Hostility themes in media, community and refugee narratives

Discourse & Society
Copyright © 2008
SAGE Publications
(Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore)
www.sagepublications.com
Vol 19(2): 187–221
10.1177/0957926507085952

IVAN LEUDAR AND JACQUELINE HAYES
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER, UK
JIŘÍNEKVAPIL
CHARLES UNIVERSITY, CZECH REPUBLIC
JOHANNA TURNER BAKER
UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER, UK

ABSTRACT In this article, we use the concept of 'dialogical network' systematically to analyse hostilities towards refugees and asylum seekers in the UK and their effects on refugees' and asylum seekers' biographical self-presentations and psychological adjustment. We find that hostility towards refugees took different forms which were in part contingent on contemporary social and political activities. We also found that all our refugee and asylum-seeker informants constructed their identities around hostilities expressed towards them in the media and by the local inhabitants. In particular, their identities were constructed in terms of biographical contrasts that made the grounds of contemporary hostile rejections false and irrelevant to themselves. Most refugee/asylum-seeker informants in our study experienced psychological problems and attributed these to enforced idleness.

KEY WORDS: *asylum seekers, dialogical networks, hostility, psychological problems, refugees*

Introduction

In this article, we examine biographic narratives which, if taken at face value, qualify their tellers as refugees. From a legal point of view in the UK, however, a person does not decide that she is a refugee – she starts as an asylum seeker and only if her application for asylum is accepted does she become a refugee – the status of refugee is in this sense 'other conferred'. If the application fails, she becomes a failed asylum seeker (and in some quarters even a 'bogus' one). The same person, however, can be a refugee or an asylum seeker, depending on one's perspective and indeed can be both – some of our informants referred to themselves as 'refugees' and as 'asylum seekers', acknowledging both legal and personal perspectives. For some, a person can in fact be both a refugee and a failed asylum seeker since their application can be rejected not because their case lacked merit, but due to administrative hurdles such as having to lodge an

application without a delay at the port of entry. There is no impartial way of categorizing our informants and in the following analysis we refer to them in general as 'refugees/asylum seekers'.

In analysis of the narratives we note what refugees/asylum seekers find problematic about living in the UK and challenging to their personal well-being. We do not analyse these narratives in isolation or in the first place as exemplars of discourses. Instead, and as a matter of analytic necessity, we seek to understand the narratives in their settings – following the established principle that the meanings of words and actions are indexical to their settings. Here we specifically examine the links between what refugees/asylum seekers say about themselves and their lives and what is written about them in the media and said in their neighbourhoods. We examine these links using the concept of 'dialogical network' (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004) and take this opportunity to discuss the relationship between the concepts of discourse and dialogical network. We argue that dialogical networks can elucidate the genesis of discourses and how they are used in situ.

The representations of immigrants in the media are largely negative. Van Dijk (2000) noted that in western media immigration was represented as a threat, and immigrants presented in passive roles, except when the agents of reprehensible acts. Similarly in the television coverage of the fall of the Berlin Wall, East German refugees were described as 'floods' and 'invasions' (McLaughlin, 1999). Santa Ana (1999) examined the use of metaphors in media coverage of a 1994 debate on immigration legislation in the USA, and found discourses de-humanizing immigrants as animals, weeds blighting American society, and a disease infecting the 'body' of the USA. In the Czech Republic, legislative measures proposed to solve problems with Roma immigrants were compared with measures aimed at solving problems caused by fires (Nekvapil and Leudar, 2002). Goodman (2007) noted that media coverage of legislation on asylum-seeking families characterized them in terms usually used to describe animals breeding. All of these metaphors dehumanize immigrants. Hostility towards immigrants in the UK is also profound (Blackledge, 2005). Philo and Beattie (1999) observed that the coverage of immigration in the British media used the terminology of a natural disaster, presenting Britain as the victim of 'floods', even 'tidal waves' of immigrants. They also observed that the terms 'immigrants' and 'illegal immigrants' were used interchangeably. Goodman and Speer (2007) showed that the words 'immigrant' and 'asylum seeker' are likewise regularly conflated in the UK. Lynn and Lea's (2003) analysis of readers' letters to newspapers showed that 'asylum seeker' now means 'bogus asylum seeker', and genuine refugees are a rarity in the media.

One problem with studies of refugee/asylum-seeker identity is, however, that they usually analyse how others speak or write about refugees – these identities are rarely presented as refugees would construct them, or in their own voices (for some exceptions see Blommaert, 2001; Herlihy et al., 2002). This is partly a consequence of the fact that while refugees/asylum seekers are subjected to hostility, they rarely have the opportunity to assert their identity in public (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2000). Such disempowerment may be a fact

of everyday life, but even so the discursive analysis of hostility towards them is incomplete unless we include the effects it has on them – the uptake of hostility by its target so to speak. Consequently, in this article we analyse both the hostile representations of refugees and how these are taken up in refugee/asylum-seekers' narratives. Moreover, in a series of articles we have found that the identity of outsiders is almost always a matter of controversy (Leudar and Nekvapil, 1998, 2000; Leudar et al., 2004; Nekvapil and Leudar, 1998, 2003b). The way their social identity is contested in a society can, however, be captured only if the corpus of texts includes, as far as possible, narratives displaying rival perspectives on a group.

The second problem is related. The representations of refugees we listed earlier share a profound hostility, but other than that they seem a rather diverse list of descriptions: 'floods and tidal waves, invasions, animals, weeds, disease'. The question is why does the hostility come in a variety of discursive forms? Saying that the media use discourses that marginalize refugees has the advantage of drawing attention to the fact that expressions of prejudice and hostility are not simply individual matters, but are socially shared and resourced by representations provided in the language of a community. Yet making this commonality notable is a situated accomplishment and so a concern for an analyst. The language of hostility between groups is, moreover, not fixed – it comes about and changes and some expressions of hostility are creative.

Some of the variety in how hostility is formulated is to be explained by reference to the settings. Leudar and Nekvapil (2000) observed that the journalists, politicians and members of the public in central Europe attributed to Roma qualities that were negations of those which they valued in themselves. These qualities were sometimes characteristic of human beings in general, but often they were specific to activities at hand. So, for example, a businessman would reject Roma for lacking industry and a religious person would reject Roma for being materialist (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2000). Leudar and Nekvapil (2000) consequently argued that the concept of stereotype current in cognitive social psychology needed revising since it had no way of accounting for the fact that outsiders are stigmatized in way that are contingent on settings. Leudar and Antaki (1996), commenting on discursive psychology (Edwards and Potter, 1992), pointed out a similar problem. They argued that since discourses are expressions generalized over disparate dialogical contexts they inevitably lose connections with those contexts. Furthermore, because generalizations are themselves occasioned, discourses are better thought of as occasioned collections of occasioned matters, rather than something that is objective and independent of the setting. Phillips and Jørgensen (2002: 1) pointed out that the concept of discourse now has a variety of meanings and if it does have a core then that core is the idea that 'language is structured according to different patterns that people's utterances follow when they take part in different domains of social life, familiar examples being "medical discourse" and "political discourse"'. Leudar and Antaki's argument applies to such de-situated conceptions of discourse.

With these considerations in mind, Leudar and Nekvapil (1998) and Nekvapil and Leudar (1998) formulated the concept of the dialogical network. The concept

returns discourses to shared activities, and captures their intertextual nature as distributed across different activities and settings in a way that is a notable accomplishment of participants. The role of the analyst, instead of creating a collection of expressions based on their intrinsic similarities, is to foreground links – implicit and explicit – that participants themselves create between expressions, describing the practices in and through which they make these links notable. In short, there is a commitment to foregrounding member-occasioned concerns. Homoláč (2006), inspired by the concept of the dialogical network reinterpreted the term discourse along similar lines. Leudar and Nekvapil found that the cohesion of such networks is provided partly by sequential structures similar to those observed in everyday conversations, but also by commonalities and contrasts in lexicon, metaphors and arguments used by members (Nekvapil and Leudar 2003a). Cohesion of dialogical networks can be also achieved by the coordination of the participant's membership category work (Leudar et al., 2004; Nekvapil and Leudar 2006b; see Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004 for an overview). In this study, the concept of dialogical network helps to ascertain the way refugee identities are contested and formulated in ongoing and distributed conflict.

One important indexical characteristic of discursive representations is their consequences. Van Dijk (2000) observed that newspapers and television through their representations define situations for many and provide the 'facts', and Hier and Greenberg (2002) demonstrated how the Canadian media helped to construct a moral panic around the arrival of Fujinese migrants (see also Blackledge, 2005; Coole, 2002; Greenslade, 2005; Randall, 2003). But, what might be the consequences of hostile representations of refugees/asylum seekers for themselves? They face many practical 'problems of living' in exile, which include predicaments such as racism, poor living conditions, unemployment, poverty, cultural alienation and lack of social support (Gorst-Unsworth and Goldenberg, 1998; Littlewood and Lipsedge, 1997). Refugees/asylum seekers may find themselves separated from their family (Turner et al., 2003) and incarcerated in detention centres (Steel et al., 2006). All of these have been linked in research to the development of serious psychological problems, and have been established as often more instrumental to the development of these problems than pre-flight trauma (Gorst-Unsworth and Goldenberg, 1998; Hondius et al., 2005). The question, however, is whether the hostile representations also contribute to the psychological problems of refugees. This possibility becomes less far-fetched when one takes on board that the self is social in origin and narratively structured (Hermans, 2002; Leudar and Thomas, 2000; Markova, 2003; Sass, 2000). William James argued that the social self consists of recognitions that others provide to a person (James, 1902; see also Markova, 2003). Mead (1934) likewise postulated that people react to their own actions from the perspective of others and that these reactions become internalized parts of oneself as the 'other' and the 'generalized other'. More recent research indicates that when the others in oneself provide false and systematically hostile perspectives on one's conduct, mental health problems are likely (Laing, 1969; Schatzman, 1973; cf. Leiman, 2002). This is

very likely to be the problem for refugees/asylum seekers – 'the others in themselves' may provide them with recognitions that are hostile, false and irrelevant.

The hypothesis we explore in this article is as follows.

- Representations of refugees/asylum seekers are structured along *hostility themes* that are in part contingent on contemporary social happenings.
- These themes are inscribed in the media reports of social events, and in local inhabitants' talk.
- In line with our own past research we anticipate that representations of refugees/asylum seekers in the media in the UK are contested in voices that are party to the social events reported, but with the voices of refugees excluded.
- Refugees/asylum seekers do not necessarily internalize the hostilities in their host societies. Their self-presentations are constructed so as to exclude the relevance of the hostility themes to themselves as individuals, yet in having to acknowledge the themes, these become part of them, with negative consequences for personal well-being.

The project

THE INTERVIEWS

The first step in our study was to interview refugees/asylum seekers living in Manchester about their experiences of leaving their home country, coming to and living in the UK. Participants were told that our interest was in the lives of refugees and they were left to narrate their experiences in their own words. The resulting interactions could best be characterized as biographic interviews. The six refugees/asylum seekers interviewed came from Iran, Pakistan, Eritrea and Somalia and the interviews were carried out in the winter of 2003–2004. Two informants (B and S) had been granted refugee status, three (A, C, M) were awaiting a decision from the Home Office, and one (F) had her application rejected but was appealing.

The second step was to interview people in the refugees/asylum-seekers' neighbourhoods about their experiences with refugees/asylum seekers. We interviewed six 'locals', three men and three women, whom we knew by acquaintance and chose for no special reason, about how refugees/asylum seekers fitted into their lives.

The interviewers were two young white English women, students at Manchester University. They became acquainted with the informants at Manchester refugee advice social meetings. Interviews were carried out in the participants' homes. Participants were interviewed in English and all were able to make themselves understood – their competence in English varied, however, from being bilingual to struggling with syntax and vocabulary. Their linguistic competences are obvious in the interview transcripts. Interviews lasted as long as the participant wanted to talk (usually between 30 and

90 minutes). The interviews were transcribed verbatim using simplified conversation analytic conventions.

In biographic interviews participants talk about their lives in relation to the interests of the interviewer – the narratives are spontaneous but provided with an initial direction (Rapley, 2001). We cannot assume that interviews are occasions when participants simply report their experiences in a manner that is unaffected by the presence and participation of the interviewers. In particular, we pay attention to the dynamic membership status of both the interviewer and interviewee, what these are, how these are established and managed. We shall see that in our material the informants did not engage the interviewers as detached researchers.[1]

NEWSPAPER MATERIALS

The third step was to examine retrospectively representations of refugees/asylum seekers in British newspapers during the weeks preceding the interviews.

We used the internet to gather all news items in two British dailies, the *Daily Mail* and the *Guardian*, explicitly mentioning 'asylum seekers' and 'refugees' in November and December 2003 – the months before and during the period that the majority of interviews took place.[2] We excluded from our corpora letters, commentaries, long analytical articles and editorials.[3]

The search of the *Daily Mail* revealed 11 items and the *Guardian* 16 items. All were analysed but not all are used here. Some of the pertinent articles found in two national daily newspapers, the *Daily Mail* and the *Guardian*, are analysed in some detail later.

We also examined representations of refugees/asylum seekers in the e-bulletins of the National Coalition of Anti-deportation Campaigns, but we mention these only in passing because their distribution is limited and the space in this article is restricted.[4]

The media reports and the locals' narratives provide the settings for the refugees/asylum seekers biographic narratives – they indicate the community in which they live, the hostilities they face and the controversies they engender. We are not so much interested in whether detailed biographical narratives are 'true'. Instead, our interest is in documenting the influence of these settings on refugee narratives and in how the different representations of refugees are linked in a dialogical network. Our thesis is that participants orient towards hostile representations of refugees/asylum seekers in their constructions of themselves and their life histories.

The analysis itself focused on categorizations of participants and activities in texts, drawing on the notions of category-bound activities and activity-bound categories (sic), which are distributed in social activities and contested (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004).

PRESENTATIONS OF REFUGEES IN NEWSPAPERS

We start with the analysis of how refugees/asylum seekers were presented in national newspapers in this period. We then analyse the narratives of locals and refugees/asylum seekers, relating all these as we go on.

All the articles report controversies that were stirred-up by a parliamentary Asylum Bill presented to the House of Commons on 27 November 2003 by the ruling Labour party. This bill included the following measures concerning refugees: (1) their benefit payments would be withdrawn, and their children could be taken into care if they refused to be repatriated; (2) they would be forcibly screened for infectious diseases; (3) they could be tagged so that their movement could be monitored; and finally, (4) their access to legal aid would be limited. These measures carried conceptions of refugees/asylum seekers, and were justified in terms of these conceptions. The measures were all contested in the media, with government representatives, politicians and interested pressure groups. Our analysis focuses on the first three measures as these were covered most extensively during the period under examination, and proceeds from the measure most prominent in the newspapers to the less prominent measures.

Measure 1: taking the children of refugees into care[5]

Extract 1: *Daily Mail*, 24/11/ 2003

1. Outcry over care threat to refugee children
2. The Government was facing calls today to abandon plans that could see the
3. children of failed asylum seekers taken into care.
4. New measures to be announced in the Queen's Speech would mean parents
5. whose asylum claims have been rejected would be told to take a
6. 'voluntary' flight home or lose their benefits.

Reports such as this are sequentially organized. The headline topicalizes the problem which the body of an article then fleshes out. The headline topic in Extract 1 is the controversy over the threat to refugee children. This headline provides the reader with an 'occasioned collection' of four membership categories.[6] One of these is explicit ('refugee children') and three are implicit – two in the activities 'threat' and 'outcry' (i.e. the agent of the threat and those who protest against the threat) and one in another category (i.e. the refugee children's parents). Note that the agent of the 'outcry' is not a specific agency – an 'outcry' is a broadly distributed reaction, which, as we shall see, the journalist instantiates by examples in his report. Extract 1 is not just a description of a discrete event, but points readers to an extended dialogical network initiated by the Asylum Bill. The agent of the threat is not specified, but the headline provides a slot for it, which the (Labour) government fills in the next sentence. It is, moreover, significant that the *Daily Mail* in the UK supports the parliamentary opposition Conservative party. This opens the possibility that the piece not only reports the 'controversy', but situates it for readers in the party political controversy on immigration.[7]

The threat is detailed once the participant categories are set up; it is to take away benefits from 'failed asylum seeker' parents, thus forcing them either to leave the UK or to face destitution and have their children taken into care. Note also that parents are referred to as 'asylum seekers', whereas their children are 'refugees'. The two terms are applied selectively to adults and children – it is only

the children and not the adults whose status as victims is foregrounded. We shall see that the one contest in the UK is between whether refugee/asylum seekers are victims in need of help or are something altogether different.[8]

Membership categories do not operate in isolation but in pairs and families. The first pair to consider in Extract 1 is 'government' and 'failed asylum seekers'. This is not a *minimal structural pair* of membership categorization analysis (MCA), but rather an *activity occasioned pair*, the members of which are made mutually relevant by involvement in a joint a transaction (Hester and Eglin, 1997; Leudar and Nekvapil, 2000, 2004). The transaction is the government's effort to expel the 'asylum seekers' who resist – it is designed with them in mind. In their case, the resistance to repatriation is *identity implicative* – 'failed asylum seekers' resist a legal decision, and so they are breaking the law (however controversial that law may be). The plan is, moreover, based on the presumption that asylum seekers depend on social benefits – how else could withdrawing these be effective? This implies the second negative quality in asylum seekers – economic inactivity and dependence.[9] These two negative qualities – lack of respect for law and economic dependence – are not asserted, but are insinuated and inscribed into the settings of our experience of asylum seekers. Insinuations are harder to refute than bold on-the-record statements.

The second pair of membership categories are those in the phrases 'failed asylum seekers' and 'refugee/failed asylum seekers' children'. 'Parent–child' is a standardized relational pair, the members of which care for and are dependent on each other respectively. Having children taken into care is shameful for the parents and implies a basic human failure. The fitness of 'failed asylum seekers' for parenthood is brought under suspicion in Extract 1, as it was in the parliamentary debate on section 9 of the bill. Paradoxically, of course, the plan to expedite the departure of 'failed asylum seekers' can work only if they care for their children. Then they would not be separated from their children and would depart the UK. However, should they resist repatriation, remain in the UK, loose the social benefits and subject their children to economic hardship, and possibly be separated from them, they would be bad parents. This assumes that the alternatives the 'failed asylum seekers' face would be less harmful to their children. The measure creates circumstances in which resistance to repatriation arguably constitutes 'failed asylum seekers' as bad parents.

The measure institutes a public *suspicion* that refugees/asylum seekers lack concern for their children – a basic human quality. This seems to be a familiar scheme – it has been used to dehumanize immigrants in Central Europe and the Middle East (Jayussi, 2006; Leudar et al., 2006). Dehumanizing refugees/asylum seekers in this way is not, however, simply a matter of discursive representation. The measures introduced by the government *create* the social and legal environments in which they have to live.

The third pair of membership categories is again an occasioned one: the government and the children (of failed asylum seekers). Any humane government would be expected to ensure the safety of children under its jurisdiction, and indeed the declared motive for the plan is to spare the children from hardship. But since requires the separation of children from their parents, the 'help' would

inevitably be traumatizing. Not surprisingly, the measure is contentious and in need of justification (Extract 2).

Extract 2: *Daily Mail*, 24/11/2003

But the plan faces opposition from the Conservatives, and refugee and human rights groups have called on the Home Office to drop the proposal. Refugee Action said the plan was an "inhumane and shameful" way of coercing parents to return home.

Spokesman Stephen Rylance said the policy would mean children who had already suffered the trauma of fleeing their homeland would then be put through the trauma of being separated from their parents.

(5 lines omitted)

The Home Office, however, has defended the plan, saying in a statement: '(It) ... is the only logical way of dealing with people who have no right to be in the country and therefore no right to public funding or accommodation, but who are simply refusing the organised offer of a paid return home.'

The journalist cannot report all the reactions to the measure and chooses just some of them. The mention of 'Conservatives' makes the controversy a party political matter. A statement by Refugee Action is reported as an example of the reactions to the measure by 'refugee and human rights groups'. The argument about the morality of the measure in Extract 2 is in two voices – those of Refugee Action and the Home Office. The report provides a *hybrid* report of what Refugee Action declared. It does not preserve most of what was actually said and is in part the journalist's formulation, which contains her sentiments about the topic. Refugees are represented as parents, their children as victims of exile trauma, who are now subjected to an additional separation trauma. The voice of the Home Office is a direct report which reiterates the negative qualities we noted earlier. So, the implicit discursive conflict is between refugees presented as victims and as an economic burden, lawbreakers and individuals lacking in basic human qualities. It is significant, however, that the journalist does not represent the refugee *parents* as victims, only their children, and even their pre-flight trauma is not acknowledged – only the flight and potential separation are. The journalist thus draws back from acknowledging, even in reporting somebody else's argument, that refugees may be genuine victims and deserving of asylum. Narratives that detail refugees' traumas do exist but they are not widely distributed and as is common in British press the *Daily Mail* does not acknowledge them.[10]

The article then works with several *hostility themes*, which are woven into the texture of the report: asylum seekers are potentially lawbreakers, bad parents and 'scrounge' on the host community. Yet the identity of asylum seekers is not consistently negative – it is contested. The contest is, however, presented by the *Daily Mail* in a biased way because the voice presenting refugee children as victims is that of a marginalized pressure group of refugee advocates. The voice is, moreover, a hybrid report in which the sentiments of the 'Principal', which here is Refugee Action, are modulated by the journalist (Goffman, 1981). Our analysis qualifies findings of Philo and Beattie (1999) – some positive

representations of refugees are given, but in voices of unequal status. Leudar and Nekvapil (2000) noted the same discursive strategy in analysing the contested identity of Roma in central Europe. The hostility themes provide the dialogical network with intertextual cohesion.

These representations of refugees/asylum seekers in the *Daily Mail* are not idiosyncratic to this right-of-centre publication. The same issue was covered by the *Guardian* three days later with similar hostility themes apparent.

Extract 3: *Guardian*, 27/11/2003
I'm no Herod, insists Blunkett amid storm over refugee children)

. . .
14. Defending for the first time his plan to force failed asylum seekers to leave the
15. country by threatening to take their children into care, Mr Blunkett, says that the
16. step will only be taken in a small number of cases but that it is justified by the
17. 'unreasonable behaviour' of their parents.
18. 'I have no desire to take children from their parents and put them in care unless
19. it is an absolute last resort. I did not come into politics to be the King Herod of
20. the Labour party.'
21. But he argues that action has to be taken to protect the children of those
22. families whose state benefits were cut off because they continually refused to be
23. flown home.

The *Guardian* journalist does not specify against whom David Blunkett is defending the measure – as in the *Daily Mail*, the formulation implies that he is responding to *distributed* criticism, this feature being characteristic of sequencing in media dialogical networks (Nekvapil and Leudar, 2006a). He tacitly accepts the moral problems inherent in the measure. He accepts that some children would suffer, but shifts the blame onto the 'unreasonable' asylum-seeker parents – it is *they* who put their children in danger of destitution. However, he sidesteps the problem that it is his party that is limiting asylum seekers' access to benefit payments in the first place (ll. 22 and 23). The defence presents the government as tough on immigration and yet humane and caring. Blunkett's use of the word 'home' (l. 23) is significant – it implies that the UK is not a place where these people belong, and that the place where they do belong is safe. The journalist uses a hybrid report of Blunkett's speech; he is paraphrased, until the phrase 'unreasonable behaviour'. This is in quotes, distancing the journalist from authorship of this phrase.

Blunkett's defence of the measure, presented in a direct report does not remain uncontested in the *Guardian* article either. The voice contesting it is again an indirect report but of a different agency – Save the Children.

Extract 4: *Guardian*, 27/11/2003

36. Save the Children said it was another disgraceful attempt to isolate refugee
37. children: "Already some of these vulnerable children are being locked up; many
38. will soon be stopped from going to mainstream schools; and now the
39. government proposes to take some away from their own parents. This is
40. unreasonable, inhumane and a breach of fundamental human rights."

The measure is represented as part of a sustained attack on refugee children in the UK – the list further includes denying them education and detaining them. As in the *Daily Mail*, in the *Guardian* refugee children are presented as victims of abuse, with the government being one abuser. The grounds for the claim are, however, different – the measure is formulated as a denial of 'fundamental human rights' (l. 40) and so refugee children are re-humanized – they are *due* these rights. Even so, the hybrid Save the Children voice again does not present refugee *parents* as victims (ll. 39–40). Our analysis of the dialogical network invoked by the measure indicates that there are many reactions to the measure – reported in Extract 1 collectively as 'an outcry' and elsewhere as a 'storm'. It is not unusual for journalists to summarise networks for their readers (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004; Nekvapil and Leudar, 2002). Here, however, journalists *select* reactions and the choices are significant. That of the *Daily Mail* stresses the refugee in 'refugee children', whereas that of the *Guardian* stresses the children.

So the hostility themes implicit in the *Guardian* coincide in part with those in the *Daily Mail*:

- asylum seekers lack the human quality of loving their children enough to put them first;
- asylum seekers lack economic agency and so are burden on the UK (rather than an asset);
- asylum seekers are geo-ethnically alien and their home is elsewhere.

Measure 2: forcibly screening refugees for HIV and TB[11]

Extract 5: *Guardian*, 20/11/2003

1. <u>Warning issued against screening asylum seekers</u>
2. Forcing asylum seekers to be screened for HIV and TB risks driving sick people
3. underground and could cause more problems than it solves, a Blairite think tank
4. warned today.
5. The Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) said compulsory health
6. screening, being considered by the government, would also be costly and
7. ineffective and have worrying moral implications.
8. The government has screened asylum seekers at an induction centre in Dover
9. and is looking at ways to stop refugees bringing serious communicable diseases
10. into the country.

The headline foregrounds a 'warning' by an unspecified agent, which indicates that this is a response to something that occurred elsewhere and previously – the announcement of the measure in the Asylum Bill. Two membership categories are explicit – 'asylum seekers' and 'sick people' (ll. 1 and 2). These categories are usually independent. A person can normally refuse a medical examination, and a sick person has the right to refuse treatment. Yet, this measure would have asylum seekers forcibly screened for diseases and presumably detained and even treated against their will. The journalist uses the term 'asylum seeker' rather than 'refugee', which would acknowledge victim status. This is in tune with the spirit

of the measure; asylum seekers are constructed as a source of disease rather than the victims, and in addition, they lack the social responsibility to safeguard others and have to be coerced.[12] The measure then even uses asylum seekers' suffering from diseases to dehumanize them. Is this representation contested? Only the plan to screen them forcibly is, not the representation of them as disease carriers.

This measure was covered in the *Daily Mail* on 25 November. The report concerned the rise of tuberculosis in poor areas of London and attributed the rise to the influx of refugees. It did not contain any voices dissenting from forcible screening. We concluded earlier that negative qualities attributed to refugees are contested – clearly not all of them are all of the time. The hostility themes implicit in the measure are:

- asylum seekers are a source of disease and so a danger to the host community;
- asylum seekers lack a basic social responsibility.

Measure 3: electronically tagging refugees[13]

Extract 6: *Daily Mail*, 27/11/2003

1. <u>Blunkett: Asylum seekers may be tagged</u>
2. Asylum seekers could be electronically tagged rather than locked up in
3. detention centres, Home Secretary David Blunkett said.
4. A new Asylum Bill will bring in powers which would largely be used to
5. tag asylum seekers whose applications have been rejected.

The aim of the Home Office is to expel and monitor failed 'asylum seekers', even if this means using oppressive control measures and reducing their legal rights in general, and restricting their access to the judiciary. Note that, unlike some participants elsewhere in the dialogical network, Blunkett's speech as reported by the journalist consistently uses the term 'asylum seekers'. This emphasizes their ambiguous status and fits the suspicion introduced in line 5 that they may be bogus, as well as the overall purpose to justify his proposed measure. British citizens cannot be legally tagged unless they have committed a crime but asylum seekers can. The measure tacitly joins together the categories 'criminal' and 'asylum seeker' in that it introduces a salient category-bound activity applicable to both. The measure is, in fact, publicly perceived as criminalizing (Extract 7, ll. 29–30).

Extract 7: *Daily Mail*, 29/11/2003

25. 'What we need is not more detention centres but a very calm and
26. measured debate on the basis of burden-sharing with our European
27. partners in order that we can begin to tackle the issue on a humane basis,
28. not threatening asylum seekers with putting their children in care, and
29. putting a whole group of people in the category of criminals who ought
30. to be treated with tags and all sorts of repressive measures.'

The voice in Extract 7 is that of Sir Bill Morris, former general secretary of the Transport and General Workers Union, and normally a Labour ally. His comments

presented in the *Daily Mail* appear two days later and are framed as a response to Blunkett's statement. Note that it is not, however, the kind of reaction found in a conversation, as it is said in a different place and at a different time. Rather, the journalist creates the contingency between Blunkett's and Morris' statements, and this marks further development of the dialogical network concerning the Asylum Bill. He contests the measure as repressive (l. 30) and inhumane (l. 27). In formulating the government measure to take their children away as a 'threat', Morris re-humanizes asylum seekers in general – if they did not care for their children, the threat would not be serious. Moreover, he does not deal with the measure in isolation but brings together tagging and taking the children into care to document a sustained and inhumane attack on 'asylum seekers'. His is the first politically prominent voice in our analysis to present asylum seekers as victims of inhumane treatment in Britain. Note, however, that even Morris does not contest the representation of refugees as lacking in economic agency – the idea that they are a 'burden' is implicit in his argument (l. 26). Note also that Morris's sentiments are reported directly and thus specific to him. Using this voice in effect highlights divisions over the Asylum Bill in the Labour camp and it is consistent with the political orientation of the *Daily Mail*.

Newspaper presentations of refugees/asylum seekers: summary

Over a short period, several measures were introduced to discourage and control refugees. These were reported and contested extensively in the UK with controversy reported in and mediated by national newspapers. We cannot report all of the coverage here but its extensiveness is indicated in the extracts by the use of words such as 'outcry'. The basic contest was between whether refugees are victims in need of asylum or migrants to be characterized by the following hostility themes:

- they are an economic drain;
- they lack basic human qualities such as love for their own children and responsibility to the community;
- potentially, they are criminals;
- they are carriers of dangerous diseases.

These representations were not features of generalized discourses but were relevant to the particular local activities in-hand. So representing refugees/asylum seekers as potential sources of disease was used to justify compulsory screening for disease (Measure 2), and representing them as potentially criminal was used to justify tagging them (Measure 3). But some of the hostility themes transcended particular activities and reappeared elsewhere in the dialogical network. For example, the theme of refugees as an economic drain was used in arguments that supported several measures, and importantly also in rhetoric *contesting* Measure 3. Similarly, the theme that refugees/asylum seekers lack social and parental responsibility appeared in several activities; to justify screening them, to justify tagging them and to warrant taking their children into care.

We are not of course saying that these were the only forms of hostility operating in Britain – these were, however, those highlighted by the media at the time. The hostility themes, however, provide some of the cohesion of the dialogical network the measures stimulated. The network is made dialogical mainly through the three part sequential structure 'action–criticism–defence', this structure extending our list of network structures as presented in Nekvapil and Leudar (2006a).

The important point to note is that even though the measures concern refugees/asylum seekers, and partly define the world in which they live, their voices did not figure in the articles – they are presented as objects of the measures, not participants in the controversy the measures evoked.

We now move to consider two questions. First, how do the representations of refugees/asylum seekers in the media link to the ways local inhabitants relate to refugees – what do they feel about them, how do they act towards them, how do they speak about them? Second, what personal consequences do the hostile representations have for the refugees/asylum seekers themselves?

THE NARRATIVES OF THE LOCALS

We do not conceive the relationship between newspapers and their readers to be a one-way didactic influence, with journalists shaping the attitudes of their readers to refugees/asylum seekers (Nekvapil and Leudar, 2002). The question we ask here is simply whether the narratives of the locals about refugees are organized along the same hostility themes.

So what kind of recognition do the locals provide to the refugees? Of our six informants, two were openly hostile, three denied personal knowledge of refugees and one person was accepting.

The hostile informants

The hostile informants R and W were both middle-aged men, one a native Mancunian and the other originally from Ireland. The terminology they used is notable. The interviewers spoke of 'refugees', but both informants switched to using 'asylum seekers'. R starts by using the term 'refugee' but puts its appropriateness in doubt (Extract 8).

Extract 8: local informant R

5. **JH:** so err I'd-I'd like to hear (.) <u>your</u> story especially about any experiences you've
6. had with refugees (.) anything you say will be confidential your personal details won't
7. be (.) put into the report erm please feel free to ask any questions at any point. um
8. (0.8) so umm and umm (..) just begin really when you're ready. just take your time.
10. **R:** refugees? well there's all kinds of refugees aren't there er: (1.3) I <u>suppose</u>
11. they've gotta come some place to live, <u>but</u> (..) how many refugees are (.) actually
12. refugees from their country just wanna come 'ere for (..) a better life y'know not
13. that they're being persecuted (..) in the country that they er: come from.

R resonated the common suspicion about refugees, lexicalized in the term 'bogus asylum seeker' – was she really persecuted in her place of origin or is her presence in the UK economically motivated? This suspicion needs to be resolved

for every one of them and makes it inappropriate to use the term 'refugee', which presupposes that the person had to flee in danger of her life. R thus uses throughout the term 'asylum seeker' which foregrounds this dilemma. What meaning does the term have for him? Later in the interview R says the following.

Extract 9: local informant R

84. **R:** (.) really er about asylum seekers er as I said if they're true
85. and they are really going to get persecuted in
86. their own country (.) by all means yes (.) come here but if they're just here so
87. they can get their their ( ) they get this they get that money, housing, blah blah,
88. send them back (2.0) er: when they <u>do</u> come

R reasons with two categories: (1) those who were persecuted; and (2) those who were not, and are economically motivated instead. The formulation does not order these classes according to their likelihood, but the common sense informal logic has it that every asylum seeker is suspected of belonging in category 2 and so to be examined (Goodman and Speer, 2007). This is not just a representation true or false – what is in effect the bogus asylum-seeker category is invoked to justify expulsion of refugees from the UK. As we noted earlier, the term 'refugee' acknowledges the incumbents' status as victims – the term 'asylum seeker' in both legal and mundane usage opens each incumbent to suspicion as to their motives and honesty. The term is marked as bogus but this implication is cancelled when expressions such as 'genuine' or 'true asylum seeker' are used. This way of reasoning also characterises the narrative of the second hostile informant W, for whom, in fact, the suspicion is valid by default.

Extract 10: local informant W

24. **W:** and er: (...) the asylum seekers the derrr they er (...) and er (.) what
25. d'you call them? (.) the refugees (..) in my opinion the refugees the asylum
26. seekers are a con (.) a lot of them, there's a lot genuine (.) but there's a lot
27. of er (.) the Americans and the British wants to get er (..) wants to get
28. the Taliban you see when when the last regime got (.) down (.) when
29. America went in (..) there was payback time

W begins by using the term 'asylum seeker', hesitates, switches back to using the interviewers' term 'refugee', then resumes the use of his term (ll. 24–26). His narrative varies the meaning of bogus – bogus asylum seekers again come here not to escape persecution, their real reason is more bizarre – they are eminent members of the Taliban resettled in the UK to dampen down the conflict in Afghanistan (ll. 27–29). This account is only bizarre if we assume that it is meant to be factually correct, rather than identity-constitutive. For who are the Taliban? They are militant Islamic radical insurgents well-publicised for their fanaticism, cruelty and bigotry. By implication, these characteristics are attributable to them. This representation of refugees is not quite idiosyncratic, but draws on and reproduces common suspicions of Muslims in Britain.

W and R both organize their definition of refugees around a denial of their victim-hood and around suspicions. As in the newspapers, refugees are by

default bogus asylum seekers, not victims. But what exactly are they? W's and R's narratives were partly organized along the hostility themes we found in the media. Informant W's narrative mirrored three of them: he presented refugees as an economic burden, potentially as sources of disease and as involved in serious criminal activity. Informant R's account elaborated the 'economic burden' theme by constructing refugees as a drain on scarce resources and he also associated refugees with criminal activity. In addition, both used negative constructions of refugees *not* seen in the contemporary newspaper texts. W, for example, appealed to social cohesion as a basis for rejection of refugees – a rhetorical strategy observed elsewhere in asylum debate (Goodman, 2007). R constructed refugees as people with strange customs who impose these rudely on their hosts. Clearly, the locals can be somewhat creative in the way they reject refugees. Note also that the hostile informants never spoke of particular asylum seekers but instead about the category and its putative incumbents.

Informants claiming ignorance

These informants include two female pensioners V and L, who were interviewed together. At the beginning both emphatically deny any contemporary personal experience of refugees.

Extract 11: local informants V & L

1. **JTB:** good morning (..) very nice to meet you,
2. umm ok (..), [so, umm, we're doing a
3. **V:** [yes
4. **JTB:** project, umm(.) and we're collecting stories from local people round
5. Manchester (.) about their experiences with refugee:s =
6. **L:** =yes
7. **JTB:** and umm=
8. **V:** = <u>refugees?</u> (..) oh '<u>eck</u> I've not had any [experience
9. **L:** [no we've not come into contact
10. **JTB:** [heh heh heh]
11. **JH:** [heh hehe]

The interviewer, JTB, is introducing the point of the interview (ll. 1–4) but, almost the moment she utters the word 'refugees' the informant V denies having any relevant experience (ll. 8–11), and, moreover, the denial is designed to close the topic. L and V claim social segregation from refugees, declaring that their paths simply do not cross in everyday life. Moreover, the lack of experience is not presented as something incidental and individual to either L or V. The segregation from refugees is instead something that is socially shared by these two informants – L supports V's assertion in l. 8 not by reasserting the individual experiences for herself only; she instead uses the pronoun 'we' (l. 9).

The interviewers persevere and induce L and V to address the topic. L and V however do not talk about 'refugees' but about 'coloured people' (Extract 12, l. 39) and they place relevant experiences in their childhood.

Extract 12: local informants V & L, continued

37. **V:** yes uhm well you see, when I was young (.)
38. **L:** is this what you wanted to talk about, when we were younger?=
39. **V:** =and er (.) there was no coloured people at all (.) you know in Manchester,
40. [th]ere was nobody, I never saw anybody coloured, and then a (.)couple came
41. **JH:** [yeah]
42. **V**: to live near us and they was, and we considered them you know, ooh we
43. was always looking at them, thinking how strange they looked, y'know being
44. black (.) and it appeared that this man (.) had been a <u>slave</u>
45. **JH:** really
46. **V:** yes. and that would have been when I'd be about eight year old, sometime
47. when they came, and I always remember their name, their name was Moore (.)
48. and er they were <u>very</u> very nice people (.) yes and er (.) truly speaking, I've not
49. had any experience with them

V and L are not explicitly hostile as R and W were. Instead, they construe refugees as immigrants and as racially distinct, exotic and the objects of curiosity. They stress their positive attitudes towards specific immigrants they encountered in the past, but they are vague about them, and still they deny any social engagement with refugees in the present.

The third of our informants A, was an elderly Mancunian. She constructed her account of refugees in a similar way. She denied having contact with refugees, but presented herself as one friendly to them. Like L and V, she characterized refugees as visually distinct people – without personal engagement with refugees/asylum seekers, she only knows them 'from the outside'.

The accepting informant

P, a middle-aged male Mancunian who works in a charity shop, was the only informant who accepted refugees.

Extract 13: local informant P

17. **P:** that's about it really y'know I mean, I <u>do</u> yeah. (...) yeah. (...) an I know
18. there's a lot of prejudice (..) about err refugees y'know 'cos I hear it all the time
19. y'know blame them for this blame them for that y'know but I know it's all a
20. loada bullshit and err (..) y'know (...) I agree th-th-that we should err if we can
21. <u>help</u> (.) refugees and countries we should do, why not, yeah? that's it yeah.

What is notable about P's narrative is how it fuses personal experiences and collective engagement. He reports witnessing hostility to refugees and denies in very personal terms what is said about them (l. 20) without specifying who the hostiles might be – in doing so he distinguishes himself from all those who are prejudiced against refugees. His resistance is, however, not an individual matter – the phrase 'I agree' ties him dialogically to likeminded people who 'defend refugees', and the formulation also takes the shape of a preferred answer, suggesting the 'we' (ll. 20–21) could subsume the interviewers. P then situates what he says in the dialogical network in which the hostility to refugees/asylum seekers is expressed and contested.

Unlike any of our other local informants, P acknowledges the victim-hood of refugees. They are victims as scapegoats for the host community's problems (Extract 13, l. 19) and of pre-flight persecution (Extract 14, l. 15)

Extract 14: local informant P continued

14. **P**: an they're all nice people, an no doubt they're 'ere y'know because
15. err (...) pfft err through persecution at home innit. and errm (..) got sympathy
16. for 'em yeah, y'know I think they're entitled to all the help we can give 'em (...)
17. that's about it really y'know I mean, I do yeah.

This acknowledgement is reflected in his consistent use of the term 'refugee' – unlike the hostile informants he does not switch to 'asylum seeker'. He presents refugees as deserving of sympathy, and help (ll. 15–16) in assertions requiring no warrant. The account indicates that presentations of refugees reflect positions entrenched in emotions rather than in reasoned arguments.

Unlike the other locals, P does not deny interaction with refugees. He gives examples of two unaccompanied refugee children that he had met and befriended. This illustration of his account is in sharp contrast to the 'asylum seekers' in the accounts of the hostile locals and in the newspapers. There the debates are about refugees/asylum seekers in general, in effect about membership categories and not their incumbents, who are de-personalized in this way, and without qualities irrelevant to the category membership.

To summarize, as in the newspapers, refugees are identified as either (1) victims deserving of sympathy (refugees proper) or (2) 'bogus asylum seekers' whose situated identity is constituted along rather simple hostility themes. Not all locals are, however, overtly hostile. One strategy is to segregate oneself from refugees/asylum seekers and maintain ignorance. If these informants were affected by the hostility of the media, it was to motivate avoidance. Even so, they did not actually echo these themes explicitly. Acceptance of refugees/asylum seekers is, however, clearly uncommon.

REFUGEES' NARRATIVES

Going by our analysis of newspaper texts and the narratives of locals, the environment in which refugees/asylum seekers live in the UK is mostly hostile. British newspapers tend to represent refugees along a set of hostility themes that tie in with repressive measures against them. The orientation to the hostility themes in the media by the locals, however, seems to vary. Some are hostile and reproduce the themes in their narratives, occasionally extending them. Our findings are in tune with Nekvapil and Leudar (2002), who noted that readers do not simply reproduce media representations but use them flexibly in locally situated activities, and sometimes irrespectively of the author's original intent. Other locals, although not explicitly hostile, avoided any contact with refugees and disclaim any experience. Only two participants – one local and a voice in a newspaper report – accepted refugees as trauma victims and in need of asylum. Note, however, that none of our local informants referred *explicitly* to newspapers (or other media).

The newspaper representations of refugees/asylum seekers were polyphonic, with refugee advocates, but not refugees themselves, being given the opportunity to assert the identity of refugees. In this section, we examine how the hostility themes enter refugees' biographical narratives. We first analyse two cases in detail and then use the results as a frame to present the rest. We focus both on commonalities in the narratives, as well as on features unique to each informant. Unlike the stereotype, each refugee's life story is unique but with some common features produced by their orientation to the hostile environment.

The case of M

At the time of the interview M had been waiting for a year and a half for a decision on his asylum application – legally then he is an asylum seeker and we have already seen what this meant in the UK at the time. Any person can, however, be categorized in many ways that are true and the question is, which will be relevant in an interaction and ascendant (Schegloff, 2007). M proposes an identity in his narrative biography complementary to that of a refugee. His story is that in Iran he was a highly educated person, successful and socially consequential, but he had to leave for political reasons. His chosen identity does not contradict being a refugee, but it instead manages his incumbency of the category. In the UK he is not allowed to work, is forced to be dependent and idle which is driving him insane. M builds his narrative around the contrast between his life in Iran and his life in exile. He describes his life as changing, but not for the better.

Extract 15: case M

36. **M:** I got to finish MS (.) at university. I have- I have to- I have
37. to pass the entrance exam. after that went to university and finish this course
38. MS- MS in textile engineering.hhh and after that (.) >err during this time I
39. worked- I worked< in three in three factories >in three textile factories< to get
40. some (.) experience about (.) mm: my job mm: (.) sometimes er (.)
41. mm: I get to sleep I got to sleep for four or five hours (.) mm: (.).hh per day
42. (.) I didn't have the time (.) extra time.hh because I worked sometimes eleven
43. yea > e hours per day.hh and sometimes two- two shift factory work factory
44. hours y'know erm eight hours is one shift in a factory (.) I'd work two shifts in a
45. factory (.) not for money just for experience (.) and after that I I went to (.) er
46. to teach in university

The media and hostile locals represent refugees as economically dependent and idle. Although M does not refer directly to such hostility, in recounting his life in Iran, he puts much effort into establishing a contrary identity. He was educated, successful, hard working and idealistic – all of these personal qualities are implicit in his activities (finishing university, passing entrance exams, working for experience rather than for money, respectively). Significantly, becoming that sort of person was not a routine matter but an accomplishment

Extract 16: case M continued

184. **M:** when I was in Iran I worked- worked (.) everyday (0.5) we have just one
185. day for weekend in Iran, just Friday (0.6) I worked a (.) six-day week.hh:::

186. and er (.) I was very happy (1.0) because (.) it was (1.0) it means er:::
187. ((*clears throat*)) be a lecturer I was a lecturer (.) it was (.)for me (.) just a dream

M uses extreme-case formulations – here of how hard he worked in Iran (Extract 16) and how terrible the situation is for him in the UK (Extract 17). Extreme-case formulations are devices usually used to contest contrary positions in arguments (Pomerantz, 1986). Since there is nothing relevant said by the interviewers to contest, it is likely that he is orienting towards the hostility in his environment, and specifically to the theme that refugees are idle and economically dependent. The problem is that, in the UK, M is indeed not working and depends on National Asylum Support Service benefits. How does he block the implication that he actually fulfils the hostility theme?

Extract 17: case M continued

103. **M:** and here what difference when I when I cannot (.) do something (.)
104. as a human?.hh a=heh what difference? what difference between
105. prison for me and here? (.) I have to er I have to share with
106. some flatmate (.) I <u>have to</u> (.) that erm is not matched with
107. me::.hh I have to spend my time (.).hh just going to college (0.2) without
108. any work
109. **JH:** mm
110. **M:** .hh even <u>even</u> any voluntary work

He accepts that he is inactive now, and financially dependent. But this is his *predicament*. M presents the opportunity for work as a basic human need – without it he might as well 'be in prison'. So, the media and hostile locals present refugees as lacking a basic human quality, industry; M argues, to the contrary, that he is prevented from fulfilling his humanity by working. Both sides accept that idleness is morally accountable and work is an important positive characteristic.

M does not just narrate his identity, he also conveys it through how he engages the interviewers. He expresses his desperation to work and his unhappiness about his forced dependency on the state, and this marks directly the assimilation of the hostility theme into his presentation of himself. He positions the interviewers not as researchers, but in the category of English people who could help him, a refugee, to change his situation.

Extract 18: case M continued

126. **M:** (.) and you (.) you are English people (.) you saved
127. my life I really appreciate you ev:ery:body every British people (.) but
128. <u>ple:ase ple:ase</u> think about my situation think about my my I I am
129. going to be (.) mad (.) to became mad (2.0) jus just imagine jus (.) if
130. possible for you just err take this situation for yourself (.) for one week
131. (3.0).hh you go to share with some flatmate that you doesn't like
132. them (.) you don't like them? like he or she I don't know (.) and just
133. >go to college< hehheh and and mm I don't know (.) something like
134. this (.) if you agree with this situation (.) if you don't agree? (.) please
135. just please help me (.) and help <u>every</u> refugee and asylum seeker

In fact, he positions the interviewers as *representatives* of English people and himself as a 'refugee and asylum seeker' (l. 135). The category pair immigrant/host seems omnirelevant (Sacks, 1992).

What are the consequences of his predicament as he sees them? In Extract 18 he predicts that he is going to go 'mad' (l. 129). This is an extreme-case formulation of his psychological problems. The extreme-case formulation of the consequences is used to formulate the gravity of the predicament. In Extract 19, M positions his psychological problems in the present rather than solely in the future and these again stem from his predicament. M, however, notably does not narrate having psychological problems in the past in Iran – such problems are a discontinuous aspect of himself contingent on his situation in the UK.

Extract 19: case M continued

148. **M:** you know what what I mean (.) mm but I can work it helps me to
149. become more successful for another people
150. **JH:** mm::=hmm
151. **M:** to become more ermmm ermmm to have a more good manner for
152. another people (0.8) if I if I became nervous if I became mentally prob
153. If I have mental mental problem then maybe it er er affects on other
154. people (..) but there needs to be (.) to have a good manner with each
155. other (..)sometimes I er er erm I am going for a walk er or I go for a
156. walk hehe and some (.) I see some people in the morning and they say
157. <u>morning</u> (.8) and I 'll say morning (.6) <u>sometimes</u> and because of
158. errr (.) my mental problems (.) I didn't hear what they say (.)

His account prior to this point has set up an explanation for his mental health problems – inactivity, disempowerment, dependency. M presents a disparity between his past and present identity: he goes from 'very happy' (Extract 16, l. 186) in Iran, to depressed in the UK, from active and independent, to inactive and dependent. But how does he establish some coherent sense of self through all of his fragmentation? A continuous aspect of M's identity is his willingness to be hardworking and independent. His problem is that in exile he cannot exercise these qualities, with disastrous effects on his mental well-being.

Why then did M leave Iran for a place which is so inhospitable?

Extract 20: case M continued

204. **M:** I really erm (0.9) really controlled myself (.) when I was teaching (.)
205. not to say something bad (.) against government or supreme leader
206. hh:: but I ah: (.) I wanted to say to my students (1.0) something (.)
207. that is wrong (.) or something that is (.) right.hh that my students (0.8)
208. have to go to the right way not the wrong way

He spoke out against the government for his students, so that they could go 'the right way' (l. 208), but this put him in danger. So contrary to the hostility theme, M came to the UK not for economic reasons, but as the result of a political act that made Iran an unliveable place for him.

M's life story is consistent with research findings on identity loss and reconstruction in refugees (Colic-Peisker and Walker, 2003). His narrative

is structured in terms of discontinuities and continuities between his past in Iran and the present in the UK. The continuities in him are his education, industry and social responsibility. So M used the same themes that we saw in hostile representations to construct his identity, but without expressing specific attacks on refugees either by locals or in the media.

Even though these aspects of M's identity cannot be expressed in the present, they are not changed by exile. The discontinuities are in his living circumstances, with negative changes in himself contingent. One *discontinuity* is that in Iran he was free to work hard and to live where he wanted, whereas in the UK he is forced to be idle, has no choice about where he lives, and consequently he is depressed. The places themselves have attributes that are contrary or compatible with M at different times. So M's construction of the places 'Iran' and 'the UK' are interweaved with M's establishment of personal identity. M attributes his depression not to his own nature, but to circumstances in exile. But one could ask if it is the circumstances (e.g. not being able to work) that cause the M's psychological problems, or the hostility themes (refugees are idle and economically parasitic)? This distinction would be wrong. The important point is that hostility themes create and modulate circumstances – they bring activities under descriptions and make them morally accountable in particular ways. They go hand-in-hand and should not be separated – hostility themes are features of circumstances. M cannot work is due to legislation, but under the description of this hostility theme inactivity becomes idleness and an aspect of his nature. M is in an ongoing conflict with his host environment about the meaning of his activities.

The case of F

F was born and educated in Pakistan, and married-out twice by her father. Both her husbands were violent. She wished to achieve some independence through work, but both husbands objected. M had described certain aspects of his place of origin as a paradise lost; F formulates Pakistan as an unliveable place.

Extract 21: case F

28. **F:** you would say socially its even more (0.4).hh fundamentalist and backward than
29. the rest of Pakistan m[m
30. **JH:** [right]
31. **F:** so: but my father (.) fo:rtunately for us I s'pose oh was a- he was educated
32. and he was in the civil civil service and he educated all his daughters (0.8).hh
33. but when it came to (0.5) m- marriage (0.4) he: he felt maybe his girls do no know-
34. he=he you know we would not make the right choice so he married us off to
35. people (.) of his choice.

F's account interweaves formulation of the place (ll. 28–29) with her personal biography (ll. 31–35). She first establishes a consensus with the female interviewer about the nature of her place of origin (it is 'fundamentalist and backward'; ll. 28–31), then, through providing biographical details, she indicates consequences of the place for herself, highlighting restrictions and the lack of choice even in important decisions (ll. 33–35). A narrative feature to note is

that she does not speak just for herself but subsumes herself in the collections 'his daughters' and 'his girls' – indicating that it is not just herself but women in general that are disempowered in Pakistan (e.g. her use of the pronoun 'us' in l. 31). F therefore formulates a patriarchal place where women exist not as autonomous persons but as daughters and wives. This invokes category-bound activities for men and women in Pakistan; men make the choices for the women and themselves; the women respond passively to this. Like M, she is not talking to detached researchers. Schegloff (1972) argued that 'formulating place' depends on how interlocutors categorize one another in the conversation. In telling her story she negotiates the membership-status of the interviewers as western women, in whose culture forced marriage and traditional restrictions on women are unacceptable. It is from this position that she formulates her predicament in Pakistan and presents herself as a victim in terms appropriate to her audience – she was an educated, independent and industrious woman in a place of extreme misogyny. So in telling her story F sets up relations between two categories; Pakistan as a place, and 'independent, industrious women'; they conflict with each other with consequences for the women. As her narrative proceeds, F adds further features to her formulation of Pakistan, her family and herself – these are mutually inseparable. Pakistan is a place that offers violence to independent women and women are expected to accept violence with fatalism (Extract 22). F's formulation of Pakistan presents misogyny not as its accidental feature, but as a constitutive one.

Extract 22: case F continued

126. **F:** and he started being violent towards them also you know.hh I was so helpless
127. I was- I used to tell my parents and brother, and they would say that (0.8) this
128. happens to every woman this is: (0.3) the life every woman has to accept and
129. >you have to accept it< you just <u>can't</u> leave him now (.) we don't care what
130. happens you have to bear it (0.7) this is your fate and destiny an (.) you're
131. meant to (0.2) to lead such a life so let it be

In formulating Pakistan, F enriches her self-presentation as someone who will not accept such a predicament. She is independent and strives for self-determination; she is a woman in conflict with her place of origin. Moreover, she connects the patriarchy's general hostility to women to her daughters and her love for them (Extract 22, l. 126; Extract 23). The violence met them (Extract 22, l. 126) and the threat of arranged marriages make the place unliveable for her (Extract 23, ll. 228–229).

Extract 23: case F continued

214. **F:** one day she [her mother-in-law] just told me you know
215. I've got your two daughters engaged to my nephews an
216. (0.3) an (0.4) at that time they were just six and eight years old (0.8) I was
217. horrified I said how?

(11 lines omitted)

228. he said (.) <I don't care (0.7) you have nothing to do with this
229. decision> that is the point where I decided I'm going to leave this country

Like M, F orients her narrative to the hostility themes current in the UK at the time of the interview. Contrary to representations by the hostile media and locals, F presents herself and her daughters as economic victims of exile, rather than economic migrants. She does this by contrasting the affluent area in which she used to live in Pakistan with the run-down area she is sent to in the UK (Extract 24).

Extract 24: case F continued

421. **F:** I lived a very (0.2) economically, financially comfortable life in (0.2) Pakistan (0.2)
422. I lived in the best area (0.3) I had a (.) driver, we had (0.1) two cars, we had.hh (0.3)
423. y:ou know (0.2) a woman who was working f:ull time (.) looking after the children we
424. had people to cook for us and (..) everything. and here it was suddenly you end up
425. in the w:orst possible (area). Cheetham Hill is the eighth poorest ward (0.2) i(h)n
426. the UK you know.hh::::: I mean I still remember when (0.4) when we-we were
427. sent here (.) I was so scared how will we survive here you know? it was- I
428. don't know if you're familiar with umm (0.4) with Pakistan has very big hous:es,
429. because umm (0.3) there's no shortage of space he=he and plus maybe (.) land is
430. cheaper whatever but (0.4) people live in big houses. and this small house an
431. uhh it just has three very small bedrooms you have seen how small it i[s]
432. **JH:** [mmm]=
433. **F:** =six of us live here.
434. **JTB:** yeah
435. **F:** overcrowded you know. and plus when they dropped us here the first night
436. the asylum team told us that 'don't go out this is a very rough area [it has]
437. **JH:** [oh no]
438. **F**: drugs an-, you know? I was so scared (0.8) thought how can I raise my children here?

F provides a general gloss of her economic situation in Pakistan (l. 421) and follows with details instantiating this (ll. 422–424, 428–430). The aspects of her lifestyle that she lists are not common, either in Pakistan or in the UK. Even in the UK, her lifestyle would be available only to the very rich. By contrast, her situation in the UK is as negative as could be (ll. 425–427). F then contrasts two extreme case formulations ('the best area', l. 422, with the 'worst possible area', l. 425) of two periods in her life and, as M did, orients to the hostility theme that refugees come to better themselves economically. F foregrounds a discontinuity in her economic conditions and in doing so she inter alia establishes her status as a victim of immigration practices (ll. 435–438).

F elaborates on her situation in exile, establishing further continuities and discontinuities in her self. We saw that F presented herself in Pakistan as a voice against oppression of women (Extracts 22 and 23). In narrating her family members, F presented herself as an individual who does not accept her fate, but strives for self-determination (Extract 22, ll. 126–129; Extract 23, l. 229). She retains these personal qualities in the UK; independence and industriousness are central to her identity and continuous throughout changes in her circumstances (Extract 25).

Extract 25: case F continued

442. **F:** on no choice (.) basis (..) mm: (..) yeah (..) but as soon as I got permission
443. to work I started to (..) work.hh and I've always believed that (..) y-you

444. know, in working (..) for me work has always been (.) very, very important, so I
445. even did voluntary work

F also implicitly counters the hostility theme that refugees are a burden on the host community; she even worked voluntarily when she was not allowed paid employment (Extract 25). Furthermore, she works as an advice worker in an economically deprived area, thus countering the hostility theme of refugees as lacking in social responsibility (Extract 26).

Extract 26: case F continued

392. **F:** I'm working at the (.) [name] Advice Centre as an advice worker err
393. ((*clears throat*)) when we first came to (.) M:anchester I used to feel (0.3) I used to be
394. very depressed sitting at (0.2) <u>h</u>ome (.) <u>plus</u> when I was in Pakistan in the last two or
395. three years (.) because all of it had been so stressful, last three-four year (0.2).hh:: I
396. had (0.4) g:ot addicted t(h)o (.) err pain killers. I used to get <u>rag</u>ing headaches you know.

Unlike M, F refers explicitly to the hostility in the media, and to attacks by non-refugees (Extract 27, ll. 457–459). However, she may provide the hostility with a meaning not found in the newspaper articles – although she does not use the word, she may attribute hostility towards refugees to racism (Extract 27).

Extract 27: case F continued

454 **F:** seekers (0.2) or refugees (1.0) we've had a lot of <u>bad</u> experiences, people (0.2) I
455 mean some people are very negative about asylum seekers. some are very (.)
456 negative about ethnic communities. they don't even know you're an asylum
457 seeker (.) you know, just the fact that you (0.4).hhh look Asian (.) or are Asian
458 they pass all kinds of remarks (0.9) yeah the media makes- the media makes it
459 really bad. (0.8) bogus asylum seekers.

At this point, F speaks as a representative of 'asylum seekers' (ll. 454–455), but clearly she uses this term differently to how the hostiles do. In her account, she presents asylum seekers as victims of unspecified racist agencies with their status misrepresented by media as being 'bogus'. For F, the term 'bogus asylum seeker' is used for racist purposes. F creates a family of membership categories in her description, joining together 'asylum seekers' and 'refugees', with 'ethnic communities' and those who 'look Asian', as being the victims of racism. F makes it moreover clear that such hostility has serious consequences for incumbents of all membership categories, and herself in particular (see Extract 29). At this point, a methodological remark may be useful – it is important to remember that the researchers did not mention media, hostility themes, racism or health problems; instead they introduced their research to F (and to all other refugee informants) as follows:

Extract 28: case F continued

1. **JTB:** we're collecting stories from refugees and local people.hhh and we'd like to
2. hear about your life in the country where you used to live and your life in the
3. UK (.) we won't really be asking any questions

The interviews with all refugees followed this format, and themes and concerns beyond this general introduction were raised spontaneously by informants.

So when M discussed experiencing psychological problems, this was also not inspired by the researchers. Like M, F also spontaneously reveals that she has had personal and psychological problems (Extract 26, ll. 393–396). However, unlike M, she does not present these as exclusively due to exile. Her problems started in Pakistan because of her circumstances there, but the problems are exacerbated in the UK. F's psychological problems are contingent on disempowering situations in Pakistan and in exile.

As in M's case, F connects mental health problems in refugees with forced idleness (Extract 29).

Extract 29: case F continued

452. **F**: god, if I had to just sit at home and just (..) be on (.) NASS benefits I would, I would've (.) I
453. would have gone <u>mad</u> (4.0) at least I have a job (2.0) most of the people living round here are
454 asylum seekers (4.0) or refugees (3.0) we've had a lot of <u>bad</u> experiences, people (0.9) I
455 mean some people are very negative about asylum seekers. (.)

There is reciprocity between the hostility to refugees and their accounts of their own psychological problems. According to a hostile media and hostile locals, asylum seekers are by nature idle and come to the UK for an easy life of economic dependence. F and M, however, both reject idleness and present themselves as industrious by nature – idleness for them is a *source* of psychological distress. Like M, F uses an extreme-case formulation to bring home the consequences of her enforced idleness (Extract 29, l. 453). Economic inactivity is enforced on them by legal regulations and prejudice but it is re-presented as reflecting flaws in their nature. The refugees' inactivity predicament is transformed by the hostility themes into personal inadequacies. This supports our thesis that 'the others' provide refugees with recognitions that are hostile, false and irrelevant and this is consequential to their personal well-being. In fact, F's inner dialogue provides a sense of alienation from herself (Extract 30, ll. 459–461).

Extract 30: case F continued

459. **F**: you really start feeling bogus (after a while), you think maybe I've come here for the
460. benefits, maybe.hh::: you know you start believing it, think maybe I'm imagining my
461. life in Pakistan, maybe I wasn't er::, you know? like, maybe I've come for the money
462. even though (0.2) what I earn <u>here</u> now is not even half of what I was earning in (0.4)
463. Pakistan an Pakistan is a cheaper place (0.8) and plus it's (.) err (0.2) it's <u>your</u> country it's
464. your- whatever it is, you're at least a first class citizen, you know? you <u>feel</u> you belong,
465. here you never get that feeling that (0.3) you belong even

She is aware of the hostility themes but is nevertheless invaded by them. They influence the meaning that her actions have for her. There is a sense of struggle between these two competing voices (ll. 459–461), that of the hostility theme and that which retains a sense of her personal agency. This time, her agency wins out, and designates the suspicion as irrelevant to her situation (ll. 462–465).

To summarise, F and M's life narratives are very different – one is from Pakistan, the other from Iran. One is a woman, the other a man. Their exact reasons for leaving their original countries are very different. But there are commonalities which stem partly from hostilities in their place of asylum. What is common in F's and M's accounts is their stress on relative economic affluence in their countries of origin compared with the place of asylum. Both present themselves as autonomous and resourceful, having held good socio-economic positions in their countries of origin. Their stories deny an economic basis for exiling themselves in the UK. Their reasons for leaving comparatively privileged situations vary in specifics but both stress humanistic reasons. Clearly, they did not become refugees/asylum seekers to better themselves economically as the hostility themes would have it.

Discontinuities in their lives have negative implications for F and M's psychological adjustment. In particular, the misrepresented enforced idleness creates a situation that is distressing and experienced as leading to psychological distress. The accounts chime with previous research findings that living situations in exile and especially hostile exclusion result in and exacerbate mental distress.

Cases C, B, A and S

So far, we have analysed two cases in detail. The remaining cases are:

- C, an Iranian business man who left Iran because he was persecuted after he converted to Christianity;
- B, a journalist from Eritrea who was persecuted for political reasons and had to leave;
- A, a woman from Somalia who escaped civil war but had to leave her children in Kenya;
- S, a woman from Somalia who also escaped civil war.

We provide only summaries of these cases in terms relevant to what we have observed so far.

The remaining refugees do not refer explicitly to hostile representations in the local community or to attacks in the way that F did. Instead, their narratives resemble more those of M's – they implicitly deny the relevance of the hostility themes in their construction of identity.

Socio-economic standing in the country of origin and the reasons for leaving

First, all informants implicitly oriented against characterizations of refugees as economic opportunists. B was a journalist and diplomat in Eritrea. He described how in Eritrea he was 'leading wonderful life'; had many opportunities, and was in a position of importance. Reminiscent of F and M, he had to leave Eritrea for moral and political reasons. His situation in the UK is altogether different. He has trouble finding employment despite his qualifications but he attributes this to influences beyond his control. C also described his fortunes as changing for the worse economically – he provides an alternative reason for exiling himself – the persecution consequent on his conversion to Christianity.

The two Somalian women, A and S, are exceptions in that neither was well-off economically in their country of origin. A describes in detail her and her people's impoverished situation in Somalia. Even so, her account of why she left Somalia is contrary to the hostility themes – she escaped civil war in Somalia and the racism that designated her as an inferior stranger. According to her, in Somalia there are systematically limited opportunities for women except to 'produce' babies. She seeks opportunities in the UK to develop as a person rather than for easy economic advancement.

Self-presentation

Like F and M, the remaining refugees present themselves in terms of continuities and discontinuities that are interleaved in how their life changed with exile. B, for example, presents significant negative changes in his life since becoming a refugee, but maintains continuous personal qualities through these. He cannot avoid revealing problems he is having in the UK, but he attends to his face each time by showing that these happen despite his positive qualities. B's account of his life as a refugee parallels that of F and M – it is a portrait of a resourceful person who is denied opportunities to exercise this quality. Maintaining personal continuity is, however, not an easy accomplishment. C describes many discontinuities between his past as a successful businessman, and his subsequent fall from grace following his conversion and exile. His efforts at accomplishing continuity seem less prominent – they are his Christianity, and being funny. Both A's and S's stories orient to significant differences in their positions as women in Somalia and here. S, in particular, narrates cultural practices and customs that were relevant to her gender and a dilemma in the new society as to which to preserve for herself and her daughter.

Problems of living

We have seen that both F and M reported psychological problems contingent on exclusion and in particular on not working. The problem was not simply the idleness, but enforced idleness misrepresented in hostile representations as reflecting their nature. Most of the remaining refugees also express this problem. B narrates significant personal frustrations at not being able to work. C echoes F's comment 'You really start feeling bogus' when he reveals that what 'they' say about asylum seekers has consequences for his self-concept. As a refugee he feels like the 'man who hasn't anything'. The prejudice that refugees are an economic burden results in his feeling of shrinking as a person. S discussed problems with depression in refugee communities and commented that many have problems with accessing sources of support. She related her personal psychological problems to a loss of family support and missing her mother who remains in Somalia.

Conclusion

The representations of refugees/asylum seekers in contemporary UK are not consensual but contested, and as a result not mutually independent – the

competing representations are coordinated in part by shared 'hostility themes'. These vary in their universality – some are general and deny to the refugee aspects of common humanity (e.g. not being fit parents); others are transparently contingent on specific social activities (e.g. being a source of specific infectious diseases). Hostility themes are representations of refugees/asylum seekers, but not just that – they justify their exclusion from the community in the UK. Inevitably, xenophobes and refugees, politicians and refugee advocates orient to these themes differently.

How do hostility themes accomplish the exclusion from the community? – they do this by being aspects of social settings and bringing social activities 'under descriptions' that make the activities of refugees/asylum seekers morally and legally questionable (see Leudar et al., 2007 and Sharrock and Leudar, 2002 for an outline of the analytic framework). 'Hostility themes' can be thought of as shifting but omnipresent features of circumstances that create a meaning potential for refugees and their activities. Can we think of hostility themes as discourses? The important point is that the hostility against and stigmatization of refugees/asylum seekers are not individual matters but are instead socially coordinated. Yet the hostility themes are evidently not fixed formulations or expressions that fit into activities like cog wheels. Our analysis revealed a dialogical network in which discourses are distributed in participants' contributions.

The network was set off by the government proposing four administrative measures to control refugees/asylum seekers. Two important ways in which the cohesion of this network was accomplished by participants was dialogically and thematically. Dialogically, it was managed partly through the three-part sequential structure 'action–criticism–defence'. The measures were announced in the Asylum Bill in the House of Commons (but also advertised elsewhere). These announcements were taken up by numerous others, including politicians, relevant pressure groups and trade unions, all of them speaking or writing in a variety of places. Some of these reactions were collected as reportable and hence made significant by journalists. These reactions were responded to in turn, and the four measures defended. The depressing fact is that the refugees themselves were not included in the media part of the network – there they were objects of debate rather than participants.

Each part of this network sequence was duplicated – several agencies, for example, objected to a measure, but each in its own words. Such duplication of dialogue sequence parts is characteristic of dialogical networks (Leudar and Nekvapil, 2004). The point important here is that the duplicates were never exactly the same, linguistically or pragmatically (Leudar et al., 2004.) This, however, does not mean that the duplicates were independent. First, the reactions to the announcements of the four measures were coordinated by the hostility themes. Second, and as we noted elsewhere, where duplicates echoed a prior contribution, they depended on it – participants usually amplified prior contributions by allies (Leudar et al., 2004).

The views of local informants or the refugees/asylum seekers were not introduced in the media reports and so these two were not acknowledged by

journalists as participants in the controversy. Yet the hostility themes were present in the narratives of both, which moreover, oriented towards the media. All refugees/asylum seekers' narratives sought to establish an authentic personal identity, and the sequential structure 'hostility theme – defence' was implicit (hostility themes do not have to be explicitly voiced, they seem omnirelevant). Each refugee/asylum seeker strived to rule out the relevance of hostility themes to themselves. The problem is how to claim the status of a refugee without having the negative personal qualities attributed to oneself. The general solution was to construct an autobiography in which the life in the place of origin negated personal qualities and that place was an unliveable one. Thus F was an affluent, independent and caring woman in a place of extreme misogyny; M was an educated critic of government wrongdoings in a dictatorship, C was a Christian in a strictly Islamic country. The second recurrent aspect of the narratives was that the change in living circumstances on becoming a refugee was not one for the better – neither economically nor socially. Refugees' discourse strategy thus involved joint constructions of self and places (Schegloff, 1972).

The important aim of our project was to investigate the effects of hostility towards refugees/asylum seekers on their well-being. An analytical study such as this cannot establish causal relationship between social hostility and psychological problems. We have, however, established the parameters of the hostility and that refugees/asylum seekers orient to that hostility in their narrative constructions of themselves. This means that the conditions for suffering a trauma – the presence of pervasive hostility and its 'internalization' in oneself – seem to be satisfied. In fact, we have seen that most of our refugees/asylum-seeker informants reported psychological problems and attributed them to their 'problems of living' in the UK.

NOTES

1. The informants did not engage the interviewers as detached researchers. Should we then regard the evidence yielded using the biographic interview method as lacking in reliability or validity? Nekvapil (2003) found that the basic core of the biographical narratives of Germans living in the Czech Republic was only partly affected by characteristics such as the time (basically the same story was narrated in first and second interviews some months later), the researcher's ethnicity, or even by how the research aims were introduced. The interviewees in his study used different words but raised the same core concerns in subsequent interviews. We acknowledge the impact of interviewer/interviewee positioning, but the fact that our informants engaged the interviewers as English women rather than researchers arguably adds to the validity of the interview data.
2. We read the national and local newspapers for the period, but, because of the considerations of space we select the *Guardian* and the *Daily Mail* for analysis. We chose these two because (1) they are widely read, (2) they cover the range of attitudes towards refugee/asylum seekers, and (3) they have distinct party political allegiances. Future work might compare local and national newspapers and their respective roles in dialogical networks and self narratives of the refugee/asylum seekers.

3. The choice in newspaper pieces we analysed had to be made for considerations of space and we aimed for a sample of newspaper representation that would be relatively homogenous in genre. We deliberately focused on reports because in these hostility to refugees/asylum seekers is on the whole implicit in descriptions of activities and indexical to contemporary social events. The choice was thus made so as to reveal pragmatic aspects of hostilities. Examining editorials, for example, would not provide a better measure of hostility but it might reveal different relationships and variations. Future analysis might compare representations of refugees in these different newspaper piece genres as well as the respective role of these genres in dialogical networks.
4. See http://www.ncadc.org.uk/
5. This measure was covered in the *Daily Mail* on 24 and 29 November and in the *Guardian* on 25, 26, 27 and 28 November.
6. Some collections of membership categories, such as 'family' are relatively independent of settings and which categories belong to them is a matter of shared background knowledge. The occasioned collections, however, are context dependent and determined by the activity in hand – one of their uses is in formulation of new and change of existing membership categories.
7. Leudar and Nekvapil (2004) noted that journalists may describe and influence the development of dialogical networks in a focused way reflecting their own social engagement.
8. That asylum seekers are by default 'bogus' is often insinuated into the background of talk on asylum seekers. Consider the following extract from the *Guardian* on 27 November, regarding measure 4 of the Bill.

   Also today, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Falconer of Thoroton, announced details of plans to cut legal aid for asylum seekers.

   ((3 lines omitted))

   The legal services commission will be able to approve additional funding in worthwhile cases,

   Lord Falconer said.

   'If a case does require more than five hours because it takes time to get the legitimate story from

   a legitimate asylum seeker, and there is a prospect of success, then that time will be provided,' he said. 'It will be targeted at those cases which need it.'

   The essence of Lord Falconer's argument that legal aid should be cut and additional funding only provided in exceptional cases rests on an implicit assumption that the 'legitimate' asylum seekers he talks of are the exception. The logic of the argument denotes asylum seekers as by default 'illegitimate' or 'bogus'

9. Economic inactivity can of course be due to the lack of opportunity rather than willingness to work and a problem with the asylum system in the UK – this is, in fact, as we shall see, what our informants argued.
10. National Coalition of Anti-deportation Campaigns (NCADC) reports the following story – 'Anne a national of Kenya and her husband were forced to leave Kenya in 1990 as her husband was Ugandan and at the time Ugandans were being persecuted in Kenya. Anne and her husband fled to Swaziland. Unfortunately Anne's husband passed away. The Swaziland Authorities started making life very difficult for Anne to carry on working there . . .' (NCADC, 11 April 2007)

11. This measure was covered in the *Guardian* on 24 and 25 November. However, asylum seekers were connected with TB in the national press on 15 occasions in the two-month period.
12. The only other group which can be detained and treated forcibly against their will are individuals with psychotic diagnoses. And, as the insane in the French asylums in nineteenth century, the refugees are feared as a source of infection (Foucault, 1967).
13. This measure was covered in detail in the *Daily Mail* on 27 and 29 November and in the *Guardian* on 27 and 28 November. The representations are similar and we only include the analysis in the *Daily Mail*.

REFERENCES

Blackledge, A. (2005) *Discourse and Power in a Multilingual World*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Blommaert, I. (2001) 'Investigating Narrative Inequality: African Asylum Seekers' Stories in Belgium', *Discourse & Society* 12: 413–49.

Colic-Peisker, V. and Walker, I. (2003) 'Human Capital, Acculturation and Social Identity: Bosnian Refugees in Australia', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology* 13: 337–60.

Coole, C. (2002) 'A Warm Welcome? Scottish and UK Media Reporting of an Asylum-seeker Murder', *Media, Culture & Society* 24: 839–52.

Edwards, D. and Potter, J. (1992) *Discursive Psychology*. London: Sage.

Foucault, M. (1967) *Madness and Civilization*. London: Tavistock.

Goffman, E. (1981) *Forms of Talk*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Goodman, S. (2007) 'Constructing Asylum Seeking Families', *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis Across Disciplines* 1: 35–49

Goodman, S. and Speer, S.A. (2007) 'Category Use in the Construction of Asylum Seekers', *Critical Discourse Studies* 4: 165–85.

Gorst-Unsworth, C. and Goldenberg, E. (1998) 'Psychological Sequelae of Torture and Organised Violence Suffered by Refugees from Iraq. Trauma-related Factors Compared with Social Factors in Exile', *British Journal of Psychiatry* 172: 90–4.

Greenslade, R. (2005) 'Seeking Scapegoats: The Coverage of Asylum in the UK Press', Available: http://www.ippr.org/ecomm/files/wp5_scapegoats.pdf

Herlihy, J., Scragg, P. and Turner, S. (2002) 'Discrepancies in Autobiographical Memories – Implications for the Assessment of Asylum Seekers: Repeated Interviews Study', *British Medical Journal* 324: 324–7.

Hermans, H.J.M. (2002) 'The Dialogical Self as a Society of Mind: Introduction', *Theory & Psychology* 12: 147–60.

Hester, S. and Eglin, P. (1997) *Culture in Action. Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis. Studies in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. Washington, DC: International Institute for Ethnomethodology and Conversation Analysis/University Press of America.

Hier, S.P. and Greenberg, J.L. (2002) 'Constructing a Discursive Crisis: Risk, Problematisation and Illegal Chinese in Canada', *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 25: 490–513.

Homoláč, J. (2006) 'Diskurz o migraci Romůna příkladu internetových diskusí' [Discourse on the Migration of Roma – The Example of Internet Discussion], *Sociologický časopis* [*Czech Sociological Review*] 42: 329–51.

Hondius, A.J.K., van Willigen, L.H.M., Kleijn, W.M. and van der Ploeg, H.M. (2005) 'Health Problems Among Latin American and Middle-Eastern Refugees in the Netherlands: Relations with Violence Exposure and Ongoing Sociopsychological Strain', *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 13: 619–34.

James, W. (1902) *Principles of Psychology*. London: MacMillan.

Jayussi, L. (2006) 'Qalandia Crossing, Palestine: Notes on the Concerted Production of a New Moral Economy', Paper presented to 3rd Wars, Borders and Identities workshop, Charles University, Prague, 24–26 June 2006.

Laing, R.D. (1969) *Self and Others.* London: Tavistok.

Lavik, N.J., Hauff, E., Solberg, O. and Skrondal, A. (1996) Mental Disorder Among Refugees and the Impact of Persecution and Exile. *British Journal of Psychiatry* 169: 726–32.

Leiman, M. (2002) Toward Semiotic Dialogism. *Theory and Psychology* 12: 221–35.

Leudar, I. and Antaki, C. (1996) 'Discourse Participation, Reported Speech and Research Practices in Social Psychology', *Theory and Psychology* 6: 5–29.

Leudar, I., Marsland, V. and Nekvapil, J. (2004) 'On Membership Categorisation: "Us", "Them" and "Doing Violence" in Political Discourse', *Discourse & Society* 15: 243–66.

Leudar, I. and Nekvapil, J. (1998) 'On the Emergence of Political Identity in Czech Mass Media: The Case of the Democratic Party of Sudetenland', *Czech Sociological Review* 6: 43–58.

Leudar, I. and Nekvapil, J. (2000) 'Presentations of Romanies in the Czech Media: On Category Work in Television Debates', *Discourse & Society* 11: 487–513.

Leudar, I. and Nekvapil, J. (2004) 'Media Dialogical Networks and Political Argumentation', *Journal of Language and Politics* 3: 247–66.

Leudar, I., Nekvapil, J. and Hayes, J.A. (2006) 'Us, Roma and Human Nature – On Exclusion Practices in Czech and British Media', Paper presented to 3rd Wars, Borders and Identities workshop, Charles University, Prague, 24–26 June 2006

Leudar, I., Sharrock, W., Truckle, S., Colombino, T., Hayes, J.A. and Booth, K. (2007) 'Conversation of Emotions: On Transmuting Play into Psychoanalytic Psychotherapy', in A. Perakyla, C. Antaki, S. Vehvilannen and I. Leudar (eds) *Conversation Analysis and Psychotherapy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Leudar, I. and Thomas, P. (2000) *Voices of Reason, Voices of Insanity: Studies of Verbal Hallucinations.* London: Routledge.

Littlewood, R. and Lipsedge, M. (1993). *Aliens and Alienists: Ethnic Minorities and Psychiatry*. London: Unwin-Hyman

Lynn, N. and Lea, S. (2003) 'A Phantom Menace and the New Apartheid': The Social Construction of Asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom', *Discourse & Society* 14: 425–52.

Marková, I. (2003) *Dialogicality and Social Representations.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McLaughlin, G. (1999) 'Refugees, Migrants and the Fall of the Berlin Wall', in G. Philo (ed.) *Message Received: Glasgow Media Group Research, 1993–1998*. Harlow: Longman.

Mead, G.H. (1934) *Mind, Self and Society from the Standpoint of a Social Behaviourist*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Nekvapil, J. (2003) 'Language Biographies and the Analysis of Language Situations: On the Life of the German Community in the Czech Republic', *International Journal of the Sociology of Language* 162: 63–83.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (1998) 'Masmediální utváření dialogických sítí a politické identity: případ Demokratické Strany Sudety' [Emergence of Dialogical Networks

and Political Identity in Mass Media: The Case of Democratic Party of Sudetenland], *Slovo a slovesnost* 59: 30–52.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2002) 'On Dialogical Networks: Arguments about the Migration Law in Czech Mass Media in 1993', in S. Hester and W. Housley (eds) *Language, Interaction and National Identity*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2003a) 'Dialogische Netzwerke und politische Argumentation im Mediendiskurs', in H. Gruber, F. Menz and O. Panagl (eds) *Sprache und politischer Wandel*, pp. 213–32. Klagenfurt: Drava Verlag.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2003b) 'O českých masmédiích z etnometodologické perspektivy: romská identita v dialogických sítích' [Czech Media from Ethnomethodological Perspective: On Roma Identity in Dialogical Networks], *Slovo a slovesnost* 64: 161–92.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2006a) 'Sequencing in Media Dialogical Networks', *Ethnographic Studies* 8: 30–43.

Nekvapil, J. and Leudar, I. (2006b) 'Prezentace událostí 11.9.2001: Bush, bin Ládin a jiní v interakci' [Presenting the Events of 9/11: Bush, Bin Laden and Others in Interaction], *Sociologický časopis* [*Czech Sociological Review*] 42: 353–77.

Phillips, L. and Jørgensen, M. (2002) *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. London: Sage.

Philo, G. and Beattie, L. (1999) 'Race, Migration and Media' in G. Philo (ed.) *Message Received: Glasgow Media Group Research 1993–1998*, pp. 171–96. Harlow: Longman.

Pomerantz, A. (1986) 'Extreme Case Formulations: A Way of Legitimising Claims', *Human Studies* 9: 219–30.

Randall, M. (2003) 'Guest Media Alert: Asylum and Immigration Comparing the *Daily Telegraph*, the *Guardian* and the *Independent*', *Medialens*. Available: http://www.medialens.org/alerts/03/031208_Asylum_Immigration.htm

Rapley, T.J. (2001) 'The Art(fulness) of Open-ended Interviewing: Some Considerations on Analysing Interviews', *Qualitative Research* 1: 303–23.

Sacks, H. (1992) *Lectures on Conversation, Vols I and II.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Santa Ana, O. (1999) '"Like an Animal I was Treated": Anti-immigrant Metaphor in US Public Discourse', *Discourse & Society* 10: 191–224.

Sass, L.A. (2000) *Madness and Modernism*. London: Harvard University Press

Schatzman, M. (1973). *Soul Murder: persecution in the family*. London: Allen Lane.

Schegloff, E.A. (1972) 'Notes on a Conversational Practice: Formulating Place', in D. Sudnow (ed.) *Studies in Social Interaction*, pp. 75–119. New York: Free Press.

Schegloff, E.A. (2007) 'A Tutorial on Membership Categorization', *Journal of Pragmatics* 39: 462–82.

Sharrock, W. and Leudar, I. (2002) 'Indeterminacy in the Past', *History of the Human Sciences* 15: 95–115.

Steel, Z., Silove, D., Brooks, R., Momartin, S., Bushra A. and Susljik, I. (2006) 'Impact of Immigration Detention and Temporary Protection on the Mental Health of Refugees', *The British Journal of Psychiatry* 188: 58–64.

Turner, S.W., Bowie, C., Dunn, G., Shapo, L. and Yule, W. (2003) 'Mental Health of Kosovan Albanian Refugees in the UK', *British Journal of Psychiatry* 182: 444–8.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2000) 'New(s) Racism: A Discourse Analytical Approach', in S. Cottle (ed.) *Ethnic Minorities and the Media*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

IVAN LEUDAR is a Professor of Historical and Analytical Psychology at the University of Manchester. He was born in Czechoslovakia, left in 1970 and was educated at the University of London. His approach to the study of language and communication is affected by ethnomethodology. His current projects include investigating organization of psychotherapy as a practice, critique of cognitive theory of communication, and developing historical sociocultural psychology. ADDRESS: Psychology Department, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK. [email: ivan.leudar@manchester.ac.uk]

JACQUELINE HAYES graduated in psychology from Manchester University. She is a trainee counsellor as well as a research assistant in the School of Psychological Sciences at the University of Manchester.

JIŘI NEKVAPIL teaches sociolinguistics, conversation analysis, and pragmatics at the Department of General Linguistics at Charles University, Prague. His research is on language interaction. He has recently published a series of articles dealing with the Czech mass media, interethnic relationships, and language planning in Central Europe. He is the author of the intercultural training module Sprechen über Personen: Soziale Kategorisierung im tschechisch-deutschen Kontakt. His current research focuses on language biographies of Czech Germans and ethnomethodologically informed analysis of media discourse.

JOHANNA TURNER BAKER is a graduate in psychology from Manchester University.