

21st Century Ideological Discourses About US Migrant Education That Transcend Registers

Dr. Shannon Fitzsimmons-Doolan
Texas A&M Corpus Christi
shannon.fitzsimmons-doolan@tamucc.edu
Accepted for publication in *Corpora* 18(2)

Please cite as: Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. (forthcoming) 21st Century Ideological Discourses About US Migrant Education That Transcend Registers. *Corpora* 18(2).

Abstract

Widely distributed and often repeated discursive patterns which represent migrants can influence the education of migrant students (Calavita, 1996; Cutler, 2017; Dabach et al., 2017; Santa Ana, 2002). Ideological discourses (e.g., *immigrants are threats*) are particularly potent structures mediating language, cognition, and social life. Yet, while there has been a recent increase in studies of texts on the topic of migration generally, there are few that focus on the intersection of migration and education or on discursive patterns that transcend registers. This study introduces a multidimensional analysis approach for the identification of ideological discourses from a 9 million-word corpus of 21st century, US texts about migrant education from multiple registers (online comments; national and regional newspaper texts; and federal and state government webpages) using the distribution of lexical variables that characterize variants of *migrant/migration*. Eleven ideological discourses (e.g., *US immigration policies are problematic, but there is no consensus for solutions*) were found. Of these, several had not been previously identified, one confirmed a previously identified discourse, and several complemented and extended previously identified discursive patterns on this topic. Together, these findings reveal the highly naturalized ideologically discursive landscape that shapes educational opportunities for US migrant students.

1. Introduction

Socially shared language has a co-constructive relationship with ‘the human lifeworld’ (Johnstone, 2008: 33). Thus, widely distributed and often repeated discursive patterns which represent migration and migrants in texts about migrant education can influence the education of migrant students¹ in important ways. These ways include the development and maintenance of widely held perceptions of migrant students (Cutler, 2017; Santa Ana, 2002), educational

¹In this paper, ‘migrant’ will be used as the superordinate term for categories such as ‘immigrant,’ ‘refugee,’ ‘migrant’ and ‘asylum seeker.’ In addition, ‘migrant student’ is used to refer to not only individual students with foreign born status, but also children of such individuals. In the US, more than 25% of K-12 children have at least one immigrant parent (Migration Policy Institute, 2018).

policies targeting migrant students (Calavita, 1996), and migrant students' own world views which mediate their learning experiences (Dabach et al., 2017). Ideological discourses are discursive patterns that implicitly relate linguistic referents to each other in ways that allocate social power (e.g., *immigrants are threats*). The identification of ideological discourses about 21st century immigrant education is important because it helps us to understand and respond to the discursive landscape that shapes educational opportunities for migrant students.

Identifying ideological discourses across multiple registers (i.e., those that transcend registers) is critical, because doing so reveals not only the ideological discourses themselves, but also evidence of their dominance—circulation in a variety of registers. As Jaworska and Kinloc (2018: 113) note, 'studying how a discursive phenomenon behaves across contexts with multiple data sets [i.e., multi-register corpora] can liberate us from the confines of contextual circumference.' Multiple register types have been documented to do ideological work in migrant or educational discourse (e.g., online comments (Antony and Thomas, 2017), regional and national newspapers (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008), Department of Education webtexts (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2014)). Further, these registers vary along important situational dimensions (e.g., participants, communicative purpose, and production circumstances). Thus, a corpus including these registers incorporates variability along these situational parameters which are associated with ideological production. These registers, then, are ideal for inclusion in a multi-register corpus from which to identify overarching ideological discourses.

In light of the scholarship described above, this study asks, *Which ideological discourses about im/migration are present in a multi-register corpus of 21st century texts about US migrant education?* To do so, it applies a novel extension of the well-established corpus linguistics

approach, multidimensional (MD) analysis, to a 9.2 million-word corpus of 21st century, US texts about migrant education from multiple registers.

2. Theoretical Framework

For this study, ideological discourses are theorized as abstract, yet socially influential entities that exist in the undetermined space between ideologies at one end and discursive linguistic data at the other. In this framework, ideologies are broadly entrenched sets of shared beliefs that help to determine social life (e.g., politically liberal or conservative ideologies). Ideologies are developed through social experience, serve the interest of particular social groups, and are quite often used as tools to ‘acquire or maintain power’ (Woolard, 1998: 7). At the other end of the space delimiting ideological discourses lies discursive linguistic data—continually produced across registers, modalities, audiences, topics, and languages. As van Dijk (2018: 242) notes, ‘We see that between fundamental ideologies (i.e., of racism) and actual racist text or talk, there are various levels of socio cognitive analysis.’ Ideological discourses are bounded by ideology and text and are also a hybrid of these two constructs. They reproduce specific aspects of ideologies and are traceable in linguistic data. Their content (ideological—therefore supporting allocation of social power) and form (discursive and implicit—therefore highly transmittable) make ideological discourses exceptionally efficient at helping to construct social reality *and* challenging to identify empirically.

Ideological discourses have linguistic, social, and cognitive characteristics (Santa Ana, 2002, 2007). Functionally, ideological discourses represent an entity (Baker, 2006; Partington, 2015) (e.g., *immigrants are hard workers*). Through that representation, dimensions of social power are inserted (Baker and McEnery, 2015a) and an understanding of the represented entity is shaped (Foucault, 1972). Linguistically, ideological discourses are marked by some degree of

lexical co-occurrence and repetition within and across texts (Stubbs, 2002). In contrast to *ideological discourses*, in this study, *discourse* is used to refer to sets of texts on the same topic (i.e., political discourse, sports discourse, migration discourse) (van Dijk, 2018).

Corpus linguistic techniques have been advanced as ideal for identifying constructs consistent with ideological discourses. Baker (2006) argues that corpus approaches can identify patterns in language across texts that reveal discourses (both dominant and resistant) that are ‘hidden’ (19); that is, not consciously processed or explicitly stated. Corpus linguistics techniques promoted for identification of ideological discourses include keyword analysis followed by qualitative analysis (Baker and McEnery, 2015b) as well as collocational network analysis (Baker, 2016). The argument for the latter builds a case for the application of the MD analysis approach introduced below.

MD analysis is a long-standing corpus linguistics approach (Biber, 2019) that reveals groups of linguistic variables that co-occur together within and across a corpus of texts. These groups of variables index underlying functional dimensions in a corpus (e.g., “Informational versus Involved Production” (Biber, 1988)). Usually employed with (lexico)grammatical variables, the approach always involves both quantitative and qualitative analysis of language. A recent, small collection of studies have used the approach with lexical variables and explored its application to constructs of interest in discourse studies (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2014; Berber Sardinha 2017; Berber Sardinha 2019). For example, Berber Sardinha (2017) used counts of the most frequent lexical variables in texts to identify factors interpreted as discourses. Combined with a powerful track-record of MD analysis for identifying implicit constructs across groups of texts, these recent studies reveal the potential of MD analysis using counts of lexical variables to identify latent discursive constructs in a corpus. The exact construct identified, however, depends on

criteria for variable selection among other design permutations. Building on this work, the current study introduces a novel application of MD analysis as a methodological technique to identify ideological discourses through the distributional patterns of ideologically loaded lexical variables.

3. Literature Review

Given the saliency of im/migration in the 21st century, much scholarship, using a variety of approaches to discourse analysis, has examined patterns in 21st century texts focused on the topic of migration or the representation of migrants generally. The majority of this work has focused on the U.K. context (e.g., Charteris-Black, 2006; Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008; Taylor, 2014; Blinder and Allen, 2016; Kirkwood, et al. 2016; Taylor, 2018). Other national and regional contexts, however, such as Germany (e.g., Vollmer and Karakayali, 2018), Italy (e.g., Taylor, 2014), North America (e.g., Antony and Thomas, 2016; López-Sanders and Brown, 2020; Perrino and Wortham, 2018), and Europe (e.g., Wodak, 2015; Viola and Musloff, 2019) have also been examined. These analyses identify and explore (1) repeated topics/themes in migration texts (Gabrielatos and Baker, 2008; Antony and Thomas, 2016), (2) patterns in the representation of migrant subcategories (i.e., refugee) (Charteris-Black, 2006; Gabrielatos and Baker 2008; Blinder and Allen, 2016; Vollmer and Karakayali, 2018), (3) patterns in longitudinal representation of migrant/migration (López-Sanders and Brown, 2020; Taylor, 2018), (4) variability of presentation of migrants/migration across language and register (Taylor, 2014), (5) frameworks for identity construction underlying migration discourse (Perrino and Wortham, 2018), and (7) identification of discursive strategies through which migrants are racialized and/or excluded (Wodak, 2015). In a synthesis of Perrino and Wortham (2018), Gal (2018) notes that ‘there are no neutral descriptions of migrants and migration’ (66), ‘discourse seems to move or

spread across speech events' (67) driven by interactional positioning, and that migration discourses often exhibit the structure of fractal recursivity (i.e., replication of form across scale).

Within this body of scholarship, however, few studies have focused specifically on discursive patterns in texts about migration and education (the more specific focus of this study). Using corpus linguistics methods, Berger et al. (2017) explored a corpus of local school district documents targeted towards parents at four schools with notably high percentages of foreign-born parents and students. The authors used keyword analysis, collocate analysis, and concordance analysis and found that the corpus of interest seemed less focused on long-term academic development and post-secondary preparation than a reference corpus.

Also focused on the domain of migrant education texts, Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2019b) investigated two corpora of online US newspaper comments on the topic of immigrant education (a subset of the corpus explored in this study) to identify new and salient patterns in 2016 relative to 2009. The author found strong patterns of (1) a zero-sum framework and (2) metonymy in which all migrants are constructed as 'illegal immigrants' underlying the discourse in addition to seven new themes that emerged in the 2016 data (i.e., *economy/finances*, *amount/disaster*, *law*, *crime*, *problem*, *animals*, *politics*). While the above studies have identified meaningful patterns in 21st century migration (education) discourse, they have not set out to identify ideological discourses specifically.

A limited number of studies have sought to identify and describe constructs aligning with the characteristics of ideological discourses (the specific construct of interest in this study) in bodies of texts on the topic of migration. In his groundbreaking work, Santa Ana (2002) argued for the parallels between discursive formation theory and cognitive metaphor theory, concluding that metaphor is 'the unit of analysis in discursive practice' (20). In his 2002 empirical

conceptual metaphor study of *Los Angeles Times* texts focused on state Proposition 187 (1994) which targeted access to public education for migrants, Santa Ana found dominant metaphors of IMMIGRATION AS DANGEROUS WATERS and IMMIGRANT AS ANIMAL, in addition to others. Santa Ana et al. (2007) used similar methods to identify metaphors about immigrants/immigration generally at two points in time in 2006. The authors found an increase in more favorable representations for immigrants (e.g., IMMIGRANTS AS WORKERS) in 2006 from 1994, however unfavorable metaphors (i.e., IMMIGRANTS AS CRIMINALS) were still dominant. In this tradition, Catalano and Mitchell-McCollough (2019) identified metaphors and found IMMIGRANTS AS DANGEROUS WATERS, IMMIGRANTS AS NUMBERS, and IMMIGRANTS AS CRIMINALS in 2016 online news texts about migrant children.

In addition to the metaphor studies, Strauss (2012) identified *conventional discourses* about immigration from interviews with 27 North Carolina residents, media texts, and surveys. She theorizes conventional discourses as ‘oft-repeated, shared schema[s]’ (15) where schemas are ‘cultural model[s]’ (60) and describes conventional discourses as ‘less encompassing than a discursive framework understood as a whole ideology’ (61). Conventional discourses are identified through iterative, emic qualitative analysis. She identified 24 conventional discourses about migration/migrants grouped into the categories: economic impacts (e.g., *immigrants’ work ethic*), legality and security (e.g., *illegal is wrong*), American culture (e.g., *speak English and assimilate*) and larger causes (e.g., *fix sending countries*).

In sum, though there is an abundance of scholarship on 21st century migration discourse, there is little on the subdomain of migrant education discourse. Furthermore, few studies on this topic have been designed to identify constructs consistent with ideological discourses. This is an important gap in the scholarship given the social potency of ideological discourses. Finally, as

revealed in this review, little is known about migrant discourse from a *multi-* or *trans-register* vantage point. That is, the overwhelming majority of the texts reviewed observe discursive patterns within individual registers. Only one study (Charteris-Black, 2006) was designed to extract patterns from a multi-register corpus. The current study aims to help fill these gaps and introduces MD analysis for the identification of ideological discourses to do so.

4. Methods

4.1 Corpus

In order to identify ideological discourses about migrant education across an extensive number of texts for a broad range of source types, the multi-register *US Migrant Education Corpus* was developed. The corpus includes 4,832 texts, totals 9,242,769 words, and is comprised of five register-based subcorpora (online newspaper comment threads, national newspapers, regional newspapers, federal Department of Education (DOE) webtexts, selected states' DOE webtexts). The *US Migrant Education Corpus* spans from 2003 (the founding of the US Department of Homeland Security) to 2018. Because text identification procedures necessarily varied by register type, representation by date varies for each register. All texts that met the search criteria (as elaborated below) for each register type for each search were included in the corpus. Word and text counts for each register subcorpus are presented in Table 1 and an explanation of identification parameters for each register subcorpus follows.

The online reader comments (Table 1, Column 1) consist of the complete comment thread in relation to a set of articles about migrant education published in the *New York Times* (NYT) in 2009 and the complete comment thread in relation to an article about migrant education published in *The Washington Post* in 2016. Both newspapers are considered part of the US 'prestige press'—a description reflecting similarities in readership, rigor, and scope. The articles

eliciting the comments were subjected to a semantic tag analysis and found to be comparable. (See Fitzsimmons-Doolan 2019b for more on the comparability and identification of the texts within this subcorpus). Online comments, increasingly the subject of discourse analyses, are written and read by readers of a particular newspaper, though they are moderated to some degree by a newspaper editor. They generally serve communicative functions of engagement and stance taking, are relatively “spontaneous” in terms of production time, and can be the site of ideological reproduction (Antony and Thomas, 2017).

The national newspaper subcorpus (Table 1, Column 2) includes all of the texts meeting the search criteria (see below) in the three national newspapers with the widest circulation (*NYT*, *USA Today*, and the *Wall Street Journal*) from March 2003 to March 2017. The texts were identified by entering the search terms ‘immigration’ OR ‘immigrant’ AND ‘education’ from March 2003 to March 2017 in the advanced search in the Newspaper Source database. Based on the database search results, in newspaper texts, ‘immigrant’ was a more superordinate term than ‘migrant’ and thus was the search term used to develop the newspaper subcorpora used in this study.

Table 1. US Migrant Education Corpus by Subcorpus

Online Comment Subcorpus	National Newspaper Subcorpus	Regional Newspaper Subcorpus	Federal DOE Subcorpus	State DOE Subcorpus
<i>New York Times</i> comments 2009 892 texts 145,652 words	<i>New York Times</i> 2003-2017 295 texts 308,107 words	<i>Chicago Tribune</i> 2003-2017 154 texts 110,684 words	2005 127 texts 330,417 words	<i>California Dept of Ed</i> 2005 214 texts 473,569 words
<i>Washington Post</i> comments 2016 1,109 texts 51,878 words	<i>USA Today</i> 2003-2017 128 texts 75,788 words	<i>Denver Post</i> 2003-2017 208 texts 150,037 words	2013 226 texts 2,689,869 words	<i>California Dept of Ed</i> 2013 140 texts 467,882 words

	<i>Wall Street Journal</i> 2003-2017 121 texts 112,843 words	<i>Houston Chronicle</i> 2003-2017 289 texts 205,967 words	2018 240 texts 2,670,017 words	<i>California Dept of Ed</i> 2018 236 texts 757,159 words
		<i>LA Times</i> 2003-2017 347 texts 318,803 words		<i>Delaware Office of Ed</i> 2005 6 texts 34,292 words
				<i>Delaware Office of Ed</i> 2013 35 texts 72,631 words
				<i>Delaware Office of Ed</i> 2018 65 texts 267,174 words
197,530 words	496,738 words	785,491 words	5,690,303 words	2,072,707 words

The regional newspaper subcorpus contains all of the newspaper articles about migrant education from four regional newspapers (*Chicago Tribune*, *Denver Post*, *Houston Chronicle*, *Los Angeles Times*) from March 2003 to March 2017 (Table 1, Column 3). These texts were identified using library databases and all include the terms ‘immigrant’ or ‘immigration’ and ‘education.’ These newspapers are all among the top 15 periodicals in the US in terms of circulation during the time period of interest based on the best available industry data (e.g., circulation reports from the Alliance for Audited Media) and were chosen to supplement the national newspapers in terms of geographic representation. Therefore, the Northeast, South, Midwest, Rocky Mountain West, and Far West of the continental US are all represented.

Newspaper texts are primarily, though not exclusively, written by professional journalists. They often function to report, but a subset persuades or announces, and there are multiple opportunities for revision or editing by multiple individuals prior to publication. Newspaper texts are more strongly constrained by institutional parameters than online

comments, but less so than DOE texts. In the migration discourse literature reviewed for this study, newspaper texts were overwhelmingly the most studied register.

The US federal DOE data (Table 1, Column 4) were retrieved from the Office of Migrant Education and the Office of English Language Acquisition webpages—two offices that explicitly attend to the education of migrant students. In order to capture different versions of these websites over time, three years (2005, 2013, 2018) were identified within the overall timespan for the corpus (2003-2018) that also fell within different presidential administrations.² For each year, for each website, the *Way Back Machine* (2001) was used to capture all of the available webpages which were three ‘clicks’ away from the home page. Only the webpages that contained the stem, ‘migr’ were collected. The pages were captured even if they went off site.

Two states were selected for state-level DOE data (Table 1, Column 5). California was selected as a traditional migrant-receiving state. Delaware was selected as a new-receiving state—between 2000 and 2017, the number of children of immigrants in Delaware grew by 175% (Zong et al. 2019). The data from the California DOE and Delaware Office of Education websites were also collected using the *Way Back Machine* for the years 2005, 2013, 2018 following the same procedures used for development of the federal DOE subcorpus.

The DOE webtexts (at both the federal and state levels) were quite heterogenous. The texts included formal policies, homepages, annotated lists, meeting agendas and minutes, forms, and program reports. In many ways, the websites serve as repositories for many text types under the common communicative function of informing. Authorship of most of the texts can be attributed to the institution. Limited scholarship examining corpora of educational institution

² In the US, the president and their appointees administer the federal DOE and their policy agenda guides website management.

texts has identified patterns of ideological production related to the education of migrant students (e.g., Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2014; 2019a; Berger et al., 2017).

4.2 Analysis

As an overview, to identify ideological discourses across the texts of the *US Migrant Education Corpus* three primary steps were taken following the tradition of MD analysis. Lexical variables describing migrants/migration were identified. Next, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted to identify how those variables clustered together within and across texts into ideological discourses. Finally, qualitative analysis systematically investigated the texts in which those variables clustered the most in order to interpret the factors as ideological discourses.

The first step in the analysis was to identify the lexical variables of interest in this study (i.e., lexical items whose co-occurrence patterns within and across texts would point to ideological discourses about migrant education). According to Biber (1988: 71-72), “A principled decision must be made concerning the linguistic features to be used...The goal is to include the widest possible range of *potentially* important linguistic features.” Because this study was interested in finding ideological discourses about im/migration, the goal of the variable selection process was to identify the broadest possible set of lexical items that were associated with describing immigrants/migrants/migration/immigration in the corpus.

To accomplish this goal, Word Smith software (Scott, 2016) was used to identify all of the collocates of the node *migr* within the span 3L to 3R that occurred at least five times. This revealed 1,729 collocates for all of the lexical items for which ‘migr’ is a stem (e.g., *immigration*, *immigrant*, *migrant*, *migratory*). Next, concordance lines including the collocates and the node words were examined to observe which grammatical structures of the collocates consistently encoded descriptive information about the node word through processes such as

evaluation (Hunston, 2011, p.1), modification, or semantic prosody. For example, it was observed that collocates often co-occurred with nodes as adjectives on the same noun phrase (e.g, *migratory agricultural worker*). In this case, along with the noun “worker” that the node is modifying, the co-occurring adjective, “agricultural,” conveys information about how migrants are being represented in the text. From these observations, a set of grammatical codes for the collocates were developed (Table 2, Column 1) which, when applied as inclusion criteria, would further specify the lexical variables in this study. As an illustration, the grammatical relationship in the example above was given the code “adjective co-modifier” (Table 2, Row 6). Next, for each of the 1,729 collocates, concordance lines (or full co-text if necessary) were examined. If the collocate occurred at least five times in a slot expressing any of the grammatical relationships to the node word shown in Table 2, it was included for further analysis. Finally, a dispersion cut off of collocation with the node in at least 70 texts in the corpus was set. The frequency and dispersion parameters were set quite low so that the broadest range of variables meeting the collocational and grammatical criteria would be included. After this intensive variable selection process, $n = 114$ ideologically loaded lexical items were identified for inclusion in the analysis. These are presented in Table 3.

Table 2. Grammatical relationships between collocate and node word used for inclusion criteria

Code	Description	Examples
Verb/Verbal	If the collocate is a verb with *migr* functioning as the subject or object, include. This includes verbs in relative clauses where *migr* is in the NP being modified as well as infinitive phrases, participles, and gerunds modifying or in a subject/object relationship with *migr*.	<i>Immigrants <u>work</u> long hours.</i> <i>Migrant students who <u>dropout</u>...</i> <i>Programs <u>serving</u> immigrant children and youth...</i>

Adjective, attributive	If the collocate is an attributive adjective of *migr*, include.	<i><u>illegal</u> immigrants</i>
Adjective, predicative	If the collocate is a predicative modifier of *migr*, include.	<i>immigrants are <u>illegal</u></i>
Noun	If *migr* is a modifier, include noun being modified. This includes adjectival prepositional phrases with *migr* as NP.	<i>migrant <u>education</u></i> <i><u>numbers</u> of migrants</i>
Parallel	If *migr* is joined by a conjunction with collocate, include	<i>immigration and <u>naturalization</u></i> <i><u>LEP</u> and immigrant students</i>
Adjective, co-modifier	If collocate is working with *migr* to modify a noun, include.	<i>migratory <u>agricultural</u> worker</i>

Table 3. N = 114 collocates of *migr* used as lexical variables in factor analysis

advocates	family	million	school
agricultural	farmworkers	more	schools
all	federal	most	seasonal
American	give	move	serve
an	group	national	served
anti	groups	need	services
are	had	needs	serving
assist	has	new	some
based	have	no	state
be	health	number	states
bill	help	office	status
both	high	officials	student
California	his	one	students
center	Hispanic	only	support
child	illegal	other	system
children	include	our	the
citizenship	including	percent	their
come	information	policy	these
comprehensive	is	population	those
country	issue	proficient	undocumented
data	issues	program	was
debate	large	programs	were
education	Latino	provide	work
eligible	law	receive	worker
enforcement	laws	recent	workers
English	legal	reform	working

enrolled	many	rights	youth
ensure	Mexican	said	
families	Mexico	say	

Next, a factor analysis was conducted. Counts of any occurrence of each variable, per text were tabulated using a Python program. The counts were normed per 100 words for comparability and log transformed. A factor analysis using principal axis factoring was performed on the data following the same procedures reported in Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2014). These included checking assumptions and factorability, identifying a set of potential factor solutions, and choosing a factor solution based on a set of several criteria (see below). After multivariate outlier texts were removed as well as lexical variables with communalities $< .2$, there were $n = 3922$ texts and $n = 84$ lexical variables. A 10-factor solution with a KMO of .829 accounting for 23.59% of the total variance was selected. This solution was considered optimal using the criteria of total variance accounted for, interpretability, KMO scores, and communality of variables.

Finally, the resulting factors were interpreted to determine the ideological discourse labels (i.e., the underlying ideological discourses that the co-occurrence patterns of ideologically loaded lexical variables pointed towards). Friginal & Hardy (2019: 147) describe “how numerically defined factors become functionally labeled dimensions” in traditional MD analysis focused on functional dimensions using grammatical variables. They offer the following steps (147-148).

1. “Look for patterns” –in the data
2. “Examine the complementary distribution in each factor”—if present
3. “Compare distributions across all factors” –notice variables that load on multiple factors

4. “Conduct further research”
5. “Name your factors”
6. “Search for text examples” –use factor scores/text to find illustrative text samples
7. “Finalize your functional interpretation” –examine more text samples to confirm the interpretation

These were essentially the steps followed in this stage of the analysis, which will be explained in detail below.

For each factor, the lexical variables with factor loadings $\geq .3$ (*highly loading variables*) and the 50 texts in the corpus with the highest factor scores were identified. Next, each of the 50 texts with the highest factor scores were skimmed by the researcher to develop a text-level summary which provided a macro view of the texts (i.e., look for patterns). Then, the five texts with the highest factor scores were processed in WordSmith and the highly loading variables were highlighted. Each text was then read closely to examine and annotate how the highly loading variables functioned in the texts (i.e., more looking for patterns). Following this, an interpretation of an ideological discourse which synthesized the text- and variable-level patterns was developed (i.e., name your factors, which also took into consideration existing research and the one case of complementary distribution). Text samples which reflected the first interpretation were retrieved (i.e., search for text samples). Several more of the 50 texts with the highest factor scores were then loaded into WordSmith with the highly loading lexical variables highlighted in order to confirm and refine the initial interpretation of the ideological discourse presented across the texts (i.e., finalize your interpretation).

5. Results and Discussion

In a ten-factor solution, eleven ideological discourses transcending registers were identified through the MD analysis of the *US Migrant Education Corpus*. They are as follows:

1. *Government programs serve children in need*
2. *Immigrant lives are narratives (usually criminal or uplifting)*
3. *US immigration policies are problematic, but there is no consensus for solutions*
4. *Efficacy in educating migrant students is best assessed through data*
5. *Schools face tensions between teaching English and integrating students*
6. *Top-down immigration laws are punitive or permissive*
7. *Immigrants and governments have a mutual relationship founded on acts of service and work*
8. *Migrants that do seasonal farmwork and their families are a special class of migrant*
9. *Given the unique relationship between the two countries, US/Mexico partnerships are advantageous*
10. *Migrants are Others as indicated by discrete institutional structures (versus)*
11. *Migrants are Others who can be spoken about with certainty (in complementary distribution with 10 above)*

Table 4 presents results for each of the ideological discourses including highly loading variables, factor loadings, and the total variances (Columns 2-4) (resulting from the factor analysis) as well as the ideological discourse labels (Column 1) (resulting from the interpretive analysis).

These ideological discourses were found to be circulating in the corpus across all five registers (i.e., these ideological discourses transcend register). More specifically, for each ideological discourse, the 100 texts which most strongly represented the ideological discourse

were distributed across at least three registers. Furthermore, using mean summed factor scores as a measure, each of the eleven ideological discourses was found in each of the five registers with one exception (discussed below).

The remainder of this section presents and discusses the eleven ideological discourses. For each discourse, the interpretation developed through the analytical steps described above and illustrative exemplars for each ideological discourse are presented. It should be noted that the unit of analysis for this study was a full text. However, for the sake of space, the exemplars are sections from texts with the highest factor scores/ ideological discourse. The exemplars were selected to illustrate the ideological discourses expressed in the text as well as some ways that multiple highly loading lexical variables contributed to the expression of the ideological discourses. Furthermore, for each ideological discourse, attempts were made to present exemplars from multiple registers to demonstrate the expression of the ideological discourses across registers. In these exemplars, highly loading variables are bolded and names of individuals are redacted.

5.1 Government programs serve children in need

This ideological discourse was indexed by the highly loading lexical items: *services, youth, provide, programs, health, children, state, education, assist, center, ensure, information, needs, child, office, including, and comprehensive*. Among the texts that represent this discourse most strongly, there are several federal DOE pages that primarily list and describe educational resource agencies for each state and follow a template from text to text. Government programs that provide health and education services to children and youth are usually the focus of texts expressing this discourse as can be seen in exemplars 1 and 2 below.

*(1) **Comprehensive Regional Assistance Center***

*Help states, school districts, and schools meet the **needs of children, including:***

***children** in high poverty areas, migratory **children**, immigrant children, **children** with limited-English proficiency, neglected or delinquent **children**, homeless **children** and youth, Indian **children**, **children** with disabilities, and, where applicable, Native Alaskan and Hawaiian **children**.* (federal DOE text)

(2) *Metropolitan Family **Services** has operated a Head Start **program** in the Chicago Lawn community on the city's Southwest Side. The 102 3- and 4-year-old children we serve each year are all poor. Most are born to immigrant families with limited English literacy. Ten percent have physical or cognitive disabilities.* (regional newspaper text)

In these exemplars and across the texts strongly deploying this discourse, the concept of ‘immigrant’ is associated with characteristics such as poverty and disability. This can be seen in both exemplar 1 where “migrant children” are listed in the same series with “homeless children” and “children with disabilities” and in exemplar 2 where children in the program in question are described as “poor,” “born to immigrant families,” and having “physical or cognitive disabilities.” These associations provide a rhetorical rationale for need which is then addressed by the government service. While Fitzsimmons-Doolan (2019b) identified the theme *problem* in which migrant status is associated discursively with poverty and failure, the identification of this discourse shows how these unfavorable associations can be embedded in the seemingly sympathetic discourse of ‘help.’

5.2 Immigrant lives are narratives (usually criminal or uplifting)

This ideological discourse was indexed by the lexical variables: *was, said, had, his, were*, and *officials* and the majority of the texts encoding this ideological discourse most strongly were newspaper texts. The texts presented narratives of the lives of immigrants, most often using the tropes of ‘criminal’ (14/50) (e.g., articles about immigrants committing insurance fraud or being arrested for a variety of reasons) or ‘uplifting story’ (23/50) (e.g., articles about immigrants tutoring a mayor, building a school, or setting up a scholarship), as shown in exemplars 3 and 4.

Table 4. Factor Solution

Ideological discourse (factor label)	Highly loading lexical variables	Variable factor loadings	Total variance
<i>Government programs serve children in need</i>	services	.58	4.225%
	youth	.55	
	provide	.51	
	programs	.48	
	health	.43	
	children	.43	
	state	.41	
	education	.39	
	assist	.38	
	center	.37	
	ensure	.36	
	information	.34	
	needs	.33	
	child	.32	
	office	.31	
	including comprehensive	.31	
<i>Immigrant lives are narratives (usually criminal or uplifting)</i>	was	.62	2.774%
	said	.57	
	had	.53	
	his	.51	
	were	.35	
	officials	.32	
<i>US immigration policies are problematic, but there is no consensus for solutions</i>	reform	.52	2.437%
	bill	.45	
	issue	.35	
	debate	.33	
	citizenship	.32	
	said	.30	

Ideological discourse (factor label) Cont'd	Highly loading lexical variables Cont'd	Variable factor loadings Cont'd	Total variance Cont'd
<i>Efficacy in educating migrant students is best assessed through data</i>	data number percent proficient states include	.57 .50 .45 .43 .39 .35	2.389%
<i>Schools face tension between teaching English and integrating students</i>	school students high schools student English	.63 .61 .42 .34 .31 .31	2.313%
<i>Top-down immigration laws are punitive or permissive</i>	law federal enforcement status officials legal laws undocumented illegal	.57 .44 .41 .37 .37 .34 .34 .31 .31	2.292%
<i>Immigrants and governments have a mutual relationship founded on acts of service and work</i>	served center state number comprehensive working enrolled	.52 .43 .43 .37 .34 .33 .31	1.927%

Ideological discourse (factor label) Cont'd	Highly loading lexical variables Cont'd	Variable factor loadings Cont'd	Total variance Cont'd
<i>Migrants that do seasonal farmwork and their families are a special class of migrant</i>	seasonal farmworkers agricultural	.72 .51 .47	1.625%
<i>Given the unique relationship between the two countries, US/Mexico partnerships are advantageous</i>	Mexican Mexico	.51 .46	1.110%
<i>Migrants are Others as indicated by discrete institutional structures</i>	office information program education	.45 .45 .44 .40	2.504%
<i>Migrants are Others who can be spoken about with certainty</i>	-their -have -are	-.34 -.34 -.38	

(3) *the interim United States attorney for the Northern District of New York, **said** the business owner would be deported after serving **his** sentence of 46 months because he **was** an illegal immigrant....State **officials** said [REDACTED] worked on asbestos-removal projects throughout the state and often used crews of Korean immigrants. His lawyer, [REDACTED], **said**, "He accepted responsibility for his criminal actions."* (national newspaper text)

(4) *A local professional speaking organization recently awarded a Russian immigrant for **his** creative use of the "f" word... [he] opened **his** speech with a description of the search through **his** belongings under the intimidating stares of the Russian police at the airport, after which he and his family **were** allowed to proceed to their plane, which took them to America...."And this was the moment when we realized - finally we made that step, we were out of there, we **were** FREE," [he] **said** in **his** speech.* (regional newspaper text)

In the corpus, as in the exemplars provided, *said*, *was*, and *were* all work to locate the narrative in the past tense; the subject of the narrative was usually a male immigrant indexed by *his*; and the use of *officials* often marked a point in the narrative where a government agency played a role (especially in the “criminal” narratives).

The finding of this ideological discourse is supported by López-Sanders and Brown (2020), who found, in their study of newspaper texts from 2005-2007, evidence of ‘two master narratives: immigrants as criminals and immigrants as hard-workers, with few alternative narratives’ (827). While past work has identified texts that present narratives about individual immigrants as humanizing (e.g., Cabaniss and Cameron, 2017), this ideological discourse shows that the narrative choices for presenting immigrants are constrained. These discursive constraints call into question the ‘humanizing’ nature of such narratives.

5.3 US immigration policies are problematic, but there is no consensus for solutions

This ideological discourse was indexed in texts by the collocates *reform*, *bill*, *issue*, *debate*, *citizenship*, and *said*. Across these texts immigration is presented as an abstract issue, widely perceived as problematic and in need of reform. In these texts, while there is consensus that reform is needed, there is not consensus on what reform looks like as indicated by the repeated

failure of legislative bills. Paths to citizenship for undocumented students and workers is a highly contested aspect of proposed reforms in this discourse.

(5) *The business community is already pushing to resurrect portions of a wide-ranging immigration bill that died in the Senate last week... “At the very least a fix for a year or two while we work on comprehensive **reform** is needed,” ... **said** [REDACTED]. The Senate failed to muster the 60 votes needed to end **debate** on the immigration measure. It would have given a path to **citizenship** for an estimated 12 million undocumented immigrants now in the USA... (national newspaper text)*

(6) *Lawmakers get earful on immigration issue - Congress should remain steadfast in its pursuit of a plan to **reform** immigration and create a path to **citizenship** for those here illegally. Immigration is one of those **issues** that reliably brings out those with strong feelings on both sides...At town hall meetings and community barbecues across the country, federal lawmakers got heaping servings of opinions about how best to deal with the contentious **issue**.... the Senate will continue working on the **bill**. Unfortunately, with such divergent opinions on the **issue**, there will be no way to come up with a plan that will soothe all critics. (regional newspaper text)*

Throughout the texts and in exemplars 5 and 6, while the need for immigration *reform* is not contested through the near universal use of the referent *issue*, the type of reform is contested.

This manifests linguistically in several ways. In exemplar 5 and in many of the texts, *said* is used to index reported language which usually presents a stance towards a reform solution. The reform solution often takes the form of a *bill* (exemplars 5 and 6) and often involves “a path to *citizenship*” for a subset of migrants (exemplars 5 and 6). *Debate* conveys lack of consensus either through the formal legislative procedure (exemplar 5) or more generally (i.e., “the immigration debate” (NYT68)). The lack of consensus for ways forward is also referred to explicitly: ‘strong feelings on both sides,’ ‘contentious *issue*,’ ‘divergent opinions’ (exemplar 6).

This discourse is familiar and widely accepted in the US context and is an excellent illustration of how ideological discourses work to allocate social power. In the US, public opinion research regularly shows areas of consensus for immigration reform. As recently as 2018, for example, in one of the most politically divisive moments in recent US political history

with immigration as a central wedge issue, a reputable national poll found that a strong majority of voters (83%) endorsed providing a pathway to citizenship for Dreamers (Newport, 2018). In contrast to this consensus, however, this ideological discourse, aligned with the status quo, ultimately helps to justify political inertia and to keep millions of US residents, including Dreamers, in an unauthorized and highly vulnerable status of diminished power.

5.4 Efficacy in educating migrant students is best assessed through data

Data, number, percent, proficient, states, and include loaded highly on this ideological discourse, which was represented in state DOE reports, grant reports, and a newspaper article about student enrollment. The ideological discourse asserts that educational quality for migrant students can be best assessed by counting entities (e.g., students, states, graduates, expulsions) often relative to a proficiency benchmark. It is applied at multiple scales (e.g., state, school, student) indicating fractal recursivity which is consistent with Gal (2018).

(7) *In an increasing **number** of **states**, an increasing **percentage** of migrant students at the elementary school level will meet or exceed the **proficient** level on state assessments in reading.... Improvements: It is expected that this indicator will have greater validity and reliability, over time, as the State assessment systems become more stable and the systems **include** all migrant students.* (federal DOE texts)

(8) *About 25 **percent** of schools reported a decline in applications from China and India. The United **States** has been a popular destination for Chinese and Indian students.... About half a million students from those countries are enrolled at US universities, according to IIE **data**. ... Interest from India remains high, but the **number** of applications from China and Saudi Arabia has declined* (regional newspaper texts)

In exemplar 7 and throughout the corpus, the framework of quantitative *data* in relation to a proficiency threshold is clearly explicated with data being indexed by “*number of states*” and “*percentage of students*.” The proficiency benchmark is identified as “the *proficient* level on state assessments in reading.” Exemplar 8 shows these same patterns in a newspaper text where

data (operationalized as *number* of students and applications or a *percent* of schools) is again being used to measure a form of success in the education of migrant students.

Exemplar 7, which focuses on a threshold of adequacy as a measure of success, is highly representative of the DOE webtexts, mostly reports, that scored highly for this discourse. This supports the findings from Berger et al. (2017), one of the few studies that examined migrant education discourse, that found a lack of focus on long-term academic preparation in a corpus of texts from school districts serving high numbers of migrant students. So, while this ideological discourse is often deployed alongside discourses of inclusion (i.e., counting migrant students means they cannot be ignored) (exemplar 7), an examination of co-text for this discourse reveals that it is often used in relation to only basic educational goals.

5.5 Schools face tension between teaching English and integrating students

This ideological discourse suggests that, in educating US migrant students who have diverse needs, schools face a challenging tradeoff between sheltering students for English instruction and helping them develop relationships with English proficient students. Indicator lexical items for this discourse are *school*, *students*, *high*, *schools*, *student*, and *English* which occur in texts such as online comments, newspaper articles about educational program designs, and a federal DOE report.

- (9) *I would like to see US **schools** able to nurture ESL **students** in a “safe” environment where they can take their time learning **school** material & **English**. But, I also think it is vital that these **students** are able to, for at least one class, enter the general population. These ESL **students** have so much to teach EFL [sic] **students** & I think everybody’s education is lacking until this can be achieved.* (online comment)
- (10) *From a corner of Mónico Rivas’ office window at Lee **High School**, you can see the built-up afternoon traffic on Hillcroft, the artery that runs through the heart of Houston’s immigrant community. Just as the last **school** bus pulls away and custodians finish sweeping up the remnants of the regular **school** day from the hallways, Rivas’ **students** arrive. Their **English** is a work in progress. Much of the **school**’s focus is on mastering **English**.*” (regional newspaper)

Claims in the texts that had high factor scores for this ideological discourse, as well as both exemplars, often rest on an assumption that in order for students learning English in US schools to do so well, they must be separated from other students (“in a ‘safe’ environment” (exemplar 9); “just as the last *school* bus pulls away” (exemplar 10)). Exemplar 10 describes a newcomer school for immigrant students (a program type that intentionally separates English learners from mainstream students) and highlights that “*school*’s focus is on mastering *English*.”

This ideological discourse helps to naturalize a false binary choice (i.e., separate students to improve English instruction or integrate students to the detriment of English instruction) which erases instructional models (e.g., two-way immersion) which provide high quality instruction in multiple languages in inclusive classrooms.

5.6 Top-down immigration laws are punitive or permissive

Law, federal, enforcement, status, officials, legal, laws, undocumented, and illegal all worked together to index this ideological discourse. Texts encoding this discourse often referenced a specific *law* (exemplars 11, 12) governing police, education, or business practices in relation to migration which was positioned as supporting (exemplar 12) or restricting (exemplar 11) the rights of immigrants. In many cases the texts present how the law complicated the work of mid-level *officials* charged with implementation (exemplar 11).

- (11) *Among other things, the **law** requires police to check the immigration status of suspects and turn **illegal immigrants** over to **federal** authorities. It requires school **officials** to demand birth certificates from students enrolling for the first time.... It forbids **illegal immigrants** from engaging in business transactions with state government.... proponents are already hailing the **law** as an example of "attrition through **enforcement**."* (regional newspaper text)
- (12) *Attorneys for an anti-**illegal immigration** organization are challenging a Texas state **law** that allows **illegal immigrant** students to attend colleges and universities at in-state rates, saying it violates **federal law**In 2001, Texas became the first state in the country*

*to pass a **law** that allowed **undocumented** students to pay in-state rates and possibly receive state financial aidFour states... have **laws** on the books that ban **illegal immigrants** from receiving in-state tuition.* (regional newspaper text)

In the texts, *enforcement* was usually associated with an ultimate reduction in immigration (exemplar 11), *federal* often indicated points of intersection among local/state/federal legal frameworks (exemplars 11, 12). *Illegal* (exemplars 11, 12), *legal*, and *undocumented* (exemplar 12) were often used to signal either a punitive or a permissive stance. For example, in (exemplar 12), when referring to a permissive rule, *undocumented* is used to refer to immigration status, but, when referring to a punitive rule, *illegal* is used.

This discourse focuses on the role of law in managing the behavior of migrant individuals, supporting the findings of many previous studies (e.g., Strauss, 2012; Blinder and Allen, 2016; Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2019b) that have identified law and legality as a central lens through which migrants/migration are represented. However, the presentation of laws as falling within a binary of either punitive for or permissive of migrants (39/50) has not been previously reported. Like most binaries, deployment of this ideological discourse steers conversations away from nuance and promotes polarization.

5.7 Immigrants and governments have a mutual relationship founded on acts of service and work

This ideological discourse was indexed in texts by the collocates: *served, center, state, number, comprehensive, working, and enrolled*. This discourse naturalizes the idea that governments serve immigrants and immigrants (or their descendants), in turn, provide work and service to the state in a mutually beneficial relationship. The fifty texts that loaded most strongly were all Title III State Profiles on the National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition. These profiles are formulaic, presenting quantifiable data in graphic form. For example, each page used the following language in figure labels, ‘**Number** of Certified/Licensed Teachers

Working in Title III Language Instruction Educational Programs,’ ‘**Enrolled** Immigrant Students,’ ‘Title III **Served** Immigrant Students.’ Exemplars 13 and 14 show the lexical items working together in other registers.

(13) *The son of immigrant Italian parents, [REDACTED] was first in his family to attend college and obtain advanced degrees. He ... later taught in the same high school from which he had graduated. [REDACTED] helped support his parents by **working** as a letter carrier... he ultimately **served** as Bureau Chief for Secondary School Supervision....In his sixties [REDACTED] taught and **served** as acting president of the then fledgling Schenectady Community College....* (national newspaper text)

(14) *My grandparents came to America from Germany in 1927. They... had children who learned the language in public school and taught them the language. My dad got as much education as he could, **served** in the military, and had nine children-6 of whom are educators. Their grandchildren are highly educated professionals **working** in a wide array of professions.* (online comment)

Both exemplars (13,14), each from a different register, showcase anecdotes about immigrants (or their children) who received education from the *state*. Those immigrants (or their children) went on to reciprocate the investment by *working* “as a letter carrier” (exemplar 13) or “in a wide array of professions” (exemplar 14). They also *served* “as Bureau Chief for Secondary School Supervision,” “as acting president of” a community college (exemplar 13), and “in the military” (exemplar 14).

While previous scholarship has identified patterns relating migrants to labor (Santa Ana et al., 2007; Strauss, 2012), the expectation of labor or service as a payback for government investment is a novel finding and reveals a belief that not only are migrant individuals *required* to perform labor to be valued in US society, but also such labor is *owed* to the polity to repay government expenditure, possibly dating back generations.

5.8 Migrants that do seasonal farmwork and their families are a special class of migrant

This ideological discourse asserts that individuals who are migrants and doing agricultural work are eligible for a special status with access to benefits. That status includes access to

services provided by various levels of government. The three lexical variables that loaded highly on this ideological discourse were *seasonal*, *farmworker*, and *agricultural* and it was most strongly represented in texts such as DOE migrant education program homepages, grant reports, and program directories.

(15) *an individual is eligible to participate in the CAMP if he or she: 1. Has, or has at least one immediate family member who has, spent a minimum of 75 days during the past 24 months as a migrant or **seasonal farmworker** 206.3(a)(1)); ...**Farmwork** means any **agricultural** activity (34 CFR 206.5(c)(3))* (federal DOE text)

(16) *The bill contains special provisions for **agricultural** workers... Undocumented **farmworkers** who can demonstrate they worked 150 hours or three years in agriculture can apply for green cards.* (regional newspaper text)

In exemplars 15 and 16, migrant individuals who meet criteria related to employment in the *agricultural* sector can be classified as ‘*seasonal farmworkers*.’ This status is then linked to services such as educational assistance (exemplar 15) and immigration status (exemplar 16).

As with the deployment of *Immigrants and governments have a mutual relationship founded on acts of service and work* above, the performance of labor defines the value of the migrant individual in the polity which is ideological. Even more specifically, within the framework of this ideological discourse, the social/economic value of farmwork takes precedence over other social beliefs which hold that most migrant individuals with profiles similar to those of farmworkers are not eligible for social benefits (e.g., benefits associated with permanent residency). It is closely related to “benefits for contributors” (Strauss, 2012) which conditions government benefits on economic contributions (e.g., taxpaying). It should be noted that evidence of this ideological discourse was not found in comment texts.

5.9 Given the unique relationship between the two countries, US/Mexico partnerships are advantageous

Indexed by the two lexical items, *Mexico* and *Mexican*, this ideological discourse asserts that the US and Mexico have a strong and special relationship based on both geographical proximity and migration patterns. In light of this relationship, binational partnerships can improve outcomes, especially in education. Among the texts with the highest factor scores for this ideological discourse were newspaper texts about reparations for Mexican Americans deported in the 1930's, the role of the Mexican government in US immigration policies, and head-of-state visits. There were also DOE webtexts about a binational migrant education program, memos of understanding between the Mexican and US DOE's, and the homepage of the US embassy in Mexico.

(17) *[REDACTED], 31, recently came north from his home near **Mexico** City to teach math in Albuquerque. ... in October 2004, the state signed an agreement with **Mexican** officials to bring teachers from that country here.* (regional newspaper text)

(18) *Years ago I studied in **Mexico** as an undergraduate. There were a number of American students like me who were attending classes with matriculating **Mexican** students...Those of us who interacted with the **Mexican** students after class and in the community returned home fully fluent in Spanish and with a better understanding of the culture.* (online comment)

Throughout the texts that had the highest factor scores for this discourse, and in exemplars 17 and 18, cooperation between the US and Mexico enhances educational outcomes. This cooperation occurs across scales (i.e., individual (exemplar 18), classroom and state (exemplar 17)), indicating a fractally recursive distribution pattern (Gal, 2018). This ideological discourse marks the US/Mexico relationship as special, in large part because of the quantity of individuals migrating between the two countries, and in so doing is used to endorse privileges for migrant individuals with ties to Mexico. However, the ideological discourse can sustain positioning of Mexico as the most salient country for cooperation, even when migration patterns shift. For example, beginning in 2010 there were more migrants to the US from Asian countries than from

Latin American countries (including Mexico) (Budiman et al., 2020) a fact that was not reflected in the ideological discourses identified in this study.

5.10 Migrants are Others as indicated by discrete institutional structures/ Migrants are Others who can be spoken about with certainty

Finally, this factor was unique among those extracted in this analysis in that it had two poles, interpreted as complementary ideological discourses (following Biber, 1988; Berber Sardinha, 2017). At one end, *office, information, program, and education* indexed an ideological discourse in which information about the education of migrant children was explicitly flagged as such, usually by institutional sources, with lexical items (i.e., *information*) (exemplar 19) and elements of discourse structure (i.e., titles, website architecture).

(19) *Provides **information** on an Exchange Visitor **Program** for Teachers; the Binational Migrant Education Program; and Escribo en Espanol, a literary contest for students. Binational Migrant Education Program...* (state DOE text)

The texts representing this ideological discourse most strongly were federal and state department of education webtexts presenting information about programs serving migrant students.

At the other pole of the factor, *their, have, and, are* indexed a discourse in which migrant students and their families are othered through use of *their* and unhedged claims about their lives are indexed with *are* and *have*.

(20) *Parents who do not speak English and do not learn English **are** not helping **their** children who will be spending their adult life in an English speaking country. ... Continuing to only speak **their** native language and not being role models for **their** children creates separateness not inclusiveness for **their** children.* (online comment)

In (exemplar 20), *their* is used 4 times in 67 words construing immigrants as outgroup members (approximately 6 times per 100 words). In contrast, *their* is used much less in the COCA (4 times per 100 words). Furthermore, the writer in (exemplar 20) strongly asserts that immigrant parents

“*are* not helping their children.” Similarly, in texts expressing this discourse *have* is often used as a modal of obligation (i.e., “parents should *have* to attend and learn English as well” (NYT 594)), conveying certainty.

In addition to the revelation of the two discourses, the MD analysis presented their antipodal relation to each other, indicating a complementary distribution in the corpus that must be interpreted (Biber, 1988: 101-104; Friginal and Hardy, 2019). The complementary distribution of the two discourses seems to highlight different mechanisms for othering migrant students. That is, in texts deploying *migrants are Others as indicated by discrete institutional structures*, migrant individuals are othered through underlying institutional structures (e.g., programs, departments) and the discourse points explicitly to those structures. On the other hand, in texts deploying *migrants are Others that can be spoken about with certainty*, migrant students are othered through use of *their* and the verb structures. At one end of this apposition, othering is primarily accomplished through institutional structure and reinforced through discourse. At the other end, it is primarily accomplished through the discourse.

One of the more consistent findings across migration discourse including the limited scholarship on migrant education discourse is the presence of Us versus Them/Othering strategies (e.g., van Dijk, 2006; Wodak, 2015) which was also supported by these results. What this study contributes to the consistent evidence of an Othering ideological discourse in texts about migrants is identification of the complementary distribution of two ideological discourses revealing relationships among structural and discursive mechanisms for Othering.

In sum, the 11 ideological discourses presented in this section transcend individual registers and take the form of widely accepted propositions. Comparing these findings to findings from scholarship on migrant discourse within registers using different methodological

approaches, several new ideological discourses were identified (i.e., *US immigration policies are problematic, but there is no consensus for solutions; Schools face tension between teaching English and integrating students; and Given the unique relationship between the two countries, US/Mexico partnerships are advantageous*). Immigrant lives are narratives (usually criminal or uplifting), previously identified, was confirmed across a broader range of texts (i.e., newspapers and comments). The remaining ideological discourses in this study are related to and extend previously scholarship. This is done by revealing how discursively established associations (i.e., immigrants have problems (Fitzsimmons-Doolan, 2019b), IMMIGRANTS ARE CRIMINALS (Santa Ana et. al, 2006), immigrants are often perceived through a legal lens (Strauss, 2012)) can be juxtaposed with other associations within proposition structures to do additional ideological work. For example, it was observed that a strong association of immigrant students with poverty and disability is embedded within *Government programs serve children in need* and that *Immigrants' lives as uplifting or criminal narratives* and *Immigration laws are punitive or permissive* both use binary structures. Identifying these specific, socially potent constructs as ideological discourses present in multiple registers along with aspects of their underlying propositional structure helps to reveal how, reiterated and reaffirmed daily across influential registers, the ideological discourses identified in this study function to delimit social opportunities for migrant students in a variety of contexts.

6. Conclusion

This study adds to the limited scholarship that focuses on migrant education discourse. In terms of register-, scale-, and temporal- range, the *US Migrant Education Corpus* is a robust dataset for the study of migrant education discourse. For example, it is the first major corpus of this discourse domain to include institutional DOE texts. These DOE texts include

representations of important formal and informal policies targeting migrant students. Furthermore, because of the corpus design and analysis, there is evidence that the identified ideological discourses transcend multiple registers. This, combined with the strong contextual face validity and the highly naturalized form of the ideological discourses identified in this study, points to their dominance, thus their importance. Several new ideological discourses were identified, one ideological discourse was confirmed, and several ideological discourses related to previous findings develop our understanding of those results. The identification of these ideological discourses not only reveals the normalized discourses in wide circulation that have bearing on the education of millions of students, but also provides insight into both their wider discursive contexts and internal discursive structures at a point in time when the deployment of ideological discourses about migration and migrants is a conspicuous tool within political discourse globally.

The constructs identified in this study fit the criteria of ideological discourses advanced in the theoretical framework. Each ideological discourse identified in this study, when repeated and accepted, has the effect of allocating social power in relation to migrant education by reinforcing, for example, (1) negative associations, (2) behavioral expectations that condition social acceptance, or (3) hierarchies of privilege. At the same time, though the ideological discourses are not explicitly stated in text, each construct was identified through repeated lexical co-occurrence across texts—verifying the linguistic form of ideological discourse. Their presence across multiple texts and interpretability supports their socially shared status.

This study expands the methodological toolkit available to discourse studies scholars by introducing an extension of MD analysis combined with the design of a multi-register corpus to allow for the identification of ideological discourses expressed across registers. Through a

combination of multiple deliberate analytical strategies—corpus design, variable selection, quantitative factor analysis, and qualitative interpretive analysis—the approach used in this study allows for the identification of ideological discourses indexed through the statistical distributions of variables across a large corpus (9,242,769 words/4,832 texts). Because it identifies groups of variables which pattern in different ways in different texts, it is especially well-suited to perceive linguistic constructs across registers as they manifest in different forms. Because this approach identifies underlying discursive phenomena, it is especially well-suited to detect ideological discourses.

Taken together, the eleven ideological discourses identified in this study document a set of socially, cognitively, and linguistically powerful phenomena for those at work in the intersection of migration, education, and policy. Because the discourses identified in this study are a product of the corpus content, variable selection, and analytical approach, they are necessarily a subset of discourses working in this domain. Future work should investigate how these discourses are represented across register and move over time as well as whether dominant and resistant discourses move in similar or disparate manners.

Finally, this study deployed a novel operationalization of an ideological discourse based on connecting the corpus linguistics methodological tradition of MD analysis to theorization of ideological discourses from discourse studies. This inductive methodology can be extended to other domains of interest by discourse studies scholars in order to identify discourses that transcend register and have a highly naturalized form—arguably the hardest-to-identify type of ideological discourses. Identification of these familiar constructs as ideological discourses advances scholarship by revealing the naturalized, yet subjective premises on which so many layers of thought, language, and behavior in relation to educating migrant students rest.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Dr. Stephen Doolan and Dr. Robert Poole as well as anonymous reviewers of this manuscript for their attentive and productive feedback. In addition, Nina Gonzales, John Lister, Katie Sisk, and Sydney Spangler contributed greatly to corpus development.

References

- Antony, M. G. and R. J. Thomas. 2017. “‘Stop sending your kids across our border:’ Discursively constructing the unaccompanied youth migrant,’ *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication* 10(1), pp 4-24, DOI: 10.1080/17513057.2016.1214282
- Baker, P. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Baker, P. 2016. ‘The shapes of collocation,’ *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 21(2), pp. 139-164. doi 10.1075/ijcl.21.2.01bak
- Baker, P. and McEnery, T. 2015a. ‘Introduction’ in P. Baker and T. McEnery (eds.). *Corpora and Discourse Studies: Integrating Corpora and Discourse*, pp. 1-19. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Baker, P. and McEnery, T. 2015b. ‘Who benefits when discourse gets democratized? Analysing a Twitter corpus around the British *Benefits Street* debate’ in P. Baker and T. McEnery (eds.). *Corpora and Discourse Studies: Integrating Corpora and Discourse*, pp 244-265. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Berber Sardinha, T. (2017). ‘A corpus-based history of Applied Linguistics.’ Paper presented at AILA 2017, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- Berber Sardinha, T. 2019. ‘Using multi-dimensional analysis to detect representations of national cultures’ in Berber Sardinha and Veriano Pinto (eds.). *Multidimensional Analysis: Research Methods and Current Issues*, pp. 231-258. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Berger, C., E. Friginal, and J. Roberts. 2017. ‘Representations of immigrants and refugees in US K-12 school-to-home correspondence: an exploratory corpus-assisted discourse study,’ *Corpora* 12(2), pp 153-179. DOI: 10.3366/cor.2017.0115
- Biber, D. 2019. ‘Multi-dimensional analysis: a historical synopsis, in Berber Sardinha and Veriano Pinto (eds.). *Multidimensional Analysis: Research Methods and Current Issues*, pp. 11-26. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Biber, D. 1988. *Variation Across Speech and Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blinder, S. and W. L. Allen. 2016. ‘Constructing immigrants: portrayal of migrant groups in British national newspapers, 2010-2012,’ *International Migration Review* 50(1), pp 3-40. DOI: 10.1111/imre.12206
- Budiman, A. C. Tamir, L. Mora, and L. Noe-Bustamante. 2020. ‘Facts on US immigrants, 2018.’ Available at <https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2020/08/20/facts-on-u-s-immigrants/#fb-key-charts-origins>. Accessed Sept 18, 2020.
- Cabaniss, E. R. and A.E. Cameron. 2017. ‘“Unassimilable and undesirable”: News elites’ discursive construction of the American immigrant during the Ellis Island years,’ *Discourse & Society* 28(6), pp 614–634. DOI:10.1177/0957926517710990

- Calvita, K. (1996). 'The new politics of immigration: 'Balanced-budget conservatism' and the symbolism of Proposition 187.' *Social Problems* 43, pp 284–305. doi:10.2307/3096979
- Catalano, T. and J. Mitchel-McCollough J. 2019. 'Representation of unaccompanied migrant children from Central America in the United States' in Viola and Musloff (eds.). *Migration and Media: Discourses about Identities in Crisis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Charteris-Black, J. 2006. 'Britain as a container: immigration metaphors in the 2005 election campaign,' *Discourse & Society* 17(5), pp 563-581. DOI: 10.1177/ 0957926506066345
- Cutler, D. 2017. 'TESOL statement on second immigration executive order.' Available at <https://www.tesol.org/news-landing-page/2017/03/10/tesol-statement-on-new-immigration-executive-order>. Accessed February 3, 2020.
- Dabach, D. B., Fones, A., Merchant, N. H., & Kim, M. J. 2017. 'Discourses of exclusion: Immigrant-origin youth responses to immigration debates in an election year,' *Journal of Language, Identity, & Education* 16, pp 1–16. DOI:10.1080/15348458.2016.1239538
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2014. Using lexical variables to identify language ideologies in a policy corpus. *Corpora* 9, 57-82. DOI: 10.3366/cor.2014.0051
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2019a. Language ideologies of institutional language policy: Exploring variability by language policy register. *Language Policy* 18(2), 169-189.
- Fitzsimmons-Doolan, S. 2019b. *Taxpaying, importing, enforcing*: Emerging discourse patterns in online newspaper comments about U.S. immigrant education. *Journal of Corpora and Discourse Studies* 2, 94-116. DOI: 10.18573/jcads.25
- Foucault, M. 1972. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. New York: Pantheon.
- Gal, S. 2018. 'Discursive struggles about migration: A commentary,' *Language & Communication* 59, pp 66-69. DOI: 0.1016/j.langcom.2017.12.0020271-5309/
- Gabrielatos, C. and P. 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, pp 5–38. DOI:10.1177/0075424207311247
- Jaworska, S. and K. Kinloch. 2018. 'Using multiple data sets' in Taylor and Marchi (eds.). *Corpus Approaches to Discourse: A Critical Review*, pp. 110-129. New York: Routledge.
- Kirkwood, S., S. Goodman, C. McVittie and A. McKinlay. 2016. *The Language of Asylum: Refugees and Discourse*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Lopez-Sanders, L. and H. E. Brown. 2020. Political mobilization and public discourse in new immigrant destinations: news media characterizations of immigrants during the 2006 immigration marches. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(4), pp 820-838.
- Migration Policy Institute. 2019. 'State immigration data profiles: United States.' Available at <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/data/stateprofiles/state/demographics/US>. Accessed November 15, 2019.
- Newport, F. 2018. 'Americans oppose border walls, favor dealing with DACA.' Available at <https://news.gallup.com/poll/235775/americans-oppose-border-walls-favor-dealing-daca.aspx>. Accessed Feb 25, 2020.
- Partington, A. 2015. 'Corpus-assisted comparative case studies of representations of the Arab world' in Baker and McEnery (eds.). *Corpora and Discourse Studies: Integrating Corpora and Discourse*, pp. 220-243. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Perrino, S., & Wortham, S. (2019). Discursive struggles over migration. [Special Issue]. *Language & Communication*, 59.

- Pierce, S., J. Bolter, and A. Selee. 2018. *US Immigration Policy under Trump: Deep Changes and Lasting Impacts*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute.
- Santa Ana, O. 2002. *Brown Tide Rising: Metaphors of Latinos in Contemporary American Public Discourse*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Santa Ana, O., Trevino, S.L., Bailey, M., Bodossian, & de Necochea, A. (2007). A May to remember: Adversarial images of immigrants in US newspapers during the 2006 policy debate. *Du Bois Review*, 4(1), pp 207-232. DOI: 10.1017/S1742058X07070117
- Scott, M. 2016. *Wordsmith Tools (Version 7.0)* [Computer software]. Oxford: Lexical Analysis and Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, C. 2012. *Making Sense of Public Opinion: American Discourses about Immigration and Social Programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stubbs, M. 2002. *Words and Phrases: Corpus Linguistics Studies of Lexical Semantics*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Taylor, C. 2014. 'Investigating the representation of migrants in the UK and Italian press,' *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 19(3), pp 368-400. DOI: 10.1075/ijcl.19.3.03tay
- Taylor, C. 2018. 'Similarity' in Taylor and Marchi (eds.). *Corpus Approaches to Discourse: A Critical Review*, 19-37. New York: Routledge.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 2018. 'Discourse and migration' in Zapata-Barrero, R. and E. Yalaz (eds.): *Qualitative Research in Europea Migration Studies*. Berlin: Springer.
- Van Dijk, T. A. 2006. 'Ideology and discourse analysis,' *Journal of Political Ideologies* 11(2), pp 115-140.
- Vollmer, B. and S. Karakayali. 2018. 'The volatility of the discourse on refugees in Germany,' *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies* 16(1-2), pp 118-139. DOI:10.1080/15562948.2017.1288284
- Wayback Machine. 2001. Available at <https://archive.org/web>. Accessed February 25, 2020.
- Wodak, R. 2015. *The Politics of Fear: What Right-wing Populist Discourses Mean*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Zong, J., J. Batalova, and M. Burrows. 2019. 'Frequently Requested Statistics on Immigrants and Immigration in the United States.' Migration Policy Institute. Available at <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/frequently-requested-statistics-immigrants-and-immigration-united-states#Now>. Accessed November 15, 2019.