Corpus linguistics methods are increasingly becoming popular in research which examines discourse, ideology and attitudes in naturally occurring texts. It is argued that the use of large numbers of texts along with automatic procedures like keywords can help to reduce researcher bias. Baker et al (2008) provided a nine stage model of corpus-assisted critical discourse analysis which advises alternating between various qualitative and quantitative techniques to produce and test new hypotheses. This talk illustrates and evaluates how this model worked in practice when used in a recent research project to examine the representation of Muslims in the British press. I then describe an inter-analyst consistency experiment, where 5 analysts were separately asked to analyse the same corpus (news articles about foreign doctors). I focus on explaining why the analysts achieved different/similar results, and which techniques appeared to be most 'productive' in terms of eliciting interesting findings.