony McEnery and Ruth Wodak. 2008. A useful methodological synergy? Combining critical discourse analysis and corpus linguistics to examine discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press. *Discourse and Society* 19(3), 273-306.

Baker, Paul and Tony McEnery. 2005. A corpus-based approach to discourses of refugees and asylum seekers in UN and newspaper texts. *Journal of Language and Politics*. 4(2), 197-226.

Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Baker, Paul. 2010. Representations of Islam in British broadsheet and tabloid newspapers. *Journal of Language and Politics* 9(2), 310-338.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World.* Cambridge: Polity.

Bhatia, Aditi. 2009. The discourses of terrorism. *Journal of Pragmatics* 41(2), 279–289.

Cameron, David and Nick Clegg. 2010. *Securing Britain in an Age of Uncertainty: The Strategic Defence and Security Review*. London: Cabinet Office.

Cantle, Ted. 2001. *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*. London: Home Office.

Cantle, Ted, Daljit Kaur, Mohammed Athar, Chris Dallison, Andy Wiggans, Joshua Harris. 2006. *Challenging Local Communities to Change - a Review of Community Cohesion in Oldham: Final Report*. London: Institute of Community Cohesion. Chang, Gordon C. and Hugh B. Mehan. 2008. Why we must attack Iraq: Bush's reasoning practices and argumentation system. *Discourse and Society* 19(4), 453-482.

Cole, P. (2011) Introduction: 'Border Crossings' – the Dimensions of Membership. In: G. Calder, P. Cole and J. Seglow (eds.) *Citizenship Acquisition and National Belonging*

Migration, Membership and the Liberal Democratic State. London: Palgrave MacMillan, 1-23.

Collins. 2006. *Collins COBUILD Dictionary* (5th edition). Glasgow: Harper Collins.

Community Cohesion Unit. 2004. *Building community cohesion into Area Based Initiatives.* London: Home Office

Commission on Integration and Cohesion. 2007. *Our Shared Future, final report of the Commission on Integration and Cohesion*. London.

Cooper, Charlie. 2008. *Community, conflict and the state : rethinking notions of 'safety', 'cohesion' and 'wellbeing'*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

De Beaugrande, Robert. 2004. Critical discourse analysis from the perspective of ecologism. *Critical Discourse Studies* 1(1), 113- 145.

Denham, John. 2001. Building Cohesive Communities – A Report of the Internal Departmental Ministerial Group on Public Order and Community Cohesion. London: Home Office.

Department for Communities and Local Government (DLCG). 2007. *Preventing Violent Extremism - winning hearts and minds.* London.

Department for Communities and Local Government (DLCG). 2009. *Understanding Muslim Ethnic Communities*. Available at: http://www.communities.gov.uk/communities/ research/ race cohesionfaith/understandingmuslimcommunities/.

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). 2004. *Bringing Communities Together through Sport and Culture*. London.

Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills. 2009a. *Learning Together to be Safe: A Toolkit to Help Colleges Contribute to the Prevention of Violent Extremism*. London.

Department for Innovation, Universities and Skills. 2009b. *Promoting good campus relations: fostering shared values and preventing violent extremism in Universities and Higher Education Colleges* (2nd Edition). London.

Fairclough, Norman. 2000. *New Labour, New Language*. London: Routledge.

Freake, Rachelle, Gentil, Guillaume and Jaffer Sheyholislami (2011). A bilingual corpus-assisted discourse study of the construction of nationhood and belonging in Quebec. *Discourse and Society* 22(11), 1-27.

Gabrielatos, Costas and Paul Baker. 2008. Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: a corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK Press 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics* 36(1), 5-38.

Gales, Tammy. 2009. `Diversity' as enacted in US immigration politics and law: a corpus-based approach. *Discourse Society* 20(2), 223–240.

Graham, Phil, Thomas Keenan and Anna-Maree Dowd. 2004. A Call to Arms at the End of History: A Discourse–Historical Analysis of George W. Bush's Declaration of War on Terror, *Discourse and Society* 15(2–3), 199–222.

Halliday, Michael and Christian M.I.M. Matthiessen. 2004. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd revised edition). London: Edward Arnold.

Hammonds, Will. 2008. *Study on the Best Practices in Cooperation between Authorities and Civil Society with a View to the Prevention and Response to Violent Radicalisation*. London: Department of Communities and Local Government.

Home Office. 2003. *Prevent Strategy*. London.

Home Office. 2005. *Community cohesion, seven steps, a practitioner's toolkit*. London.

Home Office. 2006. *CONTEST: The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism*. London.

Home Office. 2009a. *CONTEST: Countering International Terrorism: The United Kingdom's Strategy*. London.

Home Office. 2009b. *Prevent Strategy*. London.

Home Office. 2009c. *Prevent Strategy (Part 2)*. London.

Home Office. 2011a. *CONTEST: The United Kingdom's Strategy for Countering Terrorism*. London.

Home Office. 2011b. *Prevent strategy*. London: Home Office.

House of Commons Communities and Local Government Committee. 2010. *Preventing Violent Extremism*. London: House of Commons.

Institute of Community Cohesion (iCoCo). 2011. *About Community Cohesion.* Available at http://www.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Resources/AboutCommunityCohesion

Jarvis, Lee. 2009. *Times of Terror: Discourse, Temporality and the War on Terror*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Johnson, Richard. 2002. Defending ways of life: the (anti-)terrorist rhetorics of Bush and Blair, *Theory, Culture and Society* 19(4), 211–31.

Kellard, Karen, Leighton Mitchell and David Godfrey. 2008. *Preventing Violent Extremism Pathfinder Fund: Mapping of Project Activities 2007/2008*. London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

Kymlicka, W. 1995. *Multicultural Citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawrence Andrew. 2008. *Better Together*. London: iCoCo and the Department of Health.

Local Government Association (LGA). 2008. *Putting people first: Leading the PVE Agenda: a Role Made for Councillors*. London.

Local Government Association (LGA). 2009. *Leading the Preventing Violent Extremism Agenda*. Available at: http://resources.cohesioninstitute.org.uk/Publications/ Documents/Document/Download Documents File.aspx?recordId=154&file= PDFversion.

Lukacs, George, 1923/1967. *History and Class Consciousness*. Merlin Press.

McGhee, Derek. 2008. *The end of multiculturalism? : terrorism, integration and human rights*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Meadows, Bryan. 2007. Distancing and showing solidarity via metaphor and metonymy in political discourse: a critical study of American statements on Iraq during the years 2004-2005. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines* 1(2), 1-17.

Mulderrig, J. 2011a. The grammar of governance. *Critical Discourse Studies* 8(1), 45-68.

Mulderrig, J. 2011b. Manufacturing consent: A corpus-based critical discourse analysis of New Labour's educational governance. *Journal of Educational Philosophy and Theory* 43, 562-578.

Office for Public Management. 2005. *New Horizons: An exploration of the challenges posed by future trends in segregation and polarisation*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. 2006. *Promoting Effective Citizenship and Community Empowerment: A guide for local authorities on enhancing capacity for public participation*. London.

Ofsted. 2006. *Towards Consensus? Citizenship in Secondary Schools* . London: Department of Education.

Osler, Audrey and Hugh Starkey. 2005. *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education.* Maidenhead: Open University Press.

Parekh, Bhikhu. 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. London: Macmillan.

Phillips, Chris, Daniel Tse and Fiona Johnson. 2011. *Community Cohesion and PREVENT: How Have Schools Responded*? London: Department for Education.

Preston, J. 2009. Preparing for emergencies: citizenship education, 'whiteness'and pedagogies of security. *Citizenship Studies* 13(2), 187- 200.

Scott, Mike. 2008. *Wordsmith Tools Version 5*. Liverpool: Lexical Analysis Software Ltd.

Scott, Mike and Chris Tribble. 2006. *Textual Patterns: Key Words and Corpus Analysis in Language Education*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Simone, Maria A. 2009. Give me liberty and give me surveillance: a case study of the US Government's discourse of surveillance. *Critical Discourse Studies* 6(1), 1-14.

Staiger, U. 2009. New agendas? Culture and citizenship in EU policy, *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 15(1), 1-16.

Taylor, C. 1994. Politics of Recognition. In: A. Guttmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition,* Princeton, NJ: Princeton, 25-74.

Van Dijk, Teun A. 2001. Critical Discourse Analysis. In: Deborah Tannen, Deborah Schiffrin and Heidi Hamilton (eds). *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Blackwell, 357–71.

Vantagepoint. 2003. *Community Cohesion Pathfinder Programme - The First Six Months*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister .

Warraich, Shaukat. 2008. *Preventing Violent Extremism: Working Groups*. London: Home Office.

Williams, Raymond . 1976. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. Glasgow: Fontana.

Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf De Cillia, Martin Reisigl, Karin Liebhart and Johnny Unger. 2009.

The Discursive Construction of National Identity. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University

Press.

About the authors

Malcolm N. MacDonald is an Associate Professor at CAL, University of Warwick. His main

research interests lie in institutional discourse, especially security discourse and medical

discourse; and intercultural communication, especially intercultural ethics. Malcolm co-edits

the journal *Language and Intercultural Communication*.

Duncan Hunter is a Lecturer at CILTE, University of St Mark & St John. His first degree is

in History, and he completed a PhD in Applied Linguistics at the University of Warwick. His

research interests include corpus analysis and language teaching methodology. Duncan is on

the Editorial Advisory Panel of the *ELT Journal*.

John P. O'Regan is a Senior Lecturer at the Institute of Education, University of London.

His main research interests include intercultural communication, critical pedagogy, critical

realism and critical discourse analysis, English and international development, globalization

and new capitalism, and the development of English in diverse world contexts. John co-edits

the journal *Language and Intercultural Communication*.

Appendix

Table 1. 100 strongest CCC discourse keywords

N	Keyword	CCC discourse		PVE discourse		Keyness
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
1	CITIZENSHIP	2144	0.29	1694	0.08	1581
2	OLDHAM	598	0.08	186		881
3	LEARNING	1230	0.17	1031	0.05	846
4	ACTIVE	909	0.12	604	0.03	800
5	COUNCIL	1827	0.25	2155	0.10	762
6	MOBILITY	384	0.05	76		679
7	ODPM	311	0.04	64		543
8	COUNCILS	544	0.07	346	0.02	498
9	PARTICIPATION	794	0.11	719	0.03	496
10	RENEWAL	346	0.05	167		395
11	CITIZEN	278	0.04	103		374
12	CITIES	330	0.04	161		374
13	DECISION	500	0.07	390	0.02	374
14	DISTRICT	349	0.05	199		351
15	POLARISATION	174	0.02	24		342
16	CITY	641	0.09	667	0.03	329
17	COMMUNITY	5971	0.81	13034	0.61	327
18	EDUCATION	1297	0.18	1936	0.09	326
19	INVOLVEMENT	488	0.07	441	0.02	306
20	HUB	171	0.02	36		296
21	LOCAL	5940	0.80	13271	0.62	277
22	HOUSING	875	0.12	1185	0.06	277
23	MAKING	710	0.10	868	0.04	277
24	DEMOCRACY	275	0.04	164		266
25	PATHFINDER	384	0.05	326	0.02	260
26	LOCALISM	123	0.02	13		257
27	REGENERATION	368	0.05	305	0.01	256
28	ABIS	97	0.01	1		254
29	LSPS	167	0.02	49		253
30	COUNCILLORS	357	0.05	301	0.01	244
31	CITIZENS	589	0.08	712	0.03	235
32	ELECTED	217	0.03	115		231
33	BRADFORD	335	0.05	287	0.01	224
34	PUBLIC	1614	0.22	2918	0.14	223
35	TENANT	116	0.02	18		221
36	VISION	403	0.05	401	0.02	221
37	SERVICES	1600	0.22	2905	0.14	218
38	AUTHORITY	795	0.11	1175	0.05	205
39	PARTNERSHIP	816	0.11	1225	0.06	202
40	SEGREGATION	311	0.04	280	0.01	196
41	BOROUGH	469	0.06	562	0.03	190
42	ROCHDALE	103	0.01	19		186
43	NDC	83	0.01	7		181
44	PERFORMANCE	397	0.05	445	0.02	181

45	HEADER	64		0		174
46	VOTING	99	0.01	20		174
47	COLLEGE	258	0.03	220	0.01	174
48	UNIT	340	0.05	355	0.02	174
49	CHEADER	63		0		172
50	BRUSSELS	81	0.01	8		172
51	PANEL	171	0.02	98		171
52	BUSINESS	416	0.06	498	0.02	169
53	MBC	73		5		165
54	TMOS	60		0		164
55	CAMDEN	118	0.02	42		162
56	FOR	8759	1.18	21659	1.01	162
57	DIVERSITY	961	0.13	1653	0.08	159
58	VOLUNTARY	622	0.08	932	0.04	155
59	USER	132	0.02	66		147
60	SCENARIOS	92	0.01	25		144
61	PAPER	277	0.04	286	0.01	144
62	SHADOW	79	0.01	15		142
63	PUPILS	761	0.10	1271	0.06	138
64	LEADERSHIP	560	0.08	858	0.04	131
65	TURNOUT	69		11		131
66	TENANTS	119	0.02	61		130
67	SERVICE	1068	0.14	1995	0.09	130
68	COMMITTEES	111	0.02	52		129
69	EXECUTIVE	255	0.03	268	0.01	129
70	TAKE	769	0.10	1320	0.06	128
71	COLLEGES	230	0.03	228	0.01	127
72	NEIGHBOURHOODS	262	0.04	283	0.01	127
73	HOMELESS	93	0.01	34		126
74	STUDIES	367	0.05	479	0.02	126
75	NEIGHBOURHOOD	668	0.09	1104	0.05	126
76	SKILLS	677	0.09	1133	0.05	122
77	USERS	176	0.02	148		121
78	SUNDERLAND	63		10		119
79	INITIATIVES	571	0.08	915	0.04	118
80	GUIDE	300	0.04	369	0.02	116
81	CHOICE	210	0.03	209		115
82	CONSULTATION	533	0.07	844	0.04	114
83	QUALITY	330	0.04	434	0.02	111
84	ACHIEVEMENT	176	0.02	158		111
85	PARTICIPATORY	78	0.01	26		111
86	AND	30752	4.16	83456	3.88	111
87	ELECTIONS	130	0.02	90		110
88	MINORITY	982	0.13	1874	0.09	109
89	REPRESENTATIVES	268	0.04	321	0.01	109
90	DETR	39		0		106
91	SATISFACTION	124	0.02	85		106
92	TMO	38		0		104
93	INTERVIEW	116	0.02	76		103
94	CONSTITUTIONS	49		5		103
95	EFFECTIVE	644	0.09	1120	0.05	102
96	NEIGBOURHOODS	37		0		101
97	DEVELOPMENT	1051	0.14	2075	0.10	100

98	POLITICAL	575	0.08	976	0.05	99
99	SHOREDITCH	36		0		98
100	LEADER	146	0.02	125		98

Table 2. 100 strongest PVE discourse keywords

N	Keyword	PVE discourse		CCC discourse		Keyness
		Freq.	%	Freq.	%	
1	PREVENT	4649	0.22	177.00	0.02	1715
2	MUSLIM	3712	0.17	276.00	0.04	941
3	VIOLENT	2722	0.13	136.00	0.02	887
4	TERRORISM	2887	0.13	198.00	0.03	777
5	EXTREMISM	2873	0.13	196.00	0.03	776
6	SECURITY	2338	0.11	249.00	0.03	422
7	WE	9934	0.46	2164.00	0.29	409
8	RADICALISATION	979	0.05	30.00		391
9	THAT	24102	1.12	6404.00	0.87	357
10	MUSLIMS	1646	0.08	158.00	0.02	333
11	I	3154	0.15	502.00	0.07	308
12	INTEGRATION	1531	0.07	148.00	0.02	307
13	INTERACTION	1173	0.05	91.00	0.01	287
14	COUNTER	1242	0.06	108.00	0.01	276
15	OUR	4706	0.22	928.00	0.13	271
16	MIGRANTS	771	0.04	36.00		260
17	MR	580	0.03	12.00		258
18	AL	981	0.05	78.00	0.01	236
19	TERRORIST	1367	0.06	152.00	0.02	234
20	MIGRATION	1108	0.05	107.00	0.01	222
21	PVE	375	0.02	0.00		222
22	CONTEST	493	0.02	10.00		221
23	BRECKLAND	357	0.02	0.00		211
24	BRITISH	1738	0.08	260.00	0.04	191
25	CLG	347	0.02	2.00		186
26	NOT	8152	0.38	2034.00	0.28	179
27	PREVENTING	948	0.04	99.00	0.01	175
28	NORFOLK	314	0.01	1.00		175
29	SECTION	1698	0.08	264.00	0.04	174
30	IDEOLOGY	396	0.02	9.00		172
31	QA	376	0.02	7.00		171
32	IDA	373	0.02	7.00		170
33	VCS	426	0.02	14.00		166
34	RESILIENCE	506	0.02	25.00		166
35	OVERSEAS	568	0.03	37.00		158
36	INTELLIGENCE	739	0.03	68.00		156
37	OR	10670	0.50	2850.00	0.39	151
38	PREJUDICE	766	0.04	77.00	0.01	147
39	PROJECTS	2057	0.10	381.00	0.05	141
40	FUNDING	2349	0.11	463.00	0.06	135
41	WHO	4721	0.22	1119.00	0.15	135
42	INTERNATIONAL	1131	0.05	162.00	0.02	134
43	INTERACTIONS	384	0.02	17.00		133
44	ESOL	301	0.01	7.00		130
45	DIVERENT	214		0.00		127
46	TABLE	952	0.04	129.00	0.02	124
47	AFFILIATION	279	0.01	6.00		123
48	PDF	418	0.02	27.00		117
49	DEFENCE	326	0.02	14.00		114

50	FUNDERS	336	0.02	16.00		112
51	INSTITUTE	674	0.03	77.00	0.01	112
52	RISK	1156	0.05	186.00	0.03	110
53	POLICE	2758	0.13	607.00	0.08	109
54	INTERVENTIONS	411	0.02	29.00		108
55	THINK	1157	0.05	188.00	0.03	108
56	HULL	248	0.01	6.00		106
57	NUCLEAR	177		0.00		105
58	EXTREMIST	697	0.03	87.00	0.01	103
59	MS	187		1.00		101
60	ORDERS	370	0.02	25.00		100
61	MIGRANT	448	0.02	39.00		99
62	THOSE	4043	0.19	988.00	0.13	99
63	WORKS	817	0.04	117.00	0.02	97
64	PRIMARY	1001	0.05	160.00	0.02	97
65	COHESION	9718	0.45	2717.00	0.37	95
66	SPECIAL	662	0.03	85.00	0.01	94
67	ICOCO	206		4.00		93
68	CAPABILITIES	347	0.02	24.00		93
69	QAEDA	171		1.00		92
70	COUNTERING	263	0.01	12.00		90
71	DATA	1624	0.08	328.00	0.04	87
72	BNP	194		4.00		86
73	WELSH	234	0.01	9.00		86
74	CHANNEL	289	0.01	17.00		86
75	COUNTRY	1185	0.06	215.00	0.03	86
76	EXTREMISTS	355	0.02	28.00		86
77	DETENTION	192		4.00		85
78	AFGHANISTAN	247	0.01	11.00		85
79	ISLAM	555	0.03	68.00		84
80	CENT	2411	0.11	551.00	0.07	81
81	LIKELY	1755	0.08	371.00	0.05	80
82	SHARED	1384	0.06	272.00	0.04	80
83	BASE	582	0.03	76.00	0.01	80
84	LOT	497	0.02	58.00		80
85	EVIDENCE	1724	0.08	364.00	0.05	79
86	RELIGIOUS	1507	0.07	306.00	0.04	79
87	CONTROL	649	0.03	93.00	0.01	77
88	CSOS	128		0.00		76
89	INDICATIVE	172		4.00		74
90	ISLAMIC	476	0.02	57.00		74
91	INDIVIDUALS	1615	0.08	341.00	0.05	74
92	ANNEX	526	0.02	68.00		74
93	IDENTITY	1236	0.06	241.00	0.03	73
94	WORRIED	161		3.00		73
95	PARAGRAPH	178		5.00		73
96	ANY	2276	0.11	528.00	0.07	72
97	ARRIVALS	270	0.01	19.00		71
98	AGAINST	1191	0.06	232.00	0.03	71
99	DG	120		0.00		71
100	THEOLOGICAL	135		1.00		71