A UK Discourse Analysis of Belonging in Romanian Identity and Immigratory Accounts

LENNON, Henry

SHEFFIELD HALLAM UNIVERSITY

A UK Discourse Analysis of Belonging in Romanian Identity and Immigratory Accounts.

By

Henry William Lennon (BSc, PgDip)

A thesis submitted to the Faculty in partial fulfilment of the requirements for

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

Faculty of Development & Society

Department of Psychology, Sociology, & Politics

January 2018

Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

It's my direction
It's my proposal
It's so hard
It's leading me astray
My obsession
It's my creation

You'll understand
It's not important now
All I need is co-ordination
I can't imagine, my destination
My intention, ask my opinion
But no excuse, my feelings still remain
My feelings still remain

(Orchestral Manoeuvres in the Dark, *Souvenir*, 1981)

This thesis is not just the culmination of words and actions. It is the symbol of all the people I have met, the plethora of relationships that have since sprung from the winding paths, false starts and dead ends that are the PhD. Before I undertook the project, naive to my supervisor's wise adage that "the PhD will be bigger than thesis", I could not have imagined just how little I really knew about myself. Or, for that matter, how little I know of those closest to me. There are many I must thank for their unyielding patience, support, and goodwill, for without their contributions I would not have made it this far.

First I must thank my supervisors, Dr Laura Kilby and Dr Rachel Abbott, for their never-ending supply of support. You have always had the confidence I could do this, especially when I doubted that for myself. Thank you for taking a chance on me, and sorry for all the spelling mistakes and overly long sentences. Thanks also to Sheffield Hallam University, particularly the PSP Department and Graduate School (yes you, Christie!), who without their goodwill, endless advice and financial support I would not be here.

Next I must thank Martin, for the unwavering patience first and foremost. It's been a long slog: many late nights and grumpy mornings. His domestic support not least has been nothing short of exemplar, and for a computer-glued student this cannot be understated. Hopefully after several years of inhabiting a world of epistemology and ontology, I can start to do some of the hoovering.

I must also thank my family. Chief among them is my mother, Lisa, who has always been my biggest fan: always encouraging, offering advice, and answering the phone. Then there is my Granddad, for all his wisdom and for always pressing me to have a reasonable answer to the question he never failed to ask: “how’s it going at the university”. Thanks also for teaching me many life lessons which have nothing but crystallised on this journey and others ongoing. Then there’s Nana, Jack, Dad, Hudson, and everyone else – too many to mention, but thank you all.

Thanks also to all my friends, from the acquaintances to the occasional meet-ups to the long lost – you each have each done your bit to helping me get to where I am. But I would not dream of mentioning these far-flung friends without specifically thanking Heather, who for her utter selflessness, generosity and academic prowess I simply would not be here. Thank you for inspiring me when we were undergraduates, trying to wade through brains, multiple choice, research methods exams and dissertations. Your influence was profound, and I can only apologise for not calling you more.

Thank you also to those academics that have taught me, offered me guidance, or provided a sounding board for my own woes. Thanks particularly to Sonja, Steve, Jon, Ruth, Penny, Julia, Richard, Mark, and Duncan. Thank you also to the PhD forum community, who for their welcoming support, would not be able to progress as I have. Particularly thanks to Jennie, Georgie, Nicola, Tamara, Nic, and Lisa for all the advice, the chats where we shouldn’t have been, and off-topic political debates.

A profound thanks also goes to my participants, not only for meeting me but also for impressing upon me the values our shared country come has to neglect more than it should these days. Thanks in particular to Alina, Gheorge and Violeta for your kindness, generosity and insight. I wish you all the best and hope this thesis honours what we discussed, providing a robust defence of values promoting inclusivity, equality and dialogue. It’s a start; and one of many opportunities to defend what is good in this world.

Thanks also must go to Ru. She has been my companion since the early days of this journey, and always there to reassure, console and distract. I would not like to imagine my life without her, for it would truly be a darker and angst-ridden place.

Finally, I want to thank all those musicians whose songs have helped find my innermost spaces of expressive creativity and intellectual clarity. For all those times I have

tried to find focus in a world filled with distraction and dead-ends; to find that personal space to recharge my resolve and endurance; to find even the words to express my thoughts and feelings. In hindsight music has been an inseparable and oft unrecognised lifeline in what would be at the very least a much quieter and less meaningful world.

Now this Chapter is nearly over. I am on the cusp of finishing this particular journey. I can begin to contemplate a life beyond, and start to hope that I can emulate Granddad in this own youthful realisation: “There’s a bigger life out there somewhere, an adventure”.

Objective and disclaimer

This thesis has been written by me in partial fulfilment of a doctoral degree in psychology in the Development and Society Faculty at Sheffield Hallam University. It has not previously been submitted towards another degree or published elsewhere. Where other sources or materials have been used, they have been cited and referenced; the thesis adheres to the university's requirements.

Abstract

The 1st January 2014 was a political milestone for speculation and warning in the UK as Romania's citizens became free to live and work visa-free across the EU. This thesis is a constructionist social psychological study drawing upon Shotter's (1993a) writing on citizenship and Balkanism studies (Todorova, 2009) to investigate how citizenship and belonging were rhetorically mobilised within this epoch. Employing a dual-site methodology, receiving society (extracts from the BBCs *Question Time* and political interviews from *The Andrew Marr Show*), and mover voices (narrative interviews with ten self-defining Romanians living in Sheffield) were analysed using interpretative repertoire analysis and discourse analysis, respectively (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The receiving society analysis explored how two interpretative repertoires were occasioned argumentatively as well as justified or contested rhetorically to construct the nation as under 'threat' from Romanian migration or the body politic as being 'abused' by Romanian migrants. Conversely, the mover voice analysis focused upon rhetorical features underpinning two key 'moments' of identity construction in the interviews: 'civic becoming', where participants narrated their acculturation and attempt to overcome 'otherness', and 'civic belonging', where 'good migrant' or 'active citizen' narratives in the receiving society were invoked. The thesis concludes by drawing upon critical psychology (Fox, D., Prilleltensky, & Austin, 2009) and Balkanism studies to make sense of the empirical findings. Future avenues of identity exploration, in light of the post-2014 political climate, are considered. The thesis provides three novel contributions to knowledge: firstly it examines the previously undocumented period whereby Romanian identity and migration were constructed in relation to commentary over lifting transitional controls; secondly it utilises a dual-site methodological approach concerned with how distinctive acculturative voices make sense of this epoch; lastly it employs Balkanism studies to historicise the legacy of such contemporary discourse, an important theoretical undertaking not previously undertaken in social psychology.

Chapter I: the thesis in cultural and ideological context

It is aimed that Chapter I will situate the thesis' chosen topic, the cultural context it is situated within, and the theoretical and empirical bases for the study. By doing this, it will be shown how a range of literature will be brought together to make sense of the current study, on a topic that has not yet received empirical attention in social psychology.

The first section establishes the topic as an investigation of Romanian identity and migration discourse within the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (henceforth 'UK') in the period leading up to and following the UK's lifting of transitional controls for Romanians in 2014. The UK's contemporary response to Romania's accession to the European Union (henceforth 'EU'), as well as narratives of national identity and attitudes to migration in both the UK and Romania, will be outlined. This will set the scene for the study as being concerned with the rhetorical achievement of Romanian identity construction in the discursive arena of citizenship and belonging in the UK. In the tradition of interdisciplinarity, 'Balkanism studies', a field of research studying the imposition and resistance of ideological practices constraining 'East Europe' identity and culture, will be introduced to provide an appropriate ideological frame to adequately historicise the 'legacy' of contemporary constructions of Romanians in the UK context.

The second section elaborates the thesis' social psychological interest in identity, in particular its social, migratory and civic aspects in three relevant research fields: Social Identity Theory, Acculturation Theory and citizenship studies. As these fields have common concern, albeit distinctive emphasises, on the study of citizenship and belonging, these would be most suitable for consideration for a social psychological study of Romanian identity and migration. While these fields offer relevant insights for this study, their methodological and philosophical limitations will be considered in turn. A dual-site discourse analysis building on the constructionist critique of the previous approaches, informed by citizenship studies, will be situated as an appropriate approach for the current study (Billig, 1996; Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Shotter, 1993a). Two core themes from Balkanism studies, a field outlined earlier in the Chapter, will be invoked as a way of evidencing the discursive legacy in contemporary constructions (explored in Chapters III and IV).

Locating the thesis within the contemporary rise of anti-immigration and anti-immigrant sentiment in Europe

It is a truism that migration of all kinds is seen as a pressing social issue requiring political intervention, both in the UK and beyond. Identity and migration are commonly invoked in contemporary debates although meanings are often assumed, ambiguous, implicit, or conflated (Anderson & Blinder, 2017; Gabrielatos & Baker, 2008; Philo, Briant, & Donald, 2013). Globalisation, humanitarian crises, international development, terrorism and security, demographic change, and declining democratic institutions are all common concerns interrelated to debates over migration (Bartram, Poros, & Montforte, 2014; Duffy & Frere-Smith, 2014). The UK, much like most of the European continent, has a longstanding (and arguably increasingly fixated) concern for the debate and governance of various political, economic and social issues related to the 'immigrant', 'outsider' or 'non-citizen' (Anderson, 2013). The notion of a 'revolving door' is an apt way of describing the multifaceted, often contradictory treatment of migrants across Europe as "an alien form of life...included yet distrusted, welcomed yet under threat of expulsion" (Arcarazo & Martire, 2014, p.1). Accordingly there is an academic concern in studying the ideological origin and the drivers of such anti-sentiment that shape the characterisation of actors such as 'victims' and 'offenders' (e.g., Wodak, 2015). There is also concern on how the consequences of such discourse impact the groups under discursive scrutiny in their respective cultural contexts (Wilson, & Hainsworth, 2012).

This thesis is similarly concerned with such characterisations justify or contest claims of belonging, such as the receiving society as an open civic space or an exclusive club, or the migrant as an integral 'member', a necessary 'visitor' or an unwelcome xeno requiring exclusion. The current study specifically focuses on anti-Romanian talk in the UK as a receiving society and the Romanian as a moving actor, exploring how these voices make sense of their lived accounts, being situated by, transforming, and contesting the discourse populating the period surrounding the 1st January 2014. While UK-based studies concerned with anti-immigration sentiment have burgeoned in social psychology over recent years (e.g., Condor, 2000; Condor, Figgou, Abell, Gibson, & Stevenson, 2006; Goodman & Burke, 2010; Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Kilby, Horowitz, & Hylton, 2013; Lynn & Lea, 2003), Romanian identity and migration has yet to garner interest outside of sociology or the humanities, not least in social psychology.

On the morning of Wednesday 1st January 2014, Romania's EU accession was legally enacted and its citizens were now free to live, study and work across member states (European Union, 2017). As the UK's populist newsprint media were warning of an impending doom (such as "BENEFITS BRITAIN HERE WE COME! Fears as migrant flood begins"; *Daily Express*, 2014, January 1), national television news bulletins (*BBC News*, 2014b; *ITV News*, 2014; *Channel 4 News*, 2014) were headlined by a media scrum crowding two politicians and one unassuming Romanian, named Victor Spirescu, in Luton Airport. Questions abounded as to Victor's ambitions, motivations, and more fundamentally, his character. This day, following years of predictions of economic and social calamity, marked a distinctive peak of discourse concerning Romanian identity and migration to the UK. This thesis is an investigation of discourse in the period leading up to and following this juncture, a study that as yet has received little empirical attention, not least in social psychology. It will ask how receiving society and Romanian mover voices made sense of this discursive milieu: for the receiving society, how did they construct their self-identities, their culture, and the Romanian stranger? How did Romanians make sense of their movement and acculturation, their local communities and this national discourse? This thesis aims to examine these questions with accounts of citizenship and belonging: both national television debate comprising both elite and lay receiving discourse as well as interview narratives with Romanians living in the UK.

The thesis has three main aims: firstly, to show how contemporary discourse in the UK constructed Romanian identity and migration leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in 2014; secondly, to explore accounts of citizenship of belonging in this context in both receiving and mover voices; finally, to historicise this epoch by threading such discourse into a more longstanding legacy of ideological representations.

Chapter I supports these aims by situating the thesis' chosen topic within the two relevant nations' political and cultural contexts, thereby outlining the uniqueness of the topic and the discursive landscape to be explored. It will also outline a lens to historicise such discourse in a broader ideological framework, the thesis' third main aim. It also explores areas of research relevant to a social psychological study of discourse. By bringing together a novel and previously research topic with a complementary array of research studies concerned with discourse and construction, Chapter I will foreground the theoretical approach underpinning the thesis and thereby pave the way to provide topical, methodological and empirical contributions to knowledge in social psychology.

UK and Romania in context: contemporary nationhood discourse

In this section, contemporary reactions in the UK to Romania's EU accession are briefly outlined. As the current study is in part concerned with UK-based discourse (as the receiving society), space will also be given to particular studies that in their research were concerned with analysing this accession period. This is followed by a consideration of the contemporary nationhood discourse comprising Britishness and Romanianness. Because the thesis is chiefly concerned with discourse of identity construction, this review of contemporary nationhoods will lay the ground for the later Chapter's empirical investigation of Romanian identity and migration by highlighting the broader cultural politics that envelops the chosen topic. It will also underscore the issues that shape the research approaches considered in the next section.

UK discourse on the 2007 Romanian EU accession

The UK's response to Romania's accession can be succinctly summarised by an article in the online *BBC Magazine* (2013) which queried 'Why has Romania got such a bad public image?' Narrating a "long line of public relations problems to have hit Romania", *BBC Magazine* documents how UK political actors are filled with "fears about a flood of immigrants" that may move to the UK or concerns for how a pre-established population of Romanians can act as "a 'pull factor' that will encourage more to make the journey". Corruption, abandoned orphans and communism are similarly described as "stereotypes" that inform British discourse of Romania (*BBC Magazine*, 2013). A survey by *the Observer* (Mann, 2016, March 20) offers a similarly illustrative contemporary insight of this reliance of stereotypes by examining perceptions of EU nations: whereas few respondents reported to know Romanians or have visited Romania, many considered Romania to be a poor country with low life expectancy and high 'brain drain' through emigration. Indeed, this has been mirrored by the political concerns reflected in bilateral measures to counter 'illegal migration' between the UK and Romania (*BBC Monitoring European*, 2005, March 3). Following the 'A8' EU accession in 2004 which included a number of former soviet bloc nations (see European Union, 2017), socio-political attitudes such as those above were similarly mobilised. Owing to the "unprecedented and largely unanticipated" migration of people to the UK by people from the A8 intake (particularly Poland and Slovakia), Romania and Bulgaria's accession in 2007 was characterised as an

extension to this legacy (Light & Young, 2009, p.285). The newsprint media featured many stories predicting the possible numbers of movers to the UK and the possible implications. Empirical studies that investigate media discourse as discursive tools to (re)produce knowledge of Romanian identity show that Romanians were thematically constructed in a frozen, provincial and uncivilised demeanour post-accession from 2007 onwards (Fox J., Moroşanu, & Szilassy, 2012; Light & Young, 2009). While such negative pictures could be characterised as a 'moral panic' owing to their acutely fearful premise (cf. Cohen, S., 2011), the prophetic employment of stereotypes denoting an evil force invading civil society are better conceptualised as part of a more longstanding ideological frame, Balkanism, which will be explored later in this Chapter (Light & Young, 2009).

In an extensive analysis of newsprint media coverage prior to and following Romania's formal EU accession in 2007 in both the UK and Romania, Light and Young (2009) argue that socio-cultural discourse has a seminal role in "mediating and legitimating the new sets of institutional and power relations...in Europe" (p.281). As the historical narratives of communism and Cold War gave way to European Unionism and globalisation, much of the British newsprint media remained "suspicious of the EU and its further expansion" and viewed the accessions as leading to the UK being "open and vulnerable to mass migration from Romania" (p.286). Light and Young (2009) argue this was the case where a UK Government (2006) paper (assessing the A8 accession) reported that there were 450,000 (largely young and working) A8 residents in the UK. The tabloid newsprint media responded with denouncement and hysteria (e.g., "Biggest wave of migrants in history", *Daily Mail*, 2006, July 21; "GET READY FOR THE ROMANIAN INVASION", *Daily Express*, 2006, August 23). Light and Young (2009) document such media reactions and argue that coverage shifted focus between 2006 and 2007:

> "As accession drew nearer, the nature of press coverage moved away from the generic problems arising from mass migration towards a focus on the 'undesirability' of those people who would soon be free to enter the UK, particularly Romanians" (p.288)

The current study draws several insights from Light and Young (2009). Firstly, it recognises the importance of historicising contemporary discourse in relation to Balkanism studies (outlined later in this Chapter). Secondly, as evident in their consideration of both countries' newsprint media, it concurs that such discourse unfolds as an interactive and intertextual exchange. Such features help inform the current study, reviewed in Chapter II.

Situating their review of British tabloid media as a rhetorical analysis of "cultural racism", Fox J. et al. (2012, p.680-1) argue that cultural difference was often invoked as a justification "to interpret, order and indeed structure social relations" to exclude Romanians socially following their 2007 EU accession, a response made all the more stark as they analyse Hungary's comparative welcome in 2004. They also argue that the UK's labour restrictions towards Romanians without permit for seven years after accession denied Romanians the recognition of their shared European identity. Comparing it to the post-war invitation to displaced mainland Europeans and Irish citizens, Fox J. et al. explore how the government's decision towards Romanians here further toxified British discourse of the A2 accession (which included Romania and Bulgaria), echoed in the newsprint media who widely published in panic concerning future Romanian migration. For example, they cite *The Sun* (2008, February, 28) who queried with irony 'Who ate all the swans?', and reported how 'Piles of swan carcasses stripped for food have been found at a squalid camp used by East European immigrants" (p.688). Contrasting such hysteria with a prior account from the early 1990s, Fox J. et al. (2012) interpret such stories as "urban legend[s]" indicative of a violation of British culture designed to scare its readers (p.689). In sum, where Light and Young (2009) and Fox J. et al. (2012) have documented the construction of Romanian identity and migration in UK-based media discourse, as the current study will explore similar treatment is needed in the period leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls.

Such 'urban legends' are evident in more recent newsprint coverage, such as the 'horsemeat scandal' in February 2013. There were allegations that Romanian companies were selling horse as cow meat, prompting a moral panic and even government intervention (Collins, 2013, February 12; *BBC News*, 2013, April 15). The allegation of mis-selling, alongside the taken-for-granted assumption in such coverage that eating horse by choice was dubious, manufactured a cultural 'gulf' between the UK and Romania. While there are other examples of such coverage, space does not allow for detailed exploration here (however, analysis of national television media is explored in Chapter III). But we can conclude that Romania's representation in newsprint media discourse around the 2007 accession period was intensely fearful and prophetic, and contrary to the view that Romania's coverage appears expedient, it was vastly overrepresented compared to other EU accessions (Light & Young, 2009; Fox J. et al., 2012). Conversely, it remains completely unexplored in the literature, and comparatively understudied compared to other

migratory groups. As suggested by the spotlight shone upon Victor Spirescu on 1st January 2014, there are outstanding national, civic and social identity concerns that an investigation of the 2014 period, following the 2007 accession, can elucidate. However, to begin exploring these issues, both British and Romanian nationhood discourse should be situated in their contemporary cultural contexts.

A review of UK nationhood

The UK is a European constitutional monarchy organised through a union of four nations, each with limited devolutionary administrations and one overarching state (Schama, 2009b). While the union has changed in its arrangement, name, and 'members' since its original inception in 1603, British identity remains first and foremost as an abstracted category denoting citizenship and geopolitical belonging (Cohen, R., 1994). Although Britishness derives from the Old English 'Brettisc' (referring to the Celtic 'ancient Britons'), as a national identity it is thoroughly modern, born from England and Scotland uniting in the 1707 Act of Union (Colley, 1992). Successive migrations, invasions and settlements of different groups have contributed to its formation, eventually leading to the dominance of the English from the beginning of the early medieval period (Schama, 2009a). Legally, 'British' is a civic status for members by birth or merit, although it is composed of distinctive ethnic groups with discernible dialects (and indeed languages), attitudes, and culture. Geographically, 'Briton' is often termed for someone who resides within the 'British isles', although critics have contrary terms or definitions (Davies, 1999). The extent to which Britishness is expressed, celebrated or denigrated is accordingly a site of continual contestation (Mathews & Travers, 2012; Select Committee on the Constitution, 2016). Into the twenty-first century, the UK's' recent 'super-diversification' has further added weight to questions of the nation's identity and culture (Parekh, 2000; Vertovec, 2007). Accordingly, Britishness has become a field of "battle for definition" (Grube, 2011, p.628). Despite this, as an overarching national identity Britishness has historically been latched to prevailing political ambitions, be they colonialist, internationalist, or interventionist (Cohen, R., 1994; Macphee & Poddar, 2007). Some argue that domestic strife has also played an important role in ensuring that Britishness evolved in accordance with changing political and demographic circumstances (Ward, 2009). In consequence to this ambiguity, geographical, symbolic, ethnic, ideological, cultural, civic and linguistic qualities are now but a headline selection of

relevant yet inconsistent indicators used by people to define Britishness (Commission for Racial Equality, 2006b).

Despite these evolving manifestations of Britishness, in historiographical terms Britishness is at its clearest when it is defined in relation to 'Others' that fall outside or in opposition to it whether they be French, Catholic, Jewish, Irish, black, South-East Asian, Muslim, or as this thesis explores, 'East European' (Cohen, R., 1994). As Hobsawm argues, "There is no more effective way of bonding together...than to unite them against outsiders" (cited in Colley, 1992, p.309). Two particular Others are relevant to consider in understanding contemporary identity concerns regarding panics over immigration (Cohen, R., 1994). A drive towards post-war civic resettlement and economic reform would see Commonwealth immigration and EEC membership polarising British national identity.

Following the Second World War, Britishness underwent a particularly strenuous transformation as lived accounts of the war against fascism also prompted new social and political settlements which necessitated that Britishness become more civically inclusive beyond the English (Paxman, 1998; Webster, 2005). Narratives of de-industrialisation and de-colonisation followed, and these were complemented by calls for greater political and economic integration with European neighbours (Macphee & Poddar, 2010; Reviron-Piégay, 2009). However the National Archives, (n.d., a) document that integration with Europe was officially initially shunned by the UK Government as they pursued an "imperial preference" for Commonwealth trade and encouragement of immigration. The National Archives (n.d., b) conversely suggest a markedly different lived accounts by citizens as Commonwealth immigration was perceived by some as leading to a 'sudden' cultural and social transformation, with disapproval and even vitriolic sentiment particularly evident in the 1960s (see e.g., Jeffries, 2014 coverage of the Smethwick 1964 by-election, and Powell's 1968 'Rivers of Blood' speech).

The UK Government would later join the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1967 under Heath's premiership (Cohen, R., 1994). This policy was justified at the time as an attempt to diversify British civic identity with European culture (Heath, 1972). Much like the earlier encouragement of Commonwealth inclusion, this embrace of Europe was met with some domestic cynicism and political division led by emboldened critics who continually warned against the country 'relinquishing' its sovereignty (Wright, 2007) not to mention outright rejection by those who felt it was revising the accepted narrative of the

UK ‘winning’ the War (Langlois, 2009). Following a six-day Parliamentary debate EEC membership became formalised and later legitimised with a referendum (Parliament Library, n.d.). However, a fault line in the political discourse of British national identity would be defined through the struggle between opponents asserting that EEC membership relinquished international stature and embraced parochialism and advocates asserting its economic opportunities and political expediency. Having borrowed from competing historical ‘myths’, these camps have appropriated stories whose truthfulness is less important than how they shed light on nationhood in debates of identity (Gibbins, 2012).

Concerns over Commonwealth immigration and European Others, resonating in debates over immigration as a social and political ‘problem’, can therefore be traced over the past sixty years or so (Cohen, R., 1994). Over this time, conventions on terms and boundaries of debate have shifted (Barker, 1983). Provocative profanities that may have been said in post-war Britain became less common and the preserve of only the far-right and were accordingly marginalised in public life (Billig, 1978). This is because since the Enlightenment, the accusation of ‘prejudice’ has been treated as referring to thoughts dominated by emotion and irrationality (Billig et al., 1988). In a cultural sense, a ‘norm against prejudice’ would shape the conventions as to how talk of Others could be framed without such accusations being made (Billig, 1988). Such norms remain today albeit ever-renegotiated as opponents of migration invoke political correctness, free speech and/or majority rights as justifications for potentially ‘prejudicial’ discourse (Goodman, 2014; Goodman & Burke, 2010, 2011). This is interlinked with the broader identity tropes of ‘Britishness’ and its alleged decline (Commission for Racial Equality, 2006a, 2006b). The British National Party (BNP) and the English Defence League (EDL) are particular examples of groups that have invoked tropes such as political correctness to protest the censorship of their views which they say are shared by many people, including longstanding minority groups, in their opposition to further immigration (Goodman & Johnson, 2013). Such discourse also often involves denial of any kind of ideology informing its rationale, instead identifying as representing a ‘commonsensical’ position (cf. Weltman & Billig, 2001). In the early 2010s this populist position was most widely represented by the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP), self-styled opponents of European integration and (in particular Romanian) migration, who espoused a core argument that EU immigration illustrated the UK’s sovereignty deficit for having no border controls (Ford & Goodwin, 2014).

This tendency to promote an isolationist cultural sphere in accounts of national identity has long been evident accounts of the far-right advancing primordial arguments such as the BNP and EDL, concerned with ethnic narratives of entitled belonging and ownership a white community to the social, economic and sometimes even physical exclusion of newcomers. It has at varying points even been evident in factions of the main governing parties. Margaret Thatcher in 1978, as part of a broader debate on migration during the time, justified a policy of reduction owing to Britons fearing they would become "swamped" by different cultures (Burns, 1978, January 27). In 2005, Michael Howard's campaign slogan "Are you thinking what we're thinking?" implied a similar sense of suspicion and disdain for new arrivals (e.g., *Daily Telegraph*, 2016, March 23). Some Labour politicians have also warned that the party should appear 'tough' on immigration to bolster electoral credibility (e.g., Kinnock, 2016; O'Brien, 2016; Wintour, 2014). Such examples show a cyclic process whereby political narratives invoke Others to define a sense of exclusionary civic belonging. This was most successfully enacted by UKIP during the mid 2010s as they were the largest UK party in the 2014 European Parliament Elections (*BBC News*, 2014a, April 19) and enjoyed an increased vote share for the 2015 General Election despite the Conservative Party winning a small majority (BBC News, 2015, May 7). A referendum on EU membership would be enacted in 2016 and marked a distinctive turning point in the discursive atmosphere as the 'Migration Crisis' (e.g., Sherwell & Squires, 2015, May 11) and European Union membership more generally (e.g., Sculthorpe, 2016, June 22) became talking points on migration in UK discourse and interest in Romania wavered. There was a clear sense that eurosceptic discourse became more visceral, prevalent and forthright in political debate during the period that this thesis empirically explores in the receiving society discourse (2013-2014).

A review of Romanian nationhood

> Romanians are...concomitantly inside and outside, actors in and audience at a play" (Cioroianu, 2002, p.210)

Romania is a European semi-presidential nation-state. After centuries of resistance, the modern creation of Romania can be traced to the political unification between Moldavia and Wallachia in 1859 (Cioroianu, 2002). Claiming a history descended from the Dacians and Romans, Romanian culture is an amalgamation of Latin, Christian,

Mediterranean, Orthodox, and Turkish influences (Mazower, 2000). Romania in its traditional pan-nationalist form is imagined as a homeland encapsulating all Romanian speakers between the Carpathian mountains to the North, the Danube River to the South, the Black Sea to the East (as far as Ukraine) the Hungarian Plains to the West (Livezeanu, 2000). Romanian national identity is chiefly imagined through a narrative of 'uniqueness' and survival owing to its preservation of its cultural and linguistic integrity, something celebrated as reflecting a nation that views itself as a 'Latin island in a Slavic ocean' (Cioroianu, 2002). Such conceptions of course understate Romania's heterogeneous ethno-genesis, exhibited such as in its diverse linguistic composition (Lozovanu, 2012). Thus, a pervasive theme in Romanian identity discourse is the assertion of an 'authentic' version that seeks to command a narrative of uniqueness:

> "A manufactured definition of a "true" Romanian—as a Romanian Orthodox Christian, natively Romanian-speaking, and ethnically Romanian—formed the core of Romanian nationalism, regardless of the ruling ideology" (Korkut, 2006, p.131)

This drive towards national cohesion has often drawn upon the 'fatherland', "created through myths of the past and dreams about...the "soul" and "mission" of the nation" (Kohn, cited in Billström, 2008, p.31). Romania's sovereignty, inalienable and enduring, is often oriented to in political discourse as a spiritual narrative for the nation (Billström, 2008). This narrative developed from the liberalising tendencies of Romania's elites schooled in France and Italy, eager to apply 'Western' ideas in order to construct ethnic collectivism (Antohi, 2002). In contemporary times, while Romanians view themselves as having 'western' values and customs, their turbulent political history has produced a distinctive assortment of argumentative traditions which seek to define a kind of transcendental Romanianness which focused primarily on the 'rightful' trajectory of Romanian politics and its culture (e.g., Brett, 2017; Gallagher, 2005). The plethora of political parties seeking to tilt the political hegemony in their direction by re-interpreting Romanianness embodies this situation (Stan & Turcescu, 2007; Tileagă, 2012; Protsyk, 2010). Similarly, Romania's recent realisation as a presidential democracy and EU member continues to be shaped out of this legacy of political struggle, with economic problems, dubious democratic practices, dominance by the post-communist left, ethnic strife and radical nationalism common themes of debate (Maxfield, 2008; Tichindeleanu, 2010; Tileagă, 2007; Zerilli, 2013).

This strive towards a transcendental national identity is also made conspicuous when considering majority Romanians attitudes to Romania's two largest minority ethnic groups, the Roma and ethnic Hungarians, who are often centred in local and national political scandals (Tileagă, 2006a, 2007). While continually disputed, Roma-Romanian relations have a "long and complex history of Roma oppression and exclusion" (Kaneva & Popescu, 2014, p.510). The Roma are scattered throughout suburban and rural areas, and seen as marginal peoples with sexual, mystical and emotional representations stereotyping them (Huda, 2012). Discrimination, criminalisation and prejudice have been common allegations towards the Romanian majority since the Roma were enslaved to the Tartars retreating from the Mongol Invasions in the 1200s (Achim, 2004). Even following their civic emancipation, Roma continued to be criticised for failing to competently integrate within Romanian society (Brearley, 2001). Their historic treatment is alleged to have encouraged the creation of a vagrant class by perpetuated representations of criminal and opportunistic gangs antithetical to 'European' ideals, for example in allegations made of their treatment by local authorities or the media (Creţu, 2014; Project on Ethnic Relations, 2000; Zoon, cited in European Commission, 2004). Conversely, the Hungarian minority are largely settled in the west region of Transylvania, with its political representatives to the national assembly advocating the maintenance of their cultural and linguistic autonomy (Carteny, 2015/6; Toró, 2017). Since the revolution, streaming for ethnic Hungarians and reserved electoral seats have suggested a move towards compromise and recognition (Andreescu, 2004; Protsyk, 2010). However, László (2013) argues that the politics of ethnic and national identity continue to provoke debate, analysing how Romanian media present minority interests as threatening to the status quo, with "'victim' narratives" of "past 'injustices'" and "acts of oppression" used to justify suspicion that Transylvania might be lost to secessionist interests (pp.43-4). This is substantiated by Veres (2014) who documents Hungarians in focus groups self-defining as a 'cultural nation' seeking civic differentiation, speaking to Romania's national identity discourse of secession. Minority representation therefore often features as a disruptive force to unionist undertones of mainstream narrative of Romanianness and its history (cf. Tileagă, 2012, 2011, 2009).

Like narratives of Romania's national identity, its cultural heritage has been an interpretative battle that reflects its citizens' own ambivalent roots in competing socio-historical discourses, whether it concerns the 'rightful' or 'illegitimate' appropriation

musical heritage (Haliliuc, 2015), the appropriateness of secularisation/religiosity in politics (Dima, 2011), moral economical disputes over redefinitions of issues like social justice or international aid (Ieţcu, 2006; Mirela, 2012), minority-majority ethnicity relations (Cercel, 2015; Corsale & Iorio, 2014; Veres, 2014), or post-communist rehabilitation and reform (Hogea, 2010; Preoteasa, 2002; Roşca, 2013; Săftoiu & Popescu, 2014; Tănăsoiu, 2008). Antohi (2002) identifies two ideological attempts to solidify such ambiguities in Romanian identity: the first involved situating Romanian culture as being Latin, of having "Roman ancestors and *Europa nostra*...visions of aristocratic "republics"". This tradition is resonant in contemporary accounts situating Romanian affinities and sensitivities, such as Trandafiou's ethnography:

> "In Italy or Spain we Romanians feel at home. We are all Latin, for better or worse. But in the UK, the lack of chaos, bribery, clientelistic relationships, the order, the cleanliness, the absence of emotional outbursts, seem almost alien." (2013)

The second attempt Antohi (2002) documents was a more contemporary attempt to spiritualise Romanianness as unique and beyond culture itself due to its adherents' promise of "final deliverance...cosmic, metaphysical, and occasionally mystical". This emphasis is evident in contemporary political discourse, such as in the then-president Traian Basescu's speech on the communist regime and Romania's 'rehabilitation' towards enlightenment:

> "We shall break free of the past more quickly, we shall make more solid progress, if we understand what hinders us from being more competitive, more courageous, more confident in our own powers." (Basescu, 2006, cited in Tismaneanu, 2015)

Emigration from Romania has shifted in accordance with these changing narratives of national identity. Three historical trends have been asserted by Romocea (2013), with migration types linked to the fall of communism in 1989 and accession to the EU in 2007: pre-1989 political refugees, post-1989 knowledge diaspora, and post-2007 labour migrants. While refugees were those fleeing the communist regime, post-1989 emigrants moved for personal and career development, their transition eased by their command of English. Conversely, post-2007 migrants embody and enact EU ideals (albeit characterised by uncertain living and working conditions) by viewing emigration as a route to betterment, a phenomenon that has been met with sceptical views by host communities

(Romocea, 2013). This latter group, enabled through EU accession, has primarily featured in contemporary discourse of Romanian identity and migration (cf. Fox J. et al., 2012).

Since the 1989 revolution, Romania's political 'return' to Europe alongside other former soviet bloc nations has been an ongoing struggle of competing political agendas (Gallagher, 2005; Hammond, 2006). Despite officialised marketisation and condemnation of the communist regime (Hoega, 2010; Tănăsoiu, 2008), a distinctive sense of trauma and ongoing rehabilitation towards "coming to terms with the past" remains (Tileagă, 2012, p.463). This has been compounded by having actors historically connected to the old regime who bear allegations of corruption leading post-communist politics (Gallagher, 2005; Literat, 2012; Zerilli, 2013). Romania's EU accession should be contextualised in relation to these political, cultural, and economic shifts as part of its 'return' to Europe (Papadimitriou, & Phinnemore, 2008). As an EU Commission report stated on Romania's early accession preparations:

> "Romania ha[s] made further progress to complete their preparations for membership, demonstrating...capacity to apply EU principles and legislation from 1 January 2007. They have reached a high degree of alignment. However, the Commission also identifies a number of areas of continuing concern" (Commission of the European Communities, 2006)

As such, narratives of transition were still ongoing at the point of accession (Hammond, 2007). For this thesis, in the period leading up to 2014, characterisations of Romanian identity, what it means to be Romanian, moving to the UK, and the implications upon settlement should be considered as issues rooted in sites of contestability. By definition, old and new forms of knowledge might therefore be relevant sites for argument to make sense of emerging social issues (Billig et al., 1988).

In sum, while writers such as Antohi (2002) describe the Latin and spiritual narratives of self-defined national identity, there are also contemporary political issues, for example in regards to Romania's 'return' to Europe, its minority ethnic relations, or migratory patterns that inform the discursive landscape of contemporary Romanian identity. From the literature we can conclude that Romanian identity discourse portrays some recognisable features including authenticity, timelessness, and uniqueness. However, underscoring these features are a fundamental ambiguity/ambivalence owing to the tapestry of cultural influences that have historically flavoured Romanian norms and traditions in ways that defy simple characterisation. Significantly, how this phenomenon

has been managed by Romanians themselves has not been investigated since Romania's full entry into the EU as an equal member (cf. Fox J. et al., 2012). As Light and Young (2009) show, Romania's 'return to Europe' (as a discourse of a pre-socialist 'golden age') is not universally recognised by all onlookers, and is therefore informed by historical ideas both stemming from the period of communism as well as more long-established stereotypes. But to understand the import these issues have in the contemporary sense by Romanians as lived accounts, there is already a field of research that has sought to situate longstanding historical stereotypes and ideologies of representation: Balkanism studies (Todorova, 2009).

Balkanism studies: a frame to historicise Romanian identity and migration discourse in the UK context

> "The Balkans' liminal status–at the interstices between worlds, histories, and continents–is tantamount not so much to marginality as to a sort of centrality" (Fleming, 2000, p.1232)

Balkanism studies, as a field of imaginative geography research, addresses ideologies of identity representations concerning 'East' Europe(ans) (Todorova, 2009; Wolff, 1994). Following Light and Young's (2009) application of Balkanism to media discourse of Romania's EU accession circa 2007, it has been shown to have great potential in making sense of UK-based accounts of Romanian identity and migration, and thereby historicise the legacy of the intensification of interest leading up to and following the lifting of Romania's transitional controls in 2014. While contemporary narratives of nationhood have been outlined, what remains to be explained is how such issues have been deployed historically in the ideological construction of Romanian identity, and therefore account for the kinds of contemporary discourse observable in the later empirical Chapters, the third main aim of the thesis. In this section Balkanism studies is outlined as a field that analyses an ideological practice perpetuated in constructions of 'East European' identity and culture. Previously in the Chapter it was shown how Romania's nationhood is concerned with authenticity yet UK coverage was empirically shown to bastardise this identity project (Fox J. et al., 2012). Far from being a simplistic reaction following the unprecedented A8 accession, Balkanism studies as a field is equipped to illustrate how contemporary constructions of Romanians were built on essentially negative ideas formed through centuries of representations (Todorova, 2009). After outlining the field – both its

imposition and resistance – an extract of talk during the thesis' topical period will be considered as an example to explore the two key themes that will be taken forward to operationalise the empirical utility of Balkanism studies for Chapters III and IV.

As discussed above, migration has been a recurrent theme of debate in the UK for many decades now, and as political or economic events have unfolded, so to have the subjects. Between 2005 and 2015, there was a particular focus on Romanians, with some studies drawing upon Balkanism studies to tease apart the ideological undertones of such coverage (Fox J. et al., 2012; Light & Young, 2009). The claims (re)produced can be viewed in light of empirical historiographical work which documents how Romanian identity and culture (amongst other subjects in 'East Europe) have been (re)presented by British (among other) writers by using a long-established and prolific framework of chaotic, unpleasant, excludable and/or unworthy attributions (Hammond, 2006, 2007; Jezernik, 2003; Mazower, 2000; Zerilli, 2013).

Balkanism studies is the term used for a historiographical field of discourse geography that studies how particular national or ethnic identities and/or spaces are ideologically structured as 'Balkan' as therefore culturally Other (Njaradi, 2012; Todorova, 1994). Being a "hybrid" of different disciplinary interests (Fleming, 2000, p.1228), scholars investigate how an insurmountable prism of near-far-ness is formulated. A leading theorist in the field, Todorova (2010, p.176) views balkanism as a "system of stereotypes...which place the Balkans in a cognitive straightjacket". In her seminal book 'Imagining the Balkans', Todorova asserts that self-defined West Europeans have been the key antagonists to construct "an image and an ideal, a Europe belonging to Time" which was distinct from 'the Balkans' which were accorded a "frozen image" due to alleged lesser civilisation, development and capability (2009, p.43/p.7). This gaze, propagating Otherness and justifying exclusion and inequality, "...merits a whole genre of works" to contest the dearth of texts since the 'discovery' of the 'Balkans' and its "powerful pejorative designations" (Todorova, 2009, p.vii/7).

Balkanism studies is related to Said's 'Orientalism' (1995), a well-known postcolonialist thesis concerning the historical construction of the Self-Other dichotomy. Said's work studies patterns of disempowerment, arguing them to be inherently tied between the oppressor, who uses discourse to justify their actions to impose structure upon the experiences, identities, and potentialities of a colonised (or otherwise subjugated)

group (Said, 1995). Writing from a Foucauldian tradition, Said views this process as defined by power relations, a perspective that has shaped postcolonial writing over the possibility of reflexive critique and representation (e.g., Spivak, 1994). While balkanism and orientialism clearly share a common concern for the imposition of ideological action upon oppressed groups, it is argued convincingly to be a distinct historiographical frame informing Western discourse of Otherness in East Europe (see Fleming, 2000; Njaradi, 2012; Todorova, 2009). In short, while Said's orientalism is about an absolute space between the civilised Self and the savage Other, balkanism concerns the construction of the Balkans as a transitional space between West and East, its peoples defined by competing and ambiguous elements of both polarities (Todorova, 2009).

Balkanism: imposed and resisted accounts

As 'the Balkans' became 'discovered' as a 'unique' discursive space in the late 18th century between the 'Far East' and 'Western Europe' for the first time, an 'in-between' space emerged (Todorova, 1994). As the East offered luxury, rest and the 'forbidden', East Europe became known for "...unimaginative concreteness...almost total lack of wealth", which promoted "a straightforward attitude, usually negative, but rarely nuanced" (Todorova, 2009, p.13-14). Wolff (1994) argues that such ideas began following the 'civilisation' of Western Europe following the 'Enlightenment' period, and grew out of direct confrontation with the-then dominant juxtaposing influence in the Ottoman Empire (known at the time as 'European Turkey'; Mazower, 2000). Light and Young (2009, p.284) outline this attitude as acknowledging that, while distinguishably "'European' in character...[the Balkans also] characterised ...lower [sic] levels of economic and social development". While such discourse aimed at the peoples of East Europe, including Romanians, bears "overlap with any power discourse: the rhetoric of racism, development, modernization, civilization, and so on" (Todorova, 2009, p.11), there are a number of important thematic nuances that make 'Balkanism' a fruitful ideological frame of inquiry. Todorova in particular shows this by demonstrating the wide reach 'Balkan' imagery has permeated political and public discourse:

> Where is the adversarial group that has not been decried as "Balkan" and "balkanizing" by its opponents? Where the accused have not hurled back the branding reproach of "balkanism"? (2009, p.3)

Todorova acknowledges that there has been and remain "substantial differences within and between "western" [sic] discussions of the Balkans" (2009, p.ix). However, there remains a dominant narrative via journalistic, political, and academic that maintains that 'the Balkans', or perhaps more aptly, 'Eastern Europe', is a separable cultural space. For example, the designation 'Balkanisation' in western political discourse since the Kosovo conflict now espouses to be an 'objective' attempt to warn against societal collapse and ethnic conflict, despite clearly damning all 'Balkan' individuals as being propelled to barbarity or wildness. Conversely, Dracula, Romania's venerated Christian saviour monarch, has been immortalised as an archetypal symbol of horror and invasion by Bram Stoker's novelisation in 1899, with Transylvania portrayed as a demonic supernatural nightmare beyond 'civilisation' (Light, 2007; Hammond, 2007). Stoker represented protagonists entering this region as

> "leaving the West and entering the East... the wildest and least known portions of Europe...[where] every known superstition in the world is gathered into the horseshoe of the Carpathians, as if...some sort of imaginative whirlpool" (Stoker, 1993, p.1).

This passage of 'boundary crossings' is evocative of how Romania has been situated geographically by cartographers, travellers and writers as being 'apart' from the 'known' or 'familiar', yet often inconsistently (Jezernik, 2004; Mazower, 2000; Todorova, 2009). Thus, whether Romania is 'Central', 'Eastern', or 'South-Eastern' remains a controversial designation (Todorova, 2009). Of course, such designations of Otherness have been contested by Romanians themselves. The imposition of balkanism is not simply rejectable in this context, but rather, requires management as a dialogical concern: people must orient to it to redefine themselves. There is a growing field within Balkanism studies investigating the campaigning strategies of national government in order to shed light on contemporary national identity politics. Light (2007) shows how the Romanian Government advertised the nation by endorsing the 'supernatural Dracula and Transylvania' brand (Romanians only engaged with this trope following *Dracula's* translation in 1990). However, when it circulated that Vlad Țepeș was a possible inspiration for Stoker's character, this caused outrage because it estranged patriotic narratives that celebrate Vlad as an inspirational leader who rallied Romanian peoples against corrupt imperial Ottoman rule and elite Boyar rule (Light, 2007). Bran Castle

would become known Dracula's home in tourism documentation, although this link is heavily debated by Romanians (Light, 2007).

Sepi (2013) has documented eight national branding campaigns promoted between 1995-2010 by the Romanian government, demonstrating that this exercise is an endemic feature of national identity construction for Romania. Such practices are locked in acts seeking to promote "who *we* are" and "how *we* want *you* to see *us*" and are political expressions designed to compete with other expressions, such as those deriving from other nations (Light, 2001, cited in Light, 2007). Scholars that study such national representations have made sense of this national identity branding as a response to international perceptions of Romanianness. Light argues that because

> "...the state adopts the role of the definer and arbiter of cultural meaning...the representation of local cultures...and the choice of which resources and places are developed and celebrated can constitute a statement of national identity...and values" (2007, p.747).

Kaneva and Popescu (2011) draw attention to Romania's 'Simply Surprising' advertising campaign in 2004 portrayed competing liberal and traditional, simple yet sophisticated, modern yet antiquated, and rural yet developed versions (Kaneva & Popescu, 2011). Kaneva and Popescu (2008) argue that such attempts corroborate the post-communist frame within is commodified for consumption by tourist onlookers (cited in Kaneva, 2011). More recently, Kaneva and Popescu (2014) explore the 'Romanians in Europe' campaign, led by the Romanian Government as a backlash against increasingly negative conflation that all Romanians are Roma. The response, the authors argue, was to

> "...to prevent the othering of non-Roma Romanians by Western Europeans...appeal to emotional attachments and similarities among Italians, Spaniards, and Romanians, while symbolically obliterating Romanian Roma from their narratives" (p.518).

There is therefore no hegemonic means by which balkanism is contested by the people subjected to its effects. Instead, it seems that its contestation and inversion seems to be dependent upon the kinds of ideas and tropes that are invoked either by the imposer or the protester (Light & Young, 2009). This has methodological implications that will be considered in Chapter II.

In summary: distinguishing Romanian identity and migration discourse

The studies reviewed above show how Romanian national identity discourse has been advertised by drawing on a variety of competing versions of itself, ambiguously portraying itself as liberal and traditional, modern yet antiquated, rural yet cosmopolitan, through rich geographical and demographic imagery (Kaneva & Popescu, 2011). These studies demonstrate how balkanism is a relevant narrative in understanding how the Romanian identity must be negotiated in order to identify as 'western' and address their portrayal "as 'horrifically' exceptional and as not conforming to 'European' norms or values" (Light and Young, 2009, p.292). For example, through nation branding the Romanian government illustrate the contrarian origins of their culture, enriching their contemporary claim as an ideal European holiday destination akin to Greece or Italy.

This section also discussed the UK's reaction to Romania's EU accession (in particular focusing on some newsprint media coverage) and contemporary nationhood discourse. This exploration has demonstrated several features that highlight the significance and uniqueness of the study's topic. The discussion of Britishness and its development in accordance with prevailing political concerns and its continual historic redefinition against varying migratory 'Others' was reviewed in relation to debates over the 'proper' form of citizenship that Britishness should represent. The recent evocation of Romanian identity in this narrative can be seen in this light as symptomatic of a broader argument, advocated primarily by nationalist ideals, that contrasts the UK as a space that should be disentangled politically from the EU (e.g., Fox J. et al., 2012). Romania, in this context, can be viewed as a symbol of alterity to emphasise a cultural gulf and thereby a justification towards the promotion of British exceptionalism.

This section also discussed Romanianness in light of the transcendental narrative of spiritual uniqueness and the Latinesque narrative of Europeanness, two accounts of belonging seeking to shape Romania's historic and thereby present and future trajectory. They also help make sense of interpretations of Romania's EU accession, where it's nationhood was undergoing redefinition, with onlookers, such as those in the UK, viewing this process as primarily concerned with their view as a prospective receiving society poised to receive emigrating Romanians. The ambiguities that imbibe the rich culture(s) and psyche(s) of Romanian nationhood – in relation to the political questions of where the nation has come from, and where it is going to – promote suspicion by onlookers, and

balkanism is a stereotype both historically available and politically expedient (Cioroianu, 2002; Hammond, 2007). (It should be noted that these debates are strikingly similar to the UKs own political fault lines; the political distinction between receiving society and mover in the political discourse no doubt contributes to its understatement). While Romania's case is similar to other former soviet bloc nations in its redefinition post-1989, the ambiguity and the trauma of its nationhood discourse seems to contrast sharply with those in UK newsprint media, a selection of which has been shown to evoke the simplistic, stilted and supernatural (e.g., Light & Young, 2009). For example, an 'authentic' Romanian may be portrayed as white, orthodox, and latinesque; meanwhile, its portrayal by an outsider may reflect characteristics of an ethnic, linguistic and/or religious minority.

This concludes the first part of the Chapter which has showed how issues of nationhood unfold within nuanced and extensively debated socio-political settings. This contextualises the concerns embedded within the relevant identity-based research traditions that the current social psychological study will review in the next section. This section also introduced Balkanism studies, a field concerned with the ideological construction of 'East' Europeans (including Romanians). It will contextualise the data analysed in subsequent Chapters, as it has previously been shown to shape the interpretative possibilities of identity realisation, as the discourse of the present builds on the bastardised repetition, re-imagination and reclamation of discourse of the past (e.g., Wodak, 2015). Finally, this section showed how this extensive discursive landscape as a font of cultural knowledge could be further explored in an empirical investigation of specific genres of UK-based accounts of Romanian identity and migration during the selected period, a period as with of yet no previous empirical research. Having now established the topic itself, the current study needs to be situated within the social psychology research context.

Research context: situating an identity-driven approach

This thesis is primarily a social psychological study of identity, particularly citizenship and belonging. Deriving from *idem*, meaning 'the same' in Latin, the study of identity is one of the most hybrid and transdisciplinary research topics in the social and human sciences (Stryker & Burke, 2000). Gleason (1983, p.910) notes that 'identity' across academic literature is both "elusive and ubiquitous". Indeed, some contend that it is often inflated to the point of analytic vacuousness (Brubaker & Cooper, 2000, cited in

Moran, 2014). Such criticism, however, is not shared by social psychologists, for their raison d'être is the study of the relationship between individuals, groups and society (Chryssochoou, 2004). In the proceeding section, three possible approaches to the study of Romanian identity and migration will be considered: Social Identity Theory in social psychology, Acculturation Theory in cultural psychology, and citizenship studies branching both sociology and social psychology. These fields have a common interest, albeit differing methods, on the study of citizenship and belonging; thus the current study should acknowledge all of their potential contributions towards a social psychological study of Romanian identity and migration. Accordingly, their assumptions, merits and drawbacks will be considered, culminating in the rationale for the current study to explore the lived narratives of migration and belonging is outlined (cf. Shotter, 1993a).

Social identity in social psychology: its relevance and drawbacks

> "Increasingly we emerge as the possessors of many voices. Each self contains a multiplicity of others, singling different melodies, different verses, and with different rhythms. Nor do these many voices necessarily harmonize. At times they join together, at time they fail to listen one to another, and at times they create a jarring discord." (Gergen, 1992, p.83)

To situate this study as a social psychological investigation of identity, the first port of call lies in social identity, a mainstream field of research informed by psychology's appropriation of the centuries-old Descartesian tradition of individualism and cognitivism (Gergen, 2001). Tajfel was the chief architect of Social Identity Theory (SIT), regarded as one of the "central figures who shaped the development of post-war European social psychology" (Dumont & Louw, 2009, p.46). Social identity is a relevant conceptual tool for the current study as SIT theorises identity as a "self-concept" which derives from knowledge of (a) particular group membership(s) along with the "value and emotional significance" of membership (Tajfel, 1981, cited in Augoustinos, Walker, & Donaghue, 2006, p.25). SIT views identity creation as chiefly unfolding on an intergroup basis whereby individuals project themselves by identify with groups with consensual objectives and membership requirements: groups are therefore the engine of cooperation and conflict (Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Chiefly, individuals' identifications towards a perceived 'in-group' will promote a positive self-concept, although they may project negative attributions to other 'out-groups', thereby entailing that evaluation of other

groups is concerned with the acquisition or maintenance of power or prestige (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). While group re-identification can occur, this depends on the new groups' aspect or 'permeability' (Sindic & Condor, 2014). The central contribution from Tajfel that identities are formed socially, through identification and recognition, is one of the least contested concepts in social psychology (Augoustinos et al., 2006).

SIT gained traction in social psychology as the 'minimal group paradigm' methodology was developed as an experimental setup for studying the antecedents of group categorisation and discrimination (Tajfel, 1970). Chryssochoou (2004, p.158) presents the core concern of the minimal group paradigm as concerned with the "minimal necessary and efficient conditions to produce group discrimination and in-group favouritism". Early studies such as Tajfel (1970) found that participants, when artificially placed into group memberships where their decisions are weighted to only benefit their the in-/out-group, would choose in-group profit over equal distribution, and even forgo in-group profit if it furthered differentiation from the out-group. Thus SIT became an established explanatory model of identity as a motivational endeavour to promote an individual's esteem and belonging by means of both attitudes (particularly prejudice) and behaviour (particularly discrimination). A range of studies in so-called 'real world' settings now draw upon SIT as a 'metatheory' of identity, the individual's cognitive processes making social life coherent (Sindic & Condor, 2014).

Turner's Self-Categorisation Theory (SCT) is a substantive development of SIT (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). While SIT refers to Tajfel's original conception of the approach, SCT is a cognitive psychology perspective, with group categorisation viewed as an internal process bringing coherence to an otherwise chaotic world by enabling inferences to be made about group (non)members using 'depersonalised' stereotypes (Turner et al., 1987). As social categories are theorised as hierarchical, the categorisation one 'activates' into depends on the inclusiveness of the most relevant category: thus, the main analytic question for SCT is why certain categories become relevant in situ, considering factors such as 'accessibility' and 'fit' (Sindic & Condor, 2014). As such, for SCT the aim of empirical studies is to establish the processes promoting the social cognitive retrieval of relevant category memberships (Oakes, 1987).

SCTs assumption of automatic category retrieval grew out of the experimental tradition that has gripped psychology since the disputed 'cognitive revolution' of the 1960s

(Greenwood, 1999). This experimental tradition entailed psychologists trying to establish cause and effect between alleged behavioural/cognitive processes and their underlying organisation and function in the 'mind' and/or 'body' (Viney, 1993). In what became known as social psychology's empirical 'crisis' during the 1970s critics were concerned with the increasingly trivial, artificial, fragmented, reductionist and isolated nature of inquiry (Gergen, 1973). Adherents of experimental social psychology, SCT adherents among them, were concerned with methodological issues (Potter, 2000) and, to the present day, this legacy is ongoing and evident in critiques such as those pertaining to the neglect of replication studies (Bakker et al., 2012), sensationalised publication of positive findings (Simmons et al., 2011), or the pursuit of measures of research impact deemed problematic (Curry, 2012). Other critics have had more fundamental concerns over how Descartian logic driving the cognitive revolution has led to recurring ontological dead-ends and epistemological knots (Harré & Gillett, 1994; Parker, 1989, 1998; cf. Billig, 2008). Accordingly there have been interdisciplinary efforts concerned with how epistemology and methodology might be made consistent and complementary again in the pursuit of developing alternative social psychological approaches (e.g., Potter & Wetherell, 1987; cf. Billig, 2012).

Critical psychologists in particular dispute the epistemological as well as moral basis of approaches such as SCT, arguing against "individualistic values" and "institutional allegiances" and instead advocating for "social change, not social control" by fostering communitarian, egalitarian and inclusive vales (Fox, D. et al., 2008, pp.4-5). Across the multiple critical psychology practitioners, there are different philosophical emphases that substantiate this criticism. Parker argues that mainstream experimental psychology, in pursuing modernist doctrines on 'truth', 'reality', and 'progress', allowed the discipline as a whole to nurse "a caricature of historical progress" which espoused such inquiry as scientific and thereby above subjective reproach (1998, p.602). Gergen's (2001) analysis instead considers the modernist narrative of 'individualism', 'objectivism', and 'linguistic realism' as the chief ideological legacies that depersonalised and de-socialised the claims of psychologists reinforcing an unsatisfactory status quo. Shotter (1975, p.13) contrastingly argues that the image of humanness projected by much of social psychology systematically overlooked that humans, through their knowledge of their actions and interpretations of others' actions, were progressing their position within "a culture in nature" rather than being in nature simply reacting to a de-personalised environment.

Despite their varied emphases, Parker, Gergen, and Shotter are driving towards common themes concerned with advocating social justice through community activism, defending oppressed groups and challenging and transforming the status quo (cf. Fox, D., Prilleltensky, & Austin, 2008).

Critiques of conventional social psychology (espoused in approaches such as SCT) such as those considered above are philosophically grounded in the constructionist movement in psychology. Adherents such as Gergen (e.g., 1992), Burr (1995), and Shotter (e.g., 1993b) argue that identities are constructed out of the context-specific social processes of people in a given epoch and cultural space and can only be studied as what they are: embodied 'traditions' of argumentation which can invoke innumerable identity positions to construct meaning. Citing Billig, Shotter (2014, p.45) for example agrees that the thinker is "the student or scholar, working within a cultural tradition" concerned with the project of negotiating inherited ideological dilemmas, therefore situating the 'individual' as locked in a discursive arena of rhetoric and argumentation, and not simply a product of intra-psychological processes as SCT would assert.

Despite this dispute with the cognitive direction of SCT, the domain of SIT has been nurtured as a particularly fruitful ground by constructionist thinking (Potter, 2000). Authors such as Edwards (1995) and Potter and Wetherell (1987) invoke ethno-methodological insights from Sacks (1995) and Garfinkel (1967) to argue – akin with Tajfel – that social identity is displayed in the meanings people engage in to situate themselves and others within their social world in their own right. Indeed, some studies engage with both SIT and discursive methods to explore questions of social identity (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). The question then becomes one of asking how social identities are used to make sense of actors' actions or characterise relationships between groups. Rather than being mentally activated through an elaborate top-down process of identity formation and maintenance, social identity is observed in a social world (Lynch & Bogen, 1994). Identity becomes a dynamic process of linking self to the social world, communicating one's position and establishing relationships, thereby forming a cycle of "knowing, claiming and recognizing" (Chryssochoou, 2003, p.225). While there is an array of possible constructionist approaches that could be taken, all are concerned with observable in situ socio-cultural meanings (Chryssochoou, 2003). Accordingly, the methodological question becomes one of methods: namely, how to capture those particular

identity accounts that invoke causality, establish 'fact' and justify actions on issues of analytic relevance (Antaki, 1994).

A SCT approach might investigate Romanian identity through a minimal group design, seeking to identify the conditions whereby Romanians randomly allocated in different groups might favour their (Romanian) 'in-group' or realign to the (receiving society) out-group. However, such an approach would be simplifying the multiple competing definitions of social identity and the many variable consequences that might emerge out of lived accounts of migrancy (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). While psychological constructs like motivation and esteem are central justifications informing how knowledge and actions are invoked in the name of a given social identity, Reicher and Hopkins (2001, p.6) argue that the political, cultural and ideological factors shaping the "complex realities of national phenomena" are not empirically recognised in mainstream social psychological approaches such as SCT. This study concurs that while social identity is an informative analytic field that can contribute towards crafting a study analysing Romanian and British accounts of identity, other salient aspects of identity constitution and change are not recognised – chiefly being citizenship and belonging.

Thus, this section has outlined SIT, the central premise being that social identity is formed through identification and recognition by individuals socially (Tajfel, 1970). SITs form of social identity is a useful way of characterising the relationship between individual and group identity. Usefully, it does not prescribe a particular methodology or approach (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). It has also reviewed the cognitivist approach to social identity, SCT, and explored its potential relevance to the current study in viewing identity as a mentalised process of identification and differentiation following group membership (Turner et al., 1987). It has also been noted how constructionist approaches view social identity as a dynamic cycle of knowing, claiming and recognising (Chryssochoou, 2003). This section has also briefly addressed the main philosophical shortcomings of an SCT approach through a lens of constructionism view informed by critical psychology (Shotter, 1993a). An SCT approach would deemphasise the recognition of citizenship and belonging following migratory action, and would also deemphasise the lived accounts of migration by emulating identity in experimental settings. Thus, cultural psychology, being concerned with the interaction of different ethnic groups with divergent values, customs and norms (Chirkov, 2009), is also a relevant site consideration for the current study.

Acculturation theory in cultural psychology: its relevance and drawbacks

> "...how can peoples of different cultural backgrounds encounter each other, seek avenues of mutual understanding, negotiate and compromise on their initial positions, and achieve some degree of harmonious engagement?" (Berry, 2005, p.698)

Acculturation Theory (AT) is a prominent approach in cultural psychology that defines itself as concerned with how individuals and groups in society create, sustain and transform personal and shared meanings as a result of migratory processes. Dovidio and Esses (2001, p.377) argue that "meaningful cultures, histories, and contemporary political, social and economic relations" should be key considerations for psychological approaches: such issues crystallising vividly when considering the current study's concern with Romanian identity and migration. However, compared to other disciplines, Berry (2001) points out, psychology had not paid heed to acculturative change as a result of migration until relatively recently, with AT the most widely used to study psychological change and cultural learning (e.g., Berry, 1997, 2003). It is a focused application of an intergroup relations approach, a field studying how "culture influences the stable, characteristic ways that people think" and thereby interact with their social world (Mendoza-Denton & Hansen, 2007, p.70). Migration is theorised to entail "intra-individual, interpersonal and intergroup processes" that AT is concerned with understanding (Dovidio & Esses, 2001, p.377). Possessing a "distinctly cognitive tone" (Messick & Mackie, 1989, p.45), AT as a field is largely focused on mental representations, seeking to model how "people construe their world", their goals, beliefs, and values (Mendoza-Denton & Hansen, 2007, p.70).

AT posits that migration from place[a] to place[b] is a process whereby the moving individual adapts due to cultural contact with persons in place[b] (Berry, 2005). In theory, the mover's changes, termed 'acculturative strategies', will correspond to the receiving society, resulting in new (sometimes nominal, sometimes hybridised) forms of identity change (Berry, 2005). This also applies to the receiving society which will adopt policies for managing new groups, either seeking to preserve (reactive) or transform (proactive) their collective identity. Berry (2001) argues that two questions are important in studying both receiving and mover strategies: (1) is it considered to be of value to maintain one's own cultural heritage; and (2) is it considered to be of value to develop relationships with the larger society. Methodologically it is presented as a survey with scaled responses, with answers addressing one of four acculturative strategies (integration, yes/yes; assimilation,

no/yes; separation, yes/no; marginalisation, no/no) (Berry, 2005). These categorisations distinguish migrants in terms of their adaptation to the receiving society and are also used as predictors of other psychological measures such as personality traits (Boneva & Frieze, 2001). Intergroup relations, between both the migrant and receiving society or between different migrant groups (e.g., students and economic migrants), are also studied as predictors of migrant acculturation categories (Boski, 2013; Phinney, Horenczyk, Liebkind, & Vedder, 2001). It should be noted that only one preliminary study has been conducted which found integration was the most common strategy use by Romanians, although receiving society policy is notably absent (Pantiru & Barley, 2014). Based on this preliminary study, AT could further be used to map what acculturative attitude the UK as a receiving society advocates towards Romanians, and what acculturative strategies have Romanians chosen in their adaptation. However, like it was considered for SCT above, there are several limitations to this approach restrict its utility for the current study.

While AT is a convenient model for analysing the conditions by which a given group of migrants or the receiving society will select an acculturative strategy or policy, AT generally follows the cognitivist assumption that the process of adaptation has universal regularities independent of time, place, and the people involved that we can isolate and study (Chirkov, 2009; Cresswell, 2012). Indeed, proponents argue that the psychological "processes...operat[ing] during acculturation are essentially the same for all [cultural] groups" (Berry & Sam, 1997, p.296). This conceptualisation of culture is problematic, for as anthropologist Geertz (1973, p.14) notably argues, culture is not something that "social events, behaviors, [sic] institutions, or processes can be causally attributed; it is a context". By atomising the person of their qualitative characteristics such as their personal circumstances, cultural identities, and/or political affiliations, culture is superficially compartmentalised for the simplicity of quantitative differentiation or correlation. It also essentialises how acculturation 'should' occur as integration is often termed as the preferred strategy due to its association with health outcomes deemed to be 'positive' (Esses, Medianu, Hamilton, & Lapishina, 2014). But viewing acculturation as a "deliberative, reflective, and...comparative" phenomenon means that the "progresses, relapses, and turns...[that] make it practically impossible to predict and control" are ignored (Chirkov, 2009, p.94). Further, if we consider the nuances of migrant stories, such as in accounts making sense of issues like 'globalisation' or 'discrimination' as they move from rural to urban environments (e.g., Lawson, 2000; Golden & Lanza, 2013), we should

question whether statistical abstractions of movement between 'cultures' is possible (Chirkov, 2009). Even if this is plausible, the colourful richness of personalised stories raises the question as to whether such patterns are even insightful of lived accountss of movement (Andreouli, 2013; Andreouli, & Dashtipour, 2014). Thus, AT neither touches the surface of, nor is it interested in, to borrow Shotter's words, what "it might *feel* like to be a citizen: the feelings of 'belonging' or not" (1993a, p.115, original emphasis).

A second drawback is that, as a nomothetic measure of adaptation type, AT adopts a problem-focused conception (that is, circular definition and constrained measurement) of group communication; (Stainton-Rogers et al., 1995). It assumes that measuring quantitative data (i.e. personality, income, language proficiency) of groups can shed light on the conditions and outcome of adaptation (Boski, 2013). However, atomised psychological measures such as a migrant's attitude towards their adaptation, the receiving society, or their home country do not address how such evaluations are situated and action-oriented (Wiggins & Potter, 2003) least of all in migration discourse (Verkuyten, 1998, 2001). For example, the receiving society can promote assimilatory policies through integration phraseology, illustrating a social world filled with rhetoric of acculturative categories to achieve specific actions (Bowskill, Lyons, & Coyle, 2007). An approach that acknowledges in situ meanings, the lived accounts of acculturation, and the "context of identity" as unfolding on multiple psychological, social and political levels is needed (Andreouli & Howarth, 2012, p.361).

In this section, AT has been considered in relation to its possible utility for the current study as being concerned with migration. However its drawbacks have also been considered, acknowledging in particular the neglect of complexity in lived accounts amongst other limitations (e.g., Chirkov, 2009). Despite this, however, this perspective still informs the study by conceptualising migration as a two-way, adaptive transition between the mover and receiving society saturated in cultural context (Berry, 2005). Thus, having considered the respective approaches of SIT/SCT and AT, we can see that both are informed by cognitivist philosophy and constructionist critiques apply (e.g., Potter, 2000) equally to their separate methodologies. What remains deemphasised in both approaches however, in a study of Romanian identity and migration vis-a-vis citizenship and belonging, is citizenship itself: the direct manifestation of social identity and acculturation in situ by merit of distinguishing (un)conditional membership of (non-)members in society through criteria such as location, ethnicity, and values (Shotter, 1993a). It is important that

citizenship studies as a field, with the insights it provides to civic identity, is also reviewed for the thesis to meaningfully engage with the chosen topic.

Citizenship studies: its relevance and utility

> "After all, we are all governed, and, by that fact, joined in solidarity... [yet] very often those who govern who talk, are only able to talk, or only want to talk." (Michel Foucault at the Médecins du monde Press Conference, 19th June 1981; cited in Gordon, 2015)

Studies of citizenship and belonging in social psychology have burgeoned in the last two decades (Condor, 2011; Gibson, Crossland, & Hamilton, 2017). Researchers often focus on issues such as political participation and political attitudes on multiculturalism, racism and immigration (Condor, Tileagă, & Billig, 2013). They are therefore relevant to social psychology owing to the intersection between individuals, groups and society (Chryssochoou, 2004). This thesis sees two traditions of citizenship studies present in the literature that are particularly attuned to civic and migrant identity. The former (distinctly sociological) tradition involves studies that speak to officialised or established models of citizenship (such as political liberalism or communitarian liberalism), necessarily requiring them to acknowledge their place in debates over their meaning and manifestation (Isin & Wood, 1999). Thus there is a range of studies exploring civic manifestations in diverse environmental, social and economic contexts (Bauder, 2014; Concannon, 2008; Dean, 2001; Frey, 2003; Kerr, 2003; Schinkel, 2010; Valkenburg, 2012). Captured within a cycle of definition and counter-definition, Staeheli (2010, p.393) argues that such attempts to define citizenship reflects an "incessant search...simultaneously illusive and ubiquitous" akin to "Where's Waldo [sic]" searches.

The latter tradition, situated within social psychology, studies citizenship as a site to analyse how identity is used to make sense of contemporary social and political issues, not least to establish some sense of belonging across legal, social, economic and political domains (Abell & Stokoe, 2001; Antaki, Condor, & Levine, 1996; Condor, 2000). The social psychological study of citizenship considers the individual and social as inseparable considerations in the explanation of how it is embodied, claimed and contested in everyday settings, with long-established questions of collective identity, solidarity, pro-social behaviour, group boundaries, intra/intergroup conflict incorporated into studies of political participation, immigration attitudes, and nationalism (Condor, 2011). This tradition in

social psychology offers a discursive critique of the former sociological tradition of citizenship, arguing that we should instead consider *how people claim citizenship and to what ends* (see also e.g., Andreouli & Dashtipour, 2014; Coleman & Firmstone, 2014; Condor & Gibson, 2007; Ellison, 2013; Gibson, 2009, 2010; Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Gray & Griffin, 2014; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Meer, Dwyer, & Modood, 2010; Spoel, Harris, & Henwood, 2014). They build on the notion that processes of categorisation and identification enable civic and political actions to claim entitlement- and rights-based benefits according to a corresponding network of obligations and contractual affiliations (Shotter, 1993a). They study "concepts such as social inequality, power and dominance as participants' concerns" within the social fabric of everyday talk and text (Tileagă, 2006b, p.479). This may involve studying how a "concerned resident" may make an accountable politician morally-obliged to respond by being named as "our local councillor" (Barnes et al., 2004, pp.196-197). Conversely it may involve young people's accounts oscillating between effortfulness to promote an individualistic conception of successful citizenship and migration as a blameworthy reason to explain employment in a more social conception of struggling citizenship (Gibson, 2011). Alternatively, it may involve studying how minority group members manage their (mis)recognition and orienting "to an agenda that was not their own" that limits their ability to participate as co-members of a shared public sphere (Hopkins & Blackwood, 2011, p.226). Similarly, it may involve study how entry into the common space is negotiated by would-be entrants otherwise excluded in public discourse (Kirkwood, Mckinlay, & Mcvittie, 2013). As Staelhi (2010, p.395) argues, we can consider the (re)production and (re)construction of citizenship by viewing it as both

> "...a status and a set of relationships by which membership is constructed through physical and metaphorical boundaries and in the sites and practices that give it meaning...[from] the spaces of formal power, to spaces of interaction and public address, to the sites of ordinary lives. It is in these diverse, imbricated sites that citizenship is forged, given meaning, contested, and changed."

It is important to emphasise that in this tradition migration and citizenship are interchangeable features of the discursive landscape (Gibson, 2011). Indeed, contrary to ATs perspective of migration as being about matching adaptation type/policy with psychological outcomes, citizenship in this tradition is seen as a site of contestability concerned with determining the rights and entitlements migrants should (not) have over majority groups (Barnes et al., 2004). Thus, acculturation can be seen as an issue of

competing rhetorical voices seeking to pin down political 'resolutions' to individual or state shortcomings in policy or acculturative choice (Andreouli, 2013; Andreouli & Howarth, 2012). Such narratives form parts of a broader argumentative space where meanings are the ongoing subject of debate, contestability, and reconstruction between speakers (Billig, 1996). As Shotter (1993a) agrees by citing Gallie, citizenship should be seen as a 'contested concept'.

At this point empirical social psychological studies of citizenship should be explored. While there is an array of research pertinent to this thesis concerned with how majority identities have been reproduced and contested in relation to immigration to the UK (van Dijk, 2000a), there have been fewer studies of migrant identity and belonging. Studies of receiving society discourse have used a variety of methods to understand how majority discourse is constructed and managed in interviews (Abell, Condor, & Stevenson, 2006; Condor, 2000; Condor & Gibson, 2007; Condor et al., 2006), focus groups (Goodman & Burke, 2010; Verkuyten, 2001; 2005; Xenitidou & Morasso, 2014), speeches (Capdevila & Callaghan, 2007), questionnaires (Verkuyten, 1998), open letters (Barnes et al., 2004; Lynn & Lea, 2003), newspapers (Fox J. et al., 2012; Rosie, MacInnes, Petersoo, Condor, & Kennedy, 2004), academic articles (Kilby, Horowitz, & Hylton, 2013), and other public media performances (Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Kilby & Horowitz, 2013; Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004).

Research investigating migrant identity has been sparser although very useful in illustrating relations between citizenship, stigma and ethnicity. These social psychologically-relevant studies (most are self-defined sociological studies of discourse) have explored the narrative story-telling of migrants in European countries resembling the British context (Agustín, 2012; Gerritsen & Maier, 2012; Xenitidou & Morasso, 2014). Some investigate narratives for phenomenological themes (Erel, 2011; Macri, 2011; Paraschivescu, 2011; Parutis, 2013) while most study them as constructed accounts of identity and belonging (Cederberg, 2013).

There are two researchers who have conducted particularly relevant studies of Romanian identity and migration in the UK context. First is Moroşanu, who for example in Moroşanu and Fox J. (2013) discuss how participants attempted to displace ethnic stigma towards the Roma as a way of detoxifying their association with 'bad migrant' stories, or alternatively, promote their own self-worth by invoking self-identity characteristics such as 'hard working' as a way to show themselves as 'worthy' for inclusion. Then there are

studies such as Moroşanu (2013a, 2013b) which explore the networks of friendship and acquaintanceship in urban London. Another pertinent researcher is Tileagă (2006a, 2007), who has studied how Romanian professionals invoke a range of morally discrediting evaluations of the Roma as a way of differentiating themselves. Beyond these specific researchers, most of the citizenship studies literature is not focused with accounts of Romanian identity and migration in the UK. While not topically relevant in terms of a particular group, there is another selection of studies by Goodman which focus on questions of prejudice as the negative denouncement or rejection of citizenship and belonging (e.g., 2010; Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Goodman & Rowe, 2013; Goodman & Speer, 2007), exploring issues such as how immigration, asylum and race are managed in regards to the exclusionary activities of social categorisation and the interactional dilemmas of prejudicial accusations. For example, Goodman (2010) shows how taboos inhibiting racism accusations deafen the defence of immigration or asylum policy and thereby give space for cultural caricatures that imply superiority or advocate exclusion. These studies convey discursive findings akin to the broader immigration literature, such as the use of positive-self and negative-other presentation, disclaimers ("I'm not racist, but"), and variable vagueness when describing Others. However, what is significant with such strategies is how their balkanist undertones are contested by Romanians in ways that re-deploy those strategies. For example in Moroşanu and Fox J. (2013) and Tileagă (2006a), moral condemnations are made to displace stigma away from them and onto ethnic Roma, the group allegedly responsible for a given social problem. This emphasis on 'authenticating' Romanian identity – not least in relation to Others deemed problematic such as Roma – is a significant feature of these studies and warrants further investigation in its own right.

All studies of citizenship considered thus far have been influenced by the 'turn' in the social sciences towards philosophies of constructionism (Condor, Tileagă, & Billig, 2013). As drawn upon in the review of SIT/SCT and AT, this 'turn' particularly draws upon critical psychology, a movement of grounded in moral-philosophical critique (Fox, D., Prilleltensky, & Austin, 2009). In turn, critical psychology itself owes its historical origins to the Third Earl of Shaftsbury and his treatise that truth (as something that can be asserted only if its claim can survive ritual mockery) can only be found through dialogue and "social association" (Billig, 2008, p.127). Accordingly, contemporary studies of citizenship in social psychology are concerned with the social construction of identity

through meaningful practices informed by the (re)production of ideological themes in politicised cultural settings (Condor, 2011). Building on Augoustinos and Every (2007), we can review studies that have explored how majority speakers, both lay and elite, draw on a variety of rhetorical practices to construct civic claims of belonging and by definition, exclusion for non-members. These include prejudice denial ("I'm not racist, but") (Goodman & Speer, 2007; Condor et al., 2006), reality reflection ("they steal bikes from all around") (Verkuyten, 1998), positive self and negative-other presentation ("what about the rights of us Britons?") (Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Lynn & Lea, 2003), discursive de-racialisation ("it's not racist. It's common sense") (Capedvila & Callaghan, 2008), liberal argumentation ("it should be fair but it's not practical") (Kilby, Horowitz, & Hylton, 2013; Wetherell & Potter, 1992), container and disaster metaphors ("floodgates", "we're full") (Charteris-Black, 2006, 2013), and extreme case formulations ("no-one begrudges refugees a home, but") (van Dijk, 1992). Whilst space does not allow for detailed discussion, this thesis will draw upon these contributions when exploring the empirical data outlined in Chapter II and analysed in Chapters III and IV.

Citizenship studies such as these are informative insights into specific forms of civic discourse. An important principle embedded in such studies is that citizenship is recognised as a "providential space" which multiple actors can add to, draw upon, and generally debate the "mutually intelligible resources" that shape it (Shotter, 1993a, p.188). Thus it is important that citizenship be investigated in how it can be shared or disputed. Studies that are methodologically structured around a singular dataset source may consider how multiple voices – monological or dialogical – achieve these actions. Some studies may acknowledge in narration of their research contexts how receiving societies constrain migrant narratives (Cederberg, 2013; Gerritsen & Maier, 2012), or explicitly focus their analysis on how certain social actions are responded to in a given situation, such as contesting attempts at blame avoidance by an elite nationalist (Goodman, 2010; Goodman & Johnson, 2013). However, there is a growing variety of studies that show how civic actions are coordinated across multiple spaces, thereby recognising the varied manifestations that discourse can take in situ (Barnes, Auburn, & Lea, 2004). Studies have, for example, explored lay and reified versions of ethnic and civic claims of citizenship naturalisation (Andreouli & Howarth, 2012); the maintenance of authoritative and rational political identities across contexts and the negotiation of fascism/ extremism accusations (Goodman & Johnson, 2013); the networked construction of contested events through

competing identity claims (Leudar et al., 2004, Leudar, Hayes, Nekvapil, and Baker, 2008); the common moral claims-making of being a parent in both citizen and migrant talk (Xenitidou & Morasso, 2014); and how 'call to arms' speeches compare (Graham, Keenan, & Dowd, 2004). These studies show the 'argumentative fabric' (Wetherell, 1998) of civil society vis-a-vis different voices and lived accountss. This thesis builds on this important principle in citizenship studies – as well as the contribution from AT of society as a culture comprised of both receiving and mover actors – that the realisation of civil society should document the interplay of both migrancy *and* the receiving society in its own unique cultural context. The current study concurs and reflects this through the chosen datasets (see Chapter II) and analytic approach (justified below, outlined in Chapter II). By doing so, they can also interrogate Shotter's (1993a) concern with how citizenship and belonging are constructed in situ through a mutual methodological recognition of how mover narratives are situated within, and speak to, the receiving society's shared civil space.

In this section, citizenship studies – mostly in social psychology – as a research field has been outlined. Beginning with an overview of its distinction from sociological studies of citizenship, the field was distinguished in terms of how citizenship is empirically mobilised as a status of corresponding affiliations, responsibilities and entitlements. Further, different studies were showed to employ different datasets in the analysis of emergent claims of citizenship and belonging. Moroşanu (e.g., Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013) and Tileagă (e.g., 2006b) were mentioned as pertinent topical researchers of Romanian identity in the British context, alongside an assortment of related studies analysing the realisation of prejudice, ethnicity and related themes in the literature specifically through the use of rhetorical devices (e.g., Goodman, 2010). It was also addressed how this field draws upon critical psychology and thereby the constructionist critique of cognitivism, a theme that has been present in the critique of each research approach and thereby the delimitation of an approach deemed most suitable to the current study.

Having now outlined and appraised three relevant approaches pertinent to the study of Romanian identity and migration vis-a-vis citizenship and belonging, the key themes and shortcomings will be summarised. While SIT/SCT considers identity as a motivational process to promote self-esteem, power and/or prestige, AT views identity change resulting from migration as a process of adaptation and attitudinal change. Citizenship studies research broadly conceptualises identity as a status bound up with obligations and entitlements, although there is a distinction between sociologically-informed work that

contrasts emergent with official forms of citizenship and social psychological studies more concerned with lived accounts. As this study is similarly interested in lived accounts – namely, how citizenship and belonging were constructed by both receiving and mover voices leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in 2014 – there are a number of questions that could be asked from a citizenship studies perspective: how did receiving society political discourse construct civic space and its (non-)members during the period? Do ideological traditions or rhetorical commonplaces, such as balkanism or nationalism, underpin or help make sense of accounts of UK society and its culture? How are Romanians invoked in migration commentary in receiving society discourse? What has the lived accounts of Romanians living in the UK been like? How do aspects of Romanian nationhood feature as part of everyday life for acculturating movers? What have been experiences of education, work and social life for Romanians? What kinds of challenges have been faced since moving (e.g. institutional, social)? Together these questions help comprise a web of interrelated concerns that Shotter (1993a) argues are what animate citizenship discourse and mark it as having shared meaning and value.

Rationale for a discursive citizenship studies approach

> "Talk and debate upon the topics of citizenship and belonging...can generate just that continuous tradition of argumentation required to constitute a 'providential space', that is, a civil society, *our* civil society, and the 'container' from within which we can all draw the mutually intelligible resources we require in making sense of the rest of our lives." (Shotter, 1993a, p.188)

Each of the three approaches outlined have merits for studying Romanian identity and migration leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in 2014. SIT/SCT studies how individuals come to identify with in-groups and differentiate from out-groups. AT analyses the policies of the receiving society and strategies of immersed migrants alongside other psychological measures of mental well-being and adjustment. Citizenship studies use official and/or lived accounts of citizens and/or migrants to analyse identity and belonging in a given local/national context. However, there are also important limitations that have been considered: SIT/SCT alongside AT embody mainstream psychology's subscription to universalism and avoidance of in situ accounts, thereby de-emphasising lived accounts and multiplicity. Citizenship studies as an appropriate field of research has been explored to situate a social psychological investigation of citizenship

and belonging in contemporary accounts of Romanian identity and migration in the UK context. Much of the research is concerned with how lived accountss of citizenship are claimed to have effects on people's social worlds (Barnes et al., 2004). The current study aligns and builds on the particular branch of citizenship work that has previously been concerned with discursive construction and management of attitudes, prejudice and group memberships (Gibson, 2011; Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Tileagă, 2006a). It also recognises the worth of citizenship studies that have evoked themes from AT to investigate both receiving and moving voices from different genres of civic discourse (Andreouli, 2013; Andreouli & Howarth, 2012; Cederberg, 2013). Thus, the current study will acknowledge both receiving society and Romanian mover voices articulating their lived accountss as rehearsed, argumentative endeavours (Billig, 1996; Shotter, 2012). And as reviewed in the earlier section on the two studies investigating different UK- and Romania-based voices critiquing and defending Romania's EU accession in 2007 (Fox J. et al., 2012; Light & Young, 2009) the current study will extend this understanding by analysing the discursive epoch marking the period up to and following the lifting of Romania's transitional controls in 2014, a point where, no systematic analysis has yet been conducted into the receiving society discourse nor been concerned with the reflections by Romanians living within that milieu.

By situating the current study as chiefly concerned with citizenship and belonging, this thesis is therefore accordingly situating itself within the legacy of the 'constructionist turn' in the social and human sciences: it is therefore an empirical investigation of how accounts are constructed to emphasise certain identities, actions or events over others (Gergen, 1985). This is a discursive approach focused on social actions and rhetorical practices (Wetherell, 1998). While the particular analytical and methodological details of the discursive approach will be outlined in Chapter II, below the particular influence informing the thesis' constructionist approach will be detailed. While many have contributed to the development of constructionist thinking (e.g., Burr, 1995; Edwards, 1997; Gergen, 1992; Potter, 1996a, 1996b), it is Shotter's 'flavour' of constructionism that the current study draws upon most closely. Foregrounding his particular influence on this thesis, a sample of Shotter's (1973, 1993a, 1993b, 2005, 2012) work will be used to make sense of the constructionist movement. Then, more substantively, his work will be cited to show how it informs the way that citizenship and belonging will be appropriated as the central analytic in this thesis.

Like other critical psychologists, Shotter (1993b) argues that the constructionist shift developed out of frustration with the long-established doctrine of Descartism that comprised much of Western psychological thought well into twentieth century. As self-contained, autonomous individuals, Descartes coined 'cartesian dualism', that is, a distinction between the 'mind' and 'body': being the metaphysical and the psychological, the implication led to the assumption that "minds...contain 'inner representations' of possible 'outer' circumstances", of "'having something like a picture of it in our heads'" (Shotter, 1993b, p.4). Constructionist thought developed out of ontological and epistemological challenges to this pervasive assumption. The ontological challenge questioned that meaning is representationally modelled as a reflection of 'out there' reality; the epistemological challenge questioned that meaning is transferred to the minds' of others through transference. Instead, Shotter, building in particular on the thoughts of Bakhtin, argued that reality is constructed in tandem *with* others: it is a social enterprise, dependent upon how we speak "in a way that is responsive to the others around us" (Shotter, 1993b, p.6). This common ground between speakers comprises what Shotter (1993a) terms the 'rhetorically-responsive' context. This multitude of possible realities are borne out of the sense-making practices all of us engage in: it is these same realities that Shotter (1993b) argues mainstream psychologies should be more interested in understanding.

To further social psychology's concern with the relationship between the individual and society, Shotter (1993a) shows that identity can be fruitfully engaged with as an investigation of citizenship as it embodies a "tradition of argumentation" concerned with establishing "patterns of relation between people", thereby providing or refusing a "sense of belonging" (p.195). Recognition therefore becomes key, as Shotter (1993a) shows when he considers the psychological trauma that can emerge out of repeated struggles against the 'conditionality' status society might place upon its 'less' worthy (non-)members (cf. Honneth, 1995). The categorisation and particularisation of identities becomes politicised as their 'appropriate' use or 'true' meaning are contested (Shotter, 2012). This centres between the civic Self and migrant Other, a symbolic division between imagined 'insiders' and 'outsiders' of a given 'homeland' (Billig, 1995). Thus, Shotter's observation that citizenship should be rooted in the social psychology of identity raises questions as to how one conceptualises identity knowledge, claims and recognition: how they are theorised within a responsive cultural environment (cf. Taylor, C., 1992).

Shotter's contributions also help us in conceptualising citizenship as a discursive practice. Drawing on Shotter's (1993a, 2005) work and the rhetorical investigations conducted by Billig (e.g., 1991, 1995, 1996) we can extract a number of core themes that comprise the concerns that a discursive study of citizenship should recognise. Together, these works articulate the themes that comprise the core tenets informing contemporary studies of citizenship (e.g., Barnes et al., 2004). The first theme is that citizenship involves being *situated* in a number of ways. As Billig explains:

> "the social psychological study of identity should involve the detailed study of discourse…. Having a national identity also involves being situated physically, legally, socially, as well as emotionally: typically, it means being situated within a homeland, which itself is situated within the world of nations. And, only if people believe that they have national identities, will such homelands, and the world of national homelands, be reproduced." (1995, p.8)

The second theme is that of *voice* – that is, to (re)produce accounts of belonging one must be able to participate and be heeded for one's concerns with a 'taken-for-granted' competency. In Shotter's words, these fall into the realm of 'cultural politics', which:

> "...[regard] those activities in which people are able to play a part in the constructing of their own way of life: being able to voice (or not, as the case may be) the character of one's own concerns, and have them taken seriously by others around one, is an essential part of being a citizen and having a sense of belonging in one's society." (2005, p.159)

A third theme from Shotter is that one must be able to meaningfully participate, enact and (re)shape the responsibilities and entitlements of citizenship. It is a *performance*, of

> "...rhetorically achieving an identity and sense of belonging in relation around us, and (re)constituting norms which regulate public life and impinge upon the individual in terms of rights/duties...[of] "...liv[ing] within a community which one *senses* as being one's own...one must be more than just a routine reproducer of it; one must in a real sense also play a part in its creative reproduction". (1993a, p.187/193)

Thus citizenship is a situated, voiced and performative practice: it is an active feature of everyday life. We can see the importance of such features when such components of belonging are denied, thereby contributing towards an "impetus for social resistance and conflict, indeed, for a struggle for recognition" (Honneth, 1995, p.132).

By building upon the studies of media coverage of Romanian migration post-accession and their explorations of claims of (mis)knowing, (mis)claiming and (mis)recognising (Light & Young, 2009; Fox J. et al., 2012), this study views constructions of Romanian identity and belonging as immersed within the social and civic contexts of both the receiving society as well as the migrant. Concurring with Howard (2000, p.367), this thesis situates itself as a "politicized social psychology of identities" that recognises both "the structures of everyday lives and the socio-cultural realities in which those lives are lived". And, building on Shotter's (1993a) particular theorisation of citizenship as a situated, voiced, and performative practice within the constructionist tradition, this study of Romanian identity and migration will investigate the lived accounts of both receiving and mover voices as negotiations of (non-)belonging.

Having now outlined approaches relevant to the social psychological study of Romanian identity and belonging and provided rationale for the constructionist discursive approach that will be taken, the thesis now situates its study more broadly. Taking seriously the notion that both social psychology and discursive studies should seek to practice interdisciplinarity (e.g., Chryssochoou, 2004; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001), the current study follows Light and Young (2009) by incorporating Balkanism studies (reviewed earlier) as a lens to investigate Romanian identity and migration discourse. The current study therefore seeks to contextualise the novel chosen topic area by linking how contemporary themes and actions in discourse are linked to historical concerns documented in Balkanism studies. It shows that the thesis takes seriously Billig's (2008) recommendation that psychology should re-imagine itself as being concerned with the 'social history' of ideas and arguments, not least being reflexive as to those that attain hegemony and come to define the life-worlds of individuals, groups, and cultures.

Applying Balkanism studies to UK discourse of Romanian identity and migration

Having outlined Balkanism studies earlier in the Chapter, this section will specify how this thesis will operationalise balkanism as an ideological lens to contextualise where relevant the empirical analyses in Chapters III and IV. Firstly, from the review above it can be concluded that the presentation of Romanian identity and migration in British media and political discourse should be understood as building on an ideological legacy primed

to imply discreditation, disputation and dejection (Fox J. et al, 2012; Hammond, 2006, 2007; Kaneva & Popescu, 2011; Light & Young, 2009; Razsa & Lindstrom, 2004). This thesis argues that Romanian representations in media and political discourse in the UK prior to free movement leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in 2014 can be usefully studied through the lens of Balkanism studies because representations of Romania's past and present were invoked to make sense of the political or cultural implications of its accession (Fox J. et al., 2012; Light & Young, 2009). For example, their formal accession in 2007, Romania's long-awaited Europeanisation, rather than something of hope, was established as a self-evident 'problem' (Hammond, 2007).

Balkanism studies as a field is a useful lens for understanding Romanian identity discourse because it provides deeper insight. It explains how claims and predictions in debates concerning Romanian identity are rooted in historical stereotypes. It also recognises how Romanians themselves can be shown to orient to them as a means of redress as they comprise a common system of ideas to contest (Cioroianu, 2002). Without balkanism as Light and Young (2009) argue, discourse analysis cannot account for the meaning beyond it as a moral panic, devoid of rootage and trapped as spontaneous in situ talk without historical corroboration. Thus, this study draws two interests remarks from Fleming (2000) who mentions two interesting tropes, 'ambiguity' and 'predictability', that feature as core components of balkanist discourse. They are complementary means by which the target of such talk is tautologically "fully known", yet at the same time, "wholly unknowable" (Fleming, 2000, p.1219).

Ambiguity. The first trope is that 'balkan' people are an ambiguous and amorphous group. Fleming (2000, p.1219) argues that according to 'outsider' perceptions, "they can neither be told apart nor put together." The designation 'Eastern European' is a prominent signifier that alerts to this ambiguity, which is fleshed out when the group's identity, motivations and actions are blurred in order to justify balkanism's ideological simplification and convenience. Perhaps most prominently this is shown with culture: while in some ways 'European', Balkan people may also be presented with exotic aspects of the 'East'. As Fleming (2000, p.1220) puts it: "The simultaneous proximity and distance of the Balkans (the point of reference, geographical and cultural, being Western Europe)...add up to the paradoxical "intimate estrangement"". Bjelić (2002) also substantiates this when he points out how "The intense...polarities created by *Balkanism's*

binary logic (Christianity/Islam, civilization/barbarism, etc.) infuses any reality...with pernicious instability" (p.7).

Predictability. For this trope, while the group may be ambiguous, however, what may be 'known' are members' characteristics: in Balkanist terms they may be asserted to be 'predictably' warlike, quarrelsome, impetuous, simple-minded, or otherwise burdensome. Fleming (2000) puts it tongue-in-cheek: ""Killing one another" is not just a sort of "national hobby" but an intention or imperative that must be obeyed, and that can only be exhausted, not avoided". This assertion of knowability may be generalised further than individuals or groups: 'Balkan' civilisation may be characterised as being 'less' socially or economically developed. Living standards, incomes, industries or other quantified attributes may be contrasted as 'clearly' inferior.

These themes, simultaneously claiming ambiguity and predictability, are a potent combination hence the historical resilience of balkanism (Todorova, 2009). They will be used to historicise this study's investigation of Romanian identity and migration discourse vis-a-vis in situ accounts from both receiving society and migrant voices.

Chapter review

Chapter I began by introducing the thesis and its main aims before describing how each section in the Chapter would support these aims. The main aims were firstly to analyse discourse concerning Romanian identity and migration to the UK leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in 2014; the first section of the Chapter contextualised this by outlining how Romania's EU accession was narrated in the UK alongside discussion of contemporary debates of UK and Romanian nationhood. This section initially showed that while there are a couple of studies that documented the discourse concerning Romanian EU accession within the UK context, there remains a gap concerning discourse on the lifting of transitional controls, a point where political discourse concerning Romanian identity and migration became particularly widespread. Building on Light and Young (2009), this section also introduced Balkanism studies to support the third aim of the thesis, which was draw upon a historicised frame to help contextualise the ideological representations found in the later empirical Chapters.

Secondly, the thesis has outlined three possible approaches that could be employed for a social psychological study of identity and belonging: SIT/SCT, AT, and citizenship

studies in social psychology. Having taken each in turn, discussed their relevance and possible application, and considered their drawbacks, a constructionist discursive approach in the tradition of citizenship studies was justified. Being particularly informed by Shotter (1993a), this approach was justified to explore both receiving society and mover voices concerning Romanian identity and migration, an undertaking informed by studies that have explored a similar topic (Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013), used a dual-site methodological approach (Andreouli & Howarth, 2012), or concerned themselves with themes of citizenship (Barnes et al., 2004; Goodman & Johnson, 2013). Finally, as introduced earlier in the Chapter, Balkanism studies will be used to historicise the contemporary discourse under study. While this is an overarching historical insight informing how the topic is theorised (i.e., that Romanians are viewed as *being* or *behaving* a certain way due to specific forms of stereotypical constructions), it will also become useful in the identification of two interesting tropes drawn from the literature, 'ambiguity' and 'predictability'. These will be interpreted where relevant to make specific instances of discourse in the empirical analyses of Chapters III and IV, demonstrating the evidential ways in which balkanist talk can manifest (beyond its implicative interpretation more broadly). In Chapter II, the thesis' analytical and methodological approach to the two specific datasets will be discussed in full.

Chapter II: analytic and methodological approach

Chapter II is divided into two sections as it surveys the thesis' analytic and methodological approach. It first involves outlining the philosophical and analytical approach adopted for the thesis, drawing upon constructionist epistemology (Shotter, 1993a) and the critical discursive psychology literature (Wetherell, 1998; Goodman, 2010). The thesis will be situated in relation to its particular stance among the multifarious discourse analytic traditions, focusing in particular on discourse as the rhetorical construction of meaning action, ideology as patterns of powered action, and context as the weaving of situational and cultural frames.

The second section outlines the methodological consideration taken as a dual-site study of discourse concerned with both receiving society and mover voices. While the receiving society discourse is a combination of national television media (question segments from BBCs *Question Time* and political interviews from *The Andrew Marr Show,* taken between December 2012 and December 2014), the mover discourse data are interviews conducted by the researcher between September 2014 and March 2015 with ten self-defined Romanians living in Sheffield. The rationale for the data choices, ethical preparations and acquisition strategies will be outlined, as well as descriptions of the data, with particular emphasis on the second dataset regarding reflexive considerations. Due to the researchers' concern with voice, divergent analytical treatment of the datasets will be justified: interpretative repertoire analysis (Wetherell & Potter, 1988) of the receiving society discourse and a discourse analysis informed by citizenship and belonging (Shotter, 1993a) of the mover discourse. While both are concerned with rhetorical construction, the former emphasises the ideological 'legacy' shaping contemporary public discourse of Romanian identity and migration, whereas the latter emphasises the importance of how citizenship and belonging themes resonate in self-defined Romanians' accounts.

This Chapter contributes towards the thesis' first main aim by documenting how the chosen topic of Romanian identity and migration discourse in the UK context will be approached in methodological and analytical terms. It also contributes to the thesis' second main aim by showing how the current study will investigate both receiving society and mover discourse, documenting what the dataset is comprised of and when it was gathered.

Analytic approach: constructionist discourse analysis

> "...when we argue about such things as 'society', 'the individual', 'the person', 'identity', 'the citizen', 'civil society', 'thought', 'speech', 'language', 'desire', 'perception', 'motivation'...we all know perfectly well what 'it' is that is being represented by the concepts we use in our arguments...We find it difficult to accept that objects such as these are not already 'out there' in the world in some primordial naturalistic sense... that they only 'make sense' as they are developed within a discourse" (Shotter, 1993a, pp.198-199)

In this section the epistemology and analytic approach are outlined. Firstly the rationale and implications of a constructionist epistemology are outlined before moving on to establish the analytic approach, focusing on three terms to situate it in the literature: discourse, ideology, and context. This underpins the second section on the methodological approach.

Epistemic constructionism

This thesis acknowledges that one's ontological and epistemological position shapes how data can be analysed and thereby the knowledge that can be generated (Silverman, 1997). As was explored in Chapter I, there is a tradition of debate over citizenship vis-a-vis identity and belonging in both empirical studies as well as the research approaches themselves, demonstrating the multifarious cultural politics involved in struggles for the assertion and recognition of (non-)members and the contingency of 'reality' in any given epoch (Shotter, 1993a). Accordingly, given the thesis' concern with the construction of identity, it is therefore appropriate to situate the study as constructionist (Gergen, 1985). Building on the narration of constructionism – its development and critique of mainstream cognitivist thinking in social/cultural psychologies – below the specific consequences of the perspective taken will be outlined.

The current study is conceptualised ontologically as sceptical of realist assertions as to the exact 'nature' of reality, while also being agnostic to multiple possibilities (cf. Demeritt, 2002). Language is treated as the primary means of accounting for the world; this entails open-mindedness as to the prospect of multiple realities which may each hold semblances of recognisable 'truth' as they are presented against one another (Edwards, 2005). Because metaphysical realities are empirically dubious (Wittgenstein, 1953), this thesis seeks to study how social realities are warranted and justified in situ, as such

displays are situated social facts locked in particular argumentative traditions and cultural contexts (Ribes-Iñesta, 2006). This does not deny, refute, nor privilege any particular reality (cf. O'Neill, 1995). Instead this position acknowledges the many physical, psychological, social, digital and philosophical levels within which reality may be situated when we invoke them to make sense of everyday life. Edley (2001a) argues that there is a distinct difference between arguing that *nothing exists outside of representation* (ontological constructionism) – a rarely self-defined position yet commonly prescribed accusation by critics – and *a single, concrete, or ultimate reality is not possible without representing it* (epistemic constructionism) – which is the common claim of many constructionists (Edwards, Ashmore, & Potter, 1995; Gergen, 1991; Shotter, 1993b; Wetherell, 2007). The current study accordingly is concerned with epistemic constructionism, a position that can be used to investigate how Romanian identity and migration constructions are rhetorically invoked and naturalised, with concern to how specific actors may be ideologically positioned in such accounts.

Epistemic constructionism is thus concerned with how realities are constructed through knowledge use (Burr, 1995; Gergen, 1985). The position can be contrasted to the 'correspondence' view that language 'reflects' objects or events, all social acts – even acts presenting 'evidence' – are rhetorical and po2sitioned versions and subject to response by its audience (Edwards et al., 1995). Utterances don't just describe states of affairs; they do things, and by implication, change states of affairs (Austin, 1962). This view is not postmodernist mischief or nihilistic in effect (cf. Parker, 1998) as it can be a powerful tool to interrogate how contemporary social problems about identity and belonging are constructed and thereby begin to challenge them (Burr, 1995; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). There are no closing remarks or 'final' words; merely counter arguments (Billig, 1996). Willig (1998) takes this further, arguing that the debate should be on how researchers can go about managing the bottom line that all actions are social, producing and reproducing subjectivity. She argues in favour of acknowledging "permanent ontological contestation among individuals and groups in society" (p.92). Willig's (1998) socialist constructionism inspires the possibility of transformative change, providing clarity over "*whose* reality to relate to and act upon, within the context of competing versions" (p.92). Just because we cannot be sure of the ultimate ontological nature of a given 'reality', as researchers we must reconcile one's own philosophical positioning with one's practical and reflexive ethical concerns as to whose voices' – and therefore whose realities – are recognised.

This thesis' constructionist epistemology thereby informs the methodological approach taken, for the social world becomes a dynamic and argumentative space maintained and transformed as its (non-)members textually and verbally discuss and debate knowledge (Shotter, 1993a). While this is particularly salient for 'public' discourse, where 'Western' values invoking liberal citizenship are enacted by means of popular media and political discourse (Billig, 1995), this is more nuanced for 'private' interactions, informed by both the in situ context as well as broader public ideas that inform and constrain 'acceptable' boundaries. Whilst we cannot know the entire semiotic space, we can study segments in any given time and thereby map out how meanings are reproduced and debated (Andreouli & Howarth, 2012; Leudar et al., 2004). The importance of multi-site discourse analyses, the (counter-)argumentation between different positions, not to mention the dialogicality within the same voices, cannot therefore be understated for a constructionist study (Shotter, 1993b). And as Shotter (1993a) argues at the beginning of this section, it is this dialogical realm that the taken-for-granted 'real' objects of the world are situated. As Shotter goes on to argue:

> "people continually arguing with each other over who or what they are...[comprises] the poetic, rhetorical and 'reality-creating' nature of talk (speech)" (1993a, p.200)

Discourse: occasioned rhetorical construction of meaning

Since Harris (1952) coined the term for his linguistic approach investigating the relationship between 'sentences' and 'texts', 'discourse analysis' (DA) has been appropriated by a range of writers critical of dominant structuralist, positivist, and realist approaches in the social sciences and humanities, including in psychology (Wooffitt, 2005). A common starting point is that 'discourse' refers to language beyond the sentence level (e.g., Salkie, 1995, p.ix). However, the unit of analysis delimiting analytic focus varies in accordance to ontological and epistemological concerns. However, many seek to maintain an inclusive working definition to ensure that knowledge production is not hampered by disciplinary self-closure (Billig, 2012; Potter & Wetherell, 1987). However, as Jørgensen and Phillips (2002, p.1) assert, DA in its different forms has now developed into a "complete package" concerning its theory and application; accordingly, they treat discourse as "a particular way of talking about and understanding the world", rendering it interpretative as to what sort of 'ways' match the orientation of the approach taken (e.g.,

institutional, pragmatic, linguistic, interactive). Paltridge (2006, p.2) provides an inclusive description that neatly acknowledges the broad range of interests common to DA:

> "Discourse analysis...looks at patterns of language [in both spoken and written texts]...and considers the relationship between language and the social and cultural contexts in which it is used. [It] also considers the ways that the use of language presents different views of the world and different understandings. It examines how the use of language is influenced by relationships between participants as well as the effects the use of language has upon social identities and relations. It also considers how views of the world, and identities, are constructed through the use of discourse."

DA is accordingly a diverse field of different disciplines, institutions, and schools (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Wooffitt argues that by the 1980s, three strands of DA had developed out of Halliday's linguistics of quasi-syntactical speech rules, Foucault's work on the genealogy of biopower and subjectivity, and Gilbert and Mulkay's work on scientist's accounts of beliefs and actions (cited in Wooffitt, 2005). While sharing a common interest in language, the different emphases in these approaches have led to the "different forms in different disciplines" that manifest today (Parker, 2013, p.223).

This thesis in particular aligns with the conceptualisation of 'discourse' as the occasioned and rhetorical construction of meaning through language use (Potter, Wetherell, Gill, & Edwards, 1990). Discourse is a social action instead of a verifiable statement, constructed using grammar, categories, metaphors, idioms, etc. and construct*ive* of particular, stabilised versions of the world (Wetherell, 1998). In a similar vein, Billig (1996) draws upon classic rhetorical thinking and describes an occasioned use of discourse drawing upon specific kinds of arguments as a 'logos' (singular; 'logoi' plural). This DA tradition derives from constructionist work in social psychology such as that from Gergen and Shotter (see Wooffitt, 2005). This approach initially drew inspiration from Gilbert and Mulkay's (1983) work on empiricist and contingent repertoires, but also drew inspiration from other writers in philosophy, sociology and the humanities in the pursuit of studying traditional social psychological topics such as social identity, prejudice, attitudes, and emotions, becoming what is now termed as 'discursive psychology' (see Edwards, 2005; Potter, 2005). Despite a rich catalogue of influences, the DA tradition recognises that the realisation of meaning is achieved through purposeful human conduct (Wood & Kroger, 2000). In particular, this claim draws upon Wittgenstein's treatise that "human psychological phenomena [only] become[s] meaningful...in the context of social life"

(Ribes-Iñesta, 2006, p.110); Garfinkel's use of 'breaching' to uncover the "ordinary practices whereby stability is achieved" (Maynard & Kardish, 2007, p.1484); and Bakhtin's view that "relationally responsive activity ceaselessly unfolding" is central for intellectual enrichment (Shotter & Lannamann, 2002, p.579).

This strand of DA involves analysing "what people do" with discourse (Potter, 1996b, p.146), "developing, testing out and justifying interpretations and readings of texts", being sensitive to the ethnography of interaction *and* the genealogy of practices in ideological context (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.105). While some argue DA is a "craft skill" akin to "bike riding or chicken sexing" (Potter, 1997, p.147) others argue that there are ways of interrogating data by asking specific questions of form and structure (Wood & Kroger, 2000). However, DA can be broadly characterised by asking questions of performance instead of competence (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). They follow Sacks' (1995, p.11) point that one has to "come to terms with how it is that the thing comes off".

Following Edwards and Potter's (1992) book of the same name, 'discursive psychology' (DP) was coined both as an intention to overcome the increasingly opaque distinctions between approaches and to demarcate the DA movement within social psychology. Since then, DP has itself undergone considerable divergence in empirical and analytic concerns: where some have increasingly drawn upon CA to study particular psychological actions (e.g., Potter & Hepburn, 2010; Potter & Wiggins, 2008; Wiggins & Potter, 2003), others have continued as the approach initially emerged (e.g., Wetherell & Potter, 1992) by studying how, for example, speakers use discourse to construct identities, present attitudes and/or interpretative repertoires, or negotiate ideological dilemmas (e.g., Barnes et al., 2004; Condor & Gibson, 2007; Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Tileagă, 2006a, 2007). The current study builds on the latter array of studies, termed by some as 'critical discursive psychology' (e.g., Goodman & Johnson, 2013). They advocate a more critical agenda that recognises how discourse draws upon ideologies which circulate, interact and compete in the vast argumentative fabric of society (Wetherell, 1998).

In this section, 'discourse' and DA has been addressed. The different approaches of DA and their respective origins have been recognised (Wooffitt, 2005), with the current study particularly aligning with the conception of discourse as occasioned and rhetorical construction of meaning through language use (e.g., Potter et al., 1990). In particular, the current study aligns with the 'critical' variant of DA within social psychology, termed by some as 'critical discursive psychology' (e.g., Goodman & Johnson, 2013).

Ideology: common patterns of powered action

The study of ideology began with de Tracy, who conceived it as an aspirational 'science of ideas' (van Dijk, 2000b). Classic Marxist theory defines ideology as the proliferation of a dominant false consciousness upon the working class to exploit them by those who own the means of production in a capitalist economy (Marx & Engles, 1997). Twentieth century thinking saw ideology framed as either a determinant of social behaviour or cognitive processing, resulting in a neglect of how social change happens or how actors negotiate and justify contradictory ideologies (Billig, 1991). In political discourse, it is often used as a term of abuse to accuse opponents of being dogmatic, subjective or zealous (Weltman & Billig, 2001). Ideology is commonly characterised as a continuum on left-right (economic attitude) and libertarian-authoritarian (social attitude) quadrants (Leach, 2011). In migration discourse, while ideology is often framed as a social tension between liberals who embraces globalisation and cosmopolitanism versus the social conservative who is sceptical of multiculturalism and keen to preserve traditional norms and values in the national identity and culture. However, the problem with such dichotomous reasoning is that it oversimplifies how adherents rhetorically acknowledge or deny, for example by redefining the label 'right-wing' as 'responsible', or 'left wing' as 'compassionate'. Accordingly, ideology is viewed by rhetorically-minded thinkers as a resource for promoting "particular set[s] of effects" rather than a system of knowledge, beliefs and practices per se (Eagleton, 1991, p.194).

Accordingly, ideology is about its adherents imagining the world in ways which aspire to be seen as 'truth' and become 'commonsense' (Billig, 1991, 1996). Eagleton (1991, p.199) argues that its end point is to orchestrate "a 'naturalisation' of social reality". DP work concerned with ideology builds on this concern with construction, building on post-Marxist theory to investigate the ways in which ideological discourse is used to reinforce or transform the argumentative fabric of society, in a battle to attain hegemony between counter-narratives (e.g., Billig, 1991; Wetherell, 1998). This thesis accordingly builds on this approach by studying how citizens and migrants are "implicated in the very instantiation and maintenance of social and economic relations" (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.60). Ideology is therefore viewed as a patterned form of action, not simply categorical or logical, but active, compelling and persuasive in the fabric of social life (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). This conception of ideology underpins the discussion of balkanism in Chapter I. The construction of specific forms of Romanianness produce specific sets of

effects that structure power relations between parties: for example civilisation superiority by a travel writer reporting on the simplistic habits of the peasantry, or misrecognition as a country is deemed as an aspiring and unequal partner in international institutional memberships (e.g., Hammond, 2006, 2007; Mirela, 2012).

The implication that ideology is rhetorical – that it can be claimed (or denied), justified (or criticised), and legitimated (or discredited) – means that it is solely reliant upon argumentation and dilemma management (Billig, Condor, Edwards, Gane, Middleton, & Radley, 1988). Drawing on Protagoras, Billig (1996) argues that all thought (i.e., unsaid discourse) and discourse is 'dialogical'. By not acknowledging this context, Billig argues, "argumentative meaning will be lost" (1996, p.121). This maps nicely onto Shotter's own work as he cites Bakhtin to make sense of the 'third' space between speakers whereupon people "live in a world of others' words" (Shotter, 1992, p.6). Billig's observation can be applied to the example of migration discourse: by advocating a need for greater border control to prevent 'illegal' migration, someone is opposing (without stating) greater freedoms for individuals to travel. This thesis therefore views ideology as invoking recognisable commonplaces or metaphors to create specific patterns of action in talk or text (Verkuyten, 2003). Ideological effects are "practical discursive action[s] linked to power", whereby as analysts we explore (and to different extents critique) how:

> "the effect of truth is created...and in how certain discursive mobilisations become powerful – so powerful that they are the orthodoxy, almost entirely persuasive, beyond which we can barely think. To describe a piece of discourse as ideological, therefore, is an interpretative act; it is a claim about the power of talk and its effects" (Wetherell, 2003, p.14).

Thus, to summarise, the current study conceives of ideology as being the interpreted content of discourse that espouse specific patterns of actions or effects that connote power relations between individuals or groups (Eagleton, 1991; Wetherell, 1998). Often manifesting as an implicit undercurrent of rhetorical practice, it is recognised that the argumentative context is of central importance to interpreting ideology in action (Billig, 1991). This directly relates back to the discussion of balkanism as a particular frame by which to situate the current study's discursive focus. As ideology is embedded rhetorically, it stands to reason that talk about Romanians can be interpreted as balkanist depending upon the interpretation of the meanings in said talk. Contestation then becomes a feature of ideological struggle over what should be counted as 'truth' (Light & Young, 2009).

'Context' as a situational-cultural frame

The Latin origins of 'context' lie in the root words 'together' ('con') and 'to weave' ('textere') (Harper, 2015). Shotter's (1993a, 1999b) characterisation of constructionism views context as a 'third' space whereby co-participants reflexively interpret their own and others' sense-making practices, drawing on Bakhtin to frame it as a 'chain of communication', where meanings are 'woven' together, producing what becomes recognised as 'conversations' of a given speech genre. 'Context' in this sense forms a hermeneutic circle where interpretations are continually re-described and reinterpreted (Calder, 2003).

Across the DA traditions, the boundary of 'context' is hotly contested, with scholars interested in discourse debating how much 'context' should be included in transcripts (Griffin, 2007a, 2007b; ten Have, 2002; Henwood, 2007; Lynch, 2002; Potter, 2002; Potter & Hepburn, 2005, 2007; Speer, 2002a, 2002b), whether or how analysts incorporate exogenous features to explain discourse (Billig, 1999a, 1999b; Campbell, 2004; Coyle & Walton, 2004; Edwards & Stokoe, 2004; Korobov & Bamberg, 2004a, 2004b; Schegloff, 1997, 1999a, 1999b; Wetherell, 1998), to what extent categories can be used to make sense of accounts (Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002; Stokoe, 2012; Schegloff, 1997, 2007) and even to what extent specific terms permit the framing of a coherent 'context' at all (e.g., 'postmodernism', 'relativism') (Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Edwards et al., 1995; Hammersley, 2003; Hibberd, 2001; McLennan, 2001; O'Neill, 1995; Parker, 1990, 1998, 1999; Potter, 2003; Potter, Edwards, & Ashmore, 1999; Potter et al., 1990). Thus 'context' is clearly a contentious matter in how its meaning applies to procedures in DA approaches.

In particular, CAs ethno-methodological tradition views this process of 'weaving' as exclusively about maintaining alignment between participants (Heritage, 1984). Schegloff (1997) notably argues that 'context' should entail analysts focus 'endogenously' on participant orientations to maintain this alignment, in opposition to self-avowed 'critical' approaches that articulate 'academic imperialism' by imposing 'exogenous' (arbitrary and unempirical) frameworks. These 'critical' approaches, such as critical discourse studies (CDS; van Dijk, 2000b), conversely, view 'context' as something not only constructed and oriented to by participants, but also a discursive "frame... that provides resources for the appropriate interpretation" (Verkuyten, 2003, p.140). In this sense, context is a situational structuring of talk, whether linguistic, situational and/or cultural (Song, 2010). Responding

to Schegloff's (1997) argument against 'academic imperialism', Wetherell (1998) argues that Schegloff's promotion of conversation analysis (CA) instead fails to demonstrate how local features of talk explain the cultural situatedness of how certain issues or practices become salient. In another paper, in a related vein, Wetherell argues that the benefits of recognising this broader context means that one can elucidate "...the cultural resources people have available for telling their patch of the world" (2003, p.13). Also challenging Schegloff, Billig (1999a) points out how CA legitimises problematic actions owing to treating speakers as having 'equal' agentive status and alleging itself as showing analytic neutrality. Billig (1999b) further argues that CAs own analytical rhetoric unavoidably invokes 'exogenous' claims due to conducting explanatory rather than descriptive analysis.

This thesis concurs that it is possible to characterise context in a way that recognises the value of both traditions (Wetherell, 1998). For example, context can be understood as a dynamic reproduction and reshaping of moral order through the practices of interactants (Heritage, 1984; Jayussi, 1984). However, within this moral order particular ideas dominate, owing to "cultural rules, conditions and practices that govern how people talk", which shape and constrain the expression and interpretative meaning in ways that "sound authentic, meaningful, and worth saying" (Lindstrom, 1992, p.102). For the purposes of constructing and sustaining social identities and relations (Ibáñez, 1997), contexts vary due to how different groups imagine themselves and others in accordance with their own histories, languages, ideologies, values, customs, and practices (Billig, 1995). Accordingly, we are positioned in this milieu, for when "...we write culture...[it] is not an innocent practice" (Denzin, 2001, p.23). By identifying the historicity of "conceptual resources that people take as natural and self-evident", their contingency can be shown (Verkuyten, 2003, p.140). This thesis therefore argues that context should be seen in both a situational and cultural sense, impactful both in how people embody specific interactional customs as well as invoke broader sense-making resources to shape and constrain the interpretative possibilities of identity and belonging. Billig (2008, p.10) argues that such a project entails that one studies "how history creates patterns of thinking–how social processes create the individual mind". Thus, context can be temporally framed as *both* past and present. It may unfold in situ as a lived moment, but the spectre of history will equally inform its manifestation. Concurring with Wetherell (1998, p.388) this recognition reflects an aspiration for a "synthetic approach" that seeks to "weave a range of influences".

The current study's delimitation of analytic 'context' is also informed by the constructionist epistemology being adopted, for a key tenet of this position is to interrogate "...dominant, taken-for-granted understandings of reality" (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002, p.176). Viewed in this way, both the research and analytic 'context' is situated within a nest of lived accountss and civic politics requiring debate and resolution. Disengaging from this context might imply political naivety (Billig, 1999a) or even that the researcher aspires to be impervious to the reflexive dilemma of a rhetorician analysing rhetoric (Billig, 1996). This thesis approaches the topic of Romanian identity and migration concerned with its construction as a social problem, as per its realisation in national and local politics post-accession (Light & Young, 2009). Accordingly, such accounts are viewed as having a history informed by ideological traditions, something the analyst must themselves be reflective of as they too are immersed in such discourse (Billig et al., 1988).

To summarise, this thesis treats context as an ongoing relationship between 'society' in its ineffable-yet-recognisable forms and the in situ practices of interactants, continually reproducing forms of knowledge as much as evolving and reshaping them. History is embedded in our discourse, and, accordingly, is a necessary consideration for the DA approach adopted in the current study.

The thesis' analytic approach has now been outlined. This initially included the epistemological approach to knowledge taken, epistemic constructionism. It followed by a review of DA and its multifarious strands, with 'critical discursive psychology' adopted as the tradition the current study's follows. The recognition of 'ideology' as an interpretation and claim of patterned action or effect embedded within discourse was then discussed, and finally debates over analytic 'context' as understood across DA was reviewed, with the current study viewing it as both a cultural and situational frames co-constructing in situ meanings. Below, the thesis' methodological approach is outlined, which will include data choice rationale, the receiving society voice data and analytic procedure adopted, and the mover voice data and analytic procedure adopted.

Methodological approach: discursive study of receiving society and mover discourse

> "media events, such as television and radio programmes, press conferences and newspaper articles are networked: connected interactively, thematically and argumentatively" (Leudar et al., 2004, p.245)

This thesis' topical focus is constructions of Romanian identity and migration in the UK context leading up to and following the lifting of transitional controls in January 2014. Owing to the conclusions made from the literature review in Chapter I, it was clear that methodological considerations would need to incorporate recognition of the importance of both receiving society and mover voices, not to mention the dialogical complexities within each voice too (Shotter, 1993b). Therefore, a dual-site discourse analysis, an established albeit rarer instance of research (e.g., Leudar et al., 2004) was selected to encapsulate the thesis' methodological approach.

Data choice rationale

In Chapter I, three relevant research approaches (SIT, SCT, AT, and citizenship studies) were reviewed and critiqued before the current study rationale was situated as building on the third reviewed approach, specifically citizenship studies in social psychology. However, for methodological purposes the current study also drew upon the conceptual resources reviewed for SIT (Tajfel, 1970) and AT (Berry, 2005). SITs distinction between the individual and their actions towards defining with or against certain group identities is a useful way of understanding their social actions. ATs characterisation of migration as being a dialogue between the 'receiving society' and moving actors with emergent acculturative implications was particularly drawn upon to make sense of how the study's data could be framed. Balkanism studies and its emphasis on the contestation of 'truth' over national identity over time was an additional feature that having a dual-site methodology would meet by investigating multiple situated voices.

As this thesis is a dual-site discursive study of receiving society and mover voices with regards to Romanian identity and migration, two datasets would be required. The data choice rationale, shaped by DP, was initially shaped by a preference for 'naturally-occurring' data; that is, for data unfolding in situ not influenced by a researcher's motivations or agendas as it would occur whether they were present or not (Potter, 2004). It was thought that a core advantage would be that such data would not be constrained by imposed meanings 'contrived' by the researcher, allowing for more direct exploration of the research question because the data would be focused and could be accumulated more efficiently than producing it from scratch (see Goodman & Speer, 2015). 'Contrived' data, by contrast, might have too many problems when compared to a 'naturally-occurring' alternative (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). While this is argued to be the case, 'naturally-

occurring' data as a benchmark for researcher involvement is nigh impossible to meet, for the researcher's presence is never completely absent from the datasets: involvement may require gaining ethical consent, practical access to set up recording devices, or delimiting transcription to meet the level needed for the study (Speer, 2002a). Further, 'contrived' data also implies participants are dominated by the researcher, when participants can be very sensitively attuned to the mutual interests of the research and participant (Griffin, 2007a). Nonetheless, either choice of data is dependent upon what is available at the time.

While for the receiving society discourse there was an abundance of available 'naturally-occurring' sources (e.g., television, radio, and online media), this was not the case for the mover discourse. After several failed attempts to source appropriate local sources attuned to narratives of identity and movement, the preference for 'naturally-occurring' data was sidelined to prioritise the producing a dataset of mover voices located within, and speaking to, receiving society discourse. Primarily this was a practical consideration over principle as it would ensure a suitable corpus could be assembled and analysed appropriately in the timeframe. In hindsight, it can be argued that actually this researcher 'contrived' setting was potentially more illuminating anyway (Speer, 2002a). Building on Leudar et al.'s (2008) exploration of how refugees attend to media discourse, the current study's concern for identity, movement and belonging (where no contemporary data was available) will allow for exploration of how mover voices explicitly organised their lived accounts in relation to receiving society discourse. Comparable 'naturally-occurring' data, even if it were it available (e.g., in an online forum), would not produce as much data as this 'contrived' alternative, nor as conversationally owing to its different expression.

Thus, the corpus that was collected for the receiving society discourse comprised secondary data: two topical debate and current affairs programmes broadcasted on the BBC: *Question Time* (hereby 'QT') and *The Andrew Marr Show* (hereby 'TAMS'). This data was chosen particularly because both samples' extracts were publically accessible online and could be harvested easily from video platform websites, such as BBC iPlayer. The dataset were selected on the basis that as public institutional discourse, their content was both communicative between interactants (following specific, well-rehearsed and widely-respected conventions) as well as being intended for a wider audience, one which was well-defined owing to both shows' broadcast schedules (Livingstone & Lunt, 1994; Scannell, 1991). These samples also embody the argumentative texture of public discourse

of the receiving society during a time when Romanian identity and migration was deemed worthy of discussion (e.g., Fox J. et al., 2012; Moroșanu & Fox J., 2013). Similarly, being current affairs programmes, they juggle the political, journalistic and sociological concerns of the day; this offered a useful theoretical insight into the ongoing concerns of Romanian identity and migration in relation to other broader social and political issues. Further, there was utility in gathering data from two related-yet-distinct subgenres: whereas QT involves panel/audience debate with audience questions selected by the editors, TAMS political interviews are between the presenter-interviewer and politician-interviewee with an imagined audience, drawing upon a relatively broad-brush array of contemporary questions with the usual demands of politicians to orient to issues of fact construction and accountability.

Due to the thesis' interest in identity constructions and ideological effects, while the datasets are presented as 'receiving society' discourse, such a label does not espouse to represent the 'entirety' of society, nor does it presume that there is an equal representation of voices contributing to discourse (van Dijk, 2000a). Similarly, it is only one subgenre of television media: drama, comedy, and/or documentary are but three examples of possible alternative samples which a future study could investigate. The same genre may also vary slightly across the broadcast channel (although the inclusion of adverts was deemed a transcription nuisance and would yield shorter duration of data). Finally, it is recognised that micro-level nuances in the interactional set up (such as those found in CA) between the two data sources are analytically consequential even if they are not the focus of the current study (cf. Greatbatch, 1998). One such example is topic digression, where speakers start on one issue then deviate; such problems are occasional features in live broadcast political programmes, and would not be found in a recorded documentary, for example.

Despite having the same priorities for the mover discourse, after much research no pre-established corpus of data could be found. Thus primary data needed to be generated. Semi-structured interviews were chosen as the method of data collection as it was an appropriate way of gathering rich, focused narrative-driven discourse that could speak to the issues pertinent to receiving society discourse (e.g., Denzin, 2003; Silverman, 1997). The possibility of a focus group design was considered at an earlier phase. Focus groups are an obvious possibility from the perspective of emulating the QT data already gathered for the receiving society. However, a focus group design would create problems not easily circumvented for this study. First, is the participant numbers – presuming a similar number

of Romanians participants could be recruited ten would yield no more than three groups (it was deemed too challenging socially and ethically to bring together individuals from both receiving and Romanian communities). With the possibility of some speaking more than others, this meant the data could gravitate around particular speakers. Another factor lay in the chemistry, which is not easily managed if considering the insider/outsider dynamic, both between the participants and the chair and possibly even between speakers. From a perspective of certainty over the data quantity, it felt more appropriate to interview ten people and narratively explore individually. With the possibility of a larger sample and more time/capacity to recruit, focus groups would have been a more feasible; however the time and sample constraints entailed that interviews were a more prudent method choice.

Receiving society data: acquisition and appropriation

> "And now, what's going to happen to us without barbarians? They were, those people, a kind of solution." (Cavafy, 1992, *Waiting for the Barbarians,* pp.18-19)

Once the data was selected for this dataset, advice was sought through the supervisory team from an independent source as to any possible legal issues regarding transcribing and reproducing the dataset in a research study as at the point of selection it was publically accessible online and that does not always entail public availability with regards to reproduction. The independent source confirmed it could be transcribed and reproduced as part of an examined research study.

The QT sample involved listening to a total of 76 episodes between 2012 through to early 2015. This marked the earliest point in the relevant period where entire episodes were available to listen to (at the point of data collection). Segments of the programmes that included questions on Romanian migration or topics such as culture, the economy, or education that invoked migration were selected. Of the episodes available, 13 discussions matched this criterion and were therefore selected. This comprised over four hours worth of data, which was copied into a new document to form the analysable dataset. This was deemed a manageable data quantity for the current study's purposes of a dual-site analysis.

The TAMS sample comprised 301 interviews between January 2012 and December 2014 were available as transcripts online (BBC, n.d.). A key word search was carried out using the terms "Roma", "immigration", and "EU" to isolate a manageable sample

focusing upon issues pertaining to Romanian migration. ("Roma" as morpheme was selected as it could flag a number of related words: Romania, Roma, Romanian, etc.) This search yielded 19 interviews; upon further inspection, three of them did not invoke Romanian identity and/or migration in meaningful depth, so 16 were taken forward for further investigation and analysis. For each interview, sequences of talk relevant to the topic were copied over into a new document to comprise the final analysable dataset, as with the QT data acquisition strategy. While many of the transcripts were retained in their original form, some symbols were changed to correspond them with the notations used in this thesis (e.g., where a speaker's turns ended and/or the next speaker turn begin with "(...)", they were replaced with "=" to in accordance with Jeffersonian conventions).

The dataset comprising the 'receiving society' discourse included 13 QT sequences and 16 TAMS interviews (see Appendix viii and ix for full details). Both were transcribed according to a limited version of the Jeffersonian system which included pauses, emphasis, intonation, elongation, overlap, latched talk, self-correction, and pertinent contextual features (Jefferson, 2004; see Appendix vi). While precise verbal components were included, prosodic, paralinguistic and extra-linguistic elements were not because the analysis conducted only necessitated enough detail so that particular patterns in description and rhetorical effects could be derived (Griffin, 2007; O'Connell & Kowal, 1995). See Table i for a summary of the receiving society discourse dataset.

Table i: summarises the receiving society discourse dataset

Initial data	**Criteria**	**Analysed dataset**	**Total data**
Question Time (QT) episodes x76 Dec 2012 - Dec 2014	Questions on Romanian identity and/or migration or relevant topics e.g., social/economic aspects of migration	13 relevant question/ debate extracts, 13-12-12 - 11-12-14	252 mins 26s, 51,579 words 5,186 lines
The Andrew Marr Show (TAMS) interviews x301 Jan 2012- Dec 2014	Keyword search including: "Roma", "immigration", and "EU"	Relevant extracts from 16 interviews, 11-11-12 - 12-10-14.	36 pages 13,128 words 1,189 lines

Receiving society voice: approaching the media discourse

For this dataset, two main considerations had to be made regarding its analysis. Firstly, as was covered in Chapter I, there is an ideological legacy, balkanism, that should be acknowledged as a potentially relevant framework of ideological 'unknowable knowables' (e.g., Fleming, 2000). Analysis of receiving society discourse should be sensitive to this, yet fine-grained enough to attend to the rhetorical features that enable its realisation. Therefore, an interpretative repertoire analysis was decided as suitable, owing to how it pays attention to "specific construction...placement in a sequence of discourse and to...rhetorical organization" (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.93).

While the conventions in each speech genre for this dataset varied, they share a common concern for the reproduction and contestation of prevalent socio-political arguments. Interpretative repertoire analysis was chosen as the analytic approach as it is concerned with documenting "culturally familiar and habitual line[s] of argument comprised of recognizable themes, common places and tropes" (Wetherell, 1998, p.400). It enables consideration of how discourse invokes cultural sense-making in situ on a given socio-political issue, with prior studies showing how this can be achieved with investigations on issues such as scientific dispute (Burchell, 2007; Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984), domestic abuse and self-harm (Croghan & Miell, 1999; Lindgren et al., 2011), young people's academic or social aspirations (Hernandez-Martinez, Black, Williams, Davis, Pampaka & Wake, 2008; Keller & Kalmus, 2009), or elderly people's reflections of ageing, competence and self-control (Jolanki, Jylhä, & Hevonen, 2000; Lumme-Sandt, Hevonen, & Jylha, 2000; Rypi, 2012). Such studies drawing upon interpretative repertoire analysis demonstrate the utility a qualitative approach concerned with coding data empirically whilst also attending to the critical dimension that identified repertoires have in maintaining and/or transforming cultural knowledge.

Interpretative repertoire analysis is an approach that straddles the discourse analytic spectrum. While not as fine-grained as CA, as data-driven as thematic analysis, or as overtly critical as CDS, repertoire analysis was once viewed as a tool within the DP toolkit (e.g., Potter & Wetherell, 1987). As DP has fragmented, it remains as an often cited yet underused method, with descriptions of classic rather than contemporary examples illustrating this (see e.g., Wooffitt, 2005). In early DP repertoire analysis was about identifying how patterns of argument were augmented using common rhetorical features.

This has gradually moved as more ideologically-concerned array of studies have linked the enactment of social actions to power effects such as racism, prejudice, sexism, violence (Gibson, 2012; Goodman, 2010; Tileagă, 2006b). This study argues that repertoire analysis remains a very useful way of exploring common patterns of argument across a dataset while remaining concerned with the rhetorical construction of meaning. Further, when linked to Balkanism studies as an historical anchor, the interpretation of tropes, metaphors to construct social psychological realities can be demonstrably linked to their contingent historical origin.

In keeping with the overarching aim to analyse how the receiving society constructed Romanian identity and migration, attention is given to "prevalent argumentative and rhetorical practices" that mobilise interpretative repertoires (Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.105). When doing repertoire analysis, like any qualitative analysis, the early phases of repertoire analysis rely the coding of the data, which essentially involves looking for chunks of meaning. They can be the collection of several themes Thus, the study drew on Braun and Clarke's (2006) widely cited recommendations for coding qualitative data and ideas from Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Billig (1996) for identifying discursive patterns. Note that because the question was concerned with common lines of argument, the analysis was not interpreting 'themes' alone as repertoires must also be located culturally, expressively, and historically. This analytic procedure occurred in seven phases.

Phase one: research question. The research question was concerned with how discourse was used to construct psychological and social realities (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Originally this started by asking 'how do speakers construct Romanian identity and migration to Britain?', evolving as common arguments and rhetorical strategies were identified to ask 'what are the common patterns/effects of Romanian identity and migration constructions'.

Phases two and three: data and transcription. The dataset was finalised as 13 question-answer sequences (QT) and 16 interviews (TAMS) (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). The dataset was transcribed verbatim using Jeffersonian conventions (see Appendix vi).

Phase four: reading/familiarisation. Different strategies were used to familiarise and interpret the data in order to examine it "...creatively in all of its multifarious aspects" (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p.91). This was a "...lengthy process of 'living with' one's data, reading, re-reading and following up hunches" (Lawes, 1999, p.5). The data was (re)read

with observations taken of notable ideas (content) and features (form). By this point the data was familiar enough that the transcripts could be read consistently as expressed on the audio file.

Phase five: coding/grouping. The data was inductively coded for metaphors and tropes relevant to the research question asking how 'Romanian identity and migration' was constructed (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Codes concerning migration and/or society (being most relevant to the research question) were prioritised (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). An array of well-established metaphors concerning container, home and nature/disaster in relation to 'immigration' and 'the nation' were interpreted (nation-as-container, migration-as-disaster, nation-as-home, society-as-ladder; cf. Ana, 1997, 1999; Charteris-Black, 2006; Musolff, 2004). Henceforth, the coded extracts became the analysis' focal point.

Phase six: repertoire grouping. Codes sharing patterned meanings were grouped to form preliminary repertoires (Wetherell, 1998). Two repertoires relevant to the research question and one group comprising miscellaneous items were created. The contents of the miscellaneous group were double-checked to ensure that its contents were dissociable (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and the two relevant repertoires were subsequently taken forward for further analysis (Potter & Wetherell, 1995). The first, the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire', involved primarily container and disaster metaphors ("breaking point", "we're full", "pressure", "intolerable strain") and phrases invoking the nation, its borders, and migration as a force ("control our borders", "influx of migrants"), whereas the other, the 'civic imperative' repertoire, involved metaphors such as nation-as-home and society-as-ladder ("they just use us as a dormitory", "undercutting our British workers") and phrases invoking unfairness and illegitimacy ("claim benefits", "tension within communities"). The repertoires had different representations of migration and the migrant: while 'mass movement' often concerned *migration* (qua either a *process* or *event*), 'national challenge' concerned elusive migrant individuals/groups. Their different ontological emphases further dissociated them ('disaster' exposure due to 'open' borders is a requisite for alleged abuse/unfairness due to civic infiltration). The repertoires were then reinvestigated for common drivers of argumentation.

Phase seven: repertoire-use. The repertoires were validated by investigating their argumentative distinctiveness. Because "discourse bears the active traces of...struggle" (Englebert, 2012, p.63), it was deemed appropriate to reinvestigate the dataset for how the repertoires were used for justificatory or oppositional arguments or "logoi" (Billig, 1991,

p.181). Two competing logoi/anti-logoi were identified in the relevant extracts for each repertoire (Billig, 1996): threat-reliance and burden-contribution. Some extracts invoked danger and finiteness (*threat* logoi), while others constructed migration as economically necessary (*reliance* logoi). Conversely, other extracts presented migrants as problematic and/or abusive (*burden* logoi), others presented migrant as contributory members (*contribution* logoi). 'Threat' and 'burden' logoi were commonly invoked, while reliance and contribution appeared as less frequent counter-arguments (cf. Billig, 1996). The 'vulnerable nation' repertoire primarily involved 'threat' and 'reliance' logoi which generally converged towards constructions of the nation as an 'island' and migration as a separate 'force'; conversely the 'civic imperative' repertoire primarily invoked 'burden' and 'contribution' logoi which drew distinctions between 'citizens' and 'migrants'. These relations could be damaging (threat and burden logoi) or benevolent (reliance and contribution logoi).

In sum, the analytic process initially interpreted the repertoires through common use of metaphors and tropes. After coding two groups their respective argumentative emphases were investigated by how they deployed recurring arguments i.e., the logoi of 'threat' or 'burden' or the anti-logoi of 'reliance' or 'contribution'. Thus the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires were interpreted within the dataset. While the analysis proper will particularly draw upon Billig (1996) to highlight how the repertoires are flagged through their logoi use, the analysis proper will be concerned with the ways they were variably bolstered by in situ rhetoric which will draw chiefly upon the established literature of discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992).

Mover data: acquisition and appropriation

> "Since scarce one family is left alive, Which does not from some foreigner derive." (Defoe, 2006, p.178, *The True Born Englishman*)

The mover discourse data comprised ten interviews, each conducted by myself between 2014 and 2015 with Romanians living in Sheffield. Ethical approval for the materials and study was first gained (Appendix i & ii). Because of the study's exploratory aims and no pre-established 'social' network, a small number of relevant groups and societies were contacted regarding the study aims and call for participation (see Appendix iii and v). This was thus a combined 'blind purposive' sampling strategy, advertising for

participants that identified as 'being Romanian and living in the UK' happy to explore their narratives of movement and belonging (see Appendix iv for the interview schedule).

The participants comprising the sample was bound not just geographically, but also according to my advertising efforts in the timeframe available and the rapport I had with two of the research participants who kindly informed a couple of their friends. The sample, while they were evenly split across age and gender and identified as being from all three regions of Romania, urban and rural, and from different class backgrounds, is not argued to be demographically representative (e.g., four of the ten identified as Catholic alone; two identified with the Hungarian minority and none identified as Roma, an unanticipated spread in a Romanian sample). The study approached the sample as sharing a social space, negotiating and disputing the receiving society by speaking their own truths in their lived accounts. These accounts were not seen as having essences to predict the views of their representative 'group', but how their ideas of belonging were embedded socially.

The interviews were organised to be semi-structured. This reflected a desire to create a less formal situation which would enable me to establish rapport and embody my aim to present the study to participants as a researcher foremost but also a fellow citizen wanting to display empathy and solidarity for their reflections (see Appendix vii). Drawing on Shotter (1993a), solidarity "simply means...one cares about establishing common ground with [people] *when required*" (original emphasis, pp.20-21). It was determined that the research process should be premised against "discrimination...exclusion and exploitation and for emancipation, self-determination and...recognition" (Reisigl & Wodak, 2001, cited in Wrbuschek, 2009). The interview schedule was accordingly organised to include questions that asked participants to reflect on Romanian identity, migration, their sense of local and civic belonging, and broader political issues of national identity, Europeanness, and movement rights (see Appendix iv). The question order was derived from AT, with the narrative moving from preparation, movement, and (non-)adjustment (Berry, 2003). While keen to explore participant accounts, questions were not intended to sound 'neutral' or gather 'information', but rather used as a guide to position myself and my questions as a sympathetic and keen, albeit unknowledgeable, confidant. In particular some of the latter questions were flavoured to capture salient political questions should participants wish to present their own replies. The relationship was layered, as I could have been viewed as an 'outsider' of the participants' lived accounts, an 'insider' in regards to the receiving society, as well as 'in-between' as rapport and acquaintanceship was established (cf.

Dwyer & Buckle, 2009). The main aim was to establish a professional, friendly relationship characterised by common purpose and respect. As Denzin (2001) writes:

> "the reflexive, dialogic, or performative interview...is a privilege...a part of a moral community...part of the dialogic conversation that connects all of us...performance events...[that] transform information into shared experience...to use language in a way that brings people together" (p.24)

As participants responded to the call for participants, some volunteered to inform colleagues/friends which helped 'snowball' the sample. Over the course of six months, 10 interviews comprising over one hour each (some as long as two) were gathered (see Appendix x). At 11,278 lines of data (137,638 words), this was deemed sufficient depth for an exploratory study focused on discourse combined with the amount of receiving society data. Once collected, the data was transcribed according to Jeffersonian conventions as described for the other dataset (Jefferson, 2004). Due to this thesis' concern with exploring constructions of identity and belonging in self-defined Romanian accounts, it was decided that the most the appropriate strategy for delimiting the data into manageable quantities would involve re-formatting the transcripts so that participant answers to my questions were 'collapsed' together to form a series of flowing, topical sequences: narratives that invoked a particular experience, issue or attitude. While some (e.g., Roulston, 2008) argue that this decision is a potential pitfall, this effective removal of the interviewers' presence from the analysis was deemed concordant with the aims of the thesis to explore self-defined Romanian voices from a rhetorical perspective concerned with the social and ideological effects of their talk. As Griffin (2007b) argues, what matters here is that transcripts "suit the type of analysis...common in the qualitative social research tradition" within which the study falls within (p.286). While it was acknowledged that micro conversational features would have co-opted such talk to take place in various places of the transcripts, it is argued that pursuing such places would have resulted in addressing analytical questions not central to this thesis. In addition, addressing them would require a level of analytic detail that would distract from the rhetorical features promoting the interpretation of ideological effects. (Extracts will be presented with a page number from Appendix x should the reader wish to consult the original transcript to explore participant accounts in tandem with interviewer contributions.)

As per the agreement in the consent forms, participants were given pseudonyms and revealing details were omitted from the transcripts; this was interpreted liberally so that

references to occupations, locations, relationships or other details could make someone identifiable were removed. A summary of participant details, presented in chronological order of the interviews that took place, is shown in Table ii (see Appendix x for details on their occurrence). The details included in Table ii were acquired during the meeting prior to the interviews or during the interview itself; they are only intended as supplementary details, not implied to be definitive or consequential in understanding the dataset itself.

Table ii: documents basic demographic information of the ten interviewees

Pseudonym	**Gender, Age**	**Nationality, Region of origin**	**Arrived**	**Migratory inspiration**
Luminita	Woman, early 30s	Romanian; Moldavia	2012	Education, Work
Alexandru	Man, early 20s	Romanian; Moldavia	2010	Education, Work
Felix	Man, early 20s	Romanian; Moldavia	2011	Education
Anna	Woman, early 20s	Romanian; Wallachia	2013	Education, Travel
Marina	Woman, mid 20s	Romanian; Wallachia	2010	Education, Travel
Alina	Woman, late 20s	Romanian-British; Moldavia	2005	Work, Education, Family
Constanta	Woman, late 30s	Romanian; Wallachia	2002	Family, Work
Andrei	Man, early 40s	Romanian-British; Transylvania	2000	Work, Education
Violeta	Woman, early 30s	Romanian; Transylvania	2007	Work, Family
Gheorghe	Man, early 40s	Romanian-British; Transylvania	2003	Work, Family

Mover voice: approaching the narrative interview discourse

The interview as a formal exercise is one of "the most common and...powerful ways we use to try to understand our fellow human beings" (Fontana & Frey, 1994, p.361). Indeed, Denzin (2001) argues that the interview, as "a way of writing the world, a way of bringing the world into play", has come to symbolise "a society which knows itself through the reflective gaze of the cinematic apparatus" (pp.23-25). This legacy of narrative 'confession' developed out of traditions such as the pastor's interview whereby subjects were prompted to "extract and produce a truth which binds one to the person who directs one's conscience" (Foucault, cited in Välikangas & Seeck, 2011). While the interview has undergone a range of historical 'moments' framing its "meanings, forms and uses", there is recognition today that it should be viewed as a "perfectly miniature and coherent world in its own right" (Denzin, 2001, p.25). By adopting the interview to explore narrated stories, this thesis has embraced the 'narrative turn' by approaching the interview reflexively, where meanings are contextual, improvised and performative (Dillard, cited in Denzin, 2001). Such an approach recognises that "understandings of who we are...derive from...wider social and cultural contexts", a melding of continuity and transformation in our narrative articulations (Taylor, S., 2006, p.94). In this sense, the focal point is how personal and social meanings weave into the "webs of significance" (Geertz, 1973, p.5) that comprise the moral politics of identity and their ideological consequences in cultural context. The term 'lived accounts' will be used where appropriate to highlight this perspective towards interview data as performed stories with personal meaning and reflection, with my interpretation recognising that their stories are their constructed reality.

Accordingly there is a recognition that the narrative aim of this analysis must meet with the thesis' broader concern with the construction of identity in cultural context. While an interpretative repertoire analysis (as carried out in Chapter III) could explore the common identity-driven reconstructions or ripostes by migrants responding to imposed narratives of the receiving society, it might not acknowledge "the identity work taking place in an expanded context", that is, that their life narratives are "a construction which is resourced by previous constructions aggregat[ing] over time" (Taylor, S., 2006, p.101). Thus, it is argued that an approach was needed that is both attentive to the argumentative facets of participant accounts that speak to the moral politics of citizenship and their ideological consequences, while being more concerned with *narrative* claims of belonging

(Shotter, 1993a). As Griffin (2007b) argues, this kind of approach is useful for conceptualising

> "talk and other activities generated in and by the research encounter...as drawing on cultural discourses with resonances beyond the immediate context of the research encounter" (p.286).

Indeed, a point that can be extrapolated from the Balkanism studies literature is that 'lived accounts' voices have been seconded on discourse concerning Romanian identity (cf. Hammond, 2006; Light & Young, 2009; Oprea, 2012). A DA concerned with citizenship and belonging (Shotter, 1993a) was therefore deemed suitable for Chapter IV, as it recognises the narrative intelligibility of people's migratory and civic sense-making as a genre of identity discourse. There is a further aspect here concerning the researcher's own positionality; for throughout the research process, analysis requires an acknowledgement that we as "human agents find ourselves within a context which things are already going on or being done" (Willig, 1998, p.95). This thesis has been assembled in the wake of the shift from the liberal citizenship outlined by T. Marshall (1950) and others towards its contemporary transformation into the 'modes' of civic alterity that discern the 'migrant' from the citizen or the 'worker' from the 'scrounger' (e.g., Anderson, 2013; Gibson, 2010, 2011). The analyst, as much as the speakers in the data, is shaped by such transformations; recognising this interpretative context is an essential part of the research process (Gough & McFadden, 2001; Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Political moral decisions – such as studying an under-studied ethnic group encapsulated by conflicting receiving society discourse – influence how this context informs our interpretations and thereby the analytic production of knowledge (Willig, 1998). Such decisions are not themselves problematic, but require reflective consideration and undergo 'intersubjective' validation, whereby readers can understand methodological pathways or empirical claims (Wood & Kroger, 2000). One implication for this study was the divergence of analytic approaches taken for Chapters III and IV (outlined below). While both follow a "reflexive, historically sensitive method of analysis of the social" (Willig, 1998, p.92), that is, analyse how contemporary social actions, embedded within ideological legacy, constitute Romanian identity and belonging, their core interest lie in different themes.

A discursive analysis concerned with citizenship and belonging (Shotter, 1993a) was deemed a suitable enmeshment of the micro and macro, capable of addressing both the receiving society discourse and the need for a performative space sensitive to peoples'

moral need for due recognition (Denzin, 2001; Taylor, C., 1992). The procedure drew upon the established coding guidelines for qualitative data articulated by Braun and Clarke (2006). The data was coded to identify common patterns in the aim to interpret how participants' make sense of their lived social worlds rhetorically as a situated, voiced and performative practice (Shotter, 1993a). The analysis will analyse the identified stories and themes with concern how their accounts were justified or, where relevant, harnessed to enforce or dispute the ideological patterns of the receiving society's rhetorical context documented in Chapter III.

Phase one: research question. Initially, the analytic question for Chapter IV was broad, being concerned with exploring 'what common themes/stories help us understand what it's like to be Romanian?' This was concerned with how participants made sense of their movement and acculturation, their negotiation of challenges and adversity, to their sense of civic/neighbourly belonging. As the themes/stories were gathered, the analytical question then moved on to asked how discourse was used to construct, justify or dispute issues of personal experience or broader social issues using the established literature of discursive psychology (Edwards & Potter, 1992).

Phases two and three: sample/collection and transcription. As discussed above, the dataset was ten interviews carried out 2014-2015 with self-defined Romanians living in Sheffield (both men and women aged early-mid adulthood, identifying with upbringings in both urban/rural settings across Romania). The data was transcribed verbatim using linguistic Jeffersonian conventions necessary to do the analysis outlined (Jefferson, 2004).

Phase four: reading/familiarisation. The data was read many times in accordance with consideration for different possible interpretations, sometimes going back to the audio files and updating the transcripts (Wood & Kroger, 2000). The data was (re)read with observations taken of notable issues or evocative passages. It was during this process that the second transcript was made, whereby segments of participant talk were collapsed together to form narrative sequences to aid the analysis and de-emphasise the in situ relevance of my own contributions. While an undeniable social feature and littered with 'footprints' of my own interviewer ethics and/or eccentricities, for the analysis proper it was deemed unsuitable for empirical exploration given its distance to the current study's empirical concerns (Griffin, 2007a, 2007b).

Phase five: coding. After the reformatted transcripts were read several times, it was coded in a 'bottom-up' fashion to explore the thesis' focus on constructions of 'citizenship and belonging' through the sense-making of accounts (e.g., 'stories' 'reflections', 'feelings'). As per Braun and Clarke's (2006) articulation of a 'latent' emphasis, the approach was guided by a general interest in an issue with data-driven analysis.

Phase six: code grouping and theme construction. Codes were tentatively grouped together when they coalesced around common narrative identity claims and actions (Potter & Wetherell, 1987). Three code groupings were made initially: narrative identity constructions, acculturation accounts and private/public identity distinctions. Following this, the codes and data were re-investigated with common phrases and words re-investigated en masse to cross-examine the possibility that extracts could be coded more effectively. The groupings were made more internally consistent by renaming codes or in some places replacing them for an alternative, eventually establishing two themes: 'civic becoming', and 'civic belonging'.

Theme one, 'civic becoming', involved subtheme narratives of (a) 'acculturative preparedness, (b) 'overcoming otherness'. Theme two, 'civic belonging', by contrast involved asserting eligibility for belonging, with subtheme narratives of (a) 'integration and recognition', (b) 'shared values and common humanity', and (c) 'pathological integration'. Both were similarly concerned with managing the well-documented 'us and them' dichotomy (e.g., Capedvila & Callaghan, 2008; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Kilby, Horowitz, & Hylton, 2013; Lynn & Lea, 2003). However, there are also nuances in their articulation: while the former largely concerned the 'past', the latter invoked the 'present'; similarly, the past was about narratives of being a 'good' migrant or overcoming the politics of migrant identity, whereas the present was about narratives of being a 'good' citizen and thereby justify their eligibility to belong. Chapter IV is therefore organised in relation to these two themes, with two main sections that are each divided into three subthemes; these subthemes, while distinct to each other, directly feed into the main themes. While both themes articulate narrative struggles, they also speak to the balkanism themes (Fleming, 2000) drawn upon in Chapter III and will accordingly be flagged where relevant. Once outlined, the thesis will draw together the analysis in both Chapters III and IV and with a view to discuss their findings and implications (see Chapter V). This will speak to the thesis' second main aim to explore how both receiving society and mover voices make sense of Romanian identity and migration

Chapter review

This Chapter has surveyed the thesis' analytic and methodological approach. Two distinct datasets will capture the thesis' focus on Romanian identity and migration with acknowledgement of both 'receiving society' and 'immigrant' voices vis-a-vis secondary data (national television media) and primary data (narrative interviews). Rationale for the data, their acquisition and appropriation was discussed. The analytic approach with reference to constructionist epistemology, the appropriation of discourse, ideology and context were then outlined. Due to the researchers' concern with voice, differentiated analytical treatment of the datasets was justified; a common concern for rhetoric alongside divergent emphasises on ideology and narrative respectively (interpretative repertoire analysis of the receiving society and thematic DA of the mover discourse). The analytic procedures were described with the main findings outline in light of that process prior to the following Chapters which will document them in full.

Chapter III: Receiving society use of 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires

> "He wondered what the man's name was and where he came from; and if he was really evil at heart, or what lies or threats had led him on the long march from his home; and if he would not really rather have stayed there in peace." (Tolkien, 1954/1999, p.332)

Having discussed how the receiving society dataset was operationalised in Chapter II, Chapter III outlines the 'interpretative repertoire analysis' findings as informed by Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Billig (1991, 1996). Being culturally familiar and habitual lines of argument invoking recognisable themes and tropes (Potter & Wetherell, 1995; Wetherell, 1998), Chapter III supports the thesis' first main aim of investigating Romanian identity and migration discourse by studying prevalent argumentative and rhetorical practices that mobilise two repertoires in contemporary political discourse. In addition to outlining the dominant use of these repertoires, the analysis also considers how they were resisted and contested, in keeping with the critical aims of the thesis to interrogate the taken-for-granted and explore alternative versions (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Chapter III also partially supports the thesis' second main aim by exploring receiving society discourse in extracts of national television talk from *Question Time* (QT) and *The Andrew Marr Show* (TAMS) between 2012 and 2014, comprising one of two acculturative voices this thesis will explore. Chapter IIIs approach recognises that the social world is informed by "active, compelling and persuasive" ideologies that shape and are argued over in everyday life (Billig, 1996; Wetherell & Potter, 1992, p.61). Thus, the Chapter also supports the thesis' third main aim by historicising the discourse studied, drawing patterns between the dataset and ideological themes found in balkanism (Fleming, 2000).

Main findings and analytic structure

Chapter IIIs main concern is to perform a DA concerned with how speakers' argumentative and rhetorical practices are mobilised to realise one of two interpretative repertoires. The 'vulnerable nation' repertoire, following Chateris-Black (2006), invokes 'threat' logoi to construct the nation as an 'island' and migration as a hostile 'force', with opponents invoking 'reliance' logoi to recast migration as benevolent. Conversely the 'civic imperative' repertoire invokes 'burden' logoi to distinguish 'deserving' citizens

from ‘abusive’ migrants, with opponents using ‘contribution’ logoi to embrace migrants as equally deserving for their labour. Each repertoire will be considered in turn which will cover both their advocating and their resisting usages, with the different rhetorical features involved in their deployment being the chief analytic concern. It will thereby not only illustrate the “social significance and the social consequences of particular interpretative repertoires”, but also the ways in which repertoire logic can be disputed and transformed (Jørgensen & Phillips, 2002). Throughout the analytic discussion, the relevance of the two themes from Balkanism studies (‘ambiguity’ and ‘predictability’, cf. Fleming, 2000) will also be flagged. Concurring that interpretative repertoires are cultural “building blocks” (Wetherell & Potter, 1988, p.172), the analysis can be seen as a systematic investigation of a portion of the public discursive milieu shaping receiving society discourse concerning Romanian identity and migration circa 2014. The repertoire findings also develop previous work concerned with how nationhood is imagined to figuratively construct identity and demarcate its membership in accessible and efficient ways (Chateris-Black, 2006). To review the Chapter’s analytic structure, see Table iii. (Note: data is marked by both speech marks and italicised; speakers from QT will be marked as either (a) for audience member or (p) for panellist member; speakers from TAMS will marked (ir) for interviewer and (ie) for interviewee. For extract subheadings, RS equates to ‘receiving society’; (a)/(b) refers to QT/TAMS respectively.)

Table iii: summarises the analytic structure of Chapter III

	Description	**Analytical focus**
‘vulnerable nation’ repertoire	nation-migration acrimony; ‘threat’ logoi reinforce, ‘reliance’ logoi contest	Argumentative and rhetorical practices
Three subthemes	strategies for mobilising repertoire: (1) ‘corroborating finite space and infinite migration’, (2) ‘rallying ethno-national consensus against migrant threat’, and (3) ‘justifying threat as rational’	
Two prominent forms of resistance	for resisting repertoire: (1) ‘recasting metaphors’, and (2) ‘exposing stake and interest	

'Civic imperative' repertoire	migrant-citizen unfairness; 'burden' logoi reinforce, 'contribution' logoi contest	
Two subthemes	strategies for mobilising repertoire: (1) 'justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'', and (2) 'identity conflation and vagueness'	Argumentative and rhetorical practices
Two prominent forms of resistance	for resisting repertoire: (1) ''us' and 'we' identity claims', and (2) 'immigrant identity claims'	

The 'vulnerable nation' repertoire

Extract RS(a)1 (QT, Romford, 27th November 2014)

(a) Audience member I'm not against that, but the housing can't cope (.) nothing can cope. We've got to say, "Hold fire a minute. We're not against foreign people, we don't want to chuck people out (.) let's hold fire until we sort this mess out." Otherwise, everything is going to start collapsing (.) schools and everything.

Extract RS(a)2 (QT, Lincoln, 17th January 2013)

(a) Audience member Boston is at breaking point. All the locals can't cope anymore. (...) The facilities are at breaking point because of these people coming into the country, and no:thing is being done. There are hardly any locals there anymore because they're all moving away. (...) It's got to stop.

In these extracts, speakers construct 'migration' as an acrimonious force threatening the 'island' nation. This is primarily signalled by metaphors that construct the nation as a container (see Charteris-Black, 2006) ("*we don't want to chuck people out*", "*everything is going to start collapsing*", "*breaking point*"). While attempting to present migration as a material force, the effect of migration is also impacting upon the nation's limited culture

and way of life: ("*We're not against foreign people*", "*There are hardly any locals there anymore*"). The nation's space in this sense is equivocal, being potentially both physical and social (Kirkwood, Mckinlay, & Mcvittie, 2013). Migration is therefore construed as a force recognisably impacting upon the 'island' society's projected identity and status. Benedict Anderson's (1991, p.5) view that the nation is "an imagined political community...both inherently limited and sovereign", substantiates these speakers' distinctions between the 'rooted' nation and 'drifting' migrations. In this sense, to preserve and realise an idealised imagined community, the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire asserts that society must guard against such migratory forces. For these examples, the 'ambiguity' trope derived from Fleming (2000) can be observed. As with generalised pronouns homogenising the migratory group (see e.g., Fox J. et al., 2012 on 'East Europeans'), the use of phrases such as "*foreign people*", "*these people coming*" in the extracts above ambiguously skirt around the nature or origin of the migration. Instead, the concern is with the alleged effects of all migration on the nation's culture and society.

Extract RS(a)3 (QT, Dover, 7th March 2013)

(a) Audience member: In Dover we've got a lot of (.) um youth unemployment anyway (.) under twenty fives just walking round the street, doing nothing. We've already got plenty of East Europeans who are doing the sa:me. Do we need any more coming in from Bulgaria and Romania next year?

Extract RS(a)4 (QT, Newbury, 16th October 2014)

(a) Audience member: (...) we cannot believe the amount of building that's taking place and ruining our countryside. Our village is virtually going to double. Some of the villages around us already have. It's destroying village life. ((continues))

Extract RS(a)5 (QT, Middlesbrough, 6th November 2014)

(p) Melanie Williams: well it's simply a question of numbers. Erm it's simply a question of numbers of too many people. We are a very overcrowded island. And our public services quite obviously er some in particularly er some areas ar ur

> ur- are particularly in difficulty and others er in less difficulty.

Similarly, these extracts forward an argument that the nation is finite and needs to be protected from migration as an overwhelming force ("*Do we need any more coming in*", "*It's destroying village life*", "*we are a very overcrowded island*"). By invoking the nation as a home, and/or migration as an invasion or disaster, this argument that the island culture and space must be 'protected' seeks recognition as reality "in the face of competing versions" (Shotter, 1993b, p.116). This bears similarity to Abell et al.'s (2006) analysis of lay constructions of what they dub as an 'island repertoire' whereby the British isles are construed as a 'naturally' separate space with its own unique homogenised nations and culture. However, speakers here invoke civic language to convey ownership and vulnerability of that space ("*we've got a lot of (.) um youth unemployment anyway*", "*we cannot believe the amount of building that's taking place*", "*our public services quite obviously er (...) are particularly in difficulty*"). Note how the antagonists are left ambiguous although migration is the topical focus, suggesting again the discourse is balkanist in character (Fleming, 2000). In effect they seem to be making the distinction between 'rightful' inhabitants who can lay claim to ownership and use of social resources and space and 'threatening' Others with no corresponding claims seem like a factual rather than interpretative marking of membership (Finlayson, 1998). In his own analyses of print-media discourse, Charteris-Black argues that such rhetoric of migration

> "is persuasive because it merges...the security of borders (a spatially-based concept) [with]...control over the rate of social change in Britain (a time-based concept)" (2006, p.563).

Extract RS(a)3 strongly conveys the Balkanist trope of ambiguity (cf. Fleming, 2000) as the receiving society is presented as saturated by a homogenised group for whom Romanians would additionally belong to ("*We've already got plenty of East Europeans who are doing the sa:me. Do we need any more coming in from Bulgaria and Romania*"). This category of 'East Europe' not only understates cultural, linguistic and ethnic diversity, but also presents Romanian movers as a questionable addition. This is made especially evident as through the use of demographic descriptions constructing the UK as having a legitimate in-group in need of consideration (e.g., "*youth unemployment anyway (.) under twenty fives just walking round the street, doing nothing*").

The next section explores subthemes of how the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire was deployed. These subthemes were common ways in which the repertoire was augmented with the main line of argument pertaining to the acrimonious nation-migration relationship. The subthemes are: 'corroborating finite space and infinite migration', 'rallying ethno-national consensus against migration threat', and 'justifying threat as rational'. While not evident in every instance of 'vulnerable nation' repertoire data regarding Romanian identity and migration, these subthemes were notable add-ons to the central tenet that the 'island' was under threat.

Subtheme one: corroborating finite space and infinite migration

For this subtheme, while 'space' was constructed by speakers as *knowably* finite, migration was *unknowably* infinite. This tenet was essentially an elaboration of a contrast structure, whereby a "core assertion is made twice…in a 'positive' and a 'negative' form" (Heritage & Greatbatch, 1986, p.122). This was presented as dilemmatic as limited space and unlimited entry form an incompatible combination.

Extract RS(a)6 (QT, Basingstoke, 17th October 2013)

(p) Diane James	(...) we've got no idea (.) and I'm sure everyone will agree exactly how many people will come from the two countries in question where the (.) er err where the current restrictions are there coming into the UK=
(p) David Dimbleby	=Bulgaria and Romania you're talking about?
(p) Diane James	I'm talking about Romania and Bulgaria. But what we do know for instance is that there is two million of them in Spain, they've already made that move therefore the likelihood for them coming to the UK is pretty high. (...) There is going to be a pressure when these two countries restrictions are lifted ((continues))

In this extract, the speaker uses a contrast between unpredictable numbers of migrants ("*we've got no idea...how many people will come from the two countries in question*") with predictable intentionality and resulting effects ("*the likelihood for them coming to the UK is pretty high…There is going to be a pressure*") to inform the broader 'vulnerable nation' repertoire argument that migration is a potential threat to the nation. The use of consensus ("*I'm sure everyone will agree*") and systematic vagueness

("*likelihood*") position her account as objective and 'out-there' despite being reliant upon speculation (Potter, 1996). Finally, by ascribing migration by "*Romanians and Bulgarians*" as nomadic ("*there is two million of them in Spain, they've already made that move*") and damaging to the nation 'container' ("*There is going to be a pressure*") (Charteris-Black, 2006), The speaker legitimises the fear that the nation is exposed to a migratory threat that is currently on its way. Note also how the use of numbers ("*two million of them*") illustrates the ambiguity Balkanist theme (cf. Fleming, 2000), as nothing more known about the group other than their ominous numerical extent relative to the nation's relative lack of preparedness/capability to withstand it.

Extract RS(a)7 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) David Dimbleby	(…) are you against the tidal wave of Romanians and Bulgarians that was expected according to the questioner?
(p) Nadine Dorris	er there has been no tidal wave, but (.) there might be tomorrow, there might be next year. We don't know. That is the problem. We could have a tidal wave from Yug- anywhere. This is the problem. And I really object to these objectives and these targets 'we're gunna have a cap on immigration'. We can't put caps on immigration. Because we have open borders. Legally we are unable to do that. There is only one solution. And that's to vote Conservative ((continues))

In this extract, David (the chair) invokes a 'threat' argument by propositioning an expected "*tidal wave of Romanians*" with reference to the audience member's question. Nadine aligns with David's disaster metaphor ("*the tidal wave of Romanians and Bulgarians*"), but quickly disclaims (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975) any potential criticism of its truth value by arguing that such disaster is ever-present ("*er there has been no tidal wave, but (.) there might be tomorrow, there might be next year. We don't know. That is the problem*"). The metaphor's repetition suggests that characterising migration as a disaster is taken-for-granted (Billig & MacMillan, 2005). This is also implied when Nadine invokes a membership category of a homogenised (hearably 'Yugoslavian') Other, although the category is unfinished and self-repaired ("*We could have a tidal wave from Yug- anywhere*"). This half-made category ("*Yug*") and the subsequent generalisation invoking an entire region ("*anywhere*") insinuates the problematic possibility of a mass 'Balkan'

migration (Bjelić, 2002). This is strong example of the 'predictability' trope in action (Fleming, 2000) as while Nadine emphasises the possibility of such migration, she does term is "*the problem*". This is reinforced by consistent 'exposure' allusions ("*We don't know*", "*We could have a tidal wave*", "*We can't put caps on*", "*we have open borders*", "*Legally we are unable*"). This exposure is compounded by a rhetorically self-sufficient argument of constitutional impotence ("*Legally we are unable to do that*") (cf. Augoustinos, Lecouteur, & Soyland, 2002). Nadine's use of "*open borders*" and metaphors threatening 'engulfment' not only discredits Romanian migration but also discredits an unworkable status quo requiring political resolution by the governing party of the day ("*There is only one solution. And that's to vote Conservative*"). This bears stark similarity with contemporary nationalist discourse that disparages liberal reformist arguments as merely superficial and preserving of large-scale migration (e.g., Goodman & Johnson, 2013). In sum, while Nadine's line of argument is that migration is threatening ("*tidal wave*"), she augments it with this finite space/ infinite migration subtheme to drive her complaint that national impotence ("*Legally we are unable*") prohibits affirmative action and requires immediate resolution.

Extract RS(b)1 (TAMS, Raworth-Hague, 3rd March 2013)

(ir) Sophie Raworth	(...) a lot of people seem to have been drawn to UKIP because of the issue of immigration – the fears particularly about the number of Romanians and Bulgarians who are going to be coming to this country as of next year. You've got figures, haven't you? You've got estimates. How many do you actually think are going to be turning up or is it all scaremongering?
(ie) William Hague	No, we don't have estimates on that. What we do have=
(ir) Sophie Raworth	=There's no government estimate?
(ie) William Hague	The figures are the figures that came out this week - that immigration is down by a third after a completely open door policy operated by [the]
(ir) Sophie Raworth	[I'm] talking about Romanians and Bulgarians.

Here Sophie justifies her pre-amble with a consensus device that rests upon a cause-effect logic between uncertainty and fear, thereby deploying a convoluted form of the predictability trope (Fleming, 2000) ("*a lot of people seem to have been drawn to UKIP*"). The un/limited subtheme is evident as Sophie voices the group's implicated stance contrasting the emotion involved with potential quantities of migration with its unstated-yet-implied effects ("*fears particularly about the number of Romanians and Bulgarians who are going to be coming to this country*"). As with Extract RS(a)6, the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) is evident as the Sophie is concern only with a single migratory concern ("*I'm talking about Romanians and Bulgarians*"). While William attempts to present an alternative argument ("*What we do have=*"), Sophie immediately challenges this by implicating the government as culpable against the fears she oriented to earlier ("*=There's no government estimate*?"). While William ripostes with a proportion quantification device (rather than a specific number, which may not seem so large) (cf. Roeh & Feldman, 1984) to assert that migration has substantially dropped ("*immigration is down by a third*"), the underlying premise of potentially unlimited migration and its alleged effects is consensual between them: William's argument is simply that it has been reduced.

The extracts presented for the finite space/ infinite migration subtheme comprise an "argumentative context" (Billig, 1991, p.44) that migration is by definition a threat due to socio-spatial limitations. Speakers were observed work up "observable and thus purported "factual" claims" (Augoustinos & Every, 2007, p.127) of what is a taken-for-granted cultural assumption concerning the exclusivity and separateness of the UK in relation to the European continent (Abell et al., 2006; Condor, 2000). Invoking this claim essentially pays homage to ethnicised narratives of nationality and homeland (Billig, 1995). Below, attention now turns to the second subtheme, which involves speakers paying attention the ways in which they position themselves as members of the nation as part of the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire's main line of argument pertaining to the nation-migration tension.

Subtheme two: rallying ethno-national consensus against migration threat

This subtheme often involved speakers identifying with an 'indigenous' or entitled majority group, melding ethnic and civic claims of belonging to justify their arguments. In accordance with Potter's (1996, p.150) explication of 'consensus' whereby descriptions are presented "...as shared across different producers, rather than being unique", here

speakers present their arguments as aligned with (majority) in-group members, thereby constructing a boundary of exclusion and legitimise arguments against further migration.

Extract RS(a)8 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) Paul Nuttall	(...) what WE'RE saying in UKIP (.) is quite simple: it makes no sense economically (.) to have a whole open border to the whole of Europe (.) cos we have to because we're members of the European Union freedom of movement of peoples is enshrined in the treaties (.) it makes no sense whatsoever to have an open door (.) when you have (.) two point four million people unemployed and a million young people unemployed (.) who can't get a job. It makes no sense whatsoever to saturate the employment market any furth↑er (...) look the traffic will only be (.) one way and quite frankly, we don't think we can cope ((continues))

Extract RS(a)8 shows the speaker using this consensus to justify his argument that "*open door*" migration is problematic and damaging. National differentiation is presented as a rational matter-of-fact ("*it makes no sense economically*", "*it makes no sense whatsoever*"). Civic allusions to 'vulnerable' people who remain members of the ethno-national group ("*two point four million people unemployed and a million young people unemployed (.) who can't get a job*") are contrasted with a metaphoric 'mass' entering through the "*open door*" ("*saturate the employment market*"). Paul's argument through metaphor also highlights a paradox of potentially vast unidirectional migration ("*look the traffic will only be (.) one way*"). This is suggestive of an asymmetrical relationship between migration and the receiving society (Ana, 1999). Appealing to a supportive majority (i.e., by arguing that the status quo has "*no sense*"), Paul therefore presents the status quo as a minority interest, with the footing intersecting between political advocacy ("*what WE'RE saying in UKIP*") and incumbent representation of the nation ("*we don't think we can cope*"). This is further substantiated with an extreme case formulation (Pomerantz, 1986) contrasting Britain's exposure (i.e., a one nation without border protection) against an entire monolithic continent ("*it makes no sense economically (.) to have a whole open border to the whole of Europe*").

Extract RS(a)9 (QT, Barking, 6th March 2014)

(p) David Dimbleby	Simon Hughes I'll come back- you asked the question
(...)	
(a) Pam	=they made us keep our b[orders o]pen, yes they have. [We need to have no we] need to police our own borders [we need t]o make our ow[n decisions]. We [don't] need [the E]U to run our country.
(p) Simon Hughes	[no no] [let me ask you a question] [er listen] [that's what] [right] [okay]

Having had her turn legitimated by the chair ("*you asked the question*"), Pam attempts to disrupt Simon's prior argument, with Simon attempting to regain his turn (e.g., "[*let me ask you a question*]"). We see Pam drawing on this ethno-civic subtheme footing by adopting the position of a citizen inhabiting the nation, desiring re-empowerment as a positive aim for majority members while understating the exclusionary implications ("*We [don't] need [the E]U to run our country*"). While migration is not specifically mentioned, Pam's argument nonetheless relies upon the premise that migration is a threat to an exposed nation as characterised by her allusions to disempowerment and compulsion ("*they made us keep our b[orders o]pen*"). Pam's footing draws on entreatments, reclamations and rejections to appeal to a national in-group that should reassert itself ("*we] need to police our own borders*", "*we need t]o make our ow[n decisions*", "*We [don't] need [the E]U to run our country*", respectively). This urge to reinstate the nation is bolstered insofar that ownership of the 'homeland' is already premised (e.g., "*our country*"), with only the power to govern requested, denoting a nationalistic undertone to this argument by justifying the ethnic identity claim with a right to inhabit and command the 'homeland' space (e.g., "*we] need to police our own borders*") (Billig, 1995). Juxtaposing this claim, the EU and migration itself are oppositional 'Others' that should be rejected ("*they made us*", "*We [don't] need [the E]U"*). In sum, Pam delegitimises migration and the EU as acrimonious processes/institutions to the integrity of the nation, bolstering this argument through footing that exhibits a re-legitimisation of an ethnicised British nation.

Extract RS(a)10 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(p) Nigel Farage	(...) and my argument (.) that I wouldn't dispute, that controlled immigration can be a big net benefit to Britain, economically, and culturally, and everything else. But we have no control, and we've no idea, just how many people are coming, five hundred thousand are coming, eight hundred thousand are coming, there is nothing we can do. And what I would advocate is that one of the big benefits of not being in the European Union, is that we get back control of our borders, so that we can decide who comes to Britain. Not discriminating, against people from India (.) and New Zealand, which we currently do, because we have an open door to Romania and Bulgaria. Let's have our own immigration policy, and let's not just control the quantity of people coming into this country, but the quality as well.

In this extract the speaker uses ethno-civic footing to identify with the 'island' nation and also draw implicitly on the unlimited migration/ limited space subtheme. The continuous use of the dietetic 'we' situates him as a British speaker frustrated by disempowerment ("*we have no control, and we've no idea, just how many people are coming*"). Initially drawing on a disclaimer with a three-part list and generalised completer (Jefferson, 1991), Nigel supports migration as potentially positive, thus positioning himself as being reasonable in having an idea of what would count as acceptable migration ("*controlled immigration can be a big net benefit to Britain, economically, and culturally, and everything else*"). The subsequent appeals to a national in-group ("*we get back control of our borders, so that we can decide who comes to Britain (...) Let's have our own immigration policy*"), beyond just signalling what has been discussed in previous extracts (e.g., on how the migration 'threat' should be met by the nation, on claiming pre-established ownership, of self-sufficient maxim use) also draw on an explicitly 'anti-discriminatory' position by asserting that all migrants should be treated equally (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Despite conveying equality, however, this actually endorses positive discrimination in favour of Anglophones in an Anglosphere-Europe contrast ("*Not discriminating, against people from India (.) and New Zealand because we have an open door to Romania and Bulgaria*"). This is further developing the rallying ethno-national consensus in Nigel's account by contrasting Britain with more and less desirable Others in terms of common language, history and /or culture (cf. Cohen R., 1995).

Nigel then develops this rallying ethno-national consensus further to his argument against future migration. Advocating a need for 'controlled' migration ("*let's not just control the quantity of people coming into this country, but the quality as well*"), Nigel displays a preference for particular types of migrants in opposition to the status quo which promotes unknowable and/or uncontrollable 'masses' of people ("*we've no idea, just how many people are coming, five hundred thousand are coming, eight hundred thousand are coming*"). Here, migration is constructed as a mass of interchangeable and abstracted objects; by contrast, the receiving nation is constructed as in need of empowerment and having the potential to 'achieve' and realise its potential in a humanistic fashion. The ontological distinction between a humanistic reinvention of the nation's citizens versus a commodified mass of migrants, overtly prioritises citizens. Thus, whereas Pam above overtly rejected particular Others (the EU, uncontrolled migration) in favour of the nation she positioned herself within, Nigel achieves this by promoting an egalitarian conception of the nation embracing specific forms of 'desirable' migration. Note here how the Balkanist 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) features as the homogenised migration Nigel warns against is looming over the exposed nation, a 'problem' treated as self-evident in itself ("*we have an open door to Romania and Bulgaria*").

Speakers invoking 'rallying ethno-national consensus' as a subtheme were chiefly concerned with an identification with a national collectivity or direct affiliation with those identified as their fellow 'in-group' members. In either case, speakers have spoken of an alleged hijacking of their national identity and political power. The evocation of democracy as a justification for such reclamation naturalises national identity as an innate and enduring birthright. The ways in which 'borders' are evoked as necessary for national survival is framed as a symbolic coup de grâce synonymous with retaking the ancestral homeland as would be central to the nation's imaging as a distinctive group (cf. Billig, 1995). Combined with the main line of argument of the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire that the nation and Romanian migration are acrimonious, ethno-civic footing amasses a 'blood and soil' identity claim based on an underlying logic that particular members of the society are more truly 'British' than others (Gibson & Hamilton, 2011). Further, as documented by Andreouli and Howarth (2012), such an argument is consequential for how identities can be claimed, as was found in their naturalised citizens interview accounts that sharply differentiated between (deemed possible) civic and (deemed impossible) ethnic claims of a 'British' identity.

Subtheme three: justifying threat as rational

For this subtheme, speakers (primarily from TAMS dataset) developed the premise of nation-migration tension by justifying the existence or scope of threat in terms of 'rational' concerns, such as questions relying on statistics or emphasising the value of 'rational' responses. While we saw some speakers orienting to rational appeals in subtheme one, for this subtheme it is about fact construction: justifying that migration is empirically damaging. As accounts are often "constructed with respect to actual or potential alternative versions of events" (Wooffitt, 2005, p.97), this subtheme brings together some examples of how those alternative realities are undermined through use of factual discourse (Potter et al., 1990).

Extract RS(b)2 (TAMS, Marr-May, 6th October 2013)

(ir) Andrew Marr	Right. Nigel Farage was raising the subject, not surprisingly of the Romanian and Bulgarian influx as he sees it, coming. Is there anything you can do to, we've delayed it for a few years but now it's going to happen next year. If like other come that will blow out of the water all your statistics on immigration won't it?
(ie) Theresa May	Well what we're doing in relation to Romanian and Bulgarians who may come here after the transitional controls are lifted, but more generally, is exactly the sort of issues that we've just been talking about. So we are looking at reducing what I call the pull factors, the factors that might lead somebody to want to come here. So that we are tightening up on the benefit system, so looking at the qualifications, the criteria for somebody to actually have access to benefits.

As this extract begins, Andrew, the interviewer, uses a reported speech device ("*Nigel Farage was raising the subject not surprisingly of the Romanian and Bulgarian influx as he sees it, coming*") to the establish the question as invoking the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire's tenet of nation-migration tension, particularly that of transitional controls as future migration is imminent and inevitable ("*we've delayed it for a few years but now it's going to happen next year*"). Andrew presents his question using an if-then structure (Wooffitt, 1992) with a metaphor that asserts that if it is akin to past migrations, it would completely overshadow all estimations ("*If like other come that will blow out of the water all your statistics*"). Both devices, the reported speech and if-then structure,

indicate a subtheme complementing the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire in that they are appeals encouraging rationality and credibility.

As the extract unfolds, the rationality that is presented is reinforced in Teresa's answer as she responds with a preamble conveying token alignment ("*exactly the sort of issues we've just been talking about*"), sidestepping Andrew's metaphor and instead focusing on the moral question of how migrant rights/entitlements will be managed. She does this through metaphors realising a burden logos which emphasises the 'problematic' qualities of the migrant and how they should be prevented ("*reducing what I call the pull factors", "So that we are tightening up on the benefit system*"). Note how the use of pronouns here, both Theresa-as-expert ("*what I call*") and Theresa-as-government-representative ("*we are tightening up*"), corroborate an assertion of competence and surety that those coming will be 'good' migrants and have limited rights/entitlements in the receiving community. Theresa's response is therefore concerned with speaking to an implicit allegation that there will be material burden placed upon society by migrants – an inference drawing upon the 'predictability' trope owing to the assertion that their social actions will be negative (Fleming, 2000). While Andrew seeks to present his question as a rationale concern, Theresa legitimises its sentiment with reassurance that moral abuse will be prevented by the actions of government.

Extract RS(b)3 (TAMS, Marr-Cameron, 5th January 2014)

(ir) Andrew Marr	(...) You must have some notion of how many Bulgarian and Romanian immigrants are likely to come in over the next year, five years and so on. But until you give us that figure, we can't really have a sensible conversation about it, can we.
(ie) David Cameron	Well, I don't agree with that, I mean we're not making a forecast because I think it's unlikely we'd get that forecast right. Because remember, it's not just Britain that's had to lift its controls at the end of seven years of transitional controls, they're also being lifted in France and in Germany and eight other European countries (.) so to try and make a forecast I think would be wrong. I think my job, what's much more important is to put in place the measures that make sure that people who do come here are coming here to work and not to claim benefits. And that's what I've done.

In this extract, Andrew's preamble invokes a normative logic that necessitates awareness and preparation concerning potential Romanian migration ("*You must have some notion of how many Bulgarian and Romanian immigrants are likely to come in over the next year*"). Thus, rationality is used as a justificatory means to problematise Romanian migration. Andrew's assessment suggests that lacking such knowledge will hinder rational discussion between himself and David ("*But until you give us that figure, we can't really have a sensible conversation about it*"). This pressurises David to either account for not disclosing knowledge or the irrationality of not having such knowledge ("*You must have some notion*"). The implication is that a lack of statistical knowledge is symbiotic with risk, thereby appealing to numbers as the arbiter of 'truth' (cf. Potter, Wetherell, & Chitty, 1991). It is notable therefore how other knowledge forms that may highlight commonalities between, or richness of, respective groups, are subdued through this standard of empirical truth.

David disagrees with Andrew's reliance upon numbers ("*Well, I don't agree with that*") by citing objectionable probability ("*I think it's unlikely we'd get that forecast right*") and that the 'threat' of Romanian migration is dispersed ("*Because remember, it's not just Britain that's had to lift its controls*"). As above with Theresa in Extract RS(b)2, David then invokes a moral claim of personal responsibility to prevent civic abuse resulting from migration ("*I think my job, what's much more important is to put in place the measures*"). Thus, David situates his identity as morally-accountable and praiseworthy ("*And that's what I've done*"), thereby defending the implication that migrants require surveillance and administration ("*make sure that people who do come here are coming here to work and not to claim benefits*"). While Andrew invokes the rationality subtheme to project an objectified 'mass' requiring calculation and prediction, David resists this by instead characterising Romanian migrants as having potentially burdensome natures which should be monitored by political actors: but in contrast to Extract RS(b)2, David also challenges the premise of Andrew's rationality stake directly, as opposed to Theresa who invoked the moral riposte exclusively.

Extract RS(b)4 (TAMS, Marr-Miliband, 22 September 2013)

(ir) Andrew Marr	=Are you concerned about the number of Romanians and Bulgarians who will be coming in very soon?

(ie) Ed Miliband	Well, obviously there are always issues about that. But that's going to be happening. But let me make this point about how we get low skill migration down. Look, one of the issues we've got as a country is that too often, governments of both parties have turned a blind eye to the fact that the minimum wage is not being observed, recruitment agencies are only hiring from abroad. All of those practices that we all know go on – you know, I think there are two prosecutions since 2010 for failing to pay the minimum wage, but we're going to change that. ((continues))

Prior to this extract, Andrew was asking Ed about Labour's migration policy. Above, Andrew again draws on the rationality subtheme to question Ed's attitude towards Romanian migration (e.g., justified by implied messages such as the emotion in "*concerned*" and the quantity in "*the number of Romanians and Bulgarians*"). Ed preambles with some token alignment suggesting that such reactions are inevitable and thereby legitimate ("*Well, obviously there are always issues about that. But that's going to be happening*"). Ed then conflates "*Romanians and Bulgarians*" with "*low skill migration*", a notable ontological inference of limited economic competence and moral value (cf. Bjelić, 2002). Like David's argument above, Ed argues that institutional failures have led to a moral degradation and thereby threat to the nation ("*governments of both parties have turned a blind eye*", "*minimum wage is not being observed, recruitment agencies are only hiring from abroad*").

Billig (1989) argues that for some public controversies, competing perspectives presume the "existence of a singular, ultimately discernible, empirical reality" (cited in Condor, Tileagă & Billig, 2013, p.282). For this subtheme, we can clearly see speakers interpreting migration (notably TAMS interviewers) as knowable through measurements of size, scale, duration, and so on. In other words an abstracted reality, informed by predictions and collations of quantified objects is the territory being relied upon to understand Romanian migration. A further characteristic Billig et al. (1988, p.102) point out may be relevant here as indicative of Western thought: the term 'prejudice' is often seen as "...denot[ing] the evils of irrationality which people should eradicate from their thinking". Due to the omnipresent possibility that talk about minorities may be received as prejudicial (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Goodman & Lowe, 2014), grounding a migratory threat argument as based on rational concerns is a way of ensuring that they are seen as being based within a rubric of necessity, fact and reality, even if only specific rational

concerns are outlined and alternatives are not even considered (e.g., build more houses rather than advocate nationality-based exclusion). This concern with grounding opinion as fact, while directly considered in this subtheme, is an endemic feature running throughout the dataset. For by claiming a rational position, one is articulating a claim of truth, a benchmark of reasonable and persuasive argumentation (Charteris-Black, 2013). However, while it was shown how rationality was embedded in the interviewer's questions for TAMS, the interviewee's answers sought to reframe migration as a moral issue: this moralisation is explored in more detail later with the second 'civic imperative' repertoire.

The 'vulnerable nation' repertoire's main line of argument (the nation-migration tension) and three related subthemes ('corroborating finite space and infinite migration', 'rallying ethno-national consensus against migration threat', and 'justifying threat as rational') have been explored thus far. Below, two notable means of resistance to the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire are explored: 'recasting metaphors, and 'exposing stake and interest'. While there were other means of contestation, the two strategies considered were the most rhetorically prevalent.

Resisting the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire

Recasting metaphors

Speakers used this strategy to reconstruct the relationship between migration and the nation as based on reliance rather than threat, thus reasserting more inclusive and egalitarian conceptions of the 'public' and its members (McGuire & Canales, 2010). Goatly (2007, p.402) highlights that due to the tendency for metaphors to "reduce...by highlighting some features of experience at the expense of others", it is important to study the "variety of metaphors" outside of those ascended to a platform of 'truth'. Indeed, as Ana (1999, p.194) argues, "Metaphor colors [sic] the poetic; more importantly it shapes the prosaic": in other words while they provide tangibility and intelligibility, metaphors also structure the landscape of 'commonsense'. For the extracts below, speakers invoked reliance arguments to in effect re-arrange the 'us and them' formulation from 'the nation versus migrants' to 'all workers versus elites'. This was a riposte to the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire's nationalist undertones, with metaphorical themes invoking capitalist economic philosophy, such as 'competition is a race' and 'quality as quantity' (Goatly, 2007), indicating a conflict over the determination of a 'fundamental' or 'essential' nature of the

migrant in the dataset. This echoes what Kirkwood, Mckinlay, and Mcvittie (2013) found in analyses of refugee coverage as specific kinds of spaces are associated with certain types of groups in immigration discourse, for example 'the community' as a space enjoyed by 'families' and in need of protection against 'drug abusers'.

Extract RS(a)11 (QT, Birmingham, 20th November 2014)

(p) David Dimbleby — the woman there, in spectacles

((later))

(a) Audience member — (...) All we seem to talk about is immigration. What about welfare state being dismantled? What about the NHS? Immigrants are not the problem (.) the NHS wouldn't run without them ((continues))

Having been selected by David to speak, the audience member argues that migration debate is a distraction. Using generalisation to emphasise an 'obsession' with its debate ("*All we seem to talk about is immigration*"), this speaker asks two rhetorical questions to suggest other issues require public scrutiny ("*What about welfare state being dismantled*?"). A metaphor is used to construct migrants as akin to a 'cog' operating within the NHS 'machine', disrupting the implicative notion that migrants are a burden or threat because they are vital for it to function ("*the NHS wouldn't run without them*"). Coupled with the actors "*dismantling*" social protections, the speaker is differentiating between 'reliant' and 'dismantling' groups, with society deemed to be reliant upon migrants.

Extract RS(a)12 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(p) Shirley Williams — Look, let's be quite honest. This country is tremendously dependent on some of the (.) immigrants who come here. (.) Go into any NHS hospital, go and have an operation, look to see who the health assistants are, look to see who the doctors a↓re, many of them will not be from this country. Some of them will be from other countries, some will be from other commonwealth countries. And frankly the NHS of which I am extre:mely proud, would break down without them. ((continues))

In this extract Shirley constructs the NHS as reliant on, rather than abused by, migrant labour ("*And frankly the NHS...would break down without them*"). Shirley's recasting of migration from burden to reliance is situated as personally-invested, intensifying her account ("*I am extre:mely proud*"). Additionally, various fact construction devices reinforce Shirley's counter argument, such as the honesty tag promoting a common viewpoint ("*Look, let's be quite honest*"), the extreme case formulation emphasising significance ("*tremendously important*") and generalisation presenting her view as empirically verifiable and 'out there' (Verkuyten, 2001) ("*Go into any NHS hospital, go and have an operation, look to see who the health assistants are, look to see who the doctors a↓re*"). Comparing this use of metaphor to Extract RS(a)11, while both speakers employ mechanistic imagery to convey reliance on migration, Shirley's account seeks to build consensus with other speakers.

Extract RS(a)13 (QT, Barking, 6th March 2014)

(p) Simon Hughes	I tell you why=
(a) Pam	=I kn[ow you do]
(p) Simon Hughes	[I tell you] why no I tell you w↑hy. (...) And there are two and a half million people, who are British, living in other parts of the European Union, because they chose to go there. Right? It's not a one way street ((continues))

Extract RS(a)13 involves a dispute between an audience member (Pam) who asked a question previously (arguing against socio-cultural change resulting from migration) and Simon (partially shown in Extract RS(a)9). Simon attempts to interrupt Pam by framing migration as an egalitarian exchange rather than being something that receiving communities have to experience or 'cope' with ("*two and a half million people, who are Br*ritish*, living in other parts of the European Union*"). Simon uses a metaphor evoking multidirectional journeys to promote migration as yielding shared experiential benefits ("*It's not a one way street*") rather than being based on economic reliance as in the previous two extracts.

Extract RS(a)14 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(a) Nicolai	now that the er (.) tidal wave of er Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants has er failed to materialise (.) er:: ((audience laughter)) will the racist er rhetoric now (.) s- subside and will Romanians and Bulgarians be once more feel welcome in this country?

In this extract, Nicolai uses a familiar metaphor that constructs migration as a natural disaster (see e.g., Extract RS(a)7). However, contrary to prior extracts in this section, this metaphor is used ironically to dispute the existence of a 'wave' ("*now the er (.) tidal wave of er Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants has er failed to materialise*"). Irony, as LeBoeuf (2007, p.1) points out, is a useful "tool for dissenters" as it highlights the deficiencies of public discourse whereby they "become absurd, even hilarious...[and] because it is implied rather than overtly stated". Thus, rather than fear-inducing, the uncertainty and potentiality contingent to wave metaphors becomes contradictory. Nicolai asserts that the anticlimactic disaster metaphor shows that such assertions of prejudice are emotional rather than reasoned ("*will the racist er rhetoric now (.) s- subside*") (cf. Billig et al., 1988). It is also interesting to note that the same phrase is used ("*Romanians and Bulgarians*") as prior extracts invoking the Balkanist 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000). While previous extracts have seen the use of this homogenised category to predict an unprecedented scale of migration (see e.g., Extract RS(a)7), Nicolai uses it within a rhetorical question ("*will Romanians and Bulgarians be- once more feel welcome*") to redefine the question as one concerning a moral claim to belong (cf. Bjelić, 2002).

In these extracts, speakers used metaphors to subvert the dehumanising implications of container and disaster metaphors that construct migrants as forces and structure nations as exposed or threatened (Charteris-Black, 2006). However, while these reclamations attempt to "...find new and creative ways to "socially reform" the negative languages surrounding so many immigrants, building humanizing narratives to counteract the airwaves" (McGuire & Canales, 2010, p.140), their disruption of the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire is dependent upon how institutional norms were occasioned during debate. Previous work has shown that counter arguments are shaped by how speaker identities are occasioned (Kilby & Horowitz, 2013; Thornborrow, 2001). While space does not allow this to be considered in detail, below two examples will be highlighted as an

acknowledgement to how the chair's contributions shaped the occurrence and extent of resistance, helping it to manifest or hindering its expression.

Extract RS(a)15 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(a) Nicolai	now that the er (.) tidal wave of er Romanian and Bulgarian immigrants has er failed to materialise (.) er:: ((audience laughter)) will the racist er rhetoric now (.) s- subside and will Romanians and Bulgarians be once more feel welcome in this country?
(p) David Dimbleby	the wave [of Romanians and Bulgarians] your- your Romanian yourself? Aren't you sir? You are (.) yes, right. Er well will the racist er rhetoric now subside ((continues))
(a) Audience	[applause]

David's maintenance of his institutional role as chair is chiefly realised through the chair's omnirelevance, enabling him to interject with prompts, pursuits and interruptions (see Fitzgerald, Housley, & Butler, 2008; Housley & Fitzgerald, 2002). Extract RS(a)15 is an extension to Extract RS(a)14. Nicolai's identity as a "Romanian" is asked and confirmed by David. This might be read in two ways; one possibility is that justifies the audience member's question as representing an 'authentic' voice with entitlement to 'rightfully' assert racism ("*your- your Romanian yourself? Aren't you sir? You are*") without other speakers disputing it in a 'what counts as racism' exchange, as can be evident in such exchanges (Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Goodman & Rowe, 2013). Conversely, it could be read as a way of subtly discrediting the objectivity of his account tied to his Romanian identity (cf. Shotter, 1993a) as suggested by David's own affirmation and token recognition ("*You are (.) yes, right. Er well will the racist er rhetoric now subside*"). Either way, however, the question is itself asked and maintained – David does not reject the question itself being asked.

Extract RS(a)16 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

	[((Audience applause))]

(p) Chuka Umuna [lets not forget (2) lets not forget, lets not forget] (.) we've heard this from Nigel before. (...) REM[Ember what we heard fro]m you from you on Bulgaria and Romania. You said we were going to have this hu:ge wave coming over here. That ha↑sn't happened=

(p) Nigel Farage [will be able to come here]

(p) David Dimbleby =all right thank y[ou thank you]

(p) Nigel Farage [have you seen] the migration figures?=

(p) David Dimbleby =Nigel you made your point ((continues))

Conversely to Extract RS(a)15, having spoken over applause that followed Nigel's turn, Chuka attempts to use irony in the same way Nicolai did to argue against Nigel's projected 'threat' argument ("*this hu:ge wave coming over here*"). However, as chair, David 'closes' Chuka's turn ("=*all right thank y*[*ou thank you*]") as well as attempts to silence Nigel as he attempts to speak again ("*Nigel you made your point*"). Chuka's metaphor resistance to Nigel's talk (which invoked the 'rallying ethno-national consensus' subtheme explored in Extract RS(a)10) can be read as an attempt to undermine the divisions of such rhetoric and promote an alternative version, although it is unfinished due to latching talk ("*ha↑sn't happened*=", "=*all right*"). However, David restricts Chuka's resistance and leaves it uncorroborated when compared to Nicolai's resistance.

For this section, metaphor recasting as a resistance strategy has been considered: some extracts involved metaphor use that occasioned reliance- and contribution-based arguments, which to borrow from McGuire and Canales (2010, p.133) are "life-giving...acts of courage" constructing counter narratives that emphasise the importance of and/or benefits arising from migrant labour for the nation (cf. Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013). The second use involved subverting the more dominant metaphors through irony, something Charteris-Black (2013, p.322) argues is another way common lines of argument can be "exploited or reversed".

Exposing stake and interest

The second strategy speakers used to resist the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire involved stake exposures that belittled the authority of political or public figures by

emphasising their "desire, motivations, institutional allegiances, and biases" (Edwards & Potter, 1992, p.158). Below speakers undermine the personal position of other speakers as well as their arguments in order to promote other social issues. In-so-doing the threat posed by migration, as presented through the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire, is trivialised or diminished as the speaker broadens the argumentative context.

Extract RS(a)17 (QT, Canterbury, 11th December 2014)

(a) Audience member: I agree that immigration is an issue and people are concerned about (.) but I- I agree with Mary that they're concerned about it because there are so: many o↑ther issues, about hou:sing, the NHS, the whole area of public expenditure, and that brings you back to what Russell was saying (.) we spend so much time talking about immigration, it's a s:ide issue when you think about what happened in 2008. We have been robbed (.) we are still being robbed. The amount of taxation that is not being paid by the very rich, is an absolute sca↑ndal. ((continues))

In this extract, the speaker constructs migration as a "*s:ide issue*", instead emphasising a more pressing moral scandal of citizens being "*robbed*" by the "*very rich*" through non-payment of "*taxation*" as suggested by the 'we' deixes ("*We have been robbed (.) we are still being robbed*"). While this speaker appears to convey sympathy to the 'finite space' subtheme by orienting to housing and infrastructure ("*many o↑ther issues, about hou:sing, the NHS, the whole area of public expenditure*"), she argues that its sentiment causally derives from different underlying sources ("*because there are so: many o↑ther issues*"). The speaker is therefore attempting to display reasonableness by explaining the 'true' problems as those affecting everyone ("*we spend so much time talking about immigration, it's a s:ide issue when you think about what happened in 2008*"). Much like the 'recasting metaphors' strategy, this exposure is recasting the 'us versus them' dialectic from 'migrants' and 'citizens' to 'the rich' versus 'everyone else'.

Extract RS(a)18 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) Susie Boniface: Most of us migrants in this country at the moment forty thousand or so came from China. Now (.) what was the prime minister's response to the terrible problem of

Chinese migr↑ation? He's decided to relax the visa rules for the Chinese, it's a:ll right if they come. He doesn't want the Roma↑nians here, doesn't want the Bulgarians here, doesn't want people who are a bit du::sky or a little bit dark, people that don't bring enough money in, but he's happy for people who he can make a buck out of or go on a trade mission to with his father in [law. The way we ta::lk about migration] ((continues))

[((audience applause))]

Here the speaker problematises how social groups are treated differently in migration policy ("*Chinese migra↑tion*" versus "*Roma↑nians*" and "*Bulgarians*"). Susie's stake exposure lies in showing a political bias by the prime minister in favour of Chinese migrants for his own personal gain ("*He's decided to relax the visa rules for the Chinese, it's a:ll right if they come (...) but he's happy for people who he can make a buck out of or go on a trade mission to with his father in [law*"). Susie contrasts this elite interest in 'desirable' immigrants is contrasted against a list that is hearably imposed as reflecting the prime minister's own thoughts comprising of less economically or socially desirable groups ("*He doesn't want the Roma↑nians here, doesn't want the Bulgarians here, doesn't want people who are a bit du::sky or a little bit dark, people that don't bring enough money in*"). This could be read as an inverted use of the 'predictability' balkanism trope (Fleming, 2000), with the cited rejections evoking race ("*doesn't want people who are a bit du::sky or a little bit dark*") and class ("*people that don't bring enough money in*") mirroring the claims of civilisation superiority by Western sources in the balkanism literature (e.g., Jezernik, 2003). By projecting this alleged frame of racial/social thought to explain the prime minister's alleged abuse of political power, an indirect accusation of racism could be interpreted (cf. Goodman & Johnson, 2013).

Extract RS(a)19 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(p) Grant Shapps Does the UK need to pull out of Europe to control immigration was the question, and the a:nswer is, we want you to have a say in this. I believe that immigration has benefited this country. I believe that it's important to be able to travel around a free market that includes people being able to (.) move around. I'm surprised what Ni↑gel had to say, who'd be his

se↑cretary without his German wife, for example if there was no free movement ((continues))

Grant's account is presented as a personal conviction (e.g., "*I believe*"), a notable shift from his prior identification as a political party member ("*we want you to have a say in this*"). Grant's draws on this positioning to undermine Nigel's previously articulated position that free movement instead leads to 'uncertainty' (see Extract RS(a)10) with a stake exposure. Grant presents the ability to "*move around*" as a liberal entitlement with important economic implications ("*to travel around a free market*"). He implicates Nigel within this as Grant ponders with irony how Nigel would be disadvantaged without such freedom ("*I'm surprised what Ni↑gel had to say, who'd be his se↑cretary without his German wife, for example if there was no free movement*"). Grant is therefore presenting Nigel as disingenuous due to opposing something he has himself benefitted from. Thus, Grant invokes a stake exposure to help him frame free movement as a universal and positive freedom, rather than prior extracts where stake exposures pointed to alleged 'distraction' tactics of dubious actors.

The stake exposures presented show how speakers can consequentially draw on other speakers' identities to question the legitimacy of 'vulnerable nation' repertoire use in speaker accounts. While variable in the kinds of allegations made, they commonly seek to redefine the nation's gaze towards other concerns. Further, speakers positioned themselves as primarily concerned with the social challenges facing society in contrast to the agendas of those named in the stake exposures. This exhibition is to be expected: for as Edwards and Potter (1992, p.134) point out, "stake, interest or motivation is crucial in constructing factuality", both the speaker's lack thereof and the target's exposure, together corroborate account credibility.

The first section of Chapter III has outlined how the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire was mobilised argumentatively and rhetorically. While the predominant line of argument constructed the nation as under threat from migration, three particular subthemes augmenting this argument were considered: 'corroborating finite space and infinite migration', 'rallying ethno-national consensus against migrant threat', and 'necessitating threat through rationality'. Two forms of repertoire resistance were considered: 'recasting metaphors' and 'exposing stake and interest'. The second section investigates the second interpretative repertoire.

The 'civic imperative' repertoire

Extract RS(a)20 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) Paul Nuttall	(...) people have come on site onto building sites, people have been undercut, and British workers have been driven off and now you find they're either unemployed (.) or driving taxis in many cases

Extract RS(a)21 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(p) Chuka Umuna	(...) all that they ask is that (.) er we have properly controlled borders that we don't have people coming in and er undercutting our- British workers, er and they are not exploited themselves

Extract RS(a)22 (QT, Canterbury 11th December 2014)

(a) Audience member	(...) We have one of the most open doors but we need to vet people coming into this country. We don't want people with criminal histories. We don't want rapists, we don't want murderers, we don't want them

In these extracts, speakers are invoking the core line of argument for the 'civic imperative' repertoire: that migrants cause problems for the citizen, resulting in social inequality ("*British workers have been driven off*", "*undercutting our- British workers*") and make moral complaints against the identities or behaviours of migrants, residual or prospective ("*people have come on site onto building sites*", "*We don't want rapists, we don't want murderers, we don't want them*"). These narrations are concerned with social protection and border control ("*people have been undercut*", "*all that they ask is that (.) er we have properly controlled borders*", "*we need to vet people coming into this country*"). This societal boundary has great significance, for both its crossing ("*We have one of the most open doors but*") and its consequences ("*We don't want people with criminal histories*") embolden civic claims that the crossing must be consensual by the 'original' inhabitants or it becomes a burden, evoking a well-rehearsed analogy between border-crossing and the 'rape' of the body politic (Ana, 1997). The crossing is claimed by the 'citizen', and its crossing becomes a resource for delegitimisation as migrants become subject to suspicion and surveillance.

While culture and citizenship seem to feature strongly for both the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires, there is an important distinction is terms of argumentative emphasis and therefore rhetorical construction. While the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire invokes culture among other objects as a *finite entity* requiring protection from change or overuse due to the threat of migration, it is the *relations between actors* that is the chief focus for the 'civic imperative' repertoire, where (in)equality and identity becoming more vividly described as exposed to allegedly 'draining' effects of migration. The distinction between threat and burden is therefore key: while threat is generally realised by the rhetoric of migration as a metaphoric disaster or force (Charteris-Black, 2006), burden manifests as a relational formulation concerned with the disempowerment of 'citizens' in favour of 'migrants'. As a result, migration appears less often for the 'civic imperative' repertoire than migrant groups or individuals specifically.

Extract RS(a)23 (QT, Newbury, 16th October 2014)

(p) Jeremy Hunt	(...) Because we do want the benefits of people who are able and talented who can contribute to the British economy, but we don't want this uncontro:lled immigration and we di↑d have that before (.) and I think (.) the British people think enough is enough.

Burden logoi were the most common way of characterising this moral relationship between citizens and migrants, although contribution logoi were occasionally used in commands to 'obligate' the migrant towards the citizen, and thereby realise the same moral message. In this extract, Jeremy's use of the idiom "*enough is enough*" clearly demonstrates the burden logos used to advocate social change from a civic footing ("*we do want*", "*but we don't*", "*we di↑d have that*", "*the British people think enough is enough*"). However contribution is also emphasised whereby "*the benefits of people who are able and talented who can contribute to the British economy*" are promoted, but this is mitigated inasmuch as "*uncontro:lled*" (i.e., 'too much') migration is deemed problematic, although how is left unstated. The migrant, while *potentially* contributory, is also *potentially* burdensome: the citizen is framed as the mediator to decide the 'limit' or 'boundary'. In short, the migrant becomes a denizen, defined only in relation to their servitory relation to the citizen (Anderson B., 2013).

In the extracts presented so far in this section, speakers are constructing a position commonly emphasising how migrants and citizens *should* interact. This emergent 'moral matrix' defends citizens while also (implicitly or explicitly) challenging the legitimacy and/or value of migrants. Across the data speakers make claims favouring the rights/entitlements of the receiving community and compel the migrant with different obligations/responsibilities. Favouring the receiving community, specific national and/or civic categories of belonging (e.g., 'local' people) enact exclusionary boundaries as different "moral values, rules and considerations of fairness apply" (Opotow, 1990, p.1, cited in Tileagă, 2007, p.720-721). The resulting 'imperative' is a force constructed from both rhetorical delivery (e.g., a justification, challenge, complaint) and the prescriptions of variably construed social relations between migrant and citizen. While sometimes argued to advocate integration, assimilation is a pertinent effect of the talk (cf. Bowskill et al., 2007).

The proceeding section explores how the 'civic imperative' repertoire is constructed using two prominent subthemes, 'justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'', and 'identity conflation and vagueness', which were common but not essential variations embedded within the repertoire headline of a problematic burdensome migrant and victim citizen relationship. While not evident in every instance of 'civic imperative' repertoire talk concerning Romanian migration, these subthemes were nonetheless common features in constructing the central tenet of the repertoire that migrants by their nature are potentially burdensome (socially, economically, morally) and that the citizen needs to be shielded, usually voiced through implicit appeals to authoritarian control, protectionist restrictions and/or nationalist favour towards 'entitled' in-group members. Where relevant, the Balkanist tropes interpreted from Fleming (2000) will be flagged to draw attention to the explicit evidential deployment of balkanism in this contemporary discourse.

Subtheme one: justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'

This subtheme involves speakers drawing on egalitarian and seemingly inclusive categories/relations of belonging before discrediting them by emphasising the burdensome character or actions of the migrant who either spoils or undermines such a possibility. The result is 'unequal equality', whereby egalitarian positions are presented with justifications advocating unequal treatment. Wetherell, Stiven, and Potter (1987, p.65) argue that such contradictions become possible when the "moral language of should's, ought's, fairness

and duty" is hamstrung by presenting "facts of nature...[that] effectively undercut...the ideal" of liberalism. Equality is the 'ideal', whereas an unequal denizen-citizen relationship must be the 'reality'. Such talk justified exclusion in such a way that it becomes a regrettable yet factual and thereby 'necessary' reality (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984).

Extract RS(a)24 (QT, Basingstoke, 17th October 2013)

(p) Peter Oborne	(...) Let me just give you one fact (.) which is actually central to this whole argument. And that is that the average wage i: in Bulgaria and Romania is le: approximately ha:lf the minimum wage (.) in Britain. And so this is why last time when Labour got it wrong we had Polish professors comin- coming along to be cleaners in Britain. A:nd it does have an effect I'm afraid and like that councillor up there described it absolutely beautifully. The effect on public se↑rvices, scho:ols, housing, all of these things. I reckon tha- Europe itself needs to admit that its made a frightful (.) nonsense. (.) it's going to be the same problem (0.5) in Germany and France, and I think it's time to look again °you have time° and say to Bulgaria and Romania that it's not a good idea at the moment, to er: go ahead with this. A- a:nd sh- for the sake of Bulgaria and Romania who doesn't want to lose their best people (.) let's just put it on hold for a few years.

In this extract, Peter constructs "*Britain*" and "*Romania and Bulgaria*" as incompatible groups by invoking empirical (economic and psychological) claims. The economic claim utilises quantitative rhetoric to objectively portray Britain as more prosperous and thereby attractive for migration ("*the average wage i- in Bulgaria and Romania is le- approximately ha:lf the minimum wage (.) in Britain*"). The emphasised and elongated "*ha:lf*" and the contrasting terms for comparison ("*average wage" vs. "minimum wage*") qualify this as substantial rather than inconsequential. Peter uses this economic claim to argue that this difference has a direct causal effect on the migrant's psychology: in motivational terms they will be *solely* driven towards financial betterment which will end with an erroneous mismatch as shown through the professor-cleaner contrast ("*And so this is why last time when Labour got it wrong we had Polish professors comin- coming along to be cleaners*"). This is presented in a humanistic fashion as inherently 'wrong' (cf. Extract RS(a)10) due to the migrant not 'naturally' realising their

potential and thereby burdening the receiving community. This situation is presented regretfully: 'wishful' thinking has led to a grave mistake because different groups have been granted equality when they are not equal ("*Europe itself needs to admit that its made a frightful (.) nonsense (.) it's going to be the same problem (0.5) in Germany and France*"). While equality may be possible in the future, for now it is problematic ("*it's not a good idea <u>at</u> the moment*", "*let's just put it on hold*").

This burdensome inequality is developed by presenting migration as only occurring unidirectionally ("*A:nd it <u>do</u>es have an effect I'm afraid (...) The effect on public services, scho:ols, <u>ho</u>using, all of these things*"). Peter proposes a delay in free movement, softening its exclusionary implications by displaying concern for the migrant-sending community and presenting himself as a concerned spectator ("*you have time to say to Bulgaria and Romania that it's not a good idea <u>at</u> the moment, to er: go ahead*", "*Bulgaria and Romania who doesn't want to lose their best people*",). Peter characterises the UK as a receiving community (owing to its higher "*average wage*"), while the choice of migrants from "*Bulgaria and Romania*" to 'leave home' becomes questionable owing to the social incompatibility (the 'professor-cleaner' mismatch) and alleged moral abandonment of one's national identity and culture ("*lose their best people*"). Note also how the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) is evident in Peter's account owing to the deterministic outcome that Romanians will want to come ("*who doesn't want to lose their best people*"). Contrary to 'vulnerable nation' repertoire extracts where migration was presented as an amorphous 'force' (thereby making ambiguous the identities of those included), here Romanians are specifically positioned (alongside Bulgarian and Polish actors). To realise the inequality being advocated, Peter's account claims that Romania's civilisation status and its citizens' characteristics both entail that belonging as contributory members to UK society is not empirically possible.

Extract RS(a)25 (QT, Canterbury, 11th December 2014)

(a) Audience member	The point I want to make to Russell is that y- you claim to sort of stand up for the working cla:sses, but (.) you got to understand that it's the working classes that have been hit the <u>ha</u>rdest by immigratio- mass immigration. You know wage compression (.) th- the cha- change in the communities ove- over a short er short period of time has led to er you know te↑nsion within the communities. So you've got to appreciate that actually,

you know, it's all right sayin- er you know criticising UKIP and Nigel Farage but actually it's the people at the bottom of society that have been hit the hardest by immigration.

After criticising Russell, the speaker makes three empirical claims asserting how migration has affected the receiving community. Constructing migration as a force ("*hit the hardest by immigratio- mass immigration*"), the speaker focuses on its recipients: "*the working classes*". In contrast to Extract RS(a)24, a three-part list augments the speaker's account emphasising a profound shift in how the citizen group now imagine their "*communities*": "*wage compression*" (economics), "*change in the communities*" (demography), and "*te↑nsion within the communities*" (socio-psychological conflict). The migrant is implicitly attributed as an antagonist who has *caused* such changes following their entry, deemed by the speaker to have affected the most vulnerable citizens most, as demonstrated in the directional metaphor ("*bottom*") (where down-is-bad; see Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, p.16) ("*it's the people at the bottom of society that have been hit the hardest by immigration*"). While not as explicit as Peter's account previously, the speaker here is nonetheless presents themselves as weary of how migration is seen to cause unequal effects on receiving communities. In further contrast to Extract RS(a)24, the speaker here is invoking the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) by homogenising the migratory force and instead focusing upon its effects on the receiving community.

Extract RS(a)26 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) Nadine Dorris (...) we've got around seven hundred and fifty thousand illegal immigrants in the country, and we don't even know where they a↑re, .h we have inward net migration of about two hundred thousand. You know th- this scenario you're painting of people coming here deciding they can't find a job and going (.) just doesn't exist. People do come and they do stay. And this is one of the most important points as well. The people they present the biggest threat to, those people that come from Spain, and Romania and other countries who haven't got skills, who come to here to take the jobs of what (.) we would call blue collar workers. So it's people er in constituencies like Harlow and others who who actually feel the threat of not having protection of their borders because their jobs are in competition.

Prior to this extract, a dispute between Nadine and an audience member was unfolding based on the social and economic benefits and/or harm resulting from migration. Above, Nadine's argument emphasises a burden logos by referring to migration as morally unacceptable owing to its permanence ("*People do come and they do stay*"). This is presented as a challenge for the "*blue collar workers*" who compete against "*people that come from Spain, and Romania and other countries who haven't got skills*". Nadine reorients debate towards illegitimate and invisible Others that makes such migration appear extraordinarily wrong ("*we've got around seven hundred and fifty thousand illegal immigrants in the country, and we don't even know where they a↑re*"). Throughout Nadine's account, she draws on the 'unequal us and them' subtheme to argue the status quo is untenable because migrants possess unjust access and yield socio-economic power over citizens ("*they present the biggest threat to*", "*come to here to take the jobs*"). In this instance the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) is in play as the Romanian (and Spanish) actors are presented as lacking qualifications and harbouring threatening economic ambition ("*haven't got skills, who come to here to take the jobs*").

'Citizens' ("*people er in constituencies like Harlow and others*") are made vulnerable owing to economic encroachments and social exposure. A metaphor constructing migration as an invasion aids this argument ("*who actually feel the threat of not having protection of their borders because their jobs are in competition*"). The imperatives being advocated are that 'borders' should be 'protected', 'citizens' should have 'opportunities', and migrants should be transparent minority actors within the community. Migrants are accordingly obligated and excluded from a common identity, whereas citizens are afforded 'protection'. The emphasis on migrant obligation appears 'reasonable' (it would be rhetorically taboo to argue against 'taking responsibility') despite Nadine's footing as an 'advocate' for citizens vulnerable to immigrants is commensurate with nationalistic discourse owing to its explicit attempts to divide groups (Finlayson, 1998).

Extract RS(a)27 (QT, Falkirk, 28th November 2013)

(p) David Dimbleby	The woman in green there
(a) Audience member	M- my question to the panel is instead of enco:uraging migrants from whate↑ver country they- member come

	from I know that we have to under the EU rules, <u>hav</u>e to let them come in, but instead of <u>a</u>ctively encou↑raging them to come i::n and bring their skills with them, why don't we concentrate on [up-skilling], [and <u>tra</u>ining, and] <u>inv</u>e↑sting in our o↑wn young people?=
(p) Panellists	[Absolutely] [abs -olutely yeah]
(p) Margaret Curran	=absolutely yeah (...) an- the lady in green, if I may call you that. I think that's a ve:ry important point ((continues))

Here an audience member speaks after several panellists provided complementary accounts on migration, situating them as discordant to her own position ("*M- my question to the panel is instead of enco:uraging migrants from whate↑ver country they- member come from*"). She argues that while the status quo is unavoidable and coercive ("*I know that we have to under the EU rules, <u>hav</u>e to let them come in, but*"), the receiving society nonetheless should change the status quo where 'they' have been prioritised above 'us' ("*but instead of <u>a</u>ctively encou↑raging them to come i::n and bring their skills with them*") (cf. Lynn & Lea, 2003). While an inverted version of this argument might advocate that immigrants should be discouraged from coming, something potentially receivable as mean-spirited or even prejudicial in this interactional context (cf. Goodman, 2014), the speaker instead critiques the majority (herself included) as supporting this situation, illustrated through the rhetorical question challenging the panellists' prior accounts ("*why don't we concentrate on [up-skilling], [and <u>tra</u>ining, and] <u>inv</u>e↑sting in our o↑wn young people?=*"). The speaker also shifts footing from an individual ("*M- my question", "I know that we have to*") to instead emphasise concern for "*young people*" from a collective position ("*why don't we concentrate*", "*our o↑wn young people*"). The collective emphasis constructs consensuality within the receiving community. The actions needed are presented as a three-part list ("*[up-skilling]*", "*<u>tra</u>ining*", "*<u>inv</u>e↑sting*") which exemplifies the scale of intervention needed to redress the migrant-citizen balance.

A further important characteristic to this argument is how the 'us' group is further distinguished between types of 'young people'. By emphasising support for "*our o↑wn young people*", by implication migrant young people are excluded from this group (Billig, 1996). While less adversarial than other extracts, a clear inequality is still emphasised

between the migrant and citizen, where (young) citizens are victimised and in need of protection from migrants who are at best unimpeded or at worst actively encouraged to migrate. In a two-pronged action, the migrant is stigmatised as an unwelcome member of society while citizens conversely become empowered as an entitled group (e.g., Andreouli & Dashtipour, 2014; Barnes et al., 2004; Gibson, 2010). The 'us' and 'them' distinction places the migrant as the adversary impinging upon the receiving community's rights.

The extracts presented for this subtheme so far show complaints about the 'injustice' (note: not illegality) that unfolds following migrants entering the civic space. They present this as though such complaints unproblematically derive from "the empirical characteristics of an impersonal natural world" akin to the practices interpreted for the empiricist repertoire found in scientists' discourse (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1984, p.56). Thus inequality is presented as in need of redress to make the situation 'fair', although in effect this means shifting the balance of power from one alleged group (migrants, e.g., "*those people that come from Spain, and Romania*") to another (citizens, e.g., "*blue collar workers*", "*working classes*").

In the proceeding extracts, a slight variation to the subtheme will be explored. In prior extracts, the status quo was complained about as requiring change; conversely, speakers below will celebrate the status quo as an egalitarian achievement prior to condemning it as exposed to abuse by migrants. Thus, a similar 'unequal equality' is achieved despite celebrating equality initially. This bears close resemblance to disclaimers where speakers anticipate social criticism by minimising incongruence between their argument and those around them (Hewitt & Stokes, 1975). Thus, while prior extracts saw the migrant/citizen contrast starkly drawn, below the contrast is in effect softened.

Extract RS(a)28 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(p) Norman Baker	(...) but there lack of er logic applied to this er Vince Cable was telling me that one of his constituents er that he was canvassing said 'oh I'm fed up with all these people coming to this country, I'm going to go live in Spain' and there's a sense of irony that she was exercising the same rights as people were exercising to come he↓re. And we've got Brits (.) all over the European Union working (.) everywhere, working, studying, exercising their treaty of rights. And [if we start]

(p) Nadine Dorris [do you wa]nt a referendum Norman?=

(p) Norman Baker =start limiting other people's rights, then they'll start limiting (.) our rights as well. Of course we want people to come here to live and work for treaty of righ- we don't want people to just get treatment on the health service, but the way this has been approached by some elements of the media has not been helpful it's been destructive ((continues))

Here Norman invokes both contribution and burden logoi to emphasise an egalitarian and inclusive version of belonging prior to a complaint of inequality between citizens and migrants. Drawing on collaboration ("Vince Cable was telling me") and reported speech ("'*oh I'm fed up with all these people coming to this country, I'm going to go live in Spain*'") devices, Norman constructs a common European identity with associated rights ("*she was exercising the same rights as people were exercising to come he↓re*"). Promoting migration as opening opportunities, this egalitarian argument celebrates movement and 'active' citizenship ("*we've got Brits (.) all over the European Union working (.) everywhere, working, studying, exercising their treaty of rights*") (cf. Condor & Gibson, 2007).

Contrary to the inclusive European identity, Norman uses a consensus device to legitimate an obligation for migrants to contribute ("*Of course we want people to come here to live and work*", "*we don't want people to just get treatment*"), reaffirming a duality between citizens and migrants by obligating migrants specifically to 'contribute' due to the alleged abusive motives of the migrant ("*to just get treatment*"). Citizens reported to be funding said treatment ('genuine' contributors, as Norman implies: "*our rights*", "*we want*", "*we don't want*", "*We need*") are positioned to expect such abuse to not occur. Despite showing support for equal opportunities to "*live and work*", Norman's discouragement of burdensome conduct ("*to just get treatment on the health service*") realises this 'unequal equality' whereby the citizen is distinguished from the migrant in terms of rights and entitlements, as citizens are not predicated as having the same responsibilities to contribute (cf. Wetherell & Potter, 1992).

Extract RS(a)29 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(a) Audience member Will anybody admit that immigration from Europe has g'tten out of hand?

((later))

(p) Grant Shapps	(...) millions of Brits have gone and settled in places like Spa↑in and France, and elsewhere to reti:re (.) so we have to be looking at this in the round. So the idea that you ban it one way of course they'd just ban it the other way so there are advantages to Brits. (...) But I <u>do</u> agree that you have co[ntrol] these things. That's why this government for example has introduced measures where you <u>cannot</u> now go to the front of the housing queue if you haven't lived in the area or had an attachment (.) can't use the health service as if it's the <u>inter</u>national health service. That was wrong and we put an <u>e</u>nd to that. And that's quite right as well.
Nigel Farage	[how?]

Extract RS(a)29 demonstrates a similar display of egalitarian rhetoric, used as part of a disclaimer, to condemn 'unfairness' between migrants and rooted citizens. This extract is a part of Grant's turn following an accusatory question from an audience member ("*Will anybody admit that immigration from Europe has g't̲ten out of hand*?"). Grant first draws on an egalitarian argument favouring migration as an opportunity rather than hindrance (as in Extract RS(a)28) and portrays this position as representing 'reasonable' and unbiased thinking ("*so we have to be looking at this in the round*"). However, Grant then uses a disclaimer that marks modified realignment (Steensig, 2012) with the audience member ("*But I <u>do</u> agree that you have co[ntrol] these things*"). This is elaborated upon by advocating a 'landed citizenship' (Finlayson, 1998) argument where 'locality' is deemed a primary condition of entitlement ("*you <u>cannot</u> now go to the front of the housing queue if you haven't lived in the area or had an attachment (.) can't use the health service as if it's the <u>inter</u>national health service*"). Here, a moral position defending 'rooted' citizens is advocated as the idealised way to contribute 'properly'. Grant's argument also contrasts the values of 'queuing' and waiting 'patiently' with unfair forms of unfettered 'undercutting' ("*you <u>cannot</u> now go to the front of the housing queue*"). While all are argued to be 'equal', Grant nonetheless divides specific inhabitants, the 'local' and the 'nomadic', by evoking permanent residence as a universal requirement of inclusion and by presenting use of the nation's resources as rightfully reserved for the receiving community, with non-citizens deterred ("*can't use the health service as if it's the <u>inter</u>national health service*").

Extract RS(b)5 (TAMS, Reid-Cooper, 24 November 2013)

(ir) Andrew Marr	And if David Cameron goes back to the EU and says he wants to change the rules on welfare and so forth to try to stop the number of Romanians and Bulgarians coming in at the beginning of next year, will Labour support him on that?
(ie) Yvette Cooper	Well we already said last year that there were changes the Government could make already within the existing rules and changes that they should argue for across Europe as well to make sure that the system is fairer. I do think when people are coming to this country, they should be contributing, and so we've already said there are changes you could make to jobseeker's allowance so people can't come and claim jobseeker's allowance straightaway. (...) It's important to recognise that most people who come to this country do come to work and to contribute.

Here Andrew uses a hypothetical scenario to question Yvette on her position regarding potential action to "*change the rules on welfare*" and reduce "*the number of Romanians and Bulgarians coming in*" – a clear sense of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) owing to the 'certainty' asserted as to the migratory eventuality. Positioned as a political party representative ("*will Labour support him on that*?"), Yvette self-categorises as Labour ("*Well we already said last year*") and presents an argument that 'migrants should contribute' using a tautologia (by repeating the same idea in two different ways) ("*they should be contributing...so people can't come and claim jobseeker's allowance straightaway*"). Yvette's alignment reinforces a normative commitment to protect the receiving community, but this emphasis on obligation is inverted as Yvette then uses a disclaimer to argue that most already contribute ("*It's important to recognise that most people who come to this country do come to work and to contribute*"). The disclaimer here is fulfilling two functions insofar that it emphasises understanding for citizens by obligating migrants ("*they should be contributing*"), as well as evading a potential charge of denigrating an entire group. While Yvette orients to the rhetorically self-sufficient argument of a desire "*to make the system fairer*", the disclaimer used is actually highlighting an underlying inequality being sustained favouring citizens against prospective migrants who, while moving with the intention to contribute ("*most people...do come to work*"), are worthy of particularisation in the first instance. Following

Wood and Kroger's recommendation of acknowledging the unsaid (2000), the speaker's choice to leave unstated the responsibilities of receiving community citizens is a notable omission that reveals an unequal expectation for civic relations. By merit of arguing in favour of making the system "*fairer*", it can be argued that the status quo has elements of unfairness within it to the detriment of citizens. Of further import here is that Yvette generalises beyond Romanians: rather than speaking to Andrew's particular concern, instead it is based on migration as a whole where all European migrants as an interchangeable mass require the same administration, suggesting that the 'ambiguity' trope is being invoked too (Fleming, 2000).

Extract RS(b)6 (TAMS Marr-Gove, 24th November 2013)

(ir) Andrew Marr	The Prime Minister is determined to have a showdown if he needs to with the EU on the number of Bulgarian and Romanians coming into this country early [on to] remove benefit rights for them for a year or so. Do you agree with that? Is it practical politics, do you think?
(ie) Michael Gove	[Yes] Yes, I absolutely agree with him and I do think it's practical politics. The Prime Minister has (.) and I think Yvette acknowledged this earlier (.) struck exactly the right note on migration, which is to celebrate the achievements of people who've come here, to recognise that migration has to work for people who are already here from whatever background; but when it comes to new migrants from accession countries in the EU, we need to look properly at the benefits system here (.) to make sure that people are coming here to work and to contribute, not to take advantage of what is rightly a generous welfare state.

Here Andrew is scene-setting by employing what Lakoff and Johnson (1980) term as an 'argument is war' metaphor ("*The Prime Minister is determined to have a showdown if he needs to with the EU*"). The unstated reason to 'fight' this 'battle' is presented as something potentially 'rational' rather than 'ideological', despite its clearly exclusionary effects based on nationalistic logic ("*practical politics*"; cf. Weltman & Billig, 2001). Michael aligns with Andrew's formulation of this argument as pragmatic ("*Yes, I absolutely agree with him and I do think it's practical politics*"). By aligning with 'external' speakers, a consensus representing the receiving community is constructed and

contribution becomes morally necessary ("*migration has to work for people who are already here from whatever background*"). The inequality between groups, then, is presented as a rational necessity due to an appeal to belonging based on citizens' roots to the receiving community. While, of course, this entails a relativist descent into competing accounts over which inhabitants can claim truly 'indigenous' roots, it is somehow treated as a taken-for-granted fact that recent 'arrivals' are different to receiving 'members'. Note how Andrew's specific reference to Romanians is circumvented by Michael, who uses vague categories ("*people who've come here*") and undefined contributions ("*celebrate the achievements*") thereby avoiding any explicit Balkanist tropes (Fleming, 2000). Michael acknowledges the cultural achievements of migrants while also asserting a requirement to materially contribute ("*but when it comes to new migrants from accession countries in the EU, we need to look properly at the benefits system here*"). This disclaimer is operating differently to Yvette's in Extract RS(b)5, as Michael argues that while cultural success is noted, scrutiny concerning the principles of material contribution and/or abuse prevention remains necessary. Importantly, Michael presents the indigenous group, while open to inclusion ("*whatever background*" implies recognition of its gradual expansion), as entitled over 'new' arrivals as a natural state-of-affairs. The key question arising out of this inequality lies in the longevity or actions required whereby one becomes eligible to belong to the recognised 'indigenous' group (Taylor, C., 1992). Another noteworthy feature is the 'predictability' trope (Fleming,2000) that Romanians will even require social support.

Viewed through the 'unequal equality' subtheme, the 'civic imperative' repertoire is an interesting contrast to the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire. Unequal relations between the migrant and citizen are used to disadvantage and discourage prospective migrants by imparting blame, issuing complaints and imposing obligations. These actions markedly contrast with the fear-inducing warnings of finite space and/or emphasis on rationality for the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire. As Augoustinos and Every (2007, p.128) note, complaining of out-groups through the prism of "socially acceptable issues, such as economic parity, is...an effective way of externalising one's views". Worked up through the use of empirical markers, the 'necessity' of social exclusion is advocated as consensual politics despite actually leading to division and conflict. The 'us' and 'them' distinction is also notable insofar that the victim citizen is presented as "tolerant, hospitable, and rational", whereas migrants are "portrayed in ways that problematise and marginalise them: as criminal, deviant, passive, and culturally alien", thus furthering the argument that

migrants are *unnaturally* powerful in society and 're-equalisation' is required (Augoustinos & Every, 2007, p. 129).

Subtheme two: identity conflation and vagueness

For this subtheme, speakers go beyond simply bringing into relevance the plight of citizens resulting from migrant entry and habitation; they attribute ascriptions of character to Romanian migrants, thereby "displaying their understanding of the world" (Fitzgerald et al., 2009, p.47). It is a collection of claims where it is evident that the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) is in action owing to the anchoring of character to a social group. Sacks (1995, p.597) articulated that category work in talk is not merely descriptive, but is also "relevant for the doing of some activity". The key activity speakers engage in involves the assertion of civic and social rights to discredit, delegitimise or exclude a generalised Romanian 'Other'. Hester and Eglin (1997, p.3) argue that such formulations of categories, predicates and attributes are consequential manifestations of the "presumed common sense knowledge" of culture (cited in Fitzgerald & Housley, 2015, p.4). Thus, the conflations identified as belonging to the Romanian 'Other' notably unfolds alongside a lack of disagreement of precise meanings or groups, signalling ideological consensus over the veracity of the cultural knowledge made relevant.

Extract RS(b)7 (TAMS, Mair-Smith, 17th February 2013)

(ir) Eddie Mair	Let's turn to Romanians and Bulgarians. The Mail today says there's a secret Chequers summit planned for Thursday on scroungers and illegal immigrants. The Prime Minister will be there, George Osborne will be there, the Chief of Staff at No. 10 will be there, the polling guru Lynton Crosby will be there.
(ie) Iain Smith	Yeah.
(ir) Eddie Mair	And I searched the article. I didn't see your name. Are you in on this secret meeting or?
(ie) Iain Smith	Well I have to tell you that I've already had a meeting with the Prime Minister and the team of people last week about coordinating this ((continues))

Here Eddie occasions "*Romanians and Bulgarians*" as a topic of self-sufficient intelligibility ("*Let's turn to*") before substituting them for two paired categories invoking burdensome ascriptions ("*scroungers and illegal immigrants*"). Iain responds by aligning

with Eddie's event description ("*Yeah*") and goes on to account for his role by reclaiming credibility as a relevant and authoritative speaker ("*Well I have to tell you that I've already had a meeting with the Prime Minister*"). The predication of Romanian identity with criminals and moral villains, while interpretable as simply invoking stereotypical traits (Zerilli, 2013), can also be seen as being as 'factualised' in this exchange. By primarily focusing on the attendees of the "secret Chequers summit" and Iain's political relevance ("*I didn't see your name*"), Iain does not question the conflations made, such linking an entire nationality with indolence. Indeed, it is reinforced when elite actors are situated as potential figures prepared to solve 'the problem' ("*secret Chequers summit*").

Extract RS(b)8 (TAMS, Marr-Clegg, 17th November 2013)

(ir) Andrew Marr	Okay. Let's jump to yet another subject (.) one that's home for you, as it were, which is the Roma controversy on the streets of Sheffield.
(ie) Nick Clegg	Yeah, yeah.
(ir) Andrew Marr	Now there's been criticism of David Blunkett's intervention, but clearly there are problems on the streets. Shouldn't you be doing more to encourage Roma families and other families when they come into this country to learn about how people live (.) putting out the dustbins, dealing with waste, dealing with sort of how they treat their children in the streets (.) those kind of things, basic stuff?
(ie) Nick Clegg	Yes of course, but that is best done of course by the communities themselves with the work, with the assistance of course of local authorities and indeed local politicians. ((continues))
(...)	
(ir) Andrew Marr	I want to distinguish between Roma and Romania and Bulgaria=
(ie) Nick Clegg:	=Indeed.
(ir) Andrew Marr:	but there's a huge new migration wave just about to happen at the end of this year. There have been calls in

	the House of Commons for special new emergency legislation to stop it ((continues))

Andrew invokes the category "*Roma families and other families*" and predicates them with socio-cultural unrest. Andrew attempts to place responsibility on Nick as a representative of the area to promote cohesion ("*Let's jump to yet another subject (.) one that's home for you (...) Shouldn't you be doing more*"). Note how Andrew here adopts the same referent style as Eddie in Extract RS(b)7 when referring to "*the Roma controversy on the streets*" as recognisable. Here, Andrew invokes top-down assimilation as a means of ensuring social harmony by promoting the acquisition of cultural skills and the implied relinquishing of otherwise unacceptable behaviours ("*those kind of things, basic stuff?*"). Nick responds by fragmenting this responsibility from himself solely to a network of local agents ("*that is best done of course by the communities themselves...with the assistance of course of local authorities and indeed local politicians*").

As Nick undertakes this accountability work, the topic is turned by Andrew as he attempts to distinguish between groups ("*Roma and Romania and Bulgaria*"). While this is mutually agreed ("=*Indeed*"), this distinction is left unexplained as Andrew justifies this new categorical inclusion with a disaster metaphor used to invoke an impending 'threat' from potential migration ("*but there's a huge new migration wave just about to happen*") which has been met by alarm by legislators ("*calls in the House of Commons for special new emergency legislation to stop it*"). In effect the moral discrepancies previously documented become premised as relevant features to inform why this concern is legitimisable. The conflation, while differentiated by Andrew, is in effect nullified because a pragmatic norm of 'implicature' links the threat and associated panic within the context of moral conduct previously covered. Thus, the distinguished groups are conflated to form a generalised Other requiring civilisation ("*basic things*") or, ideally, altogether exclusion in the first place ("*stop it*"), in order to make sense (cf. Grice, 1975).

Extract RS(b)9 (TAMS, Marr-Farage, 4th April 2014)

(ir) Andrew Marr	Alright well let me ask you about something that you said yourself in an interview in the Guardian. You said that people should be worried if Romanians moved into the same street as them, and you wouldn't say the same thing about Nigerians presumably or Chinese or anybody else?

(ie) Nigel Farage	Well the question was, the question was you know "If a whole load of Romanian men moved in next door to you, would you be concerned about it?" Perhaps you would, yes.
(ir) Andrew Marr	Why?
(ie) Nigel Farage	Because you know that what has actually happened is we've opened up the doors to countries that haven't recovered from communism and I'm afraid it's become a gateway for organised crime. Everybody knows that. No-one dares say it.

Andrew asks Nigel a question based on his moral warning to citizens ("*You said that people should be worried if Romanians moved into the same street as them*") that implicates a discriminatory attitude towards Romanians ("*you wouldn't say the same thing about Nigerians presumably or Chinese or anybody else*"). Nigel attempts to justify this particularisation by reframing his claim that having "*a whole load of Romanian men*" as neighbours would merit particular concern through 'active reporting', emphasising a particular version of the question ("*Well the question was*") where the group was large and hearably intimidating ("*a whole load of Romanian men*"). The characteristics of this question are important in 'ontologically gerrymandering' (Woolgar & Pawluch, 1985, cited in Potter, 1996, p.183) Nigel's conflation of Romanianness with deviance. The use of category vagueness ("*whole load*") denotes a liminal and uncountable 'crowd' moving unpredictably en masse. Similarly, ascriptions to "*Romanian men*" suggests that specific (and unmentioned) ethnic and gender characteristics of these actors are problematic. This can be seen more clearly if we swapped the category from "*men*" to women: it would be hearably less threatening (see Wood & Kroger, 2000 on swapping categories). The response, adopted through the implied footing of a local resident ("*concerned*"), frames movement as causing primarily *negative* emotion (e.g., rather than excitement). The answer is also hedged so as to sound open rather than dogmatic or prejudiced, and is framed as reflecting a hypothetical person ("*Perhaps you would, yes*"). These devices situate Nigel as agnostic or even uncommitted to this account (cf. Wooffitt, 2005).

As Andrew challenges Nigel ("*Why*?"), Nigel invokes two metaphors presenting Britain as a container exposed to abuse from disease-stricken migration ("*we've opened up the doors to countries that haven't recovered from communism*"), inverting his argument from the problematic migrant (the implied reasons to be "*concerned*" about "*Romanian*

men") to the nation's plight. Nigel's sympathetic stance ("*I'm afraid*"), espousing to represent a consensus ("*Everybody knows that*") makes such characterisations appear honest and popular. This is contrasted to alleged prevailing 'censorship' which he challenges ("*No-one dares say it*") (cf. Goodman & Johnson, 2013 on the 'free speech' trope).

Extract RS(b)10 (TAMS, Marr-Smith, 17th February 2013)

(ir) Eddie Mair	In your opinion, are Roma potentially more of a problem than other Romanians and Bulgarians?
(ie) Iain Smith	No, I don't look at any one sub-category of groups of people. I just look at people coming in who we think don't and shouldn't have a right to claim benefits because they've made no contribution to the tax bill, national insurance bill. So that's really the guiding figure I have. I don't sub-divide any particular group. (...) My view on life is very simple: that we make sure that our door is shut to those who want to come and claim benefits and is open to those who want to come and contribute and help work and make this economy good and strong.

In this extract, Eddie's question is resisted by Iain who inverts the question to instead emphasise an obligation for migrants to contribute. As was seen in Extract RS(b)8, "*Roma*" are differentiated from "*Romanians and Bulgarians*", with Eddie occasioning burden when asking for Iain's opinion on who is more problematic ("*are Roma potentially more of a problem than other Romanians and Bulgarians*?"). Thus Eddie is conflating a broader migrant group as causing problems for the receiving community, with the issue under scrutiny simply being how sub-groups rank relative to one another. Iain disagrees, drawing on an egalitarian claim concerning his own attitudes towards these groups ("*No, I don't look at any one sub-category of groups of people*"). This situates Iain as open-minded to everyone: in other words, he is not discriminatory, contesting the basis of differentiation in Eddie's question. However, Iain then goes on to argue that he only differentiates in terms of who has or hasn't the "*right to claim*", thus instead realising an equity-based position based on 'contribution'. An obligation to contribute is marked as the indicator to consent to migrant belonging. Indeed, as Iain argues, the nation must be protected from 'dependants', and only welcome 'workers' ("*we make sure that our door is*

shut to those who want to come and claim benefits"). While this extract is an interesting example of how the ethnic ascription to "*Roma*" (and to a lesser extent, "*Romanians or Bulgarians*") as "*a problem*" is resisted (cf. Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013), the way that contribution is used to respond to questions concerning burden nonetheless affirms that this generalised migrant group who does not contribute warrants surveillance and exclusion if deemed burdensome.

Extract RS(b)11 (TAMS, Marr-Cameron, 11th May 2014)

(ie) David Cameron	(...) You get these big migratory flows when you have countries with very different levels of income, so the massive move that there was from Poland and the other countries that joined in [2004]
(ir) Andrew Marr	[And] including Bulgaria and Ro[mania]
(ie) David Cameron	[was] based on the fact that the income levels were so different. So you could have transitional controls that say, for instance, you don't have the freedom to move and get a job in another country until, say, your level of income per capita is at a certain level. ((later)) You know the fact that after 2004 you know about a million people move from parts of Eastern Europe to Britain (.) I think net now about 700,000 (.) that has changed our country, it's changed our political culture, and it's right that politicians and prime ministers=
(ir) Andrew Marr	=For better or for worse?
(ie) David Cameron	I think a lot of the people who've come have contributed a huge amount in terms of working in our economy, but I think it's absolutely right to grip this issue and have a plan for sorting it out.

Here, both Andrew and David corroborate the conflation of different Eastern European migratory groups. As David justifies an argument that equates economic comparability with social compatibility, he invokes a narrative of cause-effect ("*so the massive move that there was from Poland and the other countries that joined in [2004]...[was] based on the fact that the income levels were so different*"). The metaphor invoking migration as a liquid ("*migratory flows*") complements this allegation of a

"*massive move*", of migrants fluidly seeking material riches: and because it has occurred before ("*in [2004]*"), it may happen again. After Andrew interrupts to question if Romanians are included within this account ("*including Bulgaria and Romania*"), David proposes that to prevent the reoccurrence of such migration, an economic lever must be used whereby migration becomes possible after pre-defined 'levels' are reached ("*income per capita is at a certain level*"), leaving unsaid its short-term exclusionary social implications. Polish and Romanian migrants therefore comprise two distinct-yet-comparable groups, whereby the former acts as a justification necessitating exclusion of the latter ("*I think it's absolutely right to grip this issue and have a plan*").

As David narrates how migration and society have interacted, construing social change as caused by migration from "*Eastern Europe*", he provides an elaborate contrast between a migratory group of a large region to a single nation ("*after 2004 you know about a million people move from parts of Eastern Europe to Britain*"). Notably, the resulting change is not explicitly condemned or praised, but presented as a factual description, as shown by the repeated assertions of 'change' in the form of a three part list ("*that has changed our country, it's changed our political culture, and it's right that politicians and prime ministers*="). David uses this three-part list to justify equal relations and thereby free movement as a future ambition ("*until, say, your level of income per capita is at a certain level*"). While the past is used to disclaim prejudice ("*a lot of the people who've come have contributed a huge amount*"), and the present is used to promote David as sympathetic to civic concerns ("*it's absolutely right to grip this issue and have a plan for sorting it out*"), the resulting conflation becomes even broader as past (contributory) migrants are implicated with current (problematic) migrants. Phrased in a positive form, David does not invoke the exclusionary implication that the ideal of an inclusive society cannot be achieved minimising or even preventing newcomers from moving to Britain.

The extracts presented for the 'identity conflation' subtheme demonstrate how categories can be occasioned, combined and implicated sequentially to promote social exclusion against Romanians. Even when specific groups, such as the Roma, are differentiated from Romanians, they are commonly implicated within justifications for exclusion. It is argued that this conflation comprises a complementary means to moralise the effects of Romanian migration due to its expansive referents. As van Dijk (1984) argues, such vagueness is useful, as the necessity to engage in the cultural exclusion of

migrants belies their categorical necessity as a deviant insurgency within the receiving community.

The 'civic imperative' repertoire's main line of argument whereby speakers distinguished between those categorised as 'migrant other' causing social and/or moral damage against those categorised as 'citizens' has been explored in the context of two subthemes: one concerning unequal relation justification (whether migrants should be treated differently, or in the opposite sense why citizens should be socially elevated), the other concerning the conflation of various potentially relevant migrant groups (often subsumed as one group) allegedly responsible for said transgressions. For the latter subtheme, the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) is particularly evident through the extract owing to the connection of negative attributes to Romanians. Below two salient strategies used to resist this repertoire and its associated argument are considered: ''us' and 'we' identity claims', and 'immigrant identity claims'.

Resisting the 'civic imperative' repertoire

'Us' and 'we' identity claims

For this strategy, speakers constructed a common identity underpinned by a legacy of contribution, resisting intergroup 'us and them' formulations promoting difference to instead invoke "superordinate level" categories (Chryssochoou, 2004, p.53). The migrant-citizen distinction central to moral repertoire arguments is dissolved, and in its place an inclusive identity emphasised. Contribution is used as an implication – an actual possibility or reality, with members working harmoniously towards common goals.

Extract RS(a)30 (QT, Lewisham, 9th January 2014)

(a) Audience member	(...) How do they just take the jobs? [It's someone's cho]ice to employ somebody. [They don't just come] here and pitch up and say 'oh I'm gunna ha[ve your job'. They apply for jobs in the same way as everyone else] they apply for jobs just like everyone else and in a market economy if I employ X who comes from Spain over (.) you know=
(p) Nadine Dorris	[if you're someone] [coming from Romania]

[((audience applause
]))

=because in a black market economy people taking <u>less</u>
money and less than the minimum wage [to work]

Here, an audience member disputes Nadine's prior use of the 'civic imperative' repertoire (see Extract RS(1)26; recall that "*illegal immigrants*" were constructed as a "*threat*" to "*blue collar workers*"). This occurs by invoking the capitalist employer, a 'rational' decision-maker aversive to prejudice ("*[It's someone's ch]oice to employ somebody", "and in a market economy if I employ X who comes from Spain over (.) you know*="). Notably, the "*market economy*", contrary to being a commodifying entity filled with masses of people (cf. Extract RS(a)8), is instead a 'pure' system recruiting meritocratic ally. In addition to a shared 'rational' employer is a common employment process ("*They apply for jobs in the same way as everyone else] they apply for jobs just like everyone else*"). Disputing Nadine's criticism of "illegal" migration and the 'unfairness' resulting from unseeable migrants threatening citizens, the audience member uses a rhetorical question to challenge Nadine's claim ("*How do they just take the jobs*?"). Nadine's use of illegitimacy is contested by invoking legitimate social structures organising migration: employers and employment procedures. Between the audience member and Nadine, competing realities treated are disputed as to the 'true' nature of 'the problem', with Nadine's later response concerned with the impossibility of certain knowledge concerning elicit working practices ("*because in a black market economy*"). Thus the argument is based on speakers claiming diametrically opposed realities: a rational utopian society governed by egalitarian principles versus a dystopian underworld built on mob rule, underhand tactics, and exploitation.

Extract RS(a)31 (QT, Barking, 6th March 2014)

(p) Simon Hughes (...) we c<u>an</u>'t change the rules on the European Union because it's a free trade free movement id↑ea. And there are two and a half million pe[ople], who are <u>Br</u>itish, living in other p[arts of the European Union, because they chose to go there. Right? It's not a one way street. And together we are better than being on our own.]

(p) David Dimbleby [right]

[
((audience applause))]

Here Simon disrupts a migrant-citizen distinction by constructing Britain as a member of a collection of nations in the European Union, following a common system of rules and practice ("*we can't change the rules on the European Union because it's a free trade free movement id↑ea*"). A characteristic of this union is perpetual migrancy ("*And there are two and a half million pe[ople], who are British, living in other p[arts of the European Union, because they chose to go there*"). The shared identity is also intertwined with a metaphor constructing this collection of nations as both 'receivers' and 'senders' of migrants ("*It's not a one way street*"), contesting the 'burden' logos by implicating multidirectional movements. Constructing citizens as potential migrants renders the claim distinguishing real and meaningful 'insiders' and 'outsiders' as obsolete (cf. Billig, 1996).

Extract RS(a)32 (QT, Southampton, 8th May 2014)

(p) Shirley Williams	(...) the whole idea was the equality of citizens in the EU and above all Earnest Bevan said years ago 'I want to live in a continent where you don't have to show a passport to go from one place to another. It's the ideal of the liberty of individuals to move wherever they want [to live]

Shirley uses a reported speech device to construct a common identity and rights ("equality of citizens in the EU", "where you don't have to show a passport to go from one place to another"). Migration becomes an opportunity to engage in commonly-held practices (as in Extract RS(a)30), with freedom to move a universal possibility ("*It's the ideal of the liberty of individuals to move wherever they want [to live]*"). The metaphor constructing freedom as a passport seems to link a symbol of citizenship with migration ("*you don't have to show a passport to go from one place to another*"). This is starkly different to those that characterise migration as causing tension between movers and receivers, with citizenship implicitly used justifying this distinction (e.g., Extract RS(a)25).

In these extracts, a shared identity is used to usurp divisions. Crucially, the migrant-citizen distinction becomes fragmented and undermined by the sharing of common category predicates: whether rights, opportunities or practices. By constructing 'commonalities' rather than 'differences', contribution becomes a possibility, and

explanations of social problems are by implication a collective outcome rather than traceable to specific groups. What makes this strategy more tricky to uphold, however, is the longstanding dominance (and thereby simplicity and accessibility) of narratives that allege how things changed for 'our society' after 'they came' (Triandafyllidou, 2000).

Immigrant identity claims

For this strategy, speakers claimed an affinity to various 'immigrant' identities, allowing them interactional space to make claims under a guise of authenticity due to the integration of stake confessions and stake inoculations (cf. Edwards & Potter, 1992). However, these claims were not only used to normalise migration or emphasise commonality between migrants, citizens, and naturalised citizens, but also used to differentiate 'good' and 'bad' migrants. Thus, it was also possible to use this claim to reconstruct division between the citizen and migrant by re-imposing a migrant potential to be burdensome. The strategy therefore had potential to both resist and reinforce the 'civic imperative' repertoire.

Extract RS(a)33 (QT, Canterbury, 11th December 2014)

(p) Mary Creagh	(...) And we want to control the effects of immigration, but as the daughter of somebody who came here to work from Ireland in the 1960s and who paid his way and contributed to this economy, I think that some of the tone of what you say (.) Nigel, about immigrants and blaming them for all sorts of ra:ndom problems, is not the way our country wants to go.

Mary situates an immigrant identity claim to challenge opposition arguments that blame migration 'unduly', a claim made more powerful owing to the speaker's claimed familial links and 'entitlement' to be knowledgeable of the implications of such talk for the nation (cf. Extract RS(a)15) ("*I think that some of the tone (...) about immigrants and blaming them for all sorts of random problems, is not the way our country wants to go*"). This account is initially occasioned by a disclaimer seeking to display balance between a desire to control and the risk of blame ("*And we want to control the effects of immigration, but*"). Mary invokes an historical intention to contribute by her father, presenting herself as an example of both firm personal morality ("*came here to work*") and economic potential

("*who paid his way and contributed to this economy*"). Further, Mary contrasts her account with Nigel's which is presented as irrational due to the assertion of "*ra:ndom*" blame ("*the tone of what you say (.) Nigel, about immigrants and blaming them for all sorts of ra:ndom problems*"). Thus she is also presenting her argument as a distinction between logic and prejudice, a notable reclamation of logic when considering the use of rationality in prior extracts.

Extract RS(a)34 (QT, Bristol, 13th December 2012)

(p) Audience member I believe that the people in Britain is what makes Britain, Britain. You've got all these diverse communities; well, there's loads of them round Britain, and all coming together to be British is what makes Britain, Britain. If you think about it, for example, my granddad is Hungarian, and back in the day, I'm not sure how many years ago, but he ran his own hot-dog stand in Bristol, and he is part British. He's like kind of putting British history in a set of views

Here the speaker invokes a version of 'Britishness' using an immigrant identity claim (again, in historical familial terms as in Extract RS(a)33), defined through multiculturalism ("*You've got all these diverse communities; well, there's loads of them round Britain, and all coming together to be British is what makes Britain, Britain*"). The inclusive frame within which belonging is initially introduced ("*I believe that the people in Britain is what makes Britain, Britain*") establishes commonality between an array of different groups by emphasising the common material and symbolic space within which they share. The speaker presents a 'sum' of immigrant identities as the 'parts' that 'make' British identity. Note also how quantitative rhetoric presented as a three-part list is used to denote the extent of diversity ("*all these diverse communities*", "*loads of them round Britain*", "*all coming together*"). This diversity is celebrated as British culture becomes a mass of opinions and/or voices ("*a set of views*"). Contrary to prior extracts emphasising difference as divisive (e.g., as in Extract RS(a)24), here the speaker argues that diversity enables 'Britishness' to manifest, combining an individualist conception of uniqueness with a common symbolic identifications with Britishness with working and belonging ("*my granddad is Hungarian, and back in the day, I'm not sure how many years ago, but he ran his own hot-dog stand in Bristol, and he is part British*"). While hedged as an uncertain memory in regards to detail (e.g., "*I'm not sure*"), it is also presented as a

rehearsed and celebrated story within his family ("*back in the day*") which seem to corroborate his belief in Britishness as genuinely held.

Extract RS(a)35 (QT, Barking, 6th March 2014)

(p) Amanda Platell	(...) look (.) I think I'm the only one on the panel who is an immigrant. I came from Australia twenty eight years ago with a backpack, I love this country I'm really glad to be able to live here but I never came here expecting that I would be able to get a house, use (.) you know send child benefit back home, use the welfare system I always thought it a privilege to be here. ((continues))

In stark contrast, this extract sees an immigrant identity claim used by Amanda to establish her expertise and thus entitlement to assert a moralised account of migration 'etiquette' ("*look (.) I think I'm the only one on the panel who is an immigrant*"). This claim is insulated insofar that a particular sort of migrant identity is claimed: that of someone who "*came from Australia twenty eight years ago with a backpack*". As was interpreted in the case of Extract RS(a)10), the evocation of national and/or cultural groups can be significant in their 'inference richness' (Sacks, 1995). Amanda's Anglospheric account, while presented as an 'ordinary' migration story, invokes imagery of a young traveller discovering their 'identity' (e.g., Lyons & Wearing, 2008), a narrative worlds apart from versions evoking Romanianness as tied to disease (Extract RS(b)9) or prohibition (Extract RS(a)10), whereby the migrant becomes a potential economic and social burden. Simultaneously, Amanda's claim inoculates against two possible accusations: of lacking authenticity ("*I love this country I'm really glad to be able to live here*"), and of presuming an entitlement to be supported ("*but I never came here expecting (...) I always thought it a privilege to be here*"). Amanda's 'good' migrant identity disputes that all migrants are bad, yet by definition distances itself from a migrant Other that is "*expecting*" support with unwarranted materialist motives. It infers the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) as to the migrant groups targeted for her disapproval.

While the 'immigrant identity' strategy can be seen as having comparable interactive potential as the ''us' and 'we' identity claims' strategy by proposing an identity defined by common heritage and relevance in everyday life, it also has a nuanced difference. By claiming to have an identity informed by immigrant heritage, the speaker can be seen to be

differentiating themselves from other speakers, whether in preparation for a critique of others (Extract RS(a)33), an attempt to justify one's own argument (Extract RS(a)34), or differentiate good from bad migrants (Extract RS(a)35). It is therefore problematically straddling the boundaries between self and other identities: while all speakers are like 'everyone else' insofar that a common symbolic space is being shared, the temporal relationship to that space (i.e., when one entered it) is key in enabling the familiar 'us' and 'them' distinctions to be redeployed (Triandafyllidou, 2000).

Discussion of the receiving society interpretative repertoire analysis

Chapter III has now outlined how Romanian identity and migration were constructed in the dataset and thereby contributed to the thesis' first main aim. The next section now reviews the main findings, bringing together the overall effects and implications of the two interpretative repertoires, their subthemes, and resistance strategies in the dataset as a whole. It will also discuss how these findings help to frame the historicity of the discourse with references to Balkanism studies (as per the thesis' third main aim). Finally, by framing the receiving society discourse studied as an acculturative context, it will help establish the analysis of the reflective accounts of self-defined Romanians in Chapter IV (as per the thesis' second main aim).

A review of Chapter IIIs main findings

Chapter III's analysis has shown how the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires were variously deployed in a dataset comprising live television talk (QT and TAMS) as exemplars of UK receiving society discourse. It has been shown how the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire's main line of argument of the acrimonious nation-migration relationship was mobilised and could be augmented by three subthemes: 'corroborating finite space and infinite migration', 'rallying ethno-national consensus against migration threat', and 'justifying threat as rational'. It has also been shown how the 'civic imperative' repertoire's main line of arguments concerning the problematic burdensome migrant and victim citizen was mobilised and could be augmented by two subthemes: 'justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'', and 'identity conflation and vagueness'. Attention was also paid to how these repertoires were countered, with 'vulnerable nation' repertoire resistance including two strategies: 'recasting metaphors', and 'exposing stake and

interest'. These strategies sought to occasion reliance logoi, create common cause against newly-defined Others (elites) or assert contribution logoi as 'reality'. 'Civic imperative' repertoire counters entailed resistance in the form of two strategies: ''us' and 'we' identity claims', and 'immigrant identity claims'. These strategies sought to legitimise reliance and contribution logoi by constructing inclusive identities or by animating the migrant identity as an active and contributory presence in the receiving community.

The findings demonstrate how much of the discourse invoking the two repertoires' main arguments of nation-migration acrimony and citizen-migrant inequality situated Romanian identity as problematic and thereby deserving of political debate and social critique. The status quo, manifesting on grounds of ethno-geographical threat by migration and civic burden by migrants, was often presented as unacceptable and comprised the "argumentative texture" (Laclau, 1993, cited in Wetherell, 1998, p.393) under dispute. While not incontestable, the overwhelming use of fact construction devices and their often consensual reception in situ meant that many claims seemed to be accepted as 'self-evident' (see e.g., Extract RS(a)7). Even when considering the resistance strategies, speakers were guided by normative interventions (e.g., Extract RS(a)15 and16) and talk was also sometimes intertwined with dominant themes such as when contribution is blurred between actual and obligatory claims (e.g., Extract RS(a)23). With the exception of 'recasting metaphors' and ''us' and 'we' identity claims', the remaining resistance strategies proved to be highly contingent in disputing the two repertoire's respective arguments in situ. In any case, resistance was often unable to change the territory of opinion whereby Romanian migration or migrants were presented as a (potential or active) problem needing political resolution rather than, say, as something that merited celebration or positive affirmative action. This dominant line of argument is evidenced by its sheer prevalence in the data and thereby cements its ideological underpinning as it is conveyed as "...orthodoxy, almost entirely persuasive, beyond which we can barely think" (Wetherell, 2003, p.14). It's also notable how prevalent the balkanist 'predictability' trope was through the dataset, more so than the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000). It seems that the tendency to construct Romanians in specific, often negative, ways, was more common than the mis-labelling or vague attribution of migrant identity categorisation. This is an interesting contrast to previous studies of immigration discourse which found more ambiguity and fluidity (e.g., Goodman & Speer 2007).

Possibilities of resistance

Despite this fundamentally negative premise, there were nonetheless attempts to resist and challenge accounts discrediting Romanian identity or opposing migration. Such speakers occupied the interactional positions of both 'elite' panel and 'lay' audience members from the QT data only; this suggests that there are genre-specific nuances in the medium of debate rather than the interview that enable the manifestation of such resistance prevalently in the QT data rather than TAMS data that could be explored by CA-informed critical work (cf. Kilby & Horowitz, 2013). While the current study was not empirically concerned with the questions of a CA approach, there is nonetheless a pertinent implication that is of direct relevance for a critical DA study. Resistance to the two repertoires was thematically interpreted in the QT data; resistance was oriented to the questions themselves in TAMS data, rather than the argumentative content itself. Their respective interactional contexts should therefore be considered in light of this, in order to consider how manifestations of resistance to the dominant repertoires manifested. Following Wetherell (1998), this is the recognition that local actions occur within an institutional, social and cultural context which ideologically embeds such discourse.

The scope of the QT dataset enabled investigation of a broad array of topics and speakers across the period, while TAMS interviews allowed investigation of how specific claims or questions were oriented to as speaker concerns requiring sustained management. In this way stake and accountability and fact construction could be seen as pertinent for speakers in differing ways. An interviewee has to construct an identity over a prolonged interaction and manage a wide variety of potential personal, social or moral issues as they attempt to achieve specific rhetorical goals in persuasion (cf. Abell & Stokoe, 2001), with a successful outcome of the political interview being the defence of one's arguments and credibility (e.g., Extract RS(b)3). While fact construction is necessary for asserting one's version as legitimate and substantiated, in this context it is not conventional for interviewees to persuade the interviewer, but rather, to answer interviewer questions (Wooffitt, 2005). Fact construction therefore occurs as a supplementary, rather than driving, characteristic in such data. Conversely a public debate speaker, being one of many speakers and usually following others' contributions, primarily has the task of persuading due to generally only having limited speaking time and often having already heard counter positions to their own. Being a "townhall" style of discussion (Anstead & O'Loughlin, 2011, p.442), with panellists often given substantive conversational space by the chair

when compared to audience members, identity construction is accordingly mostly restricted to only brief clarifications (e.g., Extract RS(a)15). While the interviewer is tasked with 'holding interviewees to account', the chair is tasked with providing audience members space to contribute and keeping speakers on topic and not repeating claims (Greatbatch, 1998; Kilby, & Horowitz, 2013; Thornborrow, 2001). Speakers' limited contributions can be seen to be more reliant upon fact construction devices in order to present their discourse successfully in the space allotted to them. This stylistic difference seems to have had consequential effects upon the discourse produced: there was an emphasis in 'justifying threat as rational' subtheme for the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire in TAMS data, which can be seen as an indication that interviewees were concerned with the defence their accounts as much as conveying specific arguments against Romanian migration. Similarly, the prevalence of QT data in the 'ethno-national consensus against migration threat' might indicate an emphasis on siding with and thereby persuading the mass audience present, a more intangible concern in TAMS. While such considerations of the public debate and political interview genres are interesting as the current study is reflected upon, what the current study is mostly concerned with are the broader arguments and ideological effects such discourse collectively signals.

Repertoire nuance: migrants versus migration

An important signal that should be discussed lies in the terminology analysed in the dataset. A common, although not prescriptive, distinction between the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires lay in how the nation was distinguished from migration and the citizen from the migrant. Whereas threat arguments often constructed a need for national defence in regards to migration (e.g., by emphasising border control), burden arguments differentiated citizens from migrants (e.g., by focusing on particular examples of social inequality). While the 'us and them' implication would remain consistent (i.e., that the receiving society, whether the nation or the body politic, was distinguishable from the migrant/migration), the different deployments of logoi entailed that these relations varied (i.e., threat logoi implicated damage, burden logoi implicated drain, contribution logoi implicated obligation). One speculation may be that 'migration' is a less accusatory target for 'vulnerable nation' repertoire talk: by maintaining a level of vagueness, exclusion can be made to appear blanketed and nondescript towards a particular group,

even in instances where it was justified on the basis of Romanians specifically (e.g., Extract RS(a)24).

This has an empirical basis in previous studies (e.g., Goodman, 2010; Goodman & Rowe, 2013) where it has been shown how 'tiered' qualifications such as distinguishing between prejudice and racism, or the evocation of cultural rather than racial identity, can enable exclusionary actions to be propagated with lessened risk of accusation or dispute. For example, the logic of limited space can be mobilised as a reasonable complaint when presented with a sudden potential 'exodus', but only works this effectively because the aggressor is left implicit (e.g., Extract RS(a)6). Conversely, moral injustices or social problems sound more menacing if 'migrant' offenders carrying out such acts are directly implicated (e.g., Extract RS(b)8), but this then leaves the space vulnerable to the critique of generalisation or vagueness. Nonetheless, van Dijk (1984, p.80) argues, disputing such accounts remain difficult as the migrant's alleged transgressions of "acting weirdly, strangely, dangerously, deviantly, or incomprehensibly" are already hegemonic, taken-for-granted in discourse evoking migration, despite historical recognition that migration was tabooed as ostracisable territory for political debate (Augoustinos & Every, 2007). However, for the current study, both migrants and migration as a whole are very commonly shunned as undesirable: they are characterised as *potentially* useful if 'predictable', 'controllable', or 'manipulatable' for 'appropriate' use in specific contexts. In many cases, however, they represented either an existential threat to the nation or a symbol of civic inequality. Constructing individuals, groups and societies in this way severely hampers the possibility of seeking and securing effective solutions the social problems at the core of these accounts (cf. Fox, D., 1985).

Related to this characterisation of the migrant Other, both repertoires share an idealistic concern for sovereignty by drawing on (seemingly legitimate) public authority to enact various political powers to protect the nation and/or its polity from hostile forces (Krasner, 1999). By invoking appeals, demands or protestations against migration policy, speakers assert a need to (re)instate control. However the concern for sovereignty is also evident in competing arguments furthering its advance through international cooperation (Moravcsik, 2014; Tetlock, 1995). Indeed, questions over the purpose, status and possessor of sovereignty, outlined in Kyllästinen (2017), demonstrate the extent to which it has been historically contested in political discourse. The current study's findings also suggest these

historical questions also fed into the repertoires analysed. For example, Extracts RS(a)1-5 all underline the raison d'être of sovereignty enabling the nation to assert political control. Extracts RS(a)7 and RS(a)19 raise the question of who possesses sovereignty – the people, parliament or supranational institutions – and accordingly critique where it should belong. Extracts RS(a)25 and RS(a)26 similarly agree the people are sovereign and should assert themselves as such, indicating a dearth in the status quo. Much of the data is informed by these historical political questions, and future studies would benefit from exploring the ways in which the contested meanings of sovereignty were debated during the European Union referendum campaign. Thus, sovereignty as a concept should be viewed as an important feature of this epoch's discourse just as it would become in when invoked in political attitudes in 2016 and beyond. Based on the findings from Chapter III however, the effects of its use for immigrants seems clear: evoking sovereignty in the public sphere during this epoch was connected closely to the political reclamation of citizenship and the redrawing of its eligible membership.

Implications for Balkanism studies

The current study, having undertaken an empirical investigation of spoken discourse, complements pre-existing work that to date has largely focused upon literature, art, travel writing, historiography, and state documents (e.g., Hammond, 2006; Jezernik, 2003; Todorova, 2009). Indeed, there are instances where spoken discourse has been considered, such as by the state (e.g., Kaneva & Popescu, 2011; Light, 2007) and media (Light & Young, 2009). However, there is a scarcity of studies that have conducted a data-driven investigation of both elite and lay accounts of citizenship and belonging, not least concerning Romanian identity and migration in the UK context. This Chapter, being concerned with the kinds of discourse that helped to constitute the receiving society discursive milieu within which lived accounts of migration would encounter, reflects the critical discursive psychology tradition of investigating how discourse on the interactive, situated level speaks to the broader issues of the day and thereby corroborate or dispute such mainstream narratives.

The ideological effects considered in Chapter III have been flagged where relevant to themes interpreted from Balkanism studies (Fleming, 2000). Where the data was interpreted as bearing claims that relied upon ambiguous identities or predictable attributions to evoke a given repertoire, it was argued that balkanism represented a

coalescing of actions that in their finality penalised, discredited or excluded Romanians from participating within the UK as equal, respected and included members of the receiving community. However, owing to the data-driven values of the DA approach, the flagging of balkanism in this Chapter should be viewed as cautious and based upon the tropes or phrases that have already been pre-empted or analysed within Balkanism studies. Thus, while balkanism has been asserted in some extracts where was interpretable from the data, for other extracts balkanism could have been insinuated; for example, the speaker may have flagged the superiority of their culture or nation and not specified Romanianness, thereby making a claim in a 'positive' rather than 'negative' sense (Billig, 1996). A future study would benefit from systematically contrasting how 'positive', 'polite', or self-affirmative rhetoric can be used to otherwise negative ends, akin to how Goodman (2010) has explored in the case of taboos against making racist accusations. There may be ways of inverting the interpretation to one of *concern*, say, rather than, *bias*.

Chapter review: contributions to knowledge and activism

Chapter IIIs analysis of television media accounts of Romanian identity and migration can be seen as a segment of the prism of 'receiving society' discourse. It comprises an epoch within which to situate the interview accounts in Chapter IV: we can assert from Chapter III that at least two key tropes should be seen as relevant challenges to the lived accounts of Romanians: their migration is a threat to the nation, and that their actions as migrants are burdensome to the body politic itself. In considering how migration is constructed in public discourse, this premise gives a sense of how one side of the acculturative process has chosen to shape the dialogical social space. How Romanians might contest and/or transform such arguments in light of their own accounts of citizenship and belonging is a question that Chapter IV will address in its exploration of interviewee reflections.

Being the thesis' second main aim, this discursive awareness of both receiving society and mover discourse is argued to be an important contribution to the topic under study. It could be argued that Romanian participants might have just be asked directly how they have made sense of their receiving community's characterisation and understanding of their identities and migrations. By documenting a portion of the receiving society discourse prism using interpretative repertoire analysis, this has enabled a diverse range of

lay and elite voices have been investigated, recognising not only how the dominant arguments were occasioned, how they could be resisted, but also just how prevalent such repertoires were. By mapping the logoi and common rhetorical devices that enabled or disputed such repertoires, there is a serious attempt to unpick and potentially contest the discursive milieu should similar arguments resurface in the ongoing evolution of cultural and political discourse. It also lends intersubjective credibility to the lived claims of mover participants: for by also analysing a receiving society corpus, one is documenting the prevalence and magnitude of such discourse and thereby legitimising their reflections as self-identifying Romanian voices from an otherwise under-recognised minority in debates about their identities and actions.

This analysis has added to existing knowledge by documenting how Romanian identity and migration have been constructed in two subgenres of British public discourse, chiefly through two interpretative repertoires, their subthemes and resistance strategies. By paying heed to how socio-cultural knowledge of 'Romanianness' was invoked and reproduced between speakers, this thesis has built on prior studies of Romania's accession (Fox J. et al., 2012; Light & Young, 2009) by documenting contemporary discourse in the UK context in the period leading up to and following 2014. It can also be seen as an illustration of how balkanism, as an ideological claim placing Romania or Romanians "in a cognitive straightjacket", was occasioned and used to legitimise otherwise prejudicial arguments (Todorova, 2010, p.176). To date, this investigation of elite and lay conversational data is the first in social psychology to empirically consider how rhetoric of Romanian identity and migration draws upon balkanism to achieve exclusionary effects. Chapter IV will explore how such discourse comprising the acculturative context is negotiated in mover discourse.

Chapter IV: Romanian movers' constructions of citizenship and belonging

Following the Chapter IIIs analysis of Romanian identity and migration constructions in receiving society discourse, Chapter IV is concerned with the narrative accounts of self-defined Romanians living in Sheffield interviewed between 2014 and 2015. In keeping with the thesis' ethical rationale outlined in Chapter II, a DA drawing on Shotter's (1993a) treatise of citizenship and belonging was conducted. The analysis will cover two themes by which Romanians constructed and negotiated migrant and civic identities. Theme one, 'civic becoming', centred on a narrative of the 'good migrant', whereby interviewees focused upon managing the politics of migrant identity with the subthemes 'showing acculturative preparation' and 'overcoming otherness'. Conversely theme two, 'civic belonging', centred on a narrative of the 'good citizen', whereby interviewees made assertions of eligibility for civic belonging by invoking subthemes including 'recognition of integration', 'shared values and common humanity', and 'pathological integration'. While both themes articulate storied struggles, they also speak to the ideological effects encapsulating the context of their movement analysed in Chapter III. Chapter IV claims to contribute three key things to the thesis: it addresses the first main aim by conducting a novel empirical discursive investigation of Romanian identity and migration discourse with self-identified Romanians 2014-2015, the current study's focus. It addresses the second main aim by considering movers' reflective discourse, the other component of the accculturative mix having investigated the receiving society. Finally it supports the third main aim by flagging, where appropriate, the evocation of balkanism to historicise contemporary lived accounts vis-a-vis the 'ambiguity' and 'predictability' tropes (Fleming, 2000).

Main findings and analytic structure

While Chapter III was concerned with receiving society discourse, Chapter IV is concerned with voices articulating lived accountss of migration and the subsequent narrative struggles bound up with identity-bound questions of citizenship and belonging. These reflections of the everyday speak directly to the receiving society discourse explored in Chapter III. The two themes organising Chapter IV represent two distinct temporalities in participants' stories: the past and present. Similarly, whereas the past was largely concerned with the politics of migrant identity, the present was concerned with the moral

concerns involved with the conditionality of civic identity and the need for due recognition (Taylor, C., 1992). Participants' accounts therefore bridged between migrant and civic identities as they negotiated the well-documented 'us and them' dichotomy, something that has been explored in social psychology of citizenship studies focused on identity discourse concerning immigrants as well as citizens (e.g., Capedvila & Callaghan, 2008; Charteris-Black, 2006; Condor et al, 2006; Goodman & Speer, 2007; Kilby, Horowitz, & Hylton, 2013; Lynn & Lea, 2003; Verkuyten, 1998). Thus, Chapter III compliments this body of work through its in-depth investigation of the acculturative accounts of Romanians living in the UK. As with Chapter III, the focus of Chapter IV will be on how particular common patterns were constructed and occasioned with reference to the broader ideological context of the receiving society where relevant. For more details on the interpretative process producing the themes, see Chapter II. A summary of the analytic structure is provided in Table iv.

Table iv: summarises the analytic structure of Chapter IV

	Description	**Analytical focus**
Theme one: 'civic becoming'	A narrative of the 'good migrant', whereby interviewees reflected upon the politics of (migrant) identity	
Two subthemes	Subtheme one: 'showing acculturative preparedness', and Subtheme two: 'overcoming otherness'.	rhetorical practices
Theme two: 'civic belonging'	A narrative of the 'good citizen', whereby interviewees made assertions of eligibility for (civic) belonging	
Three subthemes	Subtheme one: 'recognition of integration', Subtheme two: 'shared values and common humanity', and Subtheme three: 'pathological integration'.	rhetorical practices

Theme one: 'civic becoming'

The civic becoming theme involved participants narrating past stories of their migrancy, attending in particular to the delicate issue of demonstrating their 'goodness' through assertions of their preparedness or justifications of their acculturative struggles and surpassing of moments indicating their 'otherness'. The theme therefore emphasised both the process of *becoming* culturally familiar as well as overcoming the ever-present stigmas of being an 'outsider', realised through elaborate contrasts distinguishing between *then* and *now*. Shotter's (1993a) emphasis on the politics of migrant identity, namely, participant awareness of the prospect of being deemed an 'outsider' should they fail to negotiate day-to-day struggles as a migrating 'newcomer', was evident as participants framed their struggles in relation to the possibility of bearing apparently 'legitimate' stigma.

Theme one, 'civic becoming' will be discussed through two subthemes that reflect two distinct migratory challenges identified by participants: the first, 'showing acculturative preparedness', concerns the work participants did when invoking preparations and their accounts of initial 'landing' in the UK, highlighting how they negotiated the cultural norms of the receiving community through preparation to amalgamate themselves. The second subtheme, 'overcoming otherness', involved participants invoking scenarios where their identity work challenged stigmatising or exclusionary actions. In both cases, participants exhibit a 'good migrant' narrative as they make sense of their past.

Subtheme one: showing acculturative preparedness

For this subtheme, participants frame their stories through a past lens of 'being' a migrant and having to negotiate cultural obstacles that could ostracise them and thereby jeopardise their acculturation. Participants orient to their initial impressions of UK society: the surprising urban landscape, the minefield of accent comprehension, and food/drink. In particular, they evidence their acculturative ambitions as prepared or willing migrants. By documenting merits, participants show they were abiding by implicit receiving society norms and expectations and thereby publically integrating themselves. These extracts vividly provide examples of the 'X-Y' structure where certain orders of events are narrated and speech is reported to establish narrative continuity (Gergen K. & Gergen M., 2007).

Extract M1a: "they must do the weddings here on Saturday's" (p.397)

Luminita: (...) if I am to be honest the first er (.) shock I came into here I thought it looked rather dirty (.) and er (.) I dunno. er that was my impression (what it looked like) I dunno. The buildings were a bit sa:d (.) thu- mm er streets dirty (.) and so on (...) and there these women er (.) dolled up you know with dresses and big hair and thinking (.) oh it was Saturday evening cos I was thinking hmm they must be do- they must do the weddings here on Saturday's as well [cos there must be many weddings around] why are people so er dressed up? You know?

This extract is from a segment where I was asking Luminita about her initial impressions of Liverpool and Sheffield following her move to the UK. In the extract she is situating herself as an outsider looking in on the unfamiliar culture she has newly entered. She prefaces her account with an honesty phrase ("*if I am to be honest*"). Edwards and Fasulo (2006, p.371-2) argue that such phrases assert sincerity when talk can be interpreted on "occasions in which something functional, normative, or invested is expectable". Luminita appears to be orienting to possible responses due to her less-than-favourable assessment of the country she has chosen to live: such responses having potential for example to challenge her as disingenuous. Luminita's orientation to her initial outside status is further illustrated as she describes the "*shock*" of unclean and unkempt surroundings as part of a three-part list ("*the buildings were a bit sa:d (.) thu- mm er streets dirty (.) and so on*"). As she goes on to describe what she saw as an unfamiliar wedding event, her description is one of an ethnographer documenting a strange and faraway land ("*I was thinking 'hmm they must be do- they must do the weddings here on Saturday's as well*").

Extract M2a: "It was a cultural shock, but I got along" (p.445)

Felix: Culturally (.) I didn't expect much because when you expect things you always get disappointed. I don't know why, but it's always like that. So I didn't expect things to be in a certain way. I just came to England. It was a cultural shock (.) but I got along. I just got along. (…) It was a shock because there are quite a lot of immigrants here. I was hoping to meet more English

people, British English, and that was a bit of a shock for me.

Here I had been asking Felix about his cultural impressions before deciding to move to the UK. In the extract, we see Felix provide a less committed account than Luminita as he hedges his assessment ("*he didn't expect things to be in a certain way*"). Like Luminita, we could interpret this as downplaying the possibility of providing an ill-received negative assessment. That said we again see the initial arrival as being a "*shock*". Felix substantiates this as being due to an underwhelming receiving community presence ("*there are quite a lot of immigrants here*"). Again, this is hedged ("*quite a lot*"). While in later extracts the prospect of acculturative growth will be exhibited, here Felix actually implies that this initial observation has remained consistent due to his evocation of the past and his implication that time to do so is now limited ("*I was hoping to meet more English people, British English*"). This expectation to experience cultural encounters is implied to have affected his acculturation ("*that was a bit of a shock for me*"). It could be argued that Felix's reflection on his hampered acculturation can explain why there is an absence of concrete present claims of belonging in the extract.

Extract M3a: "What you see on TV and the reality is different" (p.622)

Violeta: No. I watched a few programmes on TV about the UK (.) but they don't really show (.) they just show London. All the fancy places you want to go. So (.) when I came here (.) it was a shock (.) kind of (.) because I didn't know what to expect. What you see on TV and the reality is different. I remember when I came (.) because I lived with my sister first (.) and then Court Road in Sheffield. I don't know that (.) And it was just (.) I don't know. Half-naked kids outside. I didn't expect to see that. Playing and (.) I don't know.

Before this extract, I had previously asked Violeta about her pre-movement knowledge. Initially, Violeta hedges her account, presenting herself as trying to prepare but being limited by sensationalised television documentaries ("*they don't really show (.) they just show London*"). She therefore accounts for her acculturative realisation as being confused due to the mismatch between the nation's presentation and her lived reality (cf. Kaneva & Popescu, 2014) ("*So, when I came here, it was a shock, kind of, because I didn't know what to expect. What you see on TV and the reality is different*"). Violeta is therefore

presenting her past self as being 'outside' due to lacking appropriate knowledge to settle in ("*I didn't know what to expect*"). Interestingly her acculturation is initially separate to the receiving community but becomes gradually integrationist ("*I remember when I came, because I lived with my sister first, and then ((placed removed)) in Sheffield*"). While Luminita provides a specific allusion to the urban setting she is initially confused by, Violeta instead provides a more vivid description of the children in her local community ("*Half-naked kids outside (...) Playing and (.) I don't know (...) I was expecting to see places with flowers everywhere, nice and clean*"). The ordering suggests, like Luminita, that Violeta's anticipation of a bright and clean atmosphere was not met, with neglect, uncleanliness, and disorder reigning instead.

Extract M4a: "Do I really look like a chicken?" (p.623)

Violeta:	My first day in Sheffield (.) my sister sent me to the shop to get some bread and milk or something like that. And she knew (.) because=and it was (.) well (.) the owner. I walked in and I said (.) "Good morning (.)" or whatever. Then he says (.) "You alright (.) love?" I just looked at him and I was like (.) "What?" Because obviously (.) when you learn it in school (.) 'love' means something else. And then 'flower'. I'm like (.) "What's wrong with people?" Somebody called me (.) once (.) 'chick'. I was like (.) "Do I really look like a chicken?" Because (.) you know (.) it means something else.

This extract follows me asking about how her expectations met Violeta's lived reality following her emigration. Violeta's accounts, both above and previously, complement her argument of an overall willingness to acculturate and face confusing social situations. In the first case, it involves an otherwise ordinary errand to purchase groceries which resulted in a series of linguistic impasse with the shopkeeper. Violeta provides two three part lists composed of dialogic phrases that she doesn't understand (""*You alright, love*?", "'*flower*'", "'*chick*'") and her literal bafflement ("*"I was like, "What?"*"", ""*What's wrong with people*?"", ""*Do I really look like a chicken*?"") This appears to be because the formal presentation and recital of English does not resemble in situ expression by its speakers. Violeta illustrates her acculturation by showing a latent understanding in such nuances ("*Because, you know, it means something else*").

Extract M5a: "You've got me coffee". She said (.) "No (.) it's tea" (p.626)

Violeta: I just don't like tea. Even before I came here. (...) one of the girls asked me (.) "Do you want a cup o↓f tea?" And because it's so cold (.) you are so cold downstairs (.) I said (.) "Yes". But then I was thinking (.) like a cup o↓f tea (.) cup o↓f tea. No milk. Then (.) she came (.) and I was like (.) "Well (.) I'm sure you did ask me if I want a cup o↓f tea. You've got me coffee". She said (.) "No (.) it's tea. But it doesn't taste bad". (...) I was just embarrassed to tell her that I don't like it. She was looking at me (.) "Are you drinking?" – "Yes".

In this second extract, as Violeta justifies accepting her colleagues' offer of a warm drink ("*you are so cold downstairs (.) I said (.)* "*Yes*""), she displays more confusion as the drink does not appear to reflect what was offered ("*Well (.) I'm sure you did ask me if I want a cup o↓f tea. You've got me coffee*"). A sense of obligation is shown here as her concern centres on the risk of sounding rude ("*I was just embarrassed to tell her that I don't like it*") and an implied pressure to 'fit in' ("*She was looking at me*"). In this sense, Violeta's trials echo Shotter's (1993a, p.193) point that "one must in a real sense also play a part in its creative reproduction" in order to belong meaningfully in a community. For someone constructing a new life for themselves in a new space, the possibilities of social misalignments (joke misinterpretations, comprehension difficulties, etiquette faux paux) are an ever-present prospect. The implication here, as Violeta describes, is that the receiving community's well-established norms and practices exert pressure upon the acculturative possibilities of new members for whom 'fitting in' is a priority.

Extract M6a: "she was just there talking for ages" (p.627)

Violeta: I knew the landlady there (.) and there "was an old lady (.) not next door but one to me. Every time when I used to go outside to hang up my washing (.) she was just there talking for ages ((laughter)).

A final extract from Violeta's interview here follows a question from me about the local neighbourhood. Violeta responds by describing a domestic scenario with her neighbour. Despite her physical distance from a particular neighbour ("*there was an old lady, not next door but one to me*"), she establishes a routine, almost ritualistic interaction that unfolds as she hangs her laundry by using an extreme case formulation and an implicit

assertion of her neighbour's inclination to loiter ("*Every time when I used to go outside to hang up my washing, she was just there talking for ages*"). She manages the playful criticism of her neighbour's conversational 'eagerness' by laughing, suggesting a claim of tolerance and sociality despite the inconvenience. It is, in sum, a claim of acculturative merit as Violeta is honouring of what she sees as her neighbourly duty to be polite and indulge her neighbour by conversing in an otherwise unusual setting (arguably the privacy of one's own garden).

Extract M7a: "I would be like just nodding away" (p.414)

Alexandru:	on a daily bal- daily basis stuff like going to the sho:[p or ba]nks (.) stuff like that. (...) =It isn't that they speak faster (.) it is just the accent (.) the way they pronounce words it is a lot o↓f different than what I imagined. (...) In my first year I used to live in ((removed)) (.) have you heard of it? (...) It is a centre accommodation which is private (.) but it has a partnership with the university. So they had a reception and all o↓f our parcels would go the↑re and when I was speaking a lot (.) the security guys were very funny and trying to be funny with me but I didn't understand what they were saying. I would be like just nodding away= (...) Yeah (.) I was expecting the accent to be a lot (.) like it is in the South (.) like in London.

I was asking here about the expectation of accents and their comprehension. Complementarily to Violeta's stories, Alexandru is describing how everyday interactions ("*daily bal- daily basis stuff like going to the sho:[p or ba]nks*") have been shaped by interlocutors' accents ("*the accent (.) the way they pronounce words*"). Alexandru narrates that he used to feel outside of the cultural milieu, fleshing out an informal institutional encounter where he was trying to negotiate the subtle humour of security guards in order to collect his mail ("*our parcels would go the↑re and when I was speaking a lot (.) the security guys were very funny and trying to be funny with me but I didn't understand what they were saying . I would be like just nodding away*="). The cognitive markers that detail his story (the security guards' motivation to entertain; Alexandru's confusion; his accent comprehension not meeting the requirements of the situation) are indicators of an interaction fraught with acculturative challenges, whereby the acculturating individual, feeling *outside* and unprepared, is having to *learn* how to *enter*, striving to reach the

"rhetorical achievement" by being "able to show in one's actions certain social competencies...in relation to the 'social reality' of the society of which one is a member" (Shotter, 1993a, p.193).

Extract M8a: "Are you speaking English?" (p.448)

Felix: On the first days I got here (.) I went out with my friends. There were five o↓f us and we stuck together. We couldn't find the place. We lived in a top hotel. In those days we tried to get used to speaking English and get used to English people. We went to a Starbucks to grab a coffee and the cashier asked me what I wanted. I don't remember what he said because I didn't understand a word. I was looking at him (.) "Are you speaking English?" (...) Maybe he had an accent (.) maybe not. I don't know. It was that shock that struck me. (...) I got one (...) I don't know how. Maybe sign language. (...) It's this joke between us Romanians that we get muscle fever from talking with our hands.

Felix's story echoes that of Alexandru and Violeta as he responds to my question about any shocking experiences by orienting to a past self chiefly motivated to integrate ("*In those days we tried to get used to speaking English and get used to English people*"). Felix presents a now familiar situation of bewilderment whereby he has little means whereby he might negotiate non-comprehension as exemplified by the extreme case formulation ("*I didn't understand a word. I was looking at him (.) "Are you speaking English?"*"). Notably, Felix's story does end in success ("*I got one*"), but note how Felix orients to himself as a Romanian *bound* to its cultural practices in some sort of permanent way rather than being temporarily different but now integrated ("*It's this joke between us Romanians that we get muscle fever from talking with our hands*"). He therefore remains recognisable as an outsider as he retains cultural practices from his 'homeland'. Despite this apparent permanency, Felix's affinity for "*sign language*" functions as his greatest asset as by getting his coffee, he passed (albeit under duress) one of many tests of the "providential space" (Shotter, 1993a, p.188). Conversely to others so far then, Felix's story therefore bears an implicit claim that his acculturation is not a past narrative, but still shaping his present.

Extract M9a: "we were going to go to England together my brother and I and sell tulips" (p.538)

Alina: I remember the first time we got cable TV it was after communism fell. We got a black and white TV and we got cable. It was Cartoon Network and all o↓f the English and American kind o↓f TV. That is how I learned English (.) so that was my first contact with the language I was like five or six or so on. I know my brother and I used to speak in English with each other so we can pretend that our parents couldn't (.) Obviously they don't speak English so they couldn't understand us. We always had a dream that we were going to go to England together my brother and I and sell tulips. I don't know why.

Responding to my probe to explore further Alina's attitudes towards England, Alina describes her learning of English as a piecemeal journey through television and social interaction ("*Cartoon Network and all o↓f the English and American kind o↓f TV*", "*I know my brother and I used to speak in English*"). This learning is realised as a consequence of the felling of the communist regime. As the technology became available ("*we got a black and white TV*"), The mischievousness of using English as a 'private language' ("*so we can pretend that our parents couldn't (.) Obviously they don't speak English so they couldn't understand us*"). Her ambition to emigrate and sell flowers with her brother, is an idealistic dream for a life and a claim of acculturative merit: of a dream long dreamt into her childhood ("*We always had a dream that we were going to go to England together my brother and I and sell tulips*").

Extract M10a: "You have to adapt" (p.540)

Alina: You have herbal teas especially for disease that is why it took me a long time to get used to the cultural aspect o↓f drinking tea. It still works now (.) if somebody comes from Romania it is like (.) "Why are drinking tea? Are you sick (.) are you ill (.) is there something wrong with you?" (..) You had to offer them something and they said they wanted tea. If you didn't have tea they would look at you funny as if you are an immigrant. You have to adapt (.) "Why don't you have tea in the house?"

Here, Alina is responding to my queries about the distinctions in tea norms between the UK and Romania. Through this, Alina is displaying acculturative preparedness by constructing a situation whereby new residents are obliged to accommodate the receiving community's norms ("*if you are an immigrant. You have to adapt*"), in particular when having visitors over at her home ("*you had to offer them something*"). As discussed with other participants such as Violeta above, Alina is highlighting distinctive cultural dispositions towards tea-drinking, with Romanians construed as having seeing tea as something purposeful rather than simply enjoyable ("*if somebody comes from Romania it is like (.) "Why are drinking tea? Are you sick (.) are you ill*"). This is presented in a past tense and therefore a transitionary lesson which Alina has overcome ("*you had to*", "*didn't have tea*", "*took me a long time*").

Extract M11a: "the Yorkshire accent was just ma:d" (p.472)

Anna:	I thought I was prepared for any kind o↓f situation (.) but I wasn't= (...) =I think it was exactly as I was expecting it (.) like with people on the street (.) nice staff in the coffee shops (.) and stuff like that. (...) =It was (.) "What do they like to do and to eat?" and stuff like that= (...) =because it was quite different to what we used to eat (.) do and stuff like that. (...) They were more informal than I thought they would be with their spoken English and stuff like that. Then (.) the Yorkshire accent was just ma:d. (...) because I had been taught in my high school a standard British accent. It's just that the words were too fancy (.) formal and stuff like that.

Anna is narrating her linguistic acculturation in response to my question of preparations made but unlike prior extracts, here Anna acknowledges the interpretative gap between the preparations she made and the social reality she found herself operating within as being due to her unpreparedness ("*I thought I was prepared for any kind o↓f situation (.) but I wasn't*"). While Anna limits this gap insofar that she constructs herself as ready to socialise ("*it was exactly as I was expecting it (.) like with people on the street (.) nice staff in the coffee shops (.) and stuff*"), she nonetheless clearly orients to herself as an ethnographer looking from the outside-in, such as when she queries culinary habits compared to Romania (""*What do they like to do and to eat?" and stuff like that= (...) =because it was quite different to what we used to eat*"). Anna presents her interpretative

trouble as due to the same issue Violeta described above ("*the Yorkshire accent was just ma:d. (...) because I had been taught in my high school a standard British accent*"). Anna's acculturative test, then, is framed as resulting from her formal education, a challenge now deemed as overcome owing to the use of the *then* and *now* narrative ("*but I wasn't*", "*I had been taught*", "*the words were too fancy*").

Extract M12a: "boiled water with milk" (p.611)

Andrei:	=Here when I first arrived (.) and I saw my wife. She said (.) "Well (.) you have to put milk in your tea". I was like (.) "You can't have milk in your tea. Boiled water with milk. What's wrong with you?" ((laughter)) Because there's nowhere else in the world. (.) well (.) obviously in British colonies I'm sure they do (.) but they don't put milk in your tea in Germany (.) or France (.) and certainly not in Romania. So that was quite strange.

Here, Andrei responds to my question about his first experience of drinking milky tea by colourfully joking about the difference on tea preparation between his wife ("*you have to put milk in your tea*") and himself ("*Boiled water with milk. What's wrong with you?*"). Andrei is invoking an interesting variation of acculturative preparedness as he is distinguishing Romania, as a nation with 'European' customs ("*they don't put milk in your tea in Germany (.) or France (.) and certainly not in Romania*"), against the UK and its historical colonies. In this case the UK is the exception to the rule ("*Because there's nowhere else in the world. (.) well (.) obviously in British colonies I'm sure they do*"). His preparedness is evidenced by his claim of enacting Europeanness: he was simply assuming the UK would be more 'European'. Again, the past is the primary temporal frame, suggesting different narrative trajectory in the present ("*when I first arrived*", "*that was quite strange*").

Extract M13a: "tea by the motorway" (p.563)

Constanta:	I remember when Steve and his parents waited for me at the airport in London and we stopped for a cup of tea by the motorway (.) and I saw them putting milk in tea. I was like (.) "What (.) no would you like a bit of a milk?" "Milk in tea". And I just had the black tea but

> then I didn't like the taste so I said (.) "Okay I'll try with milk" and it was way better with milk so.

Finally is Constanta's reflection, which is signalled by the account's initial description as a memory ("*I remember*") as my pre-ambled question before invokes the transition from communism and its effects on her. She is situating herself as a new entrant being given support ("*when Steve and his parents waited for me*"). After what is construed as an ordinary journey break ("*we stopped for a cup of tea by the motorway*"), Constanta introduces a sudden plot twist which involves her questioning its cultural logic ("*I saw them putting milk in tea. I was like (.) "What (.) no would you like a bit of a milk?" "Milk in tea"*"). Like Felix's success, Constanta shows latent willingness as by showing how she learned to like the recommended version ("*And I just had the black tea but then I didn't like the taste so I said "Okay I'll try with milk" and it was way better with milk*"). This acculturative transition is therefore showing integrationist ambition thereby positions Constanta's present in this light.

For this subtheme, a particular temporality was considered in relation to the 'becoming' theme. The past that participants alluded to was 'being' a migrant and their negotiation of the particular scenarios whereby they narrated their acculturative preparedness. In-so-doing they document an early claim to display their 'goodness' by attending to personal achievements (cf. Moroşanu & Fox, J., 2013).

Subtheme two: overcoming otherness

For this subtheme, participants invoked situations which placed past selves in a space of vulnerability or adversity, with particular care taken to challenge the alleged stigmatising or exclusionary implications and thereby enable the ascension beyond the politics of their now-expired migrant identity. In contrast to the first subtheme, 'overcoming otherness' bore starker and more challenging circumstances, attending for example to barriers, both physical and symbolic, as manifestations promoting Otherness and thereby restricting the acculturative possibilities of participants. A core concern seemed to be the justification of this otherness as being unwarranted or misdirected, because they cannot invoke bottom-line arguments of forced migration, because the movement is a part of a broader narrative of self-betterment (cf. Kirkwood, Mckinlay, and Mcvittie, 2013). Participants in this subtheme invoke visceral challenges to their sense of

identity, therefore moving along the narrative temporality as they evoke the receiving community and their hurdles that require their 'overcoming' before participants can qualify even for "'conditional' membership" (Shotter, 1993a, p.195). By overcoming such situations, participants were documenting their strength of character and thereby circumvent the politics of migrant identity in the sense of being 'outside' the receiving community. These extracts can be read as complementary responses to the premise of the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire in Chapter III, which construed of Romanians as a threatening and invasive force acrimonious to the receiving society. They also exhibit numerous examples of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000), but note how its use is inverted; they are attempting to manage the imposition of negative traits on their identity.

Extract M14a: "Are you stealing our place for being a student rep?" (p.476)

Anna: We had that thing where you can enrol for being student reps. Obviously (.) I wanted to go for that one because I had no idea what that was about (.) so I wanted to try it and have the [experience]. I felt- that they were like (.) "Are you stealing our place for being a student rep?" you know (.) They had the atti- idea that I didn't belong there. I didn't get why= (...) I don't know. I'm still trying to talk to those people. I'm doing my best and I'm doing my part (.) but I can't tell them (.) "Do your part because I've done mine".

In this extract, we had been discussing the challenge for Anna as she is mis-recognised as an outsider in her university classes. This Otherness is evoked by Anna in relation to her response to a reactive guarding of power and status by her peers. Her story reads of a past self eager to learn and grow ("*I had no idea what that was about (.) so I wanted to try it and have the [experience]*"). But Anna's ambition is treated as illegitimate ("*"Are you stealing our place for being a student rep?" you know (.) They had the atti- idea that I didn't belong there. I didn't get why=*"). Her present-day self is of someone still managing rejection, trying to be friendly despite everything ("*I'm still trying to talk to those people. I'm doing my best and I'm doing my part (.) but I can't tell them*"). Despite invoking those claims of energy and motivation, Anna is presented with an untenable lesson that equal *opportunities* are not the same as equal *treatment*, for "respect is [viewed as] a *reward* rather than a *right*", setting the stage the "ontological insecurities" (Shotter, 1993a, p.194) that she feels in this unreciprocated relationship ("*"Do your part because*

I've done mine'""). Note Anna's insecurity is an embodied use of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) as she is herself the target of its imposition (cf. Chapter III use).

Extract M15a: "they actually asked if I have a work permit to work there?" (p.542)

Alina:	Yes (.) that is how it feels as well. I don't think we actually have an identity in a way. (...) When you meet someone it is like (.) "Oh you have got a weird accent (.) an interesting accent". (...) At work every time when I move to a different team it is kind of awkward because everybody is avoiding the question but they nominate a person to ask (.) so that is a bit awkward as well. (...) =I bought a cup saying 'Romania' on it so I just put it on my desk. That caused confusion because they only read the first part of it and thought I was from Rome. (...) "Oh she is Italian". (...) Probably because I am the only foreign person in the whole department that makes it difficult as well. That was kind o↓f rude o↓f some people to ask (.) they actually asked if I have a work permit to work there.

Alina's story, like Anna's, is one whereby isolation features as the dominant relational outcome. This is interesting because my pre-ambled question initially presents Romania as an identity composed of a variety of cultural influences, one which she initially agrees with ("*Yes (.) that is how it feels as well. I don't think we actually have an identity in a way*"). Using generalisation, Alina presents a continual bombardment of 'origin' questions that premise her as an outsider although worded to sound inquisitive rather than intrusive ("*When you meet someone it is like (.) "Oh you have got a weird accent (.) an interesting accent'"*"). Using an extreme case formulation, Alina questions its routine questioning by new colleagues at work as it revalidates claims of otherness ("*At work every time when I move to a different team it is kind of awkward because everybody is avoiding the question but they nominate a person to ask*"). Alina's conditionality is presented as a painful reminder as suggested by her apparent shock ("*they actually asked if I have a work permit to work there*"). Recognising this 'border' mentality, Alina's attempts to overcome it by presenting her cultural identity physically, which only evokes more uncertainty ("*I bought a cup saying 'Romania' on it so I just put it on my desk. That caused confusion because they only read the first part of it and thought I was from Rome. (...) "Oh she is Italian'"*"). Presenting herself as an individual separate from the group

makes this Otherness more pronounced ("*Probably because I am the only foreign person in the whole department that makes it difficult as well*"). As with Anna, we can see Alina here trying to manage the implications of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000).

Extract M16a: "orphanages with disabled children (.) Dracula and Transylvania" (p.543-4)

Alina: Yes (.) that or the orphan situation that was in the news before communist times. They are the associations o↓f orphanages with disabled children (.) Dracula and Transylvania. We do have some good thi↑ngs that people know about like Hagi or Nadia Comăneci in sports. I think that is kind o↓f our saviour because we did have some positive thi↑ngs in the media.

Prior to this extract we had been discussing the problems involved with mis-recognising Romanian identity. Here Alina's overcoming of this otherness is more direct as she makes an explicit comparison between stereotypical images ("*associations o↓f orphanages with disabled children (.) Dracula and Transylvania*") with contemporary national success (i.e. "*Hagi or Nadia Comăneci in sports*"). Her contrast is a conscious attempt to present praiseworthy achievements ("*I think that is kind o↓f our saviour*") and move beyond unhelpful Balkanist imagery that Romanian identity might be associated with (Hammond, 2006). Clearly, this is another instance of managing the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000).

Extract M17a: "there is always a Romanian person" (p.550)

Alina: Every time there is a talk about immigration there is always a Romanian person. I don't know if you watch 'Dispatches' there was a documentary about immigrants and out of five people three were Romanian immigrants and the other ones I think one was French and one was Italian. Obviously I am subjective because whenever I turn on the TV and there is something about immigration I probably tune into the Romanian point of view. It does make you wonder. I think it was about benefits at the time, did you really have to show three families of Romanians? With the pick-pocketing documentary they were showing most

of them were Romanians. I am sure that is not the realistic point of view.

Alina here provides another instance of this overcoming subtheme as she responds to my question about possible motivations for the prevailing coverage of Romanians in the media by using an extreme case formulation ("*Every time there is a talk about immigration there is always a Romanian person*"). Alina argues that national media is biased against Romanians ("'*Dispatches' there was a documentary about immigrants and out of five people three were Romanian (...) the pick-pocketing documentary they were showing most of them were Romanians*"). With a stake confession, Alina attempts to overcome this profound otherness by orienting to her position as an interested party, highlighting the impact on herself as a consumer of media in the receiving community and as victim of collateral stigma ("*Obviously I am subjective because whenever I turn on the TV*"). Again, the 'predictability' trope ("*pick-pocketing documentary*") is being resisted ("*that is not the realistic point of view*").

Extract M18a: "it's quite hard being a foreigner" (p.443)

Felix: (...) living here (.) abroad (.) you need to get your own place. It's quite a difficult task. (...) It's quite difficult if you don't have the financial support. It's really difficult because we have to pay six months in advance. (...) The second year we moved and negotiated a bit and we only had to pay three months in advance. Then we had to pay each month. When you first go to a letting agent (.) it's quite hard being a foreigner. (...) I'm not offended (.) I can understand all those measures they take because there are bad people that they don't want to work with.

Here, we had been discussing the challenges of finding and renting accommodation. Felix is constructing a sense of otherness as he negotiates a civic space that situates him suspiciously. Like Alina's ongoing questions from her colleagues, Felix's account here sounds like a permanent status hindering his negotiation of institutional barriers. He explicitly orients to himself as being 'outside' and trying to gain 'access', a challenge without material support ("*living here (.) abroad (...) It's quite difficult if you don't have the financial support*"). His story as a "*foreigner*", whereby the worst is assumed of him (cf. again, the 'predictability' trope being managed here; "*we have to pay six months in*

advance"), is transformed later in the extract. While he accepts the generalised Otherness thrust upon him ("*I'm not offended*"), he refocuses onto less savoury characters that require exclusion ("*there are bad people that they don't want to work with*"). Legitimising this exclusion of foreigners, Felix's prior success in negotiating an agreement for accommodation presents a narrow window within which he can claim to overcome his own otherness through his negotiation skills ("*negotiated a bit and we only had to pay three months in advance. Then we had to pay each month*"). Felix's construction of another group, "*bad people*", is a feature that rarely occurred in the first theme.

Extract M19a: "Romanians tend to have this sort o↓f victimised view" (p.509)

Marina: I think that Romanians tend to have this sort o↓f victimised view that everyone outside the borders just blame Romanians for being that way or the other way and that they aren't (.) they personally aren't like that. But they just kept like re-embedding those sorts of its (.) it is UKIP maybe. I don't think foreigners see Romanians that way. I think most foreigners have a quite accurate view o↓f Romanian people but Romanians themselves just like to keep like making it as if everyone blames Romanians for having gypsies for example. So having been Romanian and having lived there for 18 years I had those sorts of its embedded and as much as I don't like to accept that (.) I am sometimes like that.

Here, we had been discussing Marina's expectation to be discriminated against as a Romania. She presents Romanians as having a victimised attitude ("*I think that Romanians tend to have this sort o↓f victimised view*") primed to perceive prejudice ("*everyone outside the borders just blame Romanians for being that way or the other way and that they aren't*"). Despite sentiment by specific groups (e.g., "*UKIP*"), she argues that the problem is not of accuracy but of cyclical thinking unable to perceive beyond stereotypes ("*Romanians themselves just like to keep like making it as if everyone blames Romanians for having gypsies*"). This identity turmoil is managed by Marina interestingly as implicitly she presents herself as Romanian ("*I think most foreigners have a quite accurate view o↓f Romanian people*"), however when later reflecting on knowledge she has gained since her movement, its clouding effects are visible to her as a former Romanian ("*having been Romanian and having lived there for 18 years I had those sorts of its embedded and*

as much as I don't like to accept that (.) I am sometimes like that"). Having identified in the past as Romanian, Marina equates this identity with self-inflicted otherness. Here Marina seems to be drawing on both the 'ambiguity' and 'predictability' tropes (Fleming, 2000) as she (1) laments Romanian identity being blurred and (2) attributes this conflation as inherently negative ("*everyone blames Romanians for having gypsies*").

Extract M20a: "it just felt that they were trying to make thi↑ngs like life more difficult" (p.522)

Marina: Right. And also I remember my friends in my first year when we were all like new here and applying for it (.) there were quite a few situations when they got (.) like thi↑ngs were very confusing (.) you might be aware of it. Thi↑ngs were very confusing and it just felt that they were trying to make thi↑ngs like life more difficult for us. I remember (.) I sent all my paperwork and I didn't get a reply for obviously a few months and then I got back a reply saying that I didn't send a paper that I did send and that I had to send it. And then I had to send it within a certain time but it was just the time when I had my Christmas holiday (.) or no (.) Easter holiday (.) it was Easter holiday. So I would have been back to Romania for a whole month (.) I got that mail in the meantime.

Here, we had been discussing the changing immigration rules, particularly student visas, before EU membership removed their need. Marina places herself as a member of a group attempting to bolster her visa protections and thereby having to negotiate official protocols ("*my friends in my first year when we were all like new here and applying*"). Questioning the organisation of the process and orienting to me as a listener with potentially-relevant knowledge ("*like thi↑ngs were very confusing (.) you might be aware of it*"), Marina presents a scenario whereby she is acting appropriately as the 'good migrant' faced with an incompetent administration ("*I sent all my paperwork and I didn't get a reply for obviously a few months*") that nonetheless insists on regimenting control (cf. Codó, 2011) by calling on applicants to respond according to their own agenda ("*then I got back a reply saying that I didn't send a paper that I did send (...) I had to send it within a certain time*"). Thus, this barrier is similar to Felix's above as it is insinuated as ineffectual, being too unresponsive to those who are 'playing by the rules'.

Extract M21a: "blame everything on immigrants". Because it is the easiest thing" (p.568)

Constanta: I mean I can understand why people are worried (.) because o↓f what is happening in the media (.) I can understand that. And I can understand that it is an easy target to say "Yes (.) blame everything on immigrants". Because it is the easiest thing to do (.) they can't really defend themselves in any way. But it is (.) I don't know. I don't know the political aspects ins and out why the (.) they are part o↓f EU so they can travel freely or UK has agreed to this. So I don't understand what the problem is really. So (.) anyway (.) sorry I am just going off on one.

Here, Constanta had been asked about her sense of Romanian coverage in the media. While she is displaying sympathy for 'worried' citizens ("*mean I can understand why people are worried*") she is also critiquing the media broadly for their simplistic evocation of the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming 2000) when targeting disadvantaged and voiceless groups ("*I can understand that it is an easy target to say "yes (.) blame everything on immigrants", "they can't really defend themselves in any way*"). Constanta tries to make sense of this otherness permeating her account by first disclaiming uncertainty over the particular nuances driving such political sentiment ("*I don't know the political aspects ins and out why*") and later also uses a stake exposure to mark her own closeness to the issue ("*sorry I am just going off on one*"). However she also challenges why immigration is deemed controversial as such movement was legal and legitimate and sanctioned by the receiving society itself ("*they are part o↓f EU so they can travel freely or UK has agreed to this. So I don't understand what the problem is really*"). Interestingly, this counter argument resembles the stake exposure resistance covered in Chapter III as the thrust of Constanta's argument challenges the receiving society's logic rather than address the arguments about immigration itself.

Extract M22a: "nationality by force" (p.606)

Andrei: I ring them up (.) and I say (.) "Well (.) can I do this?" They say (.) "Yes (.)o↓f course you can" (.) the tax office. "But (.) may I ask you (.) sir (.) because you've got a foreign accent (.) are you British?" I was like (.) "No (.) no (.) I'm Romanian". He said (.) "Oh (.) right

> (.) and how long have you worked in Britain?" I was like (.) "Twelve years". He said (.) "Well (.) there's a problem". I was like (.) "What?" "If you are foreign you have to work in Britain thirty-five years before you see any money of your pension". (...) You won't see a penny. If you work thirty-five (.) However (.) if you are British (.) no matter how many years you work (.) you do get something back. (...) It was nationality by force. I started doing a calculation. I was like (.) "Oh (.) it's only £1,000 to become British" (.) and stuff. I have to go to the town hall and tell them=

Here, Andrei is responding to my query about a passing comment of his concerning his citizenship. Andrei accounts for his sense of otherness by contrasting his Romanianness with being cordoned off from civic entitlements due to his previously lacking British citizenship. The implication of concern is that Andrei's potential entitlements are blockaded by an artificial barrier that can only be overcome by redefining his civic identity. His conversation with a government official again recites the familiar trope of an accent symbolising status ("*"Yes (.)o↓f course you can" (.) the tax office. "But (.) may I ask you (.) sir (.) because you've got a foreign accent (.) are you British?"*"). In Andrei's story, the clerk's query is presented through a series of 'gatekeeping' pre-sequences ("*may I ask you*", "*are you British*", "*how long have you worked*") (cf. Codó, 2011). This leads onto Andrei's problem: of the refused opportunities and divergent institutional treatment when allocating pensions for 'citizens' and 'foreigners' ("*"If you are foreign you have to work in Britain thirty-five years before you see any money of your pension". (...) You won't see a penny. If you work thirty-five (.) However (.) if you are British (.) no matter how many years you work (.) you do get something back*"). Andrei's attempt to overcome this is a kind of coerced assimilation ("*It was nationality by force. I started doing a calculation. I was like (.) "Oh (.) it's only £1,000 to become British" (.) and stuff. I have to go to the town hall and tell them*="). Importantly, Andrei's coercion he ascribed to visiting the town hall ("*nationality by force*") speaks to a question Shotter (1993a, p.192) poses when he asked "what does it *feel* like...not to belong?" For Andrei, his institutionalised otherness was construed as insufferable enough that he had to redefine his ambitions ("*I started doing calculation*"). This is not a question of belonging, but of Andrei seeking recognition: not as "*foreign*" but instead as being entitled to his own civic contributions.

Extract M23a: "Did someone wait for the Germans in the airport" (p.552)

Andrei: Basically I understand the idea in the media that immigration has to be controlled that is fair enough (.) but why does only immigration from Romania have to be controlled why not everything else? They keep saying that European Union immigration needs to be controlled but nobody says about German immigration do they? Do they ever present a case o↓f a German person coming here? Did someone wait for the Germans in the airport to see how many people came through? It is all o↓f these situations (.) it is not fair that we are being singled out somehow. I think that is the only thing I have problems with or the fact that we are being portrayed as criminals.

Here, Andrei responding to an interpretation I presented that it seemed he juggled both concern for the perceived need for immigration control with the prejudicial construction of Romanians. Andrei is initially agreeable to this ("*the idea in the media that immigration has to be controlled that is fair enough*") also he also embodies the otherness imposed upon Romanians by challenging the media to justify why immigration control is specific to nationality. Posing a series of rhetorical questions, he articulates an inconsistency whereby critics allege to have principled opposition ("*They keep saying that European Union immigration needs to be controlled*") despite specifically denouncing Romanian migration ("*but why does only immigration from Romania have to be controlled why not everything else*"). Using a three-part list of questions, Andrei questions the selective approach to German immigrants ("*nobody says about German immigration do they? Do they ever present a case o↓f a German person coming here? Did someone wait for the Germans in the airport to see how many people came through?*"). Andrei's use of situations here focuses on the receiving society's forensic attention he alleges Romanians have received. It can therefore be interpreted as a criticism of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) owing to the presentation of Romanians as a problematic social group relative to other European groups such as Germans. As a result, Andrei argues, exclusion against Romanians specifically is baseless and unfair ("*it is not fair that we are being singled out somehow. I think that is the only thing I have problems with or the fact that we are being portrayed as criminals*"). Andrei's use of diaxes here explicitly categorises his self-identification as a Romanian embodying such criticism (cf. Nicolai in Chapter III) ("*we are being singled out*", "*we are being portrayed as criminals*").

For this subtheme it has been shown how participants constructed sites of vulnerability or adversity which realised different degrees of 'otherness'. Participants used a range of strategies that attempted to overcome the otherness enacted from their purposeful exclusion from the receiving society as immigrants and thereby enable their ascension beyond the politics of their now-expired migrant identity and thereby make some claim of qualification for "'conditional' membership" (Shotter, 1993a, p.195). Note the wide-ranging use of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) owing to their otherness deriving from the management of stereotypical misrecognitions.

The 'civic becoming' theme has now been outlined with reference to how it was rhetorically mobilised as a narrative device to manage the politics of migrant identity in the acculturative context of a past new arrival entering the UK. Two subthemes, 'showing acculturative preparedness', and 'overcoming otherness', were analysed. Now the Chapter turns to the second theme, 'civic belonging', where participants invoke, in the present time, claims of current eligibility to belong in the receiving society.

Theme two: 'civic belonging'

The 'civic belonging' theme involves participants making claims of belonging, discursively anchoring their identity to a particular place in the present: this varied and could be within the receiving community, Romania, or a wider space entirely. Actions fulfilled were divided into three subthemes: 'recognition of integration', which involves self-attributions of integration and requests for recognition; claims of 'shared values and common humanity' which are notably non-exclusionary in effect, with feelingful constructions of home-building, mobility, and community; and finally, 'pathological integration', which involves assertive positioning, mostly in contrast to 'unworthy' citizens. For this theme Shotter's (1993a) work was again salient, in particular his discussion of the conditionality of belonging: that is, of the central importance it is for 'new' civic voices seeking to display competence and address the ever-present possibility that their status be retracted or denounced.

Subtheme one: recognition of integration

For this subtheme, participants present a series of stories that promote, mostly in the present tense, a sense of acculturative integration (e.g., through recounting surmounted

challenges) or request their claim of recognition to be acknowledged. They emphasise the merits of their conduct, in turn lobbying for receiving society inclusion. While not explicit, their broader social meaning can be viewed as ripostes to the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) use in the 'civic imperative' repertoire, where Romanians were often presented as a source of social problems.

Extract M24b: "you should just integrate" (p.400)

Luminita:	you should just integrate in where you're going (.) not necessarily making an effort (.) but stop being so aware that you're not from there. If you're there (.) you might as well be [from] there so yeah.

Luminita is responding to my inference that she has not experienced any kind of prejudice by embodying the 'integration is best' mantra previously found in receiving society discourse (Bowskill et al., 2007). By placing responsibility on the migrant ("*not necessarily making an effort (.) but stop being so aware*"), she is arguing the importance of de-emphasising one's 'foreignness' through learning and adopting receiving society customs ("*not necessarily making an effort (.) but stop being so aware that you're not from there*"). Instead of separation, Luminita proposes that migrants align themselves by adopting local norms and traditions ("*If you're there (.) you might as well be [from] there so yeah*"). By advocating the receiving society's purported concern for integration and preservation of the status quo of cultural life (cf. the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire in Chapter III), Luminita is thereby marking herself as an advocate of integration in her own right.

Extract M25b: "Roma↑nians they are really hard working" (p.422)

Alexandru:	All my experiences were nice and (.) welcomi↑ng and everyone was like (.) "Oh you're from Romania (.) how is i:t? How are you finding i↑t? I know: (.) some Romanians". uh (.) I used to work in ((omitted)) at a store (.) I was promoting Windows 8 and I used to (.) talk to people quite a lot during the day and once a gentleman came and he asked me where I was from and I told him that I was Romania. He was like (.) "Oh yes (.) I know some Roma↑nians they are really hard

working" so (.) pretty much <u>ev</u>ery time I heard something about Romania[ns i]t was positive t<u>hi↑ngs</u>.

Alexandru here is telling a story about a meeting a customer at work following my question if he had been met with hostility or prejudice. His account promotes a sense of interpersonal harmony ("*All my experiences were nice and (.) welcomi↑ng*"). Notably, Alexandru invokes Romanian identity without a specific attribute, something that markedly contrasts with the dataset in Chapter III ("*"Oh you're from Romania (.) how is i:t? How are you finding i↑t? I know: (.) some Romanians"*"). The positive premise of his account runs through his story. His choice to present a work scenario ("*I used to work in ((omitted)) at a store (.) I was promoting Windows 8*") and his sociable personality attribution ("*I used to (.) talk to people quite a lot during the day*") form a chain upon which the "*gentleman's*" comment can be understood ("*"Oh yes (.) I know some Roma↑nians they are really hard working"*"). Alexandru's claims present him as a Romanian exemplifying the work ethic onlookers are reported to assume reflects his national identity. The implication forwarded is of an integrated, sociable man who seeks recognition for working and belonging in his local community with no sign of tension or animosity.

Extract M26b: "all o↓f my friends are here (.) My: li↑fe is here" (p.416)

Alexandru: I actually really enjoyed it and I really enjoy it. And (.) when I go ba:ck (.) back to Romania (.) it feels so different= (...) Yeah (.) at the moment I feel like I don't belong the↓re because I got so used to being he:re and all o↓f my friends are here (.) My: li↑fe is here basically because I work here (.) I go to uni here. (1) I am not really attached to Romania anymore.

Later Alexandru, following my question on whether his sense of belonging has developed, invokes where 'home' is for him. He attributes his change in sentiment towards home by first evoking temporal markers that denote predictability ("*when I go ba:ck (.) back to Romania*") and clarity in his perception ("*it feels so different=*"). Contrary to prior extracts only placing the present, Alexandru contrasts "*the↓re*" as unfamiliar in the present because of his past decision to re-root "*he:re*" ("*at the moment I feel like I don't belong the↓re because I got so used to being he:re*"). Thus, "*Going back*" to his historical home has been displaced because his social and economic ties have evolved ("*all o↓f my friends*

are here", "*I work here*", "*I go to uni here*") and re-cemented his roots ("*I am not really attached to Romania anymore*"). This is an interesting claim for recognition, as while Alexandru presents his identity as potentially physically mobile (e.g., "*I work here (.) I go to uni here*"), it is the psychological rootedness that justifies his in situ eligibility ("*I got so used to being he:re*").

Extract M27b: "hard working (.) studying quite diligently and thi↑ngs like language" (p.528)

Marina: Now I know that is just one post written by one person but the sorts o↓f arguments that she brought in and the sort o↓f thi↑ngs that she was talking about as Romanians students in the UK being quite generally hard working (.) studying quite diligently and thi↑ngs like language abilities

Marina complements Alexandru's reflection on Romanian identity, in this instance recalling an online commentary by an onlooker when questioned by me on how British students might view Romanian students. Marina uses a three part list of attitude, motivation and competence to portray Romanians as defined by positive attributes ("*hard working (.) studying quite diligently and thi↑ngs like language abilities*"). Interestingly she initially provides a disclaimer to pre-empt the anecdote accusation ("*I know that is just one post written by one person but*"). By providing the list of attributes, she is advocating that her eligibility be acknowledged as a prospective Romanian showing they can belong within the receiving society.

Extract M28b: "That's the untold story" (p.457)

Felix: I've seen this er clip on YouTube (.) it was about Romanians. I think it was made by O2 (.) the er (.) phone company. An:d (.) it was this musician (.) Romanian musician (.) all o↓f them were Romanians (.) that was teaching at London University. So that's quite big (.) that's quite [important]. Also (.) there was this reporter that er (.) who worked for maybe BBC or I don't know who (.) that made a lot o↓f stories erm (.) about Romanians in a good way (.) because she was Romanian. There was also uh (.) this bakery owner that had ur (.) her own like shop and

did Romanian products (.) Romanian food. They seemed like role models (.) let's say. (...) Yeah its (.) good to see people achieve something really important. That's the untold story.

Felix here is responding to my claim that he is an example of a person who is managing as best he can. Instead he cites alternative versions of Romanian merit to the stereotypes he alluded to earlier in the interview (some extracts were covered in the 'civic becoming' theme). Describing it as "*the untold story*", Felix mentions a particular social media campaign by a telecom company ("*clip on YouTube (.) it was about Romanians. I think it was made by O2 (.) the er (.) phone company*."). Felix narrates "*role models*" in the video that promote Romanian culture such as its cuisine ("*There was also uh (.) this bakery owner that had ur (.) her own like shop and did Romanian products (.) Romanian food*") and music ("*this musician (.) Romanian musician (.) all o↓f them were Romanians (.) that was teaching at London University*"). Representing the merits on show here as befitting "*role models*", these claims of cultural participation substantiate Felix's evaluation that it is "*good to see people achieve something really important*". Note how Felix's account is hedged, whereby the character who masterminded this promotion is attributed to have been motivated mainly of her background ("*made a lot o↓f stories erm (.) about Romanians in a good way (.) because she was Romanian*"). Thus Felix's argues that authenticity has driven these counter-narratives through a motivation to claim that Romanians can belong to UK society and "participate in the arguments" defining eligibility civic membership (Shotter, 1993a, p.193).

Extract M29b: "I love Yorkshire puddings" (p.626)

Violeta: Oh, yes. I love Yorkshire puddings. My mum (.) they came here two years ago for Christmas. So, obviously (.) I thought (.) "It's Christmas. I'll cook". I bought Yorkshire puddings, because I didn't know how to do it. I know now. My mum loves it, so now she's having Yorkshire puddings, and last time, she said she had some onions in. Yes, she's just eating them like that ((laughter)).

Violeta's claim of belonging here is aligned with my question of whether she eats English cuisine. This is flagged through her narration of a previous Christmas celebration which is drawing upon her enactment of English cultural norms to host her family visiting

from Romania ("*My mum (.) they came here two years ago for Christmas*"). Violeta implicitly shows herself as a good citizen as she attends to the taken-for-grantedness that she would cook for herself ("*So, obviously, I thought, "It's Christmas. I'll cook*""), As a previously unfamiliar food is tried, she follows up in the present with an update of her newly acquired culinary skills ("*I bought Yorkshire puddings, because I didn't know how to do it. I know now*"). Its prevalence is exemplified by having inspired her mother ("*My mum loves it, so now she's having Yorkshire puddings*") who herself is changing habit ("*last time, she said she had some onions in*"). This achievement, of having adopted one of the receiving society's culinary delicacies in the private domestic space, implies a form of assimilation at work.

Extract M30b: "it does look different and it feels weird" (p.625)

Violeta:	Yes. I'd been on holiday for two weeks (.) then ten days in hospital. Yes. Nice. So (.) I had to go to the pharmacy to get some tablets. Then (.) people (.) they don't know to wait in a queue. They just push in or whatever. It does feel weird (.) because it's like (.) "Well (.) I've been here before you (.)" if you know what I mean. "Wait in the queue." Now (.) it does look different and it feels weird (.) but back 10 years ago (.) 8 years ago (.) it was just (.) no (.) just do like everybody else.

Here, Violeta is responding to my question of how she feels when returning home since her migration. She does this by recounting an unpleasant illness she suffered when she was back in Romania, using it to make sense of the subsequent acculturative 'shock' she experienced when she went to a pharmacy there ("*they don't know to wait in a queue. They just push in or whatever. It does feel weird*"). This claim of feeling unjustly undercut orients herself to British values and norms, values and norms that now seem 'second nature' to invoke ("*Now (.) it does look different and it feels weird (.) but back 10 years ago (.) 8 years ago*"). Note how this success is justified using variants of the English 'first-come first-served' trope to criticise the shop's organisation ("*because it's like (.) "Well (.) I've been here before you" if you know what I mean*", ""*Wait in the queue*"", "*just (.) no (.) just do like everybody else*"). By invoking aspects of such a trope, Violeta is demonstrating she has accepted the receiving society's "narrative order" (Shotter, 1993a, p.195) concerning such public conduct. This is very similar to Alexandru's account

discussed prior where he orients to the present in the UK as familiar and established versus the past in Romania (see Extract M26b).

Extract M31b: "that's not my place anymore" (p.621)

Violeta:	I don't know. I don't regret (.) I love here. I don't think I'll ever go back. Well, I'll go for holidays, but not like to move back there. (...) It just seems like that's not my place anymore

Here, Violeta solidifies this sense of being integrated in the UK when asked where 'home' is and to whether she regrets her decision to emigrate. She attunes to 'home' as being a place one can feel ownership towards ("*that's not my place anymore*"). Violeta contrasts a cognition of certainty ("*I don't regret*") with emotion of intimacy and contentment ("*I love here*") (cf. Edwards, 1997), later reflecting that Romania has no diasporic 'pull' ("*I'll go for holidays, but not like to move back there*"). Violeta's mention of Romania as a possible future holiday destination can be interpreted as a softener, a way of showing reverence to her former home; while Romania may provide transient nostalgic sentiment, her 'home' is now the UK (cf. Shotter, 1993a). This is a further development of this 'transition' from Romania (Extracts M26b, M30b) as Violeta now presents Romania now only as a home in the briefest of circumstances.

Extract M32b: "I don't feel Romanian but I don't feel English either" (p.542)

Alina:	We talk about identity a lot and everybody is being asked (.) "Who are you?" Or (.) "What are you?" You don't really know what to answer in a way especially now because I am also a British citizen so I have double citizenship it is always difficult to answer the question I think. I don't feel Romanian but I don't feel English either so I am somewhere in-between somehow. I think with certain areas I am Romanian and certain areas I am British. I will never be 100% British probably because o↓f the accent that is the first question that everybody asks. When you meet someone it is like (.) "Oh you have got a weird accent (.) an interesting accent".

Extract M33b: "it is never excluded that we can move somewhere else" (p.556)

Alina: We always say in case something like that happens here we wouldn't want to live in a country that doesn't want us. (.) Even if we built our future and everything here it is never excluded that we ca:n move somewhere else.

This segment is the same as M15a, where we were discussing what Romanian identity means for her. For Alina, the 'home' she bases her identity upon is transitionary, for while she wants to belong, it is caught between different and potentially competing identity needs ("*I don't feel Romanian but I don't feel English either so I am somewhere in-between somehow*"). Her narration of her accent is a marker that seems to definitively sever her aspiration to be 'fully' British (""*Oh you have got a weird accent (.) an interesting accent*"). The accent is drawing an interesting contrast between civic and ethnic citizenship: while all may come to acquire the former, the latter is a status guarded by identity politics concerning boundaries such as race and class (Andreouli & Howarth, 2014). Contrary to being civically empowered by her identity richness, it is a complicating factor ("*We talk about identity a lot and everybody is being asked (.) "Who are you?" Or (.) "What are you?" You don't really know what to answer*"). This is confounded by her admission in the second extract that her 'home' might forcibly transition if social forces thrust upon her unbearable physical or symbolic stigma ("*we wouldn't want to live in a country that doesn't want us*"). 'Homes' can be rebuilt, if necessitated by events larger than Alina can tangibly shape or contest. Based on the account, it seems to depend upon the point whereby "the very words one uses in participating...make one feel that one does not belong" become unbearable (Shotter, 1993a, p.193). Thus, in a candid way, Alina is orienting to the psychosocial pain that the conditionality of belonging can invoke (cf. Shotter, 1993a).

Extract M34b: ""Yes (.) I am part o↓f something I believe in now"" (p.645)

Gheorghe: It was emotional. Obviously (.) it was not the part o↓f history on the questions because it was very simple (.) very basic. It was more emotional. I really felt (.) "Yes (.) I am part o↓f something I believe in now" I'm really happy that I'm part of it. Other people or friends of

> myself (.) I would not apply for the city transfer because I feel I'm Romanian but I keep trying (.) "Wait you live here (.) your life is here after all (.) why don't you want to be part of thi↑s? Let's try to make it better for <u>every</u>body." Because given or not (.) if you're not British (.) you cannot vote. you don't have a thing to say about it. As much as you complain that the country's not run well.

In this extract, Gheorghe is recounting his citizenship ceremony, a story filled with claims of integrationist rhetoric and informing his present in justifying his inclusion. We had been discussing citizenship and his different civic statuses. He contrasts the logic of the examination ("*it was not the part o↓f history on the questions because it was very simple (.) very basic*") with the emotional intensity of the ritual ("*It was more emotional. I really felt (.) "Yes (.) I am part o↓f something I believe in now" I'm really happy that I'm part of it*"). Becoming a citizen of the nation, Gheorghe invokes his transformation when speaking to other Romanians, challenging their alleged refusal to commit ("*but I keep trying (.) why don't you want to be part of thi↑s? Let's try to make it better for <u>every</u>body*"). Gheorghe's ambassador-like activism serves to anchor his claim as an active citizen, one who construes that belonging is a product of enacting one's civic responsibilities, an end-point that immigrants would benefit from aspiring towards as well ("*Because given or not (.) if you're not British (.) you cannot vote. you don't have a thing to say about it. As much as you complain that the country's not run well*").

For this subtheme, participants rhetorically presented their belonging as an earned status informed by their ongoing acculturative activities. While alluded to the merits of their national identity, others were concerned with showcasing the norms and values that have been acquired to permit civic inclusion, thereby managing this sense of where they 'now' belong. Shotter's (1993a) conditionality of belonging is particularly visceral here.

Subtheme two: shared values and common humanity

For this subtheme, participants make a range of nuanced claims filled with angst, frustration and irony that undermine the nationalistic undertones of specific instances of anti-migration discourse. These claims are wide and varied, but their collective emphasis on common values or identity (often beyond the national) speak to the ''us' and 'we'' identity claims explored in resistance to the 'civic imperative' repertoire in Chapter III. In

a number of extracts, a direct contrast invoking the morality of the speaker's own argument is premised. This subtheme speaks strongly to some claims receiving society discourse 'exposes' the inappropriate or unwanted motivations of deceptive immigrant groups (cf. 'civic imperative' repertoire in Chapter III; see also Leudar et al., 2008).

Extract M35b: "I was wondering (...) I should keep an eye on the Romanians next door" (p.549)

Alina: One really upsetting thing especially for me personally is when we got the UKIP flyers in the post treating us like criminals in a way. I don't know if you have seen them there was a comparison between Romanians and they were written in the way that, 'Watch out if you have got a Romanian neighbour.' I kind of felt that my privacy has been invaded somehow. Obviously our neighbours know us and they know that we are Romanians. I was wondering, "I wonder what is going through their heads, 'I should watch, I should keep an eye on the Romanians next door.'" I felt a bit betrayed because we try to be good citizens. We try to have an education here, to pay all the taxes, to volunteer, to have a good job and to give something back all the time. We always say positive thing about Romania and ever since we got here we try to integrate and to have good relationships with everyone that we meet. We help our neighbours to take the bins out for them and so on. Then all of a sudden it has kind of turned against us somehow. You kind of take it personally to be fair. I think it is different because we have been here for eight or nine years and we have seen a difference in perspective from British people of Romanians.

Both the positive and negative are invoked as Alina responds to my question about where 'home' is. She answers by invoking the socio-political isolation she has had to negotiate in her local neighbourhood. The intimacy of her recrimination ("*the UKIP flyers in the post treating us like criminals*") is presented as a personal attack, on both Alina's public and private identities (e.g., "*I felt a bit betrayed because we try to be good citizens*", "*I kind of felt that my privacy has been invaded somehow*"). Alina's resulting construction is her stigmatisation into "a person who is quite thoroughly bad, or dangerous, or weak...tainted, discounted" (Goffman, 1963, p.3). She becomes pondersome about what neighbours may now think of her, projecting a stigma onto their possible perceptions of

Alina ("*they know that we are Romanians. I was wondering, "I wonder what is going through their heads, 'I should watch, I should keep an eye on the Romanians next door'*"). Alina's identity, *both* as a British and Romanian citizen, has been compromised.

Alina's sense of "being like anyone else, a person...who deserves a fair chance" (Goffman, 1963, p.7) is continually flagged following the atmospheric transformation ("*I felt a bit betrayed because we try to be good citizens*"). Situating herself as a presence in her community ("*Obviously our neighbours know us*"), a clear sense of civic duty is evidenced with effort ("*we try to have an education*"), honesty ("*pay all the taxes*"), aspiration ("*to have a good job*"), charity ("*to volunteer*", "*to give something back all the time*", *We help our neighbours to take the bins out for them*"), sociability ("*We always say positive thing about Romania and ever since we got here we try to integrate*", "*have good relationships with everyone that we meet*"). This civic array is littered with extreme case formulations, conveying a sense that the goodwill could not be greater (e.g., "*always say*", "*all the time*", "*all the taxes*"). (Note also how these formulations map onto the contribution logos for the 'civic imperative' repertoire in Chapter III.) Despite the sharing of such values, Alina contrasts this with the abrupt and unexplained sea change ("*Then all of a sudden it has kind of turned against us somehow*"). Having had both the personal and social aspects of her identity implicated by this discursive slur, Alina conveys reassignment ("*the UKIP flyers in the post treating us like criminals* (...) *You kind of take it personally to be fair. I think it is different because we have been here for eight or nine years and we have seen a difference in perspective from British people of Romanians*").

Extract M36b: "We just want to be here with happy ever after" (p.493)

Anna:	I think (.) at this moment (.) Romanian people just don't care. At least since I was born (.) it has been like that. They generally don't tend to have an opinion. They are like (.) "We just want to be here with happy ever after (.) and that's it". (...) It is just because o↓f so many years o↓f communism. They don't have hope anymore. They're just like (.) "We just want to be happy and live here".

Anna's account reflects on a question mine about contemporary Romanian national politics to make sense of her own attitudes. The switching between "*we*" and "*they*" contrasts those who move pursuing happiness wherever with those that stayed behind

languishing in apathy, providing an explanation for their emigration (““*We just want to be here with happy ever after (...) It is just because o↓f so many years o↓f communism. They don't have hope anymore*”). The happiness is the shared value being promoted here, tying belonging with place very directly (““*We just want to be happy and live here*””) (Verkuyten, 2003). The only oppositional force or group that is operating here is in the past: as Anna sees it, it is the trauma of “*so many years o↓f communism*”. By framing it in the past, Anna is drawing on the “pleasure and pain” duo, values that are taken-for-granted in moral reasoning (Verkuyten, 2003, p.144). Whereas pain should be avoided, pleasure should be sought: accordingly, as Anna contrasts, the painful past of communism should be left in pursuit of a pleasing present, where accord and peace can reign.

Extract M37b: "it should be assessed on what that person will contribute to that society" (p.429)

Alexandru:	=Yes (.) I think it should be assessed on what that person will contribute to that society. Because if I come here and I am going to stay here and in the end I am going to pay tax:es and maybe I am going to have my own family he↓re so those are beneficial thi↑ngs to the country after all. While if I just come here and then just steal off people and scam people for a month and then I lea[ve (.) t]hat's wrong obviously. (1) But I don't think that they should limit like health benefi:ts and stuff like that=

I asked in this extract Alexandru if immigration control should be more concerned with character than financial assets. Alexandru responds by invoking shared values in a self-evidently desirable scenario of civic contribution (“*Because if I come here and I am going to stay here and in the end I am going to pay tax:es and maybe I am going to have my own family he↓re so those are beneficial thi↑ngs to the country after all*”). This is contrasted with a an unwelcome scenario of banditry and delinquency (“*While if I just come here and then just steal off people and scam people for a month and then I lea[ve (.) t]hat's wrong obviously*”). In contrast to Anna who invokes happiness, Alexandru's emphasis is on the morality of migration (particularly “*tax:es*” and “*have my own family he↓re*”, “*beneficial thi↑ngs to the country*”, “*steal off people and scam people (...) t]hat's wrong*”). The values are decisively conservative, centring on fiscal responsibility, the family, the continuity of the nation, and the respect of property, respectively (e.g., Musolff,

2004). However, a similar outcome is advocated to Anna, despite Alexandru's different emphases: both defend the mundane, wholesome motives of immigration and the shared values that both the receiving society and the immigrant would define their ambitions and concerns around.

Extract M38b: "I'm here to be part o↓f this society" (p.654)

Gheorghe: I never claimed benefits in this country (.) never ever. Even if I was entitled to them. I didn't bother. I prefer to go for interview and wait until the phone is ringing. (...) Most of people (.) I look at them (.) I can sense that thing (.) you know (.) looking to me and say (.) "You're here to steal my jobs (.)" and everything. Well (.) you know (.) what I tell them (.) I'm here to be part o↓f this society. I didn't come here to change you guys (.) the way you live or change who you are. I came here to be part o↓f what you are (.) first of all. This is what I'm trying to do. I don't think they get it (.) to be honest. I try to respond (.) "Look (.) I'm British like you guys (.) my accent will be different (.) I cannot change that". Even if- I need to be reborn probably (.) you know. That's going to stay with me for the rest o↓f my life. Trust me (.) I'm part o↓f what you are now. I'm not trying to change you from inside or anything like that.

Responding to my question about how Romania has been represented in the media, Gheorghe similarly emphasises the importance of individual values such as working hard and rule of law ("*I never claimed benefits in this country (...) I prefer to go for interview and wait until the phone is ringing*"). He also priorities the preservation of the majority receiving society's culture, part of this being his assimilation into that culture ("*I didn't come here to change you guys (.) the way you live or change who you are. I came here to be part o↓f what you are*"). He displays a sense of unease as receiving community members are construed as suspicious and requiring persuasion as to his good intentions ("*Most of people (.) I look at them (.) I can sense that thing (.) you know (.) looking to me and say (.) "You're here to steal my jobs (.)" and everything*"). Note how he also invokes his earned citizenship as a further bolster to this moral claim although the accent is treated as a barrier to unequivocal inclusion ("*Look (.) I'm British like you guys (.) my accent will be different (.) I cannot change that"*"). Indeed, Gheorghe's adaptations here are presented as one-way with receiving society members implying the accent is a problem (cf. Bowskill

et al., 2007) ("*That's going to stay with me for the rest o↓f my life*"). His further bolsters the importance of majority culture maintenance as he pre-empts an accusation that he might be trying to covertly attempt to undermine it ("*I'm not trying to change you from inside or anything like that*").

For this subtheme, so far, participants have been articulating their accounts from a civic space where shared values are emphasised. In the following extracts, more abstract claims are made in order to justify belonging. However, the polity that is commonly being constructed here is arguably a parody of (national) citizenship, for the use of irony across the accounts lends credence to far broader, 'global' and humanitarian forms of belonging. These extracts thereby pose an interesting critique to the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) in balkanism, because they broaden belonging to the point where the ideological imposition of a generic category (e.g., 'East European') is nonsensical because it is about biological markers of identity.

Extract M39b: "you are just a citizen o↓f this Earth and you can be freely living" (p.525)

Marina:	Yes (.) it sort o↓f enlarges the circle (.) it is not a country anymore (.) it is this mass. And it is going towards that direction o↓f a global citizen that you are just a citizen o↓f this Earth and you can be freely living (.) just creating your life wherever you want on the Planet. So I think that I like to think about myself as EU because it is heading in the direction o↓f a global citizenship which I am thinking would be the right thing for us.

Marina had been talking about EU membership and its implications for citizenship. In the extract she is proposing her idealised scenario of being a free agent across the world, with movers free to construct identities and homes for themselves according to their whims ("*global citizen that you are just a citizen o↓f this Earth and you can be freely living*"). Freedom, the possibility to move without restriction, is celebrated as a shared value towards the achievement of "*global citizenship*", spherically forming an interconnected and unregimented world order ("*it sort o↓f enlarges the circle (.) it is not a country anymore (.) it is this mass*"). Citizenship is not a birthright bounded by borders, but rather is about claiming a space where you wish to live ("*just creating your life wherever you*

want on the Planet"). This evokes the classic liberal conception of citizenship where the individual's rights are highlighted before groups or societies (Isin & Wood, 1999).

Extract M40b: "I'm different. "Why? I've got two eyes (.) got two hands. I'm not different" (p.627)

Andrei: Yes. I don't know if you watched the last (.) I think it's Channel Four (.) with 'The Romanians Are Coming.' I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought (.) "No (.) I'm not watching this." (...) Then they started talking (.) obviously (.) after the programme. "Oh (.) bloody Romanians. They're all gypsies (.) and they're coming here to do whatever they do". Then they tell me (.) and I just (.) you know (.) okay. That's your opinion. It's your problem. When I tell them I'm Romanian (.) "No (.) you can't be Romanian". – "Why? Do you want to see the passport? What do you want me to do?" – "No (.) you can't be". And if you ask them why (.) it's because I'm different. "Why? I've got two eyes (.) got two hands. I'm not different".

Andrei is also responding here to my question about how Romanians have been represented in the media. He was initially focused upon a television programme which was hearably disagreeable to him ("*I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought (.) "No (.) I'm not watching this."*"). He later evokes the apparent ethnic homogenisation of Romanians and Roma (""*Oh (.) bloody Romanians. They're all gypsies*"). He uses an interesting riposte that critiques the divisions wrought by the representations of the television media or his own talk. As he contests an imagined onlooker's perception of 'authentic' Romanianness, he points to fundamental attributes that makes him 'human' (""*Why? I've got two eyes (.) got two hands. I'm not different*""). His appeal to humanness here is a 'bottom line' argument (Edwards et al., 1995) used to assert an essentialist argument favouring his basic claim that ethnicity, nationality or citizenship does not override this biological reality.

Extract M41b: "I can be Chinese if you want me to. I don't care" (p.627)

Violeta: I don't know if you watched the last (.) I thi↑nk it's Channel Four (.) with 'The Romanians Are Coming.' I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought (.) "No (.)

I'm not watching this". I know even some o↓f my friends (.) because for some reason (.) they say I'm Polish (.) which to be honest (.) I don't care. I can be Chinese if you want me to. I don't care.

Violeta's argument is similarly focused with parodying nationality as she voices opposition in her answer to my question about the media representation of Romanians ("*I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought* (.) "*No (.) I'm not watching this*""). Her societal refection turns to her own social circle as she trivialises her stereotyped identity ("*for some reason (.) they say I'm Polish (.) which to be honest (.) I don't care*"). Violeta's resisting of such a generalisation can be read as an quiet echo of how balkanist stereotypes are denied or reformulated (Bjelić, 2002). By premising the account as 'truthful' ("*to be honest*") and uncaring of the friends' possible meaning ("*I don't care*"), Violeta could be understood as managing the interactional dilemma of conveying hurt by one's own friends (cf. Edwards & Fasulo, 2006). Her attempt of resolution is to mock such jokes by showing the absurdity of interchanging one form of citizenship over another ("*I can be Chinese if you want me to. I don't care*"). In this sense, Violeta is citing in a different way promoting the common humanity that all share above the inconsequentiality of one's ethno-civic identity.

Extract M42b: "((Gheorghe)) the Polish guy from Romania" (p.654)

Gheorghe: =Oh (.) the best thing at work (.) I'm with this company for five years. I still go to colleagues from the first day they know me (.) they go (.) "Oh ((Gheorghe)) the Polish guy from Romania". That says everything (.) isn't it? (...) Well (.) that's a lot to do with geography. This is how they picture me. I was the only foreigner in this company for nearly three years. Now my brother-in-law is also working for the same company (.) so we're two. I take it as a joke (.) nothing else. I'm really not offended about it. (...) I've got where people ask (.) "When are you going back?" "Oh (.) where was I? Back where (.) to Barnsley (.) Sheffield (.) where?" Where do they want me to go? Usually I answer (.) "Where are you from?" I say (.) "I'm from Japan (.) I'm Japanese". (...) They understood that I'm taking the mickey with them and they stop.

Like Violeta, Gheorghe appraises citizenship as being potentially divisive in response to my query about how his work colleagues (mis)recognised him ("*That says everything (.) isn't it? (...) I was the only foreigner in this company for nearly three years*"). Generalised as being the "*Polish guy from Romania*", whose time is deemed by some of the receiving society limited ("*When are you going back*?"), Gheorghe lists his extensive stay to emphasise his acculturative entitlements ("*Back where (.) to Barnsley (.) Sheffield (.) where?" Where do they want me to go?*"). Thus, like Violeta (but unlike his prior account concerning integration in subtheme one) Gheorghe imagines citizenship to be an absurd, arbitrary categorisation. When pressed to declare an 'origin', he mocks its consequential importance by making an extreme claim, something he argues is understood by them as illustrating its lack of fundamental importance ("*I'm from Japan (.) I'm Japanese" (...) They understood that I'm taking the mickey*"). As with the prior extracts, this geographical generalisation critiques the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) owing to its emphasis on inclusivity, but note how here its frame of reference is clearly being used to portray irony (cf. LeBoeuf, 2007).

In this subtheme then, it has been shown how participants invoked shared values or common humanity as rhetorical ripostes to various scenarios where their present day belonging might be called into question somehow. While the latter extracts invoke irony, the initial extracts instead used contrast embedded normative values to promote their projects of belonging eligibility in the receiving society.

Subtheme three: pathological integration

For this subtheme – the term borrowed from Fox and Mogilnicka (2017) – participants contrast third party actors to themselves to promote their own inclusion, often achieved at the price of excluding these 'other' actors. As Fox and Mogilnicka (2017, p.1) argue, integrationist rhetoric "is not confined to benevolent forms", with learning also involving harmful practices of the receiving society. Most often, this subtheme occurred in the interviews when Romania's coverage by the newsprint and television media was discussed. It manifested in various ways, whether referring to Romanian Others vis-a-vis perceived maladaptive acculturative strategies, 'dubious' Roma and their cultural practices, or unemployed and/or lazy 'citizens'. These bear close resemblance to the social issues and the contested roles of the immigrant and citizen raised in Leudar et al. (2008). Interestingly, participants' in this subtheme wove their own acculturative values and

journeys into their accounts, legitimising their own form of 'earned' belonging. This subtheme can be read as response to the 'civic imperative' repertoire explored in Chapter III, which at its core asserted of a social inequality between citizens and migrants (and a need for it to benefit the former over the latter). The extracts below speak to an implied need for participants to assert themselves as co-members of the receiving community, differentiating themselves from other groups as necessary – thereby upholding the 'civic imperative' repertoire's premise that citizens should always come before migrants. They additionally occasionally use the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) but contrary to previous subthemes where such tropes were unanimously disputed, here we see them used both as stereotypes for them to manage in their claims of belonging and as a means of critique against the receiving society.

Extract M43b: "if you want to work (.) get off your backside and go and work" (p.638)

Violeta:	then she was talking to him (.) to my brother (.) thinking that he was my boyfriend. Then she asked him how long we'd been together (.) and he just looked at her like (.) "Well (.) you don't have to know we are brother and sister. I don't have to explain my life". Then she started saying that (.) "She's Romanian (.) she came over here taking our jobs". Well (.) if you want to work (.) get off your backside and go and work. She's not working (.) obviously. So (.) whose job I took (.) I don't know (.) because she's never even tried to get a job (...) Obviously (.) after she found out he's my brother (.) it's just kind of like (.) "Oops"

While discussing how receiving society political discourse can have personal implications, here Violeta is contrasting herself with her landlady (introduced prior to the extract). As the landlady talks to her brother, misconstruing the situation ("*thinking that he was my boyfriend*"), the landlady is described as 'revealing' her prejudice by invoking the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) ("*Then she started saying that (.) "She's Romanian (.) she came over here taking our jobs*"). Violeta's account contains implicitly displeased evaluations of the landlady's conduct, such as her inclination to privacy ("*I don't have to explain my life*") and her reported speech that implies awkwardness of the landlady's realisation ("*after she found out he's my brother (.) it's just kind of like (.) "Oops"*"). This is crystallised as Violeta's own values are centred as she rebuts the landlady's pursuit of

sloth rather than effortful citizenship ("*Well (.) if you want to work (.) get off your backside and go and work*") (cf. Gibson, 2009, 2010). These claims consolidate Violeta's exacerbation with the landlady's alleged upset ("*She's not working (.) obviously. So (.) whose job I took (.) I don't know*"). In this sense the landlady's character and insinuations, are construed as adversative qualities of Otherness in contrast to Violeta's reasonableness.

Extract M44b: "she always referred to English people as like 'they'" (p.399)

Luminita	I have a cousin who lives in Londo↓n and she lives there with her hu:sband and with her two children (.) and erm we're not very close but we did speak at some point and she always referred to English people as like 'they' (.) you know. And I found that very we↑ird I what do you mean by 'they'? you know like there's 'they' and there's 'u:s' or something. See you're (.) already excluding yourself in that sense. And I- I always disliked the fact that when people go and live in other countries (.) when they go (.) towards the environment that they come from I mean why do they make the move anyway? You [know].

Here, Luminita responds to my query as to whether she has felt differentiated or excluded in the UK. She does so by contrasting herself with her cousin, with both actors' characterised as enacting competing acculturative strategies; while Luminita defends her 'integration', she critiques the 'separation' of her cousin (cf. Berry, 2005). Luminita initially introduces her cousin as someone she knows despite not being socially close ("*erm we're not very close but we did speak at some point*"). This stake management is a way for Luminita to establish distance and contextualise their subsequent disagreement (e.g., Edwards & Potter, 1992). Whereas Luminita presents her cousin as construing that immigrants should conceptualise receiving society members as being oppositional ("*she always referred to English people as like 'they'*"), Luminita then questions the viability of such division, presenting her view as 'normal' by favouring motivation to belong ("*And I found that very we↑ird I what do you mean by 'they'? you know like there's 'they' and there's 'u:s' or something. See you're (.) already excluding yourself*"). Luminita then presents a more generalised argument against movers who do not integrate, challenging their rationale for movement presenting this position as a belief deeply held, thereby prompting a sense of pre-established eligibility for belonging ("*I always disliked the fact that when people go and live in other countries (.) when they go (.) towards the*

environment that they come from"). In short, Luminita's use of contrast provides her a means to construct the reasonableness her own claim of belonging and embed the assumption that all who move will want to 'belong' to that place that they move into.

Extract M45b: "It's just different people" (p.467)

Felix:	I've known people that mo:ved to England and never came back. I've met people that came to study here and after the first year went back to Romania because they couldn't adapt (.) It's just different people. After studying Psychology I realised you cannot generalise.

This extract focuses on Felix's reflection contrasting his own acculturative journeys with his friends, amongst a broader discussion locating where 'home' was for him. While some appear to assimilate ("*people that moved to England and never came back*"), others decided to return to Romania ("*because they couldn't adapt*"). Note how Felix presents this as a specific position informed by experience, emphasising his reticence to extrapolate ("*It's just different people. After studying Psychology I realised you cannot generalise*"). Note also how this reticence to categorise is a direct challenge to the use of 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) so often used in Chapter III. While Felix's own journey is not specifically mentioned in this extract, the action of note is nonetheless present: the achievement or failure of acculturation is construed as an *individual* competency, one which is presented here as a contrast between the successful movers (Felix being a narrator still present to inform us), and Others for whom movement was unsuccessful. Like Luminita, this account is predicated on the implicit value of 'successful' acculturation (Berry, 2005): to not 'succeed' as an individual becomes situated as a persona; failure in its own right.

Extract M46b: "being Eastern European (.) they: think about gypsies and travelle:rs" (p.456)

Felix:	Not all o↓f them (.) but some people when you talk about being Romanian or being Eastern European (.) they: think about gypsies and travelle:rs and all that sort o↓f [stuff]. But (.) I don't mi:nd. There are these people (.) they exist the↓re. (...) well I've seen some uh:: (.) some like (.) repor:ts (.) news uh reports that (.)

> er make this category o↓f er gypsies. Instead o↓f saying Romanians (.) they say gypsies (.) and that sort o↓f [stuff]. I think er there are (.) like (.) certain people that do that. Not (.) I don't think we should generalise that people think Eastern European people are gypsies or something like that. [well] No (.) they should erm (.) there are a lot o↓f bad people (.) don't get me wrong. But they only talk about them. The media uh (.) its like (.) uh not reporting all the stuff that's going on. It's like reporting all the bad stuff it's not (.) focusing on the bad stuff. And also (.) there are a lot o↓f Romanian people or (.) Bulgarian (.) other nations that er: (.) quite- have mad[e it]. They're quite important. They made something o↓f themselves

Felix's reflection affirms an alternative conception of Romanianness as he answers my question on how he might dispute receiving society stereotypes of "*Romanian*" and "*Eastern European*" groups. He conventionally argues how they are evoked to describe everyone when they more accurately depict a minority of people and their associated attributes, this time drawing upon the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) to make his argument ("*but some people when you talk about being Romanian or being Eastern European (.) they: think about gypsies and travelle:rs and all that sort o↓f [stuff]*") (cf. Bjelić, 2002). Note how, unlike the prior extracts, Felix does not make explicit claims of psychosocial or acculturative distress caused by this generalisation, instead accepting it as reality of an 'us' and 'them' within the generalisation ("*But (.) I don't mi:nd. There are these people*"). Nonetheless he claims to have witnessed these identity conflations, and in-so-doing he premises the correctness of one description against another ("*I've seen some uh:: (.) some like (.) repor:ts (.) news uh reports that (.) er make this category o↓f er gypsies. Instead o↓f saying Romanians (.) they say gypsies*"). He warns of generalisation ("*I don't think we should generalise that people think Eastern European people are gypsies or something like that*") and later uses a stake confession which legitimises the limited press coverage ("*there are a lot o↓f bad people (.) don't get me wrong. But they only talk about them*"). Felix presents an alternative view of Romanians that have successfully acculturated and thriving, which contrasts to the "*bad people*" ("*also (.) there are a lot o↓f Romanian people or (.) Bulgarian (.) other nations that er: (.) quite- have mad[e it]. They're quite important. They made something o↓f themselves*").

Extract M47b: "pressure to keep up with all the traditions" (p.553)

Alina: Yes (.) we always felt that we are not Romanians in way so that is why we got away from the partying and the Romanian lifestyle like having to buy presents for everybody for their birthdays (.) for baptisms and weddings. They are really expensive as well so you have to baptise everybody and everybody is relatives with everybody. I don't even know what that is about. Just keeping a kid awake until 2:00am when he is one you have to cut their first bit o↓f hair and then stick it with wax on two gold coins and it needs to be holy in the church I don't know where. I think that is a lot and it is a lot o↓f pressure to keep up with all the traditions because if you are here you have to keep all the traditions. I think that is a bit too much.

Alina is similarly concerned with this separation/integration distinction in this extract as she expands on a probe concerning her choice to move away from the Romanian community she used to affiliate with. Orienting to specific Romanians for whom cultural habits are deemed burdensome (like Luminita and Felix), Alina is providing us with a character to define and contrast her current self with. Initially, Alina identifies herself as 'less' Romanian insofar that she did not wish to continue specific cultural habits, like Felix above invoking the 'predictability' trope that Romanians have certain prescribed 'ways' of behaving ("*we always felt that we are not Romanians in way so that is why we got away*"). Such habits are cited as "*partying*", "*having to buy presents*", and "*baptisms and weddings*", but in particular Alina describes a rite of passage for children ("*cut their first bit o↓f hair and then stick it with wax on two gold coins*"). Specificity and authenticity are articulated through the use of detail (Wooffitt, 2005). However her subsequent hedging, indicative of a distancing from such practices owing to their demands ("*and it needs to be holy in the church I don't know where. I think that is a lot and it is a lot o↓f pressure*"), is a way whereby Alina is able to attend to other priorities ("*if you are here you have to keep all the traditions*"). Alina's account presents the case whereby, to further her own goals, Romanian cultural norms had to be minimised ("*I think that is a bit too much*"). Integration, entailing economic and social participation in UK society, while only mentioned through inference (e.g., the "*Romanian lifestyle*", such as purchasing "*really expensive*" gifts, are presented as inhibitive of participation), is used to implicitly justify for Alina's presentation of her 'current' self, with the "*traditions*" established as necessary

casualties. Thus, the Romanians Alina has separated herself from are contrasted so Alina can present her own case for integration and condemn the strategy of separation: note also how traditions in this sense become incompatible with belonging.

Extract M48b: "now I'm British (.) now I will strangulate him on the spot" (p.585)

Andrei: This is quite a crazy thing (.) because I was working with this guy called Ryan. He was English (.) and he was working cash in hand with me while he was claiming Jobseeker's Allowance. He also had a house for free given by the government (.) so he had a council house in which everything was paid. What he was doing (.) he was also living with his girlfriend and renting out the house that he got from the state for free. (...) That was my first impression. "Wow. You really can do anything you want here". ((laughter)) Obviously now I'm British (.) now I will strangulate him on the spot (.) but back then I was just unsure. I was like (.) "Really (.) is that how it works here?" That was the first impression.

Here, Andrei contrasts himself to a citizen within the receiving society to justify his entitlement to belong as he responds to my questions about his early experiences of work. In his story, the "*English*" character, Ryan, is established as calculatingly corrupt ("*he was working cash in hand with me while he was claiming Jobseeker's Allowance. He also had a house for free given by the government*") and lacking moral fibre ("*he was also living with his girlfriend and renting out the house that he got from the state for free*"). Andrei's moral evaluations here are evident by his repetition of material burden descriptors (e.g., "*free*", "*paid*") as opposed to Ryan's own personal gain ("*cash in hand*", "*renting out the house*"). Note how this one way relationship is articulated by Andrei with a mixture of shock based on a 'past' interpretation ("*my first impression. "Wow. You really can do anything you want here". ((laughter))*") and later, admonishment as his 'current' interpretation is emphasised ("*Obviously now I'm British (.) now I will strangulate him on the spot*"). This contrast of past acceptance ("*back then I was just unsure*") and current protest is how Andrei articulates the gap between Ryan, the unjust and corrupt, and Andrei, a defender of the moral, in his current status as a citizen. Note also how, contrary to prior extracts, Andrei actually uses a 'predictability' trope to stereotype a British citizen.

Extract M49b: "they come here to work" (p.569)

Constanta: Yes (.) people do come but they come here to work (.) most o↓f the people. Most people. I mean obviously there will be people who come here to steal or to (.) I don't know there will be very few people who come to claim benefits (.) that is for sure. And they come to work but if they can't adapt and if they find it quite hard (.) they might make some money (.) let's say in a few months or a year or so but then they will go back. I don't think there is such a massive strain on hospitals or.

As we were reflecting the on 'perception versus reality' conundrum in discourse concerning immigration, Constanta is arguing for a distinction between groups of immigrants. Whereas the majority are constructed as motivated to contribute ("*people do come but they come here to work (.) most o↓f the people*") the minority are motivated to become a burden ("*there will be very few people who come to claim benefits*") (c.f. Chapter IIIs discussion of contribution-burden as a logoi-pair). This is an interesting use of the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000), as it is used to attribute Romanians with positive traits. She also presents a disclaimer, arguing that those that can't acculturate will leave again anyway, creating a win-win situation where immigration is only beneficial ("*if they can't adapt and if they find it quite hard (.) they might make some money (.) let's say in a few months or a year or so but then they will go back*"). Finally, Constanta rejects that the country, invoked through the 'container' metaphor, is under 'pressure' ("*I don't think there is such a massive strain on hospitals or*"). Thus, problematic immigrant minorities form the contrast justifying Constanta's defence of the immigrant majority.

Extract M50b: "differentiating between gypsies and Romanians (...) our national aspiration" (p.595)

Andrei: Any Romanian you will meet the first thing on the agenda would be differentiating between gypsies and Romanians. This is our national aspiration. It's that bad. (...) =It's racist. There's no question about it. It is (.) yes.

Andrei's observation, responding on my claim about Romania's diverse citizenry, crystallises the ethnic differentiation angst that has been found in other studies of

Romanian national identity (e.g., Moroşanu & Fox, J., 2013; Tileagă, 2006a). Situating himself as Romanian ("*our*"), he argues it is "*national aspiration*" for Romanians to dissociate their identity and culture from Roma ("*first thing on the agenda would be differentiating between gypsies and Romanians*"). He employs a stake confession when conceding that such sentiment is dysfunctional ("*It's that bad*") and problematic ("*=It's racist. There's no question about it. It is (.) yes*"). This contrast, while leaving the Roma unspecified, nonetheless invokes "*racist*" and so can be understood as embedding a distinct power asymmetry between the groups (van Dijk, 2000a). But in doing so, conflictingly, Andrei is also presenting Romanians using the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) by linking them to a maladaptive psychological state of mind.

Extract M51b: "Romanians are not racist" (p.596)

Andrei:	Absolutely (.) yes. Romanians are not racist. They don't have an issue with the gypsies because they have a different colour and stuff like that. It's the actual culture that they've got a problem with. Particularly it's just got worse from entrance into the European Union (.) and the gypsies going everywhere. Every time you read the news in Romania two Romanians arrested over there (.) and from the name you can tell straight away that they're ethnic Romas (.) because their names are quite different than Romanian names.

However, note how Andrei here goes on to argue that this differentiation is not itself "*racist*", following my interpretation that his frustration as opposition derives from ill-judged generalisations. The problem is managed as *not* being about race but instead culture ("*They don't have an issue with the gypsies because they have a different colour and stuff like that. It's the actual culture that they've got a problem with*"). This is a classic means of managing the possibilities of racist accusation (Augoustinos & Every, 2007; Goodman, 2014). The culture Andrei describes is one beset by uncontrolled and nomadic habits ("*the gypsies going everywhere*") and their alleged disposition towards crime ("*two Romanians arrested over there*"). His certainty is cemented by differentiating the linguistic traditions of Roma and Romanian names ("*they're ethnic Romas (.) because their names are quite different than Romanian names*"). We might argue from this combination of extracts then that the problem of ascribing 'authentic' claims of identity and representation is both reactive to stereotypes perceived as imposed *upon* Romanians as well as being reactive to

civic and ethnic claims of Romanianness that are continually reversed to acknowledge or preserve polity membership. Andrei's primary action in this extract is to distinctly separate the moral worth (based on culture) of a Romanian from a Roma (cf. Bakić-Hayden, 1995).

Extract M52b: "Assuming that we are from the same country (.) the same culture" (p.543)

Alina:	I actually had a recent experience. I am a blood donor so the lady who was taking the blood she was asking me where I am from and if I am from Romania. She said (.) "Have you seen the situation with the Roma gypsies in ((place removed)) I know there is a problem there. Are you familiar with them (.) are you friends with them?" Assuming that we are from the same country (.) the same culture (.) probably from the same village and I am the same as them and so on. It kind o↓f felt a bit put to one corner in a way.

Alina presents her opposition to being categorised as a Roma when discussing her acculturative trajectory from outsider to insider and responding to my query about whether this was gradual. We can interpret her story here as a claim of goodness owing to the voluntary status of her deed as a blood donor. She describes the point of the blood extraction where the nurse enquires if she had any local links with Roma that were alleged to be causing problems ("*Have you seen the situation with the Roma gypsies in ((place removed)) I know there is a problem there. Are you familiar with them (.) are you friends with them*"). The nurse's questions are a series of pre-questions (e.g., Sacks & Schegloff, 1973) that seem to be attempting to establish whether Alina is involved enough to lobby them ("*familiar*", "*friends*"). Her response is presented as disowning towards this homogenisation, which is presented as a three-part list of very specific (hearably unlikely) links to that group ("*assuming that we are from the same country (.) the same culture (.) probably from the same village and I am the same as them and so on*"). The tone is hearably uncomfortable, similarly to previous extracts, owing to the psychosocial harm originating from being misrecognised ("*It kind o↓f felt a bit put to one corner in a way*"). By separating oneself from the problematic group, Alina is both legitimising her claim for civic belonging and delegitimising the nurse's own questions. She is also showing the narrative consequences of the 'ambiguity' trope (Fleming, 2000) that in effect mis-recognises the group identity that the person would like to be seen as belonging to.

Extract M53b: "if you're going to speak about something (...) at least do it correctly" (p.405)

Luminita	The gypsies (...) ethnically (.) it's a different group (.) culturally (.) it's a different group (.) historically it's a different group (.) I mean (.) there is that difference. It does bother me (.) cos there is a bit o↓f ignorance there (.) but also I don't (.) if you're going to speak about something (.) I mean at least do it correctly. I mean I- I was actually looking at this. Every article that I read (.) and every new:s that I er it appears (.) and every documentary. Even the one's that are trying to be er really well made (.) every time they speak about Romanians (.) they either start with showing gypsies (1) or [they sp]end ninety percent o↓f their time speaking about gypsies and that bothers me. Because that's not Romanian (.) as such. I mean (.) they are Romanian citizens (.)and some o↓f them are truly Romanians (.) but that's not all there is to it. I feel like yeah (.) the representativity of it is completely wrong. It's as if (.) it's as if (.) it doesn't even have to be a group (.) cos I understand it looks like 'oh okay you're 'unhappy about this because o↓f a group you don't consider to be good enough'. You know it happens to be the case that with the culture (.) the culture I come from is better in some ways.

Luminita is strongly justifying the difference between Romanians and Roma after I probed the fairness of such a distinction. In-so-doing she is managing the argument that Romanians are a homogenous group, similar to the accounts above. The central claim thus far in the subtheme has been that Roma as a minority shouldn't be construed as representing 'Romanian' identity in its entirety. Using a three part list, Luminita asserts an identity for Roma that is disparate to Romanians ("*The gypsies (...) ethnically (.) it's a different group (.) culturally (.) it's a different group (.) historically it's a different group (.) I mean (.) there is that difference*"). She describes the perception of seeing the two groups as synonymous as ill-informed ("*there is a bit o↓f ignorance*"). Premising herself as knowledgeable, she emphasises that there are truths and falsehoods about such talk ("*if you're going to speak about something (.) I mean at least do it correctly*"). Luminita then turns to media, and uses a generalisation to emphasise an alleged bias and misinformed conception of Romanian identity ("*Every article that I read (.) and every new:s that I er it appears (.) and every documentary. Even the one's that are trying to be er really well*

made (.) every time they speak about Romanians (.) they either start with showing gypsies (1) or [they sp]end ninety percent o↓f their time speaking about gypsies"). By stating twice that such claims of Romanianness have a personal impact, Luminita embeds her emphasis of difference and her critique of media representation as causing psychosocial harm, akin to Goffman's (1963) treatise of stigma ("*It does bother me*", "*that bothers me*"). Assertions of 'true' Romanianness are made ("*that's not Romanian*"), although this is managed when Luminita redefines 'civic' Romanianness as being an inclusive label ("*I mean (.) they are Romanian citizens (.) and some o↓f them are truly Romanians (.) but that's not all there is to it*") (cf. Andreouli & Howarth, 2012). Notably different from prior extracts, as Luminita presents a counter argument accusing herself of prejudice ("*I understand it looks like 'oh okay you're 'unhappy about this because o↓f a group you don't consider to be good enough'*"), she discounts it by a stake confession that she identifies 'majority' Romanian culture as 'better', albeit hedged as only being in certain ways ("*You know it happens to be the case that with the culture (.) the culture I come from is better in some ways*"). It's interesting how Luminita inverts the 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) to both critique media representation of Romanian identity as well as to assert an alternative reality embedded in authenticity (akin to how metaphors were oppositely used in Chapter III).

Extract M54b: they "are:n't really Romanians (.) they are gypsies" (p.422)

Alexandru:	=er:: yes actually it doe:s. It bothers me because most o↓f the thi↑ngs are not true and they are focussing on a small group o↓f Romanians which are:n't really Romanians (.) they are gypsies. (...) And they are focussing on the bad thi↑ngs that small group o↓f people do: (.) while (.) they are completely ignoring what other people do which are like the majori↑ty who go to work (.) who pay tax:es (.) who study here (.) who (.) a[ctua]lly contribute to the society. (.) It's quite annoying (.) And they are also exaggeratin:g because before (.) I don't know if you were aware but we had work permits until [2014] and before lifting those working restrictio↑ns all the newspapers were like (.) "Oh my God millions o↓f Romanians are (.) They've already bought their tickets (.) they're comin:g (.) brace yourselves". And on the 1st o↓f January o- only one Romanian came.

Here, we see Alexandru invoking a similar claim as I query how he makes sense of media coverage of Romania. Once again Roma are distinguished from Romanians in his critique ("*most o↓f the thi↑ngs are not true and they are focussing on a small group o↓f Romanians which are:n't really Romanians (.) they are gypsies*") with familiar accusations of psychosocial harm ("*actually it doe:s. It bothers me*", "*It's quite annoying*"). Authenticity is key to Alexandru's claim, as a majority-minority dichotomy is construed to emphasise the lack of attention being paid to Romanians who fulfil their social contract obligations ("*they are focussing on the bad thi↑ngs that small group o↓f people do: (.) while (.) they are completely ignoring what other people do which are like the majori↑ty who go to work (.) who pay tax:es (.) who study here (.) who (.) a[ctua]lly contribute to the society*"). Thus, we see a sharp contrast being drawn between the majority of 'lawful' and 'contributory' Romanians and the minority of 'deviant' individuals who are disallowed Romanian identification. Note also how Alexandru's earlier accusation of media ignorance ("*completing ignoring*") is developed later as he argues that newsprint media were hysterical of imminent 'invasion' despite no reality being forthcoming ("*the newspapers were like (.) "Oh my God millions o↓f Romanians are (.) They've already bought their tickets (.) they're comin:g (.) brace yourselves". And on the 1st o↓f January o- only one Romanian came*"). Again, the 'predictable' trope (Fleming, 2000) is used but like Luminita it is used to assert both the irrational panic of the receiving society as well as asserting the positive characteristics that Romanians themselves bring to their new community.

Extract M55b: "gypsies and all these people maybe coming here just to claim benefits" (p.654)

Gheorghe: I am a bit disappointed. They all portray these gypsies and all these people maybe coming here just to claim benefits maybe which I don't think it's so real. I never claimed benefits in this country (.) never ever. Even if I was entitled to them. I didn't bother. I prefer to go for interview and wait until the phone is ringing. At first I don't understand the young English boys (.) "Well (.) there are no jobs". When I came here (.) I had no work permit (.) no nothing. I found a job straight away. How is that possible (.) you know? I don't understand this.

Like prior extracts Gheorghe presents this homogenisation as being oppressive and deflating in response to my question about Romania's coverage in the media ("*I am a bit*

disappointed. They all portray these gypsies and all these people maybe coming here just to claim benefits maybe which I don't think it's so real"). Unlike previous extracts, though, Gheorghe challenges this categorisation by presenting himself as a tax contributor who hasn't claimed anything in return ("*I never claimed benefits in this country (.) never ever. Even if I was entitled to them. I didn't bother*") and simply tries to diligently find work ("*I prefer to go for interview and wait until the phone is ringing*"). He follows this up by critiquing young and unemployed citizens lacking wherewithal in contrast to his own resourcefulness ("*At first I don't understand the young English boys (.) "Well (.) there are no jobs". When I came here (.) I had no work permit (.) no nothing. I found a job straight away*"). Thus, in contrast to the prior extracts, while Gheorghe recognises the stereotypes of Romanian identity, he is instead seeking to separate himself actually from the unemployed and inactive citizens of the receiving society, in contrast to his industrious actions, in-so-doing rejecting 'predictability' trope (Fleming, 2000) as conventionally used and revising its meaning through his own example.

This section has illustrated the ways in which participants invoked problematic groups (as a contrast to themselves) to justify their own inclusion and construct a sense of achievement or belonging. The 'civic belonging' theme alongside its subthemes, 'recognition of integration, 'shared values and common humanity', and 'pathological integration', have now all been discussed. It has also been explored how the 'predictability' and to a lesser extent 'ambiguity' tropes (Fleming, 2000) were used by speakers both to critique the receiving society discourse as well as to reinforce their meaning to present their own cases for belonging. The Chapter will now review the main findings in light of the approach taken and the implications for the study as a whole.

Discussion of the mover voice DA

Using a DA drawing upon Shotter's (1993a) discussion of citizenship and belonging, Chapter IV has explored two themes in interview data with ten Romanians participants. For the first theme, 'civic becoming', participants oriented to past selves to embed claims of acculturative merit and of overcoming otherness endemic to the politics of migrant identity. For the second theme, 'civic belonging', participants invoked present selves in different ways, such as showcasing their integration, asserting common values or humanity, or separating themselves from problematic others in order to promote inclusion and eligibility. Both themes should be recognised as attempts to negotiate the challenges of

contemporary political discourse concerning Romanian identity and the implications of migration to the UK. While some participants especially in the 'recognition of integration' subtheme do claim to have 'made' that connectivity to the receiving society, (Extracts 26b, 31b, and 34b), for others it is more fragile and up for negotiation (see Alina in Extracts 32 and 33b). In either case, the spectre of receiving society discourse was evident, primarily through the prevalent presence of the 'predictability' trope which was invoked by participants for multiple effects, ranging from the narrative consequences of such stereotypes (cf. 'overcoming otherness' and 'shared values and common humanity' subthemes) or the recycling of its categorical impingement to re-imagine one's own identity as detached from that reality ('pathological integration'). It's notable that the 'ambiguity' trope receives scant mention in Chapter IV (much like Chapter III), suggesting that the evocation of Romanianness across the dataset most often entailed specific attributions as to Romanian identity character and/or practices.

Citizenship, as discussed in Chapter I, is not only a status: it is a claim of identification that relies upon recognition (Andreouli, 2013; Chryssochoou, 2004). Inclusion and belonging should be reviewed as a social achievement: it is rhetorically worked up through descriptions and versions as a bounded and performative practice where co-members listen to their voice (Shotter, 1993a). It can be mobilised in a 'negative' sense through exclusionary practices or in a 'positive' sense whereby clear criteria set the standard for inclusive and achievable membership. However it is worked up, civic identities will always bear "...a range of entitlements and rights...[are] bound into a corresponding network of obligations and 'contractual' affiliations" (Barnes et al., 2004, p.189). Chapter IV has shown how such claims can be presented to demand acknowledgement and recognition due to affirmative action. In a spirit of dialogue and contestation with the receiving society, participants justified inclusion by exemplifying common ground and solidarity, conceding their conditionality of belonging but similarly attesting to its fulfilment. They achieve this by engaging with the "morally textured 'landscape' of 'opportunities for action'" that they find themselves shaped by and acting within (Shotter, 1993a, p.162). Chapter IV has explored how self-defined Romanians made sense of this identity project in relation to broader 'traditions of argumentation' (Billig, 1996) such as nationalism, active and earned citizenship, and ethnicity.

While authors from various disciplines have noted some of these claims individually, for example the displacement of ethnic stigma (Fox J. & Moroşanu, 2013), the moral

condemnation of the Roma (Tileagă, 2006a) or the contestation of corruption narratives (Zerilli, 2013), this analysis has presented them as complementary means by which Romanians might overcome the stigmatised migrant identity and/or resist the conditionality of their belonging in society (Shotter, 1993a). In this sense, participants have responded to the claims and implications of political civic discourse such as what was covered in Chapter III. It's notable that the subtheme 'pathological integration' (cf. Fox & Mogilnicka, 2017) contained the majority of instances where participants most directly critiqued the media representation of Romanian identity. As integration was emphasised as a social civic outcome of their acculturative journey, a stratum of groups – whether immigrant or citizen – were identified as an anchor for them to contrast themselves against and highlight their effortfulness/worthiness narratives (see also Gibson, Crossland, & Hamilton, 2018).

A prominent idea of balkanism studies, discussed in Chapter I, is that of ambiguity – being 'between' social realms and subsequently constituted as marginal to the 'centre' of a given community. This is something that has also been exemplified in the data of this Chapter. Whether referring to the acculturative journeys or civic categorisations of participants, claims of belonging were layered within smaller claims of success and achievement, contesting and rebutting the broader xenophobic and/or exclusionary claims of media, civic or political discourse. Shotter (1993a) is once again pertinent as throughout the accounts of Romanians making their lives here in the UK, we have been exploring their

> "...critical descriptive vocabulary of terms...formative-relational commonplaces ...[that they] use in expressing their (ontological) needs – their feelings of anger and despair, their dreams and expectations, their need for respect and for civil relations with others, if one is to be one's own self while still 'belonging', along with others, to one's society – while still participating in the debate, while still playing their own part in the invention of 'our' form of citizenship" (p.201)

The limitations of resistance

While participants' resistance explored in this Chapter has thus far been presented monologically (to maximise their voice potential; see Chapter II), the ways in which the interview encounter – such as the framing of interviewer questions – shaped the interaction is a valid point of consideration. For example, open or closed ways of asking participants

'how they made sense of Romanian migration in the media', would differently shape their possibilities for narration and/or critique of receiving society representation, an implication akin to the Chair's actions in the QT data (see Extracts RS(a)15 & 16).

Extract M56c: "he's got some very good ideas" (p.648)

Henry:	You're exposed then to quite a lot of the (.) sort of (.) Nigel Farage type stuff all the time then really? (...) How do you feel about things like that then? It's almost synonymous (.) isn't it (.) when those things are talked about?
Gheorghe:	On one hand (.) he's got some very good ideas and he makes a few points (.) yes (.) which I totally agree (.) even as an immigrant (.) I absolutely agree with him. Yes (.) we have to do something about it. We can't just simply leave all the doors open and let everybody come in (.) you know? It has to be a selection after all. ((continues))

Extract M57c: "No (.) I'm not watching this" (p.627)

Henry:	At this point (.) then (.) we've talked quite a lot about you specifically. I'd like to know any views (.) or any feelings you might have (.) about the way that Romanian migration is being talked about in the media (.) the newspapers (.) the television (.) what your views are on that.
Violeta:	Yes. I don't know if you watched the last (.) I think it's Channel Four (.) with 'The Romanians Are Coming.' I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought (.) "No (.) I'm not watching this." ((continues))

Consider these extracts. My question initially cites a specific individual followed by a broader focus on related talk ("*Nigel Farage type stuff all the time then really? (...) How do you feel about things like that then?*"). Gheorghe's answer, while premised with a stake interest ("*even as an immigrant*"), nonetheless embodies an example of the named politician's tropes ("*We can't just simply leave all the doors open and let everybody come*") around the preservation of space and selectivity (cf. Extract RS(a)10). His resistance elsewhere in the interview is notably contrasted in this extract, with agreement

essentially reproducing talk that was explored in Chapter III (particularly in the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire). Conversely, following my more open question to Violeta (on how "*Romanian migration is being talked about in the media (.) the newspapers (.) the television*"), her response is directed in protest against a specific televised representation pertinent at the time of interview ("*'The Romanians Are Coming.' I just put it on for 10 minutes (.) and I thought (.) "No (.) I'm not watching this*").

As van Dijk (1996) argues, that social power is not equally shared in any given society and certain individuals, groups, or individuals will have greater access to the mechanisms that will distribute certain ideas or arguments over others. While this is not an absolute state of affairs, factors such as who has access to the journalists or who will be interviewed and broadcasted, has implications for the available resources people in order to articulate and debate (Wetherell, 2003). The two extracts in this section convey the extent to which the mover voice is shaped by the receiving society discourse, whether that is projected in their everyday lives or within the interview setting itself. While resistance remains possible, it is conversationally tied to mutually-shared resources that make it make commonsensical (Shotter, 1993a).

Promoting belonging over balkanism

While their specific 'ontological needs' have varied (for example to belong as Romanians like Alina; to be seen as British, like Andrei; or a global citizen, like Marina) there has been a common thread between them. Interviewees were participating in the discourse of citizenship, thereby establishing a means by which they can be *seen to be* active and welcome members of their communities. This routinely manifested in participants' accounts as precarious at best, beset by generalisation, neglect and even suspicion. This is the argumentative context that the findings should be viewed, particularly in the case of the 'overcoming otherness' and 'pathological integration', subthemes where exclusion, both personal and other, are important means by which interviewees sought to place themselves as possible members of the receiving society.

Balkanism studies (e.g., Fleming, 2000) has been a fruitful lens for augmenting the DA approach taken. In particular, participants' orientation to the past process of overcoming otherness and/or morally distinguishing themselves from other problematic groups in the present are two patterns in the data that can be seen as speaking to

balkanism. Through mundane discursive means, by such as Anna's reflections (M14a) of being accused of 'stealing' space and resources (cf. Zerilli, 2013), Andrei's disputes over the problems of generalisations (M50b-52b) (cf. Bjelić, 2002), Alina's observation (M17a) of Romanians always being mentioned alongside sensational criminal or uncivilised behaviours (cf. Hammond, 2007), or Constanta's emphasis on the need for Romanians to 'prove' themselves (M49b) (cf. Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013). Such examples show the prevalence of balkanism in mover voice discourse reflecting upon their entry and time in the UK receiving society discursive milieu. As balkanism is concerned with alienating cultures from the Western self and asserting social power over its subjects (Todorova, 2009), such disputes as those above by interviewees are negotiations of the legacy of this ideological project. However, there are ways of circumventing, challenging and undermining this ideological narrative. Positivity (e.g., Gheorghe reflections in M38b), the use of irony (Violeta's subversion of nationality in M41b), as well as common inclusive identities (Marina's global citizenship in M39b) were all ways of attempting to re-write narratives of Romanian identity and migration. As Felix put it, such attempts to tell the kind of 'untold' stories are in need to humanise the lived accounts of ideologically-fuelled impingement, whether by balkanism or other means.

Chapter review: contributions to knowledge and civic solidarity

Chiefly, Chapter IV has explored the lived world of acculturation, civic growth and stigma through participants' own use of rhetoric situated within the receiving society's sphere. Attempts by participants to constitute their identities are accordingly balancing both the personal and the social, the most pertinent being the topical fixation of the period on Romanian identity and migration in political discourse. Viewing how such discourse has been lived and negotiated is a vital contribution that has previously been understated in social psychological investigations of discourse and identity. Further, the DA literature has been shown to be salient in understanding accounts of Romanian identity and migration.

Chapter IV provides three core contributions to knowledge: firstly, it has analysed the interview conversational data or 'lived accounts' accounts of self-defined Romanians living in the UK, a topic previously conducted only around the point of accession (Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013). Secondly it has provided the second component to the acculturative mix, mover discourse, to complete the study's empirical concern for both receiving society and mover discourse, an undertaking still novel in social psychology.

Finally, the Chapter has invoked the Balkanism studies literature to make sense of conversational data, thus marking an interesting development as prior studies have been largely concerned with the study of historical, institutional or media discourse (Hammond, 2006; Light &Young, 2009; Razsa & Lindstrom, 2004) than lived accounts. Chapter V will review the study's main findings, contributions and implications.

Chapter V: critical psychological reflections on Romanian identity and migration discourse

Having now outlined the two empirical Chapters, Chapter V is concerned with reviewing the thesis, in particular focusing upon its key findings and how the empirical work in Chapters' III and IV speak to the study's central aim to explore accounts constructing Romanian identity and migration in the period leading up to 2014. The findings from these voices – receiving society and immigrant – will be reviewed from a critical psychological standpoint. This standpoint embodies the DA work that has grown within social psychology reviewed in Chapter I and the methodological approach outlined in Chapter II. Chapter V brings the thesis together by discussing the findings of Chapters III and IV and critically situating their implications in wider cultural and political context with reference to how the findings relate to the literature and raise further questions to be explored in future research. The Chapter will also build on the methodological remarks in Chapter II, situating the thesis within a reflexive framework by outlining the researcher's own personal, functional and disciplinary impact. The Chapter concludes by reviewing the contributions of the thesis and a call for more studies concerned with identity exploration amongst migrant communities in the UK with reference to the receiving community, in critical historical and cultural context.

Main findings: recap

Chapter III analysed the receiving society discourse applying interpretative repertoire analysis to a dataset comprised of political discourse from QT and TAMS taken in the period preceding 2014, the point upon which Romania's transitional controls were lifted and correspondingly, the point after which discourse of Romanian identity and migration dramatically subsided. Across the dataset, two interpretative repertoires were analysed: the ''vulnerable nation' repertoire (headlined by a need to defend the nation from threatening migration) and the 'civic imperative' repertoire (headlined by a need protect the citizen from draining migrants). The Chapter was concerned with how these repertoires were variably rhetorically mobilised by means of subtheme exploration with reference to ideological effects. In keeping with the thesis' critical aims, the Chapter also considered how the employment of threat and burden arguments were contested by counter arguments (reliance and contribution).

Chapter IV explored the interview accounts of self-defined Romanians living in the UK gathered between 2014-2015, drawing upon DA with particular reference to Shotter (1993a). Two themes were interpreted: 'civic becoming' (which involved invoking the past to challenge politics of migrant identity) and 'civic belonging' (which involved invoking the present to address conditionality of, and thereby situate eligibility for, belonging). This Chapter was concerned with how narratives of citizenship and belonging – centrally fuelled by struggles for recognition – were rhetorically mobilised to articulate participants' accounts of their lived realities.

A critical psychological review of Chapters' III and IV

> "Whose history gets told? In whose name? For what purpose?" (Marshall, B., 1992, p.4)

This thesis has been concerned with the social psychological construction of identity, particularly in the context of citizenship and belonging (Shotter, 1993a). The discourse under consideration was the intensified focus on Romanians that manifested prior to and climaxed on 1st January 2014. It is recognised that to talk or write about migration – the movement of identities – involves differentiating 'newcomers' from those already 'rooted' amongst the raft of other ideas that are blown into the fray. A discursive study of migration must step into the argument and try to explain it in its own terms and therefore understand the consequences of these constructions. From a critical psychology perspective, this necessarily means documenting and analysing discourse that should otherwise be starved of oxygen. Without speaking to doxa, "the majority, petit bourgeois Consensus, the Voice of Nature, the Violence of Prejudice" (Barthes, 1977, p.47), explanation and thereby critique cannot be realised. Whether deriving from travel writing, speeches, or newspapers, certain forms of knowledge become hegemonic and accepted as truth, and the researcher's task is to unpack that process and understand its implications (Todovera, 2009). Romania's characterisation as the home of Dracula (Light, 2007), 'swan-skewering' migrants (Fox J. et al., 2012), or thieves (Zerilli, 2013) are instances pre-dating this study of such hegemonic truth. By systematically analysing the receiving society accounts of possible Romanian migration, alongside the stories of Romanians who have made the UK their home, one can begin to deconstruct that reality not only by showing its rhetorical contingency but by also showing how it can be contested and renegotiated to the realisation of alternative truths. In what follows, the study's findings are discussed with

reference to the literature, with the emergent ideological implications critiqued by drawing on critical psychology (e.g., Fox, D., 1985).

Critical psychology is as much concerned with empowering alternative narratives that challenge social injustices in society and calls for progressive change as it is psychology as a discipline in its own right. Chapter V will be concerned with contrasting the implications of the findings in Chapters III and IV. It will not be value-free, being concerned with the recognition of how different personal, social and political concerns shape the professional outcomes, as well as aspirational in how the findings can be used for positive change (Fox, D., 1986). While some voices in this thesis would identify that "commune is impossible, the neighbourhood dead, and the alienating existence of mass society here to stay" (Fox, D., 1985, p.58), the contributions of this Chapter would reply to the contrary that there are values which help us to critique and consider alternatives. While no option is unproblematic, this Chapter aims to show by drawing upon critical psychology that the promotion of a common identity project that many could come to identify with is worth striving towards.

Comparing the emergent discourse in Chapters' III and IV

The receiving society discourse characterised Romanian identity and migration in the main as a negative possibility/actuality. The subthemes substantiate the variability of this core claim: for example, 'corroborating finite space and infinite migration' for the 'vulnerable nation' repertoire and 'justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'' for the 'civic imperative' repertoire both drew on contrast structures in order to impose a sense of differentiation. These themes presented predictions of a predicted future of 'pressure' for the country and a justification for migrant inferiority, respectively. This understandably featured differently in the mover voice discourse, with migration mostly featuring as a positive force in the present and as an imagined future. However, in both themes, the past and present featured as temporal anchors to address the negative core claims about migration that featured so often in Chapter III. For example, 'overcoming otherness' in the first theme and 'pathological integration' in the second theme both attend to insinuations that migrant identity is a stigmatised status, one fraught with challenges and a sense of outsider-ness. Whereas 'overcoming otherness' was based on demonstrating how such challenges were personally surmounted and thereby promote a positive claim to belong, 'pathological integration' involved a series of 'other' groups deemed to be the 'real'

problem and thereby show the worthiness of the speaker's own claim. These themes show similar negativity towards the migrant's imposed status, and thereby demonstrating the dilemma in the mainstream discourse for movers entering the receiving community: they are not welcome until they prove themselves they are no longer migrants. A relevant point here can be made about the particular phraseology involved: whereas data in Chapter III talked either about migration (usually said in relation to the nation) or migrants (usually said in relation to the citizen), the data in Chapter IV did not show such a clear-cut distinctions. Instead, names like 'immigrants' were most often invoked not as a self-definition but towards identity work that situated their civic belonging.

There is common ground also in the way that the dominant repertoires of Chapter III were contested. Whereas a handful of speakers in the receiving society dataset invoked shared identities or respect to immigrants within society (cf. the 'recasting metaphors', 'exposing stake and interest', and ''us' and 'we' identity claims' subthemes), interviewees in Chapter IV invoked similar counter-arguments to similar effect, either promoting specific civic achievements or more fundamental universality (cf. the 'recognition of integration' and 'shared values and common humanity' subthemes). There are different ideological undercurrents at work here ranging from the classic liberal tradition of citizenship which recognises civil society, the nation-state, and the foreigner towards the more existentialist conceptions of humanity or 'global citizenship' that strip down or undermine clear-cut distinctions to embrace an ecological sense of co-existence and collaboration. Such agendas speak in direct opposition to the nationalist or Balkanist tenets of the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires of Chapter III, although clearly these ideologies are not neatly separable and boiled down to specific individuals or datasets. However, the contrary or fallacious tropes that are "inherent in the ideologies to which [we] have access" (Wetherell et al., 1987, p.69) means that sense-making often entails swinging between different concepts and arguments. The variability of such discourse reflects on speaker choices to represent certain things in certain ways (Potter & Wetherell, 1987).

These findings also bear broader social implications in regards to how integration as the idealised form of acculturation is realised by both the moving and rooted actors within the receiving community. According to AT, integration reflects the maintenance of cultural heritage through routine enactment in a setting beyond the person's indigenous culture (e.g., Berry, 2005). Without this crucial freedom to practice, the strategy changes and

becomes assimilationist (Bowskill et al., 2007). A pervasive issue that has featured in both Chapters lies in the construed state of the public space: namely, in the preservation of its integrity in the face of adversity, whether that is migration or problematic migrants per se. While the premise acted to anchor claims of authenticity and belonging in both the receiving and mover discourse, there was a prominent restriction for minorities a right to participate in a celebration of both commonness and diversity (Parekh, 2000). However, while integration was commonly espoused in both Chapters as an ideal acculturative outcome, the premise of individualism can be seen, with acculturative problems presented as having their source in a person's thoughts or behaviours rather than those occurring in their broader social realities (Gough & McFadden, 2001; Fox D. et al., 2009). In both Chapters there is an emphasis on the individual migrant; accordingly there is a lessened concern for the actions of the receiving community, despite their role in shaping acculturative possibilities. For example, receiving society commentary on specific migrant groups premises that their immigration has been 'problematic' and/or that they require educational intervention (see e.g., Extract RS(b)8 in Chapter III). By this point of acculturative crisis, the societal discourse has not reflected on the ways in which shared civic values could have been propagated and encouraged as a project of joint responsibility between all members, rooted and newcomer, and thereby lessening the sole individual emphasis on movers to 'succeed' by their own merits and resistance to the critiques of receiving discourse. It essentially operates as a "performative contradiction" (Butler & Spivak, 2007, p.63) as integration is claimed on a mantle of tolerance and diversity while at the same time sidelining the assimilationist implications borne out of expectations of the migrant to forgo their own desires and fall into the lines of the body politic. As Gheorghe asserted "I'm not trying to change you from inside" (in Chapter IV; see 'shared values and common humanity').

On earned citizenship: a new possibility for belonging?

> How can we preserve the global commons while at the same time facilitating the individual's attainment of both autonomy and a psychological sense of community?" (Fox, D., 1985, p.51)

Common to both Chapters III and IV, many voices embraced the possibility of 'earned' citizenship (e.g., Andreouli, 2013; Gibson, 2011). This is an interesting juncture, one that on appearance is suggestive of a fruitful opportunity for a genuinely inclusive

form of resistance. For example, in the 'immigrant identity claims' subtheme of Chapter III, speakers drew upon stories of hard work, accomplishment, and recognition: of becoming citizens through merit (cf. Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013). Similarly, interviewees invoked similar stories in the 'showing acculturative preparedness' (as a migrant) and 'recognition of integration' (as a citizen) subthemes. This was even embedded within the 'civic imperative' repertoire, for example in the 'justifying an unequal 'us' and 'them'' subtheme where speakers orient to the ultimate possibility of common citizenship based on earned status (taking the previously discussed problematic effects to one side). Taking into consideration the ethnic connotations that citizenship can acquire (Andreouli & Howarth, 2012; Gerritsen & Maier, 2012) and indeed has been shown in this thesis, this common ground would appear to be a worthy possibility for promoting a citizenship of belonging.

That is, until one considers the situational context that such talk speaks from: my interviewees can rightly and confidently claim it for themselves on their merits, but then, what of everyone else? Shotter (1993a, p.195) reminds us to consider "those of us with only 'conditional' membership...[that] whatever they do, they *feel* not quite up to requirements". This is not only immigrants yet to prove themselves, or even those that are but are not being recognised, but also pre-existing members of the polity – the vagrant, the unemployed, the disabled, other otherwise unrecognised – they too can be implicated in such discussions of attainment (Anderson, 2013). By differentiating between the proactive and the inactive, a new dichotomy is drawn: instead of nationality or birthright, citizenship becomes meritocratic. But by drawing an absolute level that all must achieve, the outcome could actually regress, for despite good intention the tenets of individualism, oppression, and institutional reinforcement are all revitalised (cf. Fox D. et al., 2009). The individual is charged with performing to the standard; if/when some fall short, they will be ostracised or neglected; in turn the successful become the investitures of the benchmark and so the cycle continues. Actually, the problem may then escalate as

> "the more the lives of people are a consequence of decisions made by Kafkaesque officialdom, the more they are robbed of those communal bonds and responsibility upon which the sense of rootedness is built." (Sarason, 1976/1982, cited in Fox, D., 1985, p.54)

And so, "ontological insecurity" (Shotter, 1993a, p.194) could reign yet still stronger. This cautionary critique is not to say that merit has no place; rather that its replacement from any other model still bears problems. Further, the critical psychological agenda of

constructing “decentralized society of federated autonomous communities” remains unmet (Fox, D., 1985, pp. 48-9). While the intention may be pure, the effect will lead to destitution and rage as a quasi-permanent state of enforced non-belonging is enacted (Butler & Spivak, 2007).

Reinforcing and disrupting balkanism

Somewhat related to acculturative action is the homogenisation of the Roma (who may be Romanian) and the Vlachs (who are by majority Romanian). The discourse concerning Romanian identity in Chapter III (and thereby the possibility for civic belonging) was premised on exclusionary logics, some of which relied upon ethnic differentiation with problems of uncivilised or criminal behaviours invoked (cf. the ‘rallying ethno-national consensus against migration threat’ and ‘identity conflation and vagueness’ subthemes). In Chapter IV, this distinction was sharply contrasted through historical, cultural and ethnic story-telling, for example in the ‘pathological integration’ subtheme through the claim that the ethnic Roma were the ‘true’ orient residing in, although not belonging to, Romania, having descended from the South-East (cf. Bakić-Hayden, 1995). This is a separable, albeit related, instance of balkanist discourse, one where the disputation is always heard less loudly than its imposition, its denial viewable as a vindication (Bjelić, 2002). So it goes that while not all Roma are Romanian, interviewees reflected that the receiving community think that all Romanians are Roma, and with that the seeds of misrecognition are sown (Honneth, 1995).

A sad, yet central implication here lies in the denial of allowing some among us to not engage in the cultural politics and be seen as “‘someone’ who ‘counts’ in society” (Shotter, 1993a, p.193). By drawing upon tropes of ‘true’ Romanianness (see transcendental and Latinesque descriptions by Antohi, 2002 in Chapter I), the stage is set for a continual division of purpose and eligibility and thereby the justification of balkanism as a rightful rather than ideological lens of (mis)interpretation. It also brings to the fore the legacy of trauma, rejection and estrangement espoused within balkanism itself and evident in contemporary identity discourse of Romania (Tileagă, 2012). A re-imagining of a more inclusive and tolerant Romanianness seems like a necessary ambition if cohabitation and understanding towards a redefined social-civic contract are to be fostered over well-worn balkanist tropes. Granted, this is easier to declare than enact, for identity discourse often invokes nationhood as a symbol to bind “forcibly, if not powerfully” its members and

accordingly "unbinds, releases, expels, banishes" non-members (Butler & Spivak, 2007, pp.4-5). Without such political distinctions, citizenship in the liberal tradition would not be meaningful (Shotter, 1993a). However, as participants like Marina showed in Chapter IV (see 'shared values and common humanity'), while citizenship is a seminal component of the identity tapestry, there are also other articulations that colour the fabrics of belonging, ranging from the prosaic meritocratic practices discussed above to universalist claims of common humanity.

Links between empirical findings and Brexit

The current study's findings and the implications considered above should also be contextualised in relation to the UKs subsequent decision to leave the EU by plebiscite in 2016. While it would require an entirely new study to investigate the discourse during the campaign itself (see e.g., Weißbecker. 2017), some patterns can be gleamed. The prevailing arguments surrounding the campaign seemed to boil down to the avoidance of pain (Remain – no definitive slogan) versus the pursuit of hope (Leave – 'Take Back Control'). The latter's slogan cannot be understated when contrasted to the 'vulnerable nation' and 'civic imperative' repertoires investigated in Chapter III. Both repertoires were concerned with the protection of the nation and/or its citizens from outside forces/groups; it's notable that the Leave message answered these repertoire's protestations by proposing to 'restore' power and sovereignty to the nation and its citizens – an inherently emotive and positive message. It's also notable that there was no singular means by which these repertoires were resisted, mirroring Remain's narrative ambiguity and suggesting why it did not match the power contained in Leave's message. While direct links are not asserted here, the current study's repertoires are clearly relevant in understanding how prevailing immigration discourse fed into the Brexit debate.

There are also links to the implications considered above. While 'integration' was agreed by receiver and mover voices an ideal acculturative social outcome in both empirical Chapters, 'earned citizenship' was invoked as a prized individual status. Between these points of agreement, there were often mentions of exclusion of groups/individuals not seen to be integrating or 'undeserving' of citizenship. These arguments bear close resemblance to the UK Government's 'settled status' policy rhetoric, a process by which EU citizens can apply for permission to stay (UK Government, 2017). Again, the link here suggests that this study's discursive focus has links beyond the epoch.

Situating the study's implications in the literature

The current study has implications for both the discursive social psychology literature and for the collection of studies concerned with Romanian identity and migration. The study's unique temporal focus contributes an as yet unexplored epoch next to previous work that has unpacked situated discourse concerned with similar issues (Capdevila & Callaghan, 2008; Condor & Gibson, 2007; Goodman & Johnson, 2013; Lynn & Lea 2003). The discursive findings of the current study – such as the use of nation and citizen repertoires in Chapter III – adds to the discursive social psychology of citizenship and belonging, both by furthering contemporary advances (Condor et al., 2013) and in reviewing classic contributions (Shotter, 1993a). In this vein it also provides an analytic implication for this previous work. The current study shows the benefits of invoking a historically sensitive and empirically-driven approach vis-a-vis interpretative repertoire analysis in the study of corpus data rather than the defaulted level of focus on discursive devices. The relative scarcity of repertoire analyses to frame such devices in DA studies is a question that warrants further critical exploration.

The study also has implications for the collection of studies that together embody an emerging – albeit eclectic – concern with Romanian identity discourse. By exploring the construction of Romanian identity in national television media and lived accounts of Romanians themselves, the current study's focus on 'competing' voices (i.e., receiving and mover) has implications for the contrasting newsprint national media frames – both British and Romanian – of Romanian identity and migration (Fox, J., et al. 2012; Light & Young, 2009). This is because the current study shows the nuanced temporal footing shifts in Romanian mover accounts which not only dispute the receiving society, but also agree and even build upon exclusionary actions (cf. 'civic becoming' and 'civic belonging' in Chapter III). The study also has implications for conceptualising ethnic stigma, which previous studies have shown is fraught with displacement onto other minorities (Moroşanu & Fox J., 2013; Fox & Mogilnicka, 2017). The current study has interpreted similar findings, which concurs with recent work investigating citizenship discourse concerned with demarcating between citizens themselves (Gibson et al., 2018). Thus, future studies investigating the construction of civic and/or migrant identity (beyond Romanians specifically) would benefit from further interrogating the ways in which apparently dichotomous logic portrayed in 'us and them' discourse betrays more intra-group

demarcation that layers within as well as between competing groups. Doing so will enable more critical insight into how such discourse can be disputed, (cf. the 'resistance' sections of Chapter III).

Finally, the current study has implications for Balkanism studies and social psychology, of which the current study has tied together to gain deeper insight into the topic. Previously, owing to its intellectual origins Balkanism studies has been primarily historiographical in approach (see Todorova, 2009). Building on the more recent sociological applications of Balkanism studies from Fox, J. et al. (2012) and Light and Young (2009), the current study has shown the psychological relevance of balkanism in social identity realisation vis-a-vis its contestation through claims-making and (mis)recognising (Chryssochoou, 2003). This is conversely also the case for social psychology; the current study has shown how balkanism can be conceptualised as an ideological tradition that can be critically situated in order to understand the contemporary realisation of psychological issues related to groups subjected to its effects. Attention to this will not recognise the historical richness and legacy of discourse in our empirical and theoretical work, but will also provide us with a means of critically appraising the psychosocial harm that vulnerable groups must sometimes contend with depending on their specific circumstances (Honneth, 1995).

Thesis contributions to knowledge

This thesis makes an original contribution to knowledge via three central achievements. Firstly, the thesis has examined how Romanian identity and migration were constructed in the lead up to the UK's lifting of transitional controls for Romania as an EU member state; with focus on a segment of political discourse from the UK as a receiving society and the accounts of self-defined Romanians living in the UK. While previous studies have investigated Romania's initial accession in 2007 (e.g., Light & Young, 2009) or subsequent reception in UK media (Fox J., et al. 2012), no study has as yet explored the discourse concerning the lifting of transitional controls, a point of acute psychological angst (in hindsight for both receiver and mover voices; see Chapters III and IV). Secondly, the study has adopted a novel a dual-site methodological approach to show how different acculturative voices – receiving and mover – constructed citizenship and belonging. While some recent studies have investigated how receiver and mover voices speak to one another (e.g., Kirkwood et al., 2013; Leudar et al., 2008), this study is as yet the first study to

investigate how lived accounts of movement are produced and contested in relation to Romanian identity and acculturation. Finally, the study has employed Balkanism studies to historicise the legacy of the contemporary discourse studied in the thesis, an undertaking not yet documented by an identity-focused social psychological study.

Chapter I underpinned the novel empirical findings in Chapters III and IV by outlining how the study was situated in the citizenship studies tradition in social psychology (in particular Shotter's (1993a) work on citizenship as a situated, voiced, and performative practice) with reference to Balkanism studies as an underpinning field to guide the study. Chapter II described how the study's dual-site methodological approach could provide insight into this topic by attending to two distinctive divergent acculturative voices. Chapter III, employing DA as practiced in social psychology, investigated how the receiving society in part mobilised (and to a lesser extent, resisted) two interpretative repertoires constructing the nation as under threat from migration and/or the citizen as burdened by the migrant. Chapter IV, similarly employing DA as practiced in social psychology, explored the rhetorical construction of citizenship and belonging in Romanian movers' accounts of movement and acculturation. Chapters III and IV comprise the thesis' novel empirical contributions via-a-vis investigation of contemporary discourse concerning Romanian identity and migration in the UK, a topic previously studied up to Romania's immediate post-accession up to 2010 (Light & Young, 2009; Fox J. et al., 2012; Moroşanu & Fox, J., 2014). Chapter V has sought to situate the study's findings critically, illustrating its contributions and directions for future research.

Limitations

The current study adopted a temporal and spatial frame in order to contain its focus: specifically, the cultural context of the UK during the time where Romania's transitional controls were due to be lifted (in 2014) and thereby subject to increasing political scrutiny. Accordingly, it provides a unique historical perspective on what are now completely re-defined concerns in the political and social arena. The study has documented the dominant interpretative repertoires in a small segment of receiving society discourse – common means by which immigration and immigrants were respectively differentiated, excluded or marginalised, as well as how a handful of Romanians themselves made sense of their citizenship and belonging as actors locked within those repertoires as integral aspects of their acculturative context. What it has not shown, however, is *the* receiving society

discourse in its entirety; nor has it shown *the* Romanian perspective, not least *the* Roma perspective (no Roma were recruited, not through choice but through happenstance of who volunteered for the study) – only segments of both, on both practical and philosophical levels. By extension, the discourse studied will be a snapshot in that temporal and spatial frame. Indeed, Romanian identity discourse has since ebbed since. From the summer of 2015, the so-called 'Migration Crisis' involved concerns over refugees masquerading as 'economic migrants' travelling over the Mediterranean. The lead-up to and fall-out following the 2016 Referendum involved the mention of 'EU citizens' and their status/ future in the UK – of which Romanians clearly feature as members of that broader group.

The study's methodological and analytic setting is also bounded. The recruitment strategy was decided to be the optimal way of finding participants where no prior networks were in place. While the participants recruited provided me with hours of narration to reflect upon and analyse – and plenty for the purposes of Chapter IV – they nonetheless represent a small range of voices. One can point to similar interview studies concerned with identity where more have been sourced (e.g., Condor, 2000; Tileagă, 2006a). While quantity does not equate with quality, it can show different patterns that may not be seen in a smaller dataset. However, it is not knowable if such patterns could have been seen as analysis is dependent upon the time available to investigate the data. The analytic choice taken to interpret at the repertoire/thematic level also had implications. While providing a means of capturing broad patterns derived out of local-level coding, the study has not been concerned with the same level of investigation as other discursive studies. The thesis has been situated as a study concerned with the rhetorical effects that can be interpreted from such codes and thereby the ideological implications, rather than linking each code pragmatically to its specific evocation in situ to explain a given action. This reflects the now forked DP tradition, with this study positioned within the citizenship studies field concerned with social identity and prejudice (Condor, 2011; Tileagă, 2006b).

Future directions

The study has insightful implications across the disciplinary concerns reflected upon above. Chiefly within citizenship studies, the study has offers methodological insights towards the growing body of comparative multi-site DA studies (e.g., Xenitidou & Morasso, 2014). For example, by observing competing discursive accounts of identity, it has been shown how certain thematic concerns may resonate as common ground (e.g., the

trope that 'hard work should pay off') while others might feature as the ground for contestation (e.g., the sense that migrants do not try enough to 'integrate'). Such common and contested grounds can be seen as a network of concepts informing the contemporary citizenship discursive landscape (cf. Leudar et al., 2004). While of course singular datasets can still illustrate such complexity, this completely depends upon the context in question, for example taking into consideration the issues at stake, the actors, and their relationships: in other words, how power in accordance to one's status, institutional norms and societal values converge in situ (van Dijk, 2000a). On a related, albeit less considered note for this thesis, lies in the different possibilities for resistance across the two receiving society data sources. There is a possible direction for more CA-minded research in the tradition of say, Kitzinger (2005) to explore the ways in which power manifests in (para)linguistic or pragmatic practices to restrict interactional possibilities.

There have been several observations in the empirical Chapters and the discussion above demonstrating how balkanism is embedded within the rhetorical mobilisations of the discourse studied, with the legacy of the discourse investigated projecting the pervasive themes that have been studied by Balkanism studies. It is not a 'new' set of identity claims, but rather, a network that blurs the distinction between past and present, while nonetheless seeking to lock them together and show how no affirmative actions are needed. The disciplinary implications here speak not only to Balkanism studies, but to social psychology as well. Balkanism studies could benefit from pursuing the possibility of tying together the historical with the contemporary more regularly (not least with lay conversational data rather than institutional, media or political discourse solely), showing empirically how the discourse might stagnate, adapt, or transform entirely in relation to the representations they espouse. Conversely, social psychology would benefit from (perhaps literally) borrowing from its neighbours, addressing the contingency of their empirical concerns and recognising the contributions that historic sensitivity or 'antiquarianism' can bring (Billig, 1996).

The study's own findings on citizenship and belonging, with reference to acculturative journeys and the occasional salience of ethnicity, will remain as pertinent avenues of inquiry following the period leading up to 2014 where EU transitional controls were lifted by the UK. Future discursive studies would benefit from considering the various complex ways in which civic identity can be constructed in light of the changing

political context. There are a number of particular questions and/or sites that could be considered.

This study specifically studied receiving society discourse and mover discourse (although of course the latter is a grossly simplified term as discussed previously). While the benefits of analysing different datasets in one study have been explored, particularly with reference to the issues that speak to or past the respective datasets, what this study did not do was capture the dialogical discussion of these issues in situ (beyond a couple of specific moments in the receiving society dataset, particularly QT). A future question to be explored is how newcomer and rooted members of a community discuss modes of citizenship in a focus group setting, and whether earned belonging has a part to play? These might be members of a common community, whether that be local, regional or national. While, as with all focus groups, one may envisage potential issues requiring the relative comfort of all members, the importance of rapport and the minimisation of dominating personalities, the discussion could shed some light on how the community on a local level is enacted through contrasting life-worlds. Where is the common ground, do they share a vision for the challenges to the community and the aspirations towards greater cohesion? Such issues would help shed light on the concerns for critical psychologists in exploring the in situ resolution of conflict and misrecognition. This study shed light on the processes by which migration and acculturation are negotiated and belonging justified as a result of past actions in relation to Romanian identity. However it could be expanded upon in future by considering how belonging in this specific dialogical conversational setting is embedded.

This particular question takes a different form in light of the result of the 2016 referendum of EU membership and the subsequent period of political renegotiation and resulting civic uncertainty. How do settled communities make sense of their belonging in a context of legal and constitutional uncertainty; how do they account for former plans and how do they project their futures? As stated above, the current study now occupies a distinctive historical epoch, after Romania's formal accession but before their recognition as 'equal' members in terms of civic rights. For Romanians particularly, such questions will take more profound meanings in light of their prior struggles for recognition in the period considered in the current study now that Brexit has defined the political landscape in the period beyond this study's empirical focus. A further avenue would be in exploring how Romanians have made sense of their communities locally since the result: have they

felt able to continue their lives as before, or has the sense of estrangement mentioned in the interview become more profound since the referendum? On a more tangential level, a further question worth considering is how the (albeit less frequent) mentions of Romania since 2014 fare next to the ones considered in current study – particularly, where/how does balkanism manifest? Are such mentions taking new form? As the majority of coverage now homogenises the 'EU citizens' against 'British citizens' in the television and newsprint representation of the renegotiation (Gibbins, 2012), it may well be that balkanism has been sidelined, lending weight to the idea of the contingency of its use with regards to Romanian identity.

There are also questions less related to immigration but more concerned with society as a whole since the referendum: questions like how the political discourse of 'taking back control' is constructed across different domains. It appears to have different faces, such as an attempt at rejuvenating the lost empire or a post-diverse re-imagining of the global world. This question of faces requires deep ideological interrogation, as all such projects seem to speak to the tenets of nationalism in any case. Relatedly, does the rhetoric of certain actors preclude, soften or suggest certain arguments in this narrative? Are there presentational regularities or variability in how self and other are relayed in this narrative in light of the backdrop of the Remain/Leave fault-line?

This thesis now represents a historical interest concern. Since 2014, the UK has had two General Elections and a referendum (and that is not even counting the local and regional ones). The political discourse as of now concerns an even older and far more visceral narrative, one that speaks of European enemies over the water conspiring against the UK (cf. Gibbins, 2012). Newly 'freed' of Brussels' shackles, we must all align as Brexiteers and forge a new national destiny. Yet Romanians, like other Europeans living here, do not yet know if they'll be able to participate as citizens. The same concerns of migration discourse explored in this thesis – nationalism and prejudice, citizenship and belonging – remain unanswered. Inclusiveness, solidarity and dialogue are still at stake; Romanians, among other Europeans, are wondering as to whether their receiving communities will still be 'home' for them. However, as history has shown, discourse ebbs and flows; and for each time a "frozen image" (Todorova, 2009, p.7) is invoked, there will be a case for critical investigation of rhetorical contingency and resistance.

Reflexive positionality

This section is structured by drawing upon Wilkinson's three-part personal, functional and disciplinary typology of reflexivity (1988, cited in Gough & McFadden, 2001, pp.66-67). As a relativist I am quite comfortable in asserting that the theoretical, methodological and analytical basis of the thesis has its origins with me: someone else may have approached the topic differently according to their own designs. However, the point of this section is not to disclose guilt or fault, but rather, to show how my own role in the different capacities has shaped the thesis as it turned out to be. The central aim is that the reader can come to understand how I made sense of the thesis, akin to the evidencing of analytical claims or methodological justifications. It is aimed that this reflexive section be seen as a resource documenting the implicit concerns driving the researcher behind the research, a consideration historically under-mentioned yet increasingly recognised as a necessity to evaluate qualitative psychological research (Gough & Madill, 2012).

Personal: on my motivations, interests, and attitudes

Personal reflexivity involves recognition of how, as a person in my own right, parts of my identity influenced the shape of the research (Wilkinson, 1988, cited in Gough & McFadden, 2001, pp.66-67). As an analyst I have attempted to analyse rhetorical features and ideological effects in accounts of Romanian identity and migration. However I must, to borrow from Barthes (1977, p.48), start by "reminding [myself] that it is language which is assertive, not [me]": my reactions to actions are rhetorical responses, part of an endemic cycle when we step in the argument (Billig, 1996). Through written interpretation, I had to manage my own position as an activist, one who by merit of engaging with the discourse has his own impressions, disagreements or affiliations. These not only manifested in the values I raised in Chapter II when approaching the interviews as data, but also in a personal sense across the project. Here, my own background merits mention. For as self-identifying English speaker born in the Midlands to a working-class family, I have long engaged with receiving society discourse before starting the project.

Being raised in Leicester, the proliferation of its multiculturalism is a recurrent debate with critics who attest to the steady decline of the city's (white) 'Englishness' and its increasingly segregated and disgruntled communities. I have long felt quite indifferent to the multicultural nature of the city, with the only exception I have struggled to

communicate to people in basic English. This indifference is not exactly common (Garner, 2010), but probably originates from my own sense of detachment from my hometown, which has never really felt like 'home' as much as the place where my family have lived for two generations. Perhaps doing DA is easier to do when one does not readily identify with – and indeed, often sceptically questions – the knowledge constructed as 'natural' in the society within which we cohabit. However, in unnecessarily saying 'sorry' and 'cheers' during most social encounters, strategically sitting on a bus to meet personal space norms, or quietly standing and rolling eyes in a long supermarket queue when someone appears to 'jump ahead', I too embody the cultural baggage and thereby no doubt its ideological traditions. Noticing it in others' talk does not immunise me from being charged with drawing on these ideological legacies to 'get by' and live myself.

I should mention my motivation in pursuing psychology in the first place here. There are those who might argue psychology is a science, and should not engage so depthfully in qualitative research, let alone in the constructionist tradition. Thankfully this narrative is changing for the better. Like Fox (D., 1983), my main inspiration to pursue the discipline was initially out of a blind trust as a means to an end, namely being "a way to approach the problems of real people in modern society" (p.78). This probably explains my interest in migration, as it is nothing if not the thorny issue of our times, one which nearly encapsulates everything social psychology is concerned with (Chryssochoou, 2004). Perhaps as a reflection of my preference for words over numbers, I have held a longstanding distrust towards the quarterly released net migration statistics, being more interested in the fallout that inevitably develops afterwards over what is 'really' the case. I have also long been concerned about the calls of nationalism that have characterised migration discourse, becoming prominent for example with the BNP during the 2000s. However, motivation for the project itself actually initially originated in my genuine enjoyment of academia and an opportunity to undertake the course. As my project took shape, in accordance with the kinds of attitudes I just discussed, I increasingly aligned myself as conducting research that uses as its anchor libertarian socialist values of solidarity, justice and equality. These values crystallised into my epistemological position after I had read the debate over Edwards et al. (1995) 'death and furniture' paper. In particular it was Edley's (2001a) explanation of Nottingham's status as a city deriving from society's constructed symbols (e.g., values, awards) that I knew then that I aligned

with a relativist position, where rhetoric is viewed as endemic to the positioned construction of knowledge and thereby the interpretation of reality.

Using a contemporary term that manifested after the project's data collection, I should probably declare myself as a former 'Remainer'. The political climate of the thesis' write up changed substantially from the time of data collection, with the 2015 General Election, the 2016 Referendum, culminating in the 2017 General Election and the 'Brexit' negotiations all trailing after the interviews themselves. My political attitudes, shaped in part by my work and developing academic thought, were chiefly concerned with respecting the integrity of the various communities that make our society special. This was most importantly reflected (from my standpoint) in my vote to Remain in the 2016 referendum. While the thesis is not intended to provide commentary on the UK's ongoing constitutional renegotiation, being attuned to the theatre of civic discourse and the plight for those wishing to belong it is by consequence providing a voice to that debate. It is clear, both as an analyst and citizen, that I have been caught between nationalism and unionism throughout the project, from the data collection during the time of the Romanian panic as well as beyond where the EU and Brexit became the raison d'être of political discourse of British identity. The politicisation of soil and water is a core tenet of banal nationalism (Billig, 1995; Tichindeleanu, 2010) and remains to this day a core concern of this discourse. Accordingly, as I analysed the public arena's constructions of 'Romanian-ness', I am also witnessing the reproduction of naturalised forms of knowledge: of 'rational' vs. 'prejudiced' ideas; of assessments of intentionality and interest; of pleas for social change, all worked into the contemporary bustle of this era of transition. As I called or aligned myself as 'British' to my Romanian participants (whether knowingly or unwittingly) in 2014, I have previously called myself 'European' to Britons, and have since then. For my sense of identity, they are mutually applicable, although for my country the politics have since moved on. Thus, I feel I can identify with the two, treading water in the proverbial English Channel. I accordingly identify as writing from a position situated on what is now the fringes of receiving society discourse. While I position myself on the 'outer' boundaries looking in, I am nonetheless still inside albeit recognising how Romanians have tried to make sense of trying to cross that threshold and establish civic belonging for themselves.

Functional: on my role as a researcher and its effects

Functional reflexivity refers to how my researcher identity and choices shaped the research process, particularly in respect to data collection and preparation (Wilkinson, 1988, cited in Gough & McFadden, 2001, pp.66-67). While some functional reflexivity was considered in the analytic procedure for the mover voice dataset in Chapter II, there are further points of reflection that would help contextualise my role within the process. Initially the journey to source empirical data ended in several dead-ends and not a little anxiety, as the data is a vital building block of the project and takes time to gather. Yet the longer you take the less time you have to look at the data. While I eventually settled upon the datasets, this initial angst particularly shaped the interviews. While I initially drafted the questions to capture the acculturative journeys of participants, it took time for me to settle into the data collection process and move on from the initial stumbling blocks. After meeting a few participants, I became increasingly concerned about the importance of belonging in their accounts, and I found my own place within the interview interaction as a sympathetic, and to some extent advocating, interviewer.

When reading the interviews once they were transcribed as data, I found myself almost instinctively 'knowing' of the intended meanings in participant talk. Being there, in the data, clearly had an impact here, not to mention being so familiar with the data preparation process. I had to remind myself that I needed to show how such knowledge was itself constructed, necessitating a re-reading of how I was interpreting it (Wood & Kroger, 2000). Such examples include participants' use of categories like 'community', or 'immigrant' to embed or defend certain moral rights or civic entitlements (cf. Barnes et al., 2004; Potter & Reicher, 1987). I interpreted the findings from the perspective of an analyst sympathetic to the ambition towards a federated, organic, and autonomous citizenship (Fox, D., 1985) emphasising the potentiality of 'earned' migrant entry and inclusion and aversive to visceral, reactive forms of 'indigenous' or 'active' citizenships concerned with barriers and exclusion.

I can remember early on in the degree speaking to an academic about my concerns over the interviews. In particular my concern (I had recently read some Foucault) was about the oppressive potentiality my input could have when re-telling their lived narratives of (not) belonging. He responded, rather efficiently, that this is a contemporary crisis for all heterosexual middle class white men nowadays, to recognise one's power and be

sensitive to the positionality that such privilege has long afforded and in the final count try to make sense of its impact on the process. Our shared whiteness aside, he would not have known I was the first of my family to even to go university let alone aspire for a doctorate, or that I had long identified as a minority myself in regards to my personality, gender, or sexuality. While my Englishness may be a factor as a self-defined member of the receiving society, my other experiences of alterity show that dichotomous 'insider'/'outsider' logic should not be seen as clear cut. Experiences of otherness, marginalisation, or angst are across the same group let alone between groups not homogenous and should encourage, not dampen, exploration. I am sympathetic to the concerns of writers like Spivak (1994) who critique the possibilities of voice: that speaking as a marginal entails that one becomes either the object of pious defence or a corroborating subject of imperialist assimilation; or that writing about a marginal entails imposed assumptions of cultural homogeneity upon what are heterogeneous subcultures that should essentially speak for themselves. However, my feeling here, translated into action in regards to how I approach the interview data, only intensified as the thesis progressed. Building on critical psychology, I agree with writers like Willig (1998) that the identification of philosophical and social values suggest whose realities we should act upon; in my own reflections I consider my participants as co-members of a shared society for whom their discourse is their primary way of making sense of their lived psychological realities. Research may have oppressive implications beyond one's designs, but its conductance was built upon voluntary input by participants and the desire to understand the lived struggles for those marginalised in the society we together share.

Having multiple identities – whether my own different selves or those of my participants – also presents a challenge in choosing certain written representations over others in the thesis. The descriptive choices taken will solidify certain identities over others in time and space. For example, in the recruitment of participants as 'migrants', the thesis at that point situated Romanians as being distinctly beyond the receiving community and not within it (even if historically). However when faced with the empirical realities of participants, their accounts contained nuanced and variable descriptions situating them as past migrants and current outsiders as much as current or aspiring insiders. This diversity paradox is unavoidable one must invoke such phrases in order to find voices that can speak to that set of issues or questions. It is not self-defeating to recognise such instances of

recognition, but instead, a reproach that there are no ways of studying an aspect of human lived accounts without treading within its discursive realm and employing its terms.

Disciplinary: the study within a nexus of competing traditions

Finally, disciplinary reflexivity refers to how I view the thesis as a situated study within the literature, paying heed to the various influences that shaped its final formation (Wilkinson, 1988, cited in Gough & McFadden, 2001, pp.66-67). Lazard and McAvoy (2017) further argue that we should consider how certain topics or methods become centralised or marginalised in academic disciplines at different times and places. Thus they are concerned with how dominant paradigms are sustained, with particular regard to the effects of institutional, social and culture ideas on the research that is subsequently (re)produced towards such ends.

As the thesis has been a social psychological study of discourse, there were several distinct disciplinary influences that informed its theoretical and methodological basis. This section will build on Chapter I's review of cognitivist theories in social and cultural psychology, citizenship studies, and Balkanism studies, showing how such ideas came together to help form what became a constructionist investigation of Romanian identity and migration concerned with citizenship and belonging using balkanism as a means of historicising the legacy of such representations.

In regards to theory, this thesis has been framed as an alternative approach to the cognitivist approaches (such as SCT or AT) to explore issues of identity, change, and acculturation. Cognitivist approaches view themselves as enacting the scientific doctrine of universalism and objectivism by means of experimental, observational and surveying methods (Chirkov, 2009). Through the quantitative analytical techniques employed, such methods entail that diversity and complexity are subdued in order to identify patterns seen as representing a bigger world. Historically these methods and analytic techniques have led to a series of interesting findings, but in equal measure have produced empirically circular homunculi arguments (e.g., cause and effect assertions over brain and behavioural functions), divisive and/or homogenising findings (e.g., regarding gender and racial differences, or the mass-representation of young white people over others) and elitist scientism (e.g., through the technical specialisation of sub-disciplines) (e.g., Augoustinos et al., 2006; Ryle, 2000). (It is recognised here that critiques of specialisation could be

directed at discursive approaches in social psychology, particularly DP, as they become more 'mainstream' and acquire a repertoire of analytic tools; see Billig, 2012). The counter-argument here is that with the open access drive, data transparency and the proper documentation of analytic procedures, specialised language can be interpretable. Such possibilities are not evident with specific forms of machinery, opaque statistical algorithms or omissions in method derived from objectivist ambitions).

The current study, while being an empirical investigation akin to cognitivist approaches, has been concerned with rhetorical actions and ideological effects employed in people's sense-making practices in a given epoch: in other words, how social worlds manifest for a given individual or group, rather than how said group can be studied as a carbon copy of a singular social world. For me, Wittgenstein was a very important influence during the early phase of the thesis, especially to his critique of psychology's engagement in category mistakes where ordinary language is converted into technical language, seen as a mirror rather than practice (Ribes-Iñesta 2006). Instead, Wittgenstein posits, ordinary language involves everyday words and expressions that are tied to particular behaviours and situations (Wittgenstein, 1956). As psychology's terms are subjective and interpretative, naturally all attempts at unequivocal meanings in relation to their domains only stokes further debate. Wittgenstein's influence on me – not to mention Shotter (1993a, 1993b) whose work strongly builds on Wittgenstein's thought – helped to show that my study should situate citizenship and belonging as being within arguments and/or narratives that have multiple lived meanings, with variability emerging out of the uniqueness and agency of personhood and expressed through the rhetorical flourishes in shared language. To document these flourishes, we as analysts must write or speak about them, in turn embedding "arguments within arguments, with the form itself part of the argumentative content" (Billig, 1996, p.3).

Balkanism studies, outlined in Chapter I, has been a seminal influence on the thesis. It is a diverse field of concerned with how 'imaginative geography' discourse constructs East Europe across a variety of settings and epochs (Light & Young, 2009). It is a motley assortment of disciplinary interests embodying the humanities, with its studies stretching across literature, history, tourism studies, geography, and political science (e.g., Hammond, 2006, 2007). The field seemed to capture some of the critical historical voice that I felt was necessary in order to situate my contemporary investigation of Romanian identity and migration discourse during the UK's lifting of transitional controls. While the

contemporary topic in the UK context has been previously undocumented within social psychology, more importantly balkanism studies had yet to be meaningfully incorporated into social psychology at all – the only exception being Light and Young (2009) whose study occupies a nuanced sociological concern with identity politics through discursive representation. By pursuing balkanism studies, I felt this social psychology thesis would become an enriched multidisciplinary product: an acknowledgement of the benefits of divergent perspectives in asking how discourse is used to construct social and civic identities in political and historical context. This reflects the contemporary citizenship studies (Condor, 2011) which is embedded within an emerging political social psychology centred upon the study of attitudes, prejudice, and ideologies in order to uncover contingent and "relative principles underlying the interpenetration of discursive, cultural and semiotic orders" (Tileagă, 2013, p.3; see also Condor et al., 2013). While there are different disciplinary questions that guide Balkanism studies scholars – ranging from the literary and historical to the political – this study can be viewed as expanding the space within which balkanism can be seen to be relevant, within the lived discourse of receiving and moving voices alike. Building on the post-colonial and post-communist era of critical theory, it is also an authentic attempt to illustrate the importance of a social psychology concerned with history and society, a goal I feel should be made more central to the discipline (Chryssochoou, 2004).

A final observation can be made here about the process of such disciplinary fertilisation. For reading, understanding and writing about ideas, old and new, is dialogical. The journey that comprises reading another discipline's journal or textbook is fraught for example with translation quandaries (constructionism vs. constructivism; socialist vs. liberal) or conventions over detail (brief methodologies being a big concern for a psychologist to read a sociological study). However, there is joy in re-reading such material owing to the common interest rather than pursuing one's own disciplinary work out of obedient loyalty. This is especially the case in philosophical works. A particular enjoyment for me lay in reading Wittgenstein who showed how important lay knowledge is in the construction of psychological themes. Then there are the indulgent post-structural and postcolonial critiques of knowledge in Foucault, Said or Spivak who remind me that my analysis has advocated social resistance on behalf of the oppressed, a vigilante power relationship I cannot ultimately avoid or justify without criticism. Those arguments of course in part distract from the 'real' work needing to be done such as following one's

disciplinary procedures for conducting empirical research (cf. Billig, 2012). But they are important in reminding oneself that there are many arguments within which can and should be had. To argue about migration is to argue about a phenomenon stretching back thousands of years as the same issues in different form become rehearsed (Williams, 1978, cited in Wetherell et al., 1987). Such discourse informs our interpretations, and constrains what we can know and what we can come to know, but in recognising the diversity of opinion that exists within academia, we can at least recognise that knowing how futile the struggle is for a 'final word': the same values must be defended again and again.

Summarising remark

This thesis has made three core contributions to knowledge: it has explored constructions of contemporary Romanian identity and migration at the point of the UK's lifting of transitional controls, a previously undocumented period; it has undertaken a dual-site approach to receiver and mover voices, a design rarely used in discursive approaches and not in the consideration of acculturation; finally it built on a prior study by Light and Young (2009) to employ Balkanism studies to historicise this discourse within a longstanding ideological legacy of representation and hopefully inspire future social psychological studies interested in European-based identity constructions to incorporate such a lens into their investigations.

From a critical psychological standpoint, Chapter V and the thesis as a whole has aimed to show that the discursive choices that we undertake as members of a society matter: they shape and constrain the possibilities for belonging to that society. Our discourse bears the legacy of history, which means it is contingent upon how it is used to make sense of the present. As citizens it is our duty to ensure we learn from the mistakes and malpractices of history – such as those under the rubric of balkanism – and instead enact values that respect the liberty, voice, and recognition of our fellow members – new and old alike. Belonging should not be at the behest of rootedness or even movement, but rather, should be acknowledged by the community of common space itself, content that its members have the power and rapport to enact their common values in that space. The prevailing political uncertainty should only add to this urgent need for more activism – within social psychology and in academic scholarship beyond.

References

A

Abell, J., Condor, S., & Stevenson, C (2006) "We are an island": Geographical imagery in accounts of citizenship, civil society, and national identity in Scotland and in England. *Political Psychology*, *27*(2), pp.207-226, DOI:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00003.x.

Abell, J, & Stokoe,, E. (2001) Broadcasting the royal role: Constructing culturally situated identities in Princess Diana's 'Panorama" interview', *British Journal of Social Psychology* 40: 417-35. DOI:10.1348/014466601164902.

Abrams, D. & Hogg, M. (1990). The context of discourse: Let's not throw out the baby with the bathwater. *Philosophical Psychology*, *3*(2), 219-225.

Achim, V. (2005). *The Roma in Romanian History*. Budapest: Central European University Press.

Agustín, Ó., (2012). Enhancing Solidarity: Discourses of Voluntary Organisations on Immigration and Integration in Multicultural Societies. *Journal of Multicultural Development*, *7*(1), 81-97. DOI: 10.1080/17447143.2011.570344

Ana, O. (1999). 'Like an animal I was treated': anti-immigrant metaphor in US public discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *10*(2), 191-224. DOI:: 10.1177/0957926599010002004

Ana, O. (1997). Empirical analysis of anti-immigrant metaphor in political discourse. *University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics*, *4*(1), 318-330. Retrieved from http://repository.upenn.edu/pwpl/vol4/iss1/19

Anderson, B. (2013). *Us and Them: the Dangerous Politics of Immigration Control*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Anderson, B., & Blinder, S. (2017) Who Counts as a Migrant? Definitions and their Consequences. *Migration Observatory Briefing*. COMPAS, University of Oxford, UK. Retrieved from http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Briefing-Who_Counts_Migrant.pdf

Anderson, Benedict (1983). *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Andreescu, G. (2004). *Report on minority education in Romania*. Ombudspersons for National Minorities. Retrieved from https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/274-EDU-Hungary-final.pdf

Andreouli, E. (2013). Identity and acculturation: The case of naturalised citizens in Britain. *Culture & Psychology*, *19*(2), pp.165-183. DOI: 10.1177/1354067X13478984

Andreouli, E., & Dashtipour, P. (2014). British citizenship and the 'Other': An analysis of the earned citizenship discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *24*(2), pp.100-110. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2154

Andreouli, E., & Howarth, C. (2012). National identity, citizenship and immigration: Putting identity in context. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, *43*(3), pp.361-382. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-5914.2012.00501.x

Anstead, N., & O'Loughlin, B., (2011). The Emerging Viewertariat and BBC Question Time: Television Debate and Real-Time Commenting Online. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, pp.440-462. DOI: 10.1177/1940161211415519

Antaki, C.(1994) *Explaining & Arguing: The social organisation of accounts*.London: Sage

Antaki, C., Condor, S. & Levine, M. (1996) Social Identities in Talk: Speakers' own Orientations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*(4), pp.473-492.

Antohi, S., (2002). Romania and the Balkans: From Geocultural Bovarism to Ethnic Ontology. *Transit-Virtuelles Forum, 21*. Retrieved from http://www.iwm.at/transit/transit-online/romania-and-the-balkans/

Arcarazo, D., & Martire, J. (2014). Trapped in the Lobby: Europe's Revolving Doors and the Other as Xenos. *European Law Review*, *39*(3), pp.362-379. DOI:

Augoustinos, M., & Every, D., (2007). The Language of "Race" and Prejudice: A Discourse of Denial, Reason, and Liberal-Practical Politics. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *26*(2), pp.123–141. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X07300075

Augoustinos, M., Walker, I., & Donaghue N., (2006). *Social Cognition: An Integrated Introduction* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

Augoustinos, M., LeCouteur, A., & Soyland, J. (2002). Self-sufficient arguments in political rhetoric: Constructing reconciliation and apologizing to the stolen generations. *Discourse & Society*, *13*(1), pp.105–142. DOI: 10.1177/0957926502013001005

Austin, J. (1962) *How To Do Things With Words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

B

Bakić-Hayden, M. (1995). Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia. *Slavic Review, 54*(4) pp.917-931.

Bakker, M., van Dijk, A., & Wicherts, J. M. (2012). The Rules of the Game called Psychological Science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7*(6), 543-554. DOI: 10.1177/1745691612459060

Barker, M. (1981) *The New Racism: Conservatives and the Ideology of the Tribe*. London: Junction Books.

Barthes, R., (1977). *Roland Barthes by Roland Barthes*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bartram, D., Poros, M., & Monforte, P., (2014) *Key Concepts in Migration*. London: Sage.

Bauder, H. (2014). Domicile citizenship, human mobility and territoriality. *Progress in Human Geography, 38*(1), pp.91-106. DOI:10.1177/0309132513502281

BBC News (2015, May 7). *Election 2015: UK results*. Retrieved form http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election/2015

BBC News (2014a, April 19) *Vote 14: European Election Results*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/events/vote2014/eu-uk-results

BBC News (2014a, January 1) *Bulgarians and Romanians free to work in UK as controls end.* Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-25549715

BBC News (2013, April 15). Horsemeat scandal to be reviewed, government announces. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-22149690

BBC Magazine (2013, February 13) *Why has Romania got such a bad public image?* Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-21550768

BBC Monitoring European (2005, March 3). *Romania, UK start joint campaign against illegal migration.* Retrieved from https://search-proquest-com.lcproxy.shu.ac.uk/docview/459683605/abstract/333DB2B29A934BDAPQ

BBC, (n.d.) *The Andrew Marr Show: Transcripts*. Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/articles/3hshxFhHM4dKd3px6Q3NzRF/transcripts

Berry, J. (2005) Acculturation: Living successfully in two cultures. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *29*(6), pp.697-712. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.013

Berry, J. (2003). Conceptual Approaches to Acculturation. In Chun, K., Balls-Organista, P., & Marin G., (Eds.), *Acculturation: Advances in Theory, Measurement and Applied Research* (pp.17–37). Washington, DC: APA Press.

Berry, J., (2001). A Psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 615-631. DOI: 10.1111/0022-4537.00231/

Berry, J., & Sam, D. (1997). Acculturation and adaptation. In Berry J., Segall, M. & Kagitcibasi, C. (eds.), *Handbook of cross-cultural psychology, vol. 3: Social behaviour and applications* (2nd edition), pp.291–326. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Billig, M. (2012). Undisciplined Beginnings, Academic Success and Discursive Psychology. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *51*, pp.413-424. DOI: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02086.x.

Billig, M., (2008). *The Hidden Roots of Critical Psychology*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1999a), Whose terms? Whose ordinariness? Rhetoric and ideology in conversation analysis, *Discourse & Society*, *10*, pp.543-558. DOI: 10.1177/0957926599010004005

Billig, M. (1999b). Conversation analysis and the claims of naivety. *Discourse & Society*, *10*(4), pp.572–576. DOI: 10.1177/0957926599010004007

Billig, M. (1996). *Arguing and Thinking* (2nd edition). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Billig, M. (1995). *Banal Nationalism*. London: age.

Billig, M. (1991) *Ideology and Opinions: Studies in Rhetorical Psychology*. London: Sage.

Billig, M. (1988). The Notion of 'Prejudice': Some Rhetorical and Ideological Aspects. *Text*, *8*(1-2), 91-110. DOI: 10.1515/text.1.1988.8.1-2.91

Billig, M. (1978). *Fascists: A social psychological view of the National Front*. London: Academic Press.

Billig, M., & MacMillan, K. (2005). Metaphor, Idiom And Ideology: the Search for 'No Smoking Guns' across Time. *Discourse & Society*, *16*(4), 459-480. DOI: 10.1177/0957926505053050

Billig, M., Condor, S., Edwards, D., Gane, M., Middleton, D., & Radley, A. (1988) *Ideological Dilemmas: A Social Psychology of Everyday Thinking*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Billström, M., (2008). Nationalism and National Identity in Romania. *Studia Universitatis Babeù-Bolyai: Philologica*, *2*, pp.29-35. Retrieved from http://www.diacronia.ro/ro/indexing/details/A15425/pdf

Bjelić, D., (2002). Introduction: Blowing up the "bridge". In Bjelić, D., & Savić, O., (eds.) *Balkan as Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation*, pp.209-233. London: MIT Press.

Boneva, B., & Frieze, I., (2001). Toward a concept of a migrant personality. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 477-492.

Bowskill, M., Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (2007). The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(4), pp.793-813. DOI: 10.1348/014466607X182771

Boski, P. (2013). A Psychology of Economic Migration. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*(7), pp.1067-1093. DOI: 10.1177/0022022112471895

Braun, V. & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), pp.77-101.

Brearley, M. (2001). The Persecution of Gypsies in Europe. *American Behavioural Scientist*, *45*(4), pp.588-599. DOI: 10.1177/00027640121957367.

Brett, D. (2017) Romania's protests: A response to a three-pronged assault on anti-corruption measures. *London School of Economics and Political Science*. Retrieved from http://blogs.lse.ac.uk/europpblog/2017/02/02/romanias-protests-a-response-to-a-three-pronged-assault-on-anti-corruption-measures/

Burchell, K. (2007). Empiricist selves and contingent "others": the performative function of the discourse of scientists working in conditions of controversy. *Public Understanding of Science*, *16*, pp.145-162. DOI: 11.1177/0963662507060587

Burns, G. (1978, January 27). *TV Interview for Granada World in Action*. Granada TV. Retrieved from https://www.margaretthatcher.org/document/103485

Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism*. London: Sage.

Butler, J. & Spivak, G. (2007). *Who Sings the Nation-State? Language, Politics, Belonging*. London: Seagull Books.

C

Calder, G. (2003). Rorty and Redescription. Monk, R., & Raphael, F., (consult. eds.) London: Orion.

Campbell, A. (2004) Words, words, words. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*(4), pp.509-513. DOI: 10.1348/0261510042378191

Capdevila, R., & Callaghan, J. (2008). "It's not racist. It's common sense". A critical analysis of political discourse around asylum and immigration in the UK. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *18*(1), pp.1-16.

Carteny, A. (2015/6). The Hungarian minority in post-Communist Romania: political activity and claims for autonomy. *Janus*, pp.70-71. Channel 4 News (2014, January 1). *New dawn for Romanian and Bulgarian migrants*. Retrieved from https://www.channel4.com/news/new-dawn-for-romanian-*and*-bulgarian-migrants

Cavafy, C. (1992). *Collected Poems* (revised edition). Keeley E., & Sherrard, P. (trans.); Savidis, G. (ed.). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Cederberg, M., (2013). Public Discourses and Migrant Stories of Integration and Inequality: Language and Power in Biographical Narratives. *Sociology, 0*(0), 1–17. DOI: 10.1177/0038038512470041

Cercel, C. (2015) Philo-Germanism without Germans in Romania after 1989. *East European Politics and Societies and Cultures, 29*(4), pp.811-830. DOI: 10.1177/0888325414550360

Charteris-Black, J. (2013) *Analysing political speeches: Rhetoric, discourse and metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Charteris-Black, J. (2006). Britain as a Container: Immigration Metaphors in the 2005 Election Campaign. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(5), 563-581. DOI: 10.1177/0957926506066345

Chirkov, V. (2009). Critical psychology of acculturation: What do we study and how do we study it, when we investigate acculturation? *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *33*(2), 94-105. DOI: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2008.12.004

Chryssochoou, X. (2004) *Cultural Diversity: Its Social Psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Chryssochoou, X., (2003). Studying identity in social psychology: Some thoughts on the definition of identity and its relation to action. *Journal of Language and Politics 2*(2), pp.225–241.

Cioroianu, A., (2002). The Impossible Escape: Romanians and the Balkans. In Bjelić, D., & Savić, O., (eds.) *Balkan as Metaphor: Between Globalization and Fragmentation*, pp.209-233. London: MIT Press.

Codó, E. (2011). Regimenting discourse, controlling bodies: Disinformation, evaluation and moral categorization in a state bureaucratic agency. *Discourse & Society*, *22*(6), pp.723-742. DOI: 10.1177/0957926511411696

Cohen, S. (2011). *Folk Devils and Moral Panics* (2nd edition). London: Routledge.

Cohen, R. (1994) *Frontiers of Identity: The British and the Others*. London: Longman.

Coleman, S., & Firmstone, J. (2014). Contested meanings of public engagement: Exploring discourse and practice within a British city council. *Media, Culture & Society*, *36*(6), pp.826-844. DOI:10.1177/0163443714536074

Colley, L. (1992). *Britons: Forging the Nation 1707–1837*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Collins, D. (2013, February 12). Horse meat abattoir revealed: We track down Romanian slaughterhouse suspected of supplying meat. *Daily Mirror*. Retrieved from http://www.mirror.co.uk/news/world-news/horse-meat-scandal-mirror-tracks-1704552

Commission of the European Communities (2006, September 26). Monitoring report on the state of preparedness for EU membership of Bulgaria and Romania. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/26_09_06_fullreport.pdf

Commission for Racial Equality (2006a). THE DECLINE OF BRITISHNESS: A research study. ETHNOS Research and Consultancy. Retrieved from http://www.ethnos.co.uk/pdfs/10_decline_of_britishness.pdf

Commission of the European Communities (2006). Monitoring report on the state of preparedness for EU membership of Bulgaria and Romania. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/26_09_06_fullreport.pdf

Concannon, L. (2008). Citizenship, sexual identity and social exclusion. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, *28*(9/10), 326-339. DOI: 10.1108/01443330810900176

Condor, S. (2011) Towards a social psychology of citizenship? *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *21*(3), pp.193-201. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1089.

Condor, S. (2000) Pride and prejudice: Identity management in English people's talk about 'this country'. *Discourse & Society*, *11*(2), pp.175-204.

Condor, S., Tileagă, C., & Billig, M., (2013). Political rhetoric. In Huddy, L., Sears, D. & Levy, J. (eds.) *Oxford Handbook of Political Psychology*, pp.262-300. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Condor, S., & Gibson, S. (2007) 'Everybody's entitled to their own opinion': Ideological dilemmas of liberal individualism and active citizenship. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *17*(2), pp.115-140, DOI: 10.1002/casp.885.

Condor, S., Figgou, L., Abell, J., Gibson, S., & Stevenson, C. (2006) 'They're not racist..' Prejudice denial, mitigation and suppression in dialogue. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*(3), pp.441-462, DOI: 10.1348/014466605X66817.

Corsale, A., & Iorio, M. (2014) Transylvanian Saxon culture as heritage: Insights from Viscri, Romania. *Geoforum*, *52*, pp.22-31. DOI: 10.1016/j.geoforum.2013.12.008

Coyle, A. & Walton, C. (2004). Why performances of accountability and normative heterosexual masculinity do not constitute maturity. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*(4), pp.515-519. DOI: 10.1348/0261510042378263

Cresswell, J. (2012). Including Social Discourses and Experience in Research on Refugees, Race, & Ethnicity. *Discourse & Society*, *23*(5), pp.553-575. DOI: 10.1177/0957926512455885

Creţu, G. (2014) Roma Minority in Romania and its Media Representation. *Sfera Politicii*, *4-5* (180-181), pp.112-120.

Croghan, C. & Miell, D. (1999). Born to abuse? Negotiating identity within an interpretative repertoire of impairment. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(3), pp.315-335. DOI: 10.1348/014466699164194

Curry, S., (2012). Sick of Impact Factors (online). Available from http://occamstypewriter.org/scurry/2012/08/13/sick-of-impact-factors/

D

Daily Express (2014, January 1). *BENEFITS BRITAIN HERE WE COME! Fears as migrant flood begins*, p.1. Retrieved from https://www.thepaperboy.com/uk/daily-express/front-pages-today.cfm?frontpage=33784

Daily Express (2006, August 23). GET READY FOR THE ROMANIAN INVASION. Retrieved from https://www.pressreader.com/uk/daily-express/20060823

Daily Mail (2006, July 21). *Britain's biggest wave of migrants in history*. Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-396825/Britains-biggest-wave-migrants-history.html

Daily Telegraph (2016, March 23). *10 worst political slogans of all time*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/men/the-filter/10-worst-political-slogans-of-all-time/are-you-thinking-what-were-thinking/

Davies, N. (2000). *The Isles: A History*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dean, H. (2001). Green citizenship. *Social Policy & Administration*, *35*(5), pp.490-505. doi:10.1111/1467-9515.t01-1-00249

Defoe, D. (2006) The True Born Englishman (new edition). In Morley, H. (ed.) *The Earlier Life and the Chief Earlier Works of Daniel Defoe*, pp.175-218. London: Kessinger Group.

Demeritt, D. (2002). What is the ‘social construction of nature'? A typology and sympathetic critique. *Progress in Human Geography*, *26*(6), pp. 767–790. DOI: 10.1191/0309132502ph402oa

Denzin, N., (2001). The Reflexive Interview and a Performative Social Science, *Qualitative Research, 1*(1), pp.23-46. DOI: 10.1177/146879410100100102

Dovidio, J., & Esses, V. (2001). Immigrants and immigration: Advancing the psychological perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, pp.375-387. DOI: 10.1111/0022-4537.00219

Dima, R. (2011) The secularization in the Romanian Orthodox Church public discourse about Romania's integration into the European Union. *Studia Universitatis Babes-Bolyai - Studia Europaea, 56*(1), pp.61-80.

Duffy, B., & Frere-Smith, T., (2014). *Perception and Reality: 10 things we should know about attitudes to immigration in the UK*. IPSOS MORI Social Research Institute. Retrieved from https://www.ipsos.com/sites/default/files/migrations/en-uk/files/Assets/Docs/Publications/sri-perceptions-and-reality-immigration-report-summary-2013.pdf

Dumont, K., & Louw, J. (2009). A citation analysis of Henri Tajfel's work on intergroup relations. *International Journal of Psychology*, *44*(1), pp.45-59. DOI: 10.1080/00207590701390933.

Dwyer, S., & Buckle, J., (2009). The Space Between: On Being an Insider-Outsider in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods*. *8*(1). Retrieved from http://ejournals.library.ualberta.ca/index.php/IJQM/article/view/2981/5198

E

Eagleton, T. (1991). *Ideology: An Introduction*. London: Verso.

Edwards, D. (2005). Discursive Psychology. In K.L. Fitch & R.E. Sanders (Eds.), *Handbook of Language and Social Interaction*, pp.257-273). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Edwards, D. (1997). *Discourse and Cognition*. London: Sage.

Edwards, D., & Fasulo, A. (2006). "To be honest": sequential uses of honesty phrases in talk-in-interaction. *Research on Language & Social Interaction*, *39*(4), pp.343-376. DOI: 10.1207/s15327973rlsi3904_1

Edwards, D., & Stokoe, E. (2004). Discursive psychology, focus group interviews and participants' categories. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*(4), pp.499-507. DOI: 10.1348/0261510042378209

Edwards, D., Ashmore, M., & Potter, J. (1995) Death and Furniture: The Rhetoric, Politics and Theology of Bottom Line Arguments Against Relativism. *History of the Human Sciences*, *8*(2), 25-49. DOI: 10.1177/095269519500800202

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

Edley, N. (2001). Unravelling Social Constructionism. *Theory & Psychology*, *11*(3), 433-441. DOI: 10.1177/0959354301113008

Ellison, N. (2013). Citizenship, space and time: Engagement, identity and belonging in a connected world. *Thesis Eleven*, *118*(1), pp.48-63. DOI:10.1177/0725513613500271

Englebert, J., (2012). From Cause to Concern: Critical Discourse Analysis and Extradiscursive Interest. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, *5*(2), 54-71.

European Commission, (2004). The Situation of Roma in an Enlarged European Union: Employment and social affairs. Office for Official Publications of the European Communities. Retrieved from https://publications.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/b628783f-622a-4e33-9133-141329672d6e/language-en

European Union (2017) *Further Expansion*. Retrieved from https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/history/2000-2009_en

Erel, U., (2011). Reframing Migrant Mothers as Citizens. *Citizenship Studies*, *15*(6-7), pp.695-709. DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2011.600076

Esses, V., Medianu, S., Hamilton, L., & Lapishina, N. (2014). Psychological perspectives on immigration and acculturation. In Simpson, J. & Dovidio, J. (eds.), *APA handbook of personality and social psychology vol.2, Group processes: Interpersonal relations and group processes*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

F

Finlayson, A. (1998). Psychology, Psychoanalysis and Theories of Nationalism. *Nations and Nationalism*, *4*(2), pp.145–162. DOI: 10.1111/j.1354-5078.1998.00145.

Fitzgerald, R., Housley, W. & Butler, C.W. (2009). Omnirelevance and interactional context. *Australian Journal of Communication*, *36*(3), 45-64.

Fitzgerald, R., & Housley, W. (eds.) (2015) *Advances in Membership Categorisation Analysis*. London: Sage.

Fleming, K. (2000). Orientalism, the Balkans, and Balkan Historiography. *American Historical Review, 105*(4), pp.1218-1233. DOI: 10.1086/ahr/105.4.1218

Fontana, A. & James F. (1994). Interviewing: The Art of Science. In *The Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Denzin. Y. (ed.) Thousand Oaks: Sage, pp. 361-76.

Ford, R. & Goodwin, M. (2014). *Revolt on the Right: Explaining support for the Radical Right in Britain*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fox, D., Prilleltensky, I., & Austin, S. (2008) *Critical Psychology: An Introduction* (2nd edition). London: Sage.

Fox, D. (1986). Beyond Individualism and Centralization. *American Psychologist, 41*, 231-232.

Fox, D. (1985). Psychology, Ideology, Utopia, and the Commons. *American Psychologist, 40*, 48-58.

Fox, D. (1983). The pressure to publish: A graduate student's personal plea. *Teaching of Psychology*, *10*, 177-178.

Fox, J. E., & Mogilnicka, M., (2017). Pathological Integration, or, how East Europeans use racism to become British. *British Journal of Sociology*, (30), (epub ahead of print). DOI: 10.1111/1468-4446.12337

Fox, J. E., Moroşanu, L., & Szilassy, E. (2012). The Racialization of the New European Migration to the UK. *Sociology, 46*(4), pp.680-695.

Frey, B. S. (2003). Flexible citizenship for a global society. *Politics, Philosophy & Economics, 2*(1), pp.93-114. DOI:10.1177/1470594X03002001425

G

Gabrielatos, C., & Baker, P. (2008). Fleeing, sneaking, flooding: A corpus analysis of discursive constructions of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK press, 1996-2005. *Journal of English Linguistics*, *36*(1), pp.5-38. DOI: 10.1177/0075424207311247

Gallagher, T. (2005). *Theft of a Nation*. London: Hurst Publishers.

Garfinkel, H., (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, USA: Prentice-Hall.

Geertz, C., (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K., (2001). Psychological Science in a Postmodern Context. *American Psychologist, 56*(10), pp.803-813. DOI: 0.1037/0003-066X.56.10.803

Gergen, K. (1992). *The Saturated Self*. New York: Basic Books.

Gergen, K., (1985). The Social Constructionist Movement in Modern Psychology. *American Psychologist, 40*(3), pp.266-275. .DOI:10.1037/0003-066X.40.3.266

Gergen, K. (1973). Social Psychology As History. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *26*(2), pp.309-320.

Gergen, K, & Gergen, M. (2006). Narratives in action. *Narrative Inquiry 16*(1), pp.112-121. DOI: 10.1075/ni.16.1.15ger

Gerritsen, D., & Maier, R., (2012). Young Migrants and Discourses on Young Migrants in the Netherlands. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *33*(7), 665–678.

Gibbins, J. (*2012*) *British discourses on Europe*: *self*/*other and national identities*. PhD thesis, University of Birmingham. Retrieved from http://etheses.bham.ac.uk/3830/1/Gibbins12PhD.pdf

Gibson, S. (2012). 'I'm not a war monger but…': Discourse Analysis and Social Psychological Peace Research. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *22*(2), pp.159-1. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1099.

Gibson, S. (2011) Dilemmas of citizenship: young people's conceptions of un/employment rights and responsibilities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(3). pp.450-468. DOI: 10.1348/014466610X520113

Gibson, S. (2010) Dilemmas of citizenship: Young people's conceptions of un/employment rights and responsibilities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*(3), 450-468. DOI: 10.1348/014466610X520113

Gibson, S. (2009). The effortful citizen: Discursive social psychology and welfare reform. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *19*, 393-410. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1003

Gibson, S, Crossland, M & Hamilton, J., (2018). Social citizenship and immigration: Employment, welfare and effortfulness in online discourse concerning migration to the UK. *Qualitative Psychology*, *5*(1), pp.99-116. DOI: 10.1037/qup0000078.

Gibson, S., & Hamilton, L. (2011). The rhetorical construction of polity membership: Identity, culture and citizenship in young people's discussions of immigration in northern England. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 21*, 228-242. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1087

Gilbert, N., & Mulkay, M., (1984). *Opening Pandora's Box*: *A Sociological Analysis of Scientists' Discourse*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gleason, P. (1983). Identifying Identity: A Semantic History. *Journal of American History*, *69*(4), pp.910-931.

Goatly, A. (2007) *Washing the Brain: Metaphor and Hidden Ideology*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Co.

Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*. Prentice-Hall.

Golden, A., & Lanza, E., (2013). Metaphors of Culture: Identity Construction in Migrants' Narrative Discourse. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *10*(2), 295–314.

Goodman, S., and Speer, S. (2015). Natural and contrived data. In Tileaga, C. & Stokoe, E. (Eds.) (2015). *Discursive Psychology: Classic and Contemporary Issues*, pp.57-69. London: Routledge. Chapter 4

Goodman, S. (2014) Developing an understanding of race talk. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *8*(4), pp.147-155. DOI: 10.1111/spc3.12095

Goodman, S. (2010) "It's not Racist to Impose Limits on Immigration": Constructing the Boundaries of Racism in the Asylum and Immigration debate. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, *4*(1), 1-17.

Goodman, S., & Johnson, A. (2013) Strategies used by the Far Right to counter accusations of Racism. *Critical Approaches to Discourse Analysis across Disciplines*, *6*(2), pp.97-113.

Goodman, S., & Burke, S. (2011) Discursive Deracialisation in talk about Asylum Seeking. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *21*(2), pp.111-123. DOI: 10.1002/casp.1065

Goodman, S., & Burke, S. (2010) "Oh you don't want asylum seekers, oh you're just racist" A discursive analysis of discussions about whether it's racist to oppose asylum seeking. *Discourse & Society*, *21*(3), pp.325-340. DOI: 10.1177/0957926509360743

Goodman, S. & Rowe, L. (2013). 'Maybe it is prejudice...but it is NOT racism': Negotiating Racism in Discussion Forums about Gypsies. *Discourse & Society*, *25*(1), 32-46. DOI: 10.1177/0957926513508856

Goodman, S., & Speer, S., (2007). Category Use in the Construction of Asylum Seekers. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *4*(2), pp.165–185.

Gough, B., & Madill, A. (2012). Subjectivity in psychological science: from problem to prospect. *Psychological Methods*, *17*(3), pp.374-84. DOI: 10.1037/a0029313.

Gough, B., & McFadden, M. (2001) *Critical Social Psychology: An Introduction*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Gordon, C. (trans) (2015) *The rights and duties of international citizenship: Michel Foucault*. Open Democracy. Retrieved from https://www.opendemocracy.net/can-europe-make-it/michel-foucault/rights-and-duties-of-international-citizenship

Graham, P., Keenan, T., Dowd A., (2004) A Call to Arms at the End of History: A Discourse–Historical Analysis of George W. Bush's Declaration of War on Terror. *Discourse & Society*, *15*(2-3), pp.199-221. DOI: 10.1177/0957926504041017

Gray, D., & Griffin, C. (2014). A journey to citizenship: Constructions of citizenship and identity in the British citizenship test. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *53*(2), pp.299-314. DOI:10.1111/bjso.12042

Greatbatch, D. (1998). Conversation Analysis: Neutralism in British News Interviews. In Bell A., Garrett, P., (eds.), *Approaches to Media Discourse*, pp.163-185. Oxford: Blackwell.

Grice, H. (1975) Logic and Conversation. In P. Cole and J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics, Vol. 3 Speech Acts*, pp. 41-58. New York: Academic Press.

Griffin, C., (2007a). Being dead and being there: Research interviews, sharing hand cream and the preference for analysing 'naturally occurring data'. *Discourse Studies*, *9*(2), pp.246-269. DOI: 10.1177/1461445607075340

Griffin, C., (2007b). Different visions: a rejoinder to Henwood, Potter and Hepburn. *Discourse Studies, 9*(2), pp.283-287 DOI: 10.1177/1461445607075341.

Grube, (2011) How can 'Britishness' be re-made? *The Political Quarterly, 82*(4), pp.628-635.

H

Haliliuc, A. (2015) *Manele* Music and the Discourse of Balkanism in Romania. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, 8, pp.290-308.

Hammersley, M. (2003). Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: methods or paradigms? *Discourse & Society, 14*(6), pp.751-781. DOI: 10.1177/09579265030146004

Hammond, A. (2007). Through Savage Europe. *Third Text, 21*(2), pp.117-127. doi:10.1080/09528820701272994

Hammond, A., (2006). Balkanism in Political Context: From the Ottoman Empire to the EU. *Westminster Papers in Communication and Culture*, *3*(3), 6-26. Retrieved from https://www.Westminster.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/20122/002WPCC-Vol3-No3-Andrew_Hammond.pdf

Harré, R. & Gillett, G. (1994) *The Discursive Mind*. London: Sage.

Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language, 28*, 1-30.

Heath, T. (1972, January 22). *Speech by Edward Heath in Brussels*. European Union. Retrieved from https://www.cvce.eu/content/publication/2001/9/14/45bb74bd-554c-49d4-8212-9144ce2e8c1d/publishable_en.pdf

Henwood, K. (2007). Beyond hypercriticality: Taking forward methodological inquiry and debate in discursive and qualitative social psychology. *Discourse Studies, 9,* pp.270-75. DOI: 10.1177/1461445607075342

Hepburn, A. & Potter, J. (2010). Interrogating tears: Some uses of 'tag questions' in a child protection helpline. In Freed A., & Ehrlich, S. (eds.). *"Why Do You Ask?": The Function of Questions in Institutional Discourse*, pp. 69-86. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heritage, J. (1984). *Garfinkel and Ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Heritage, J. & Greatbatch, D. (1986). Generating applause: A study of rhetoric and response at party political conferences. *American Journal of Sociology,* 92, pp.110-157.

Hernandez-Martinez P., Black, L., Williams J., Davis P., Pampaka, M., & Wake, G. (2008). Mathematics students' aspirations for higher education: class, ethnicity, gender and interpretative repertoire styles. *Research Papers in Education*, *23*(2), pp.153-165. DOI: 10.1080/02671520802048687

Hewitt, J. P., & Stokes, R. (1975). Disclaimers. *American Sociological Review, 40,* pp.1–11.

Hibberd, F. (2001). Relativism versus realism - all but a specious dichotomy. *History of the Human Sciences, 12*, pp.61-78. DOI: 10.1177/09526950122121023?journalCode=hhsa

Hogea, A. (2010) Coming to Terms with the Communist Past in Romania: An Analysis of the Political and Media Discourse Concerning the Tismăneanu Report. *Studies of Transition States and Societies*, *16*(2), pp.16-30.

Honneth, A. (1995) *The Struggle for Recognition: the Moral Grammar of Social Conflicts*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Housley, W., & Fitzgerald, R., (2002). The Reconsidered Model of Membership Categorisation Analysis. *Qualitative Research*, *2*(1), pp.59–83. DOI: 10.1177/146879410200200104

Huda, A. (2012) Legal Remedies for the Gypsies: Can the European Legal Frameworks Hold France Liable for the Expulsion of the Roma? *University of Pennsylvania Journal of International Law*, *33*(4), pp.1075-1108. Retrieved from http://scholarship.law.upenn.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1072&context=jil

I

Ibáñez, T., (1997). Why a Critical Social Psychology? In Ibáñez, T., & Íñiguez, L., (eds.) *Critical Social Psychology*, pp.27-41. London: Sage.

Ieţcu, I. (2006) Argumentation, dialogue and conflicting moral economies in post-1989 Romania. *Discourse & Society*, *17*(5), pp.627–650. DOI: 10.1177/0957926506066348

ITV News (2014, January 1). *Curbs lifted for Romanians and Bulgarians*. Retrieved from http://www.itv.com/news/update/2014-01-01/keith-vaz-mp-greet-romanians-off-the-plane-at-luton/

J

Jayyusi, L. (1984) *Categorisation and the Moral Order*. London: Routledge.

Jefferson, G., (2004). Glossary of transcript symbols with an introduction. In Lerner, G., (Ed). *Conversation Analysis: Studies from the First Generation*, pp.13–31. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Jeffries, S. (2014, October 15). Britain's most racist election: the story of Smethwick, 50 years on. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/oct/15/britains-most-racist-election-smethwick-50-years-on

Jezernik, B. (2003). *Wild Europe: The Balkans in the Gaze of Western Travellers*. London: Saqi.

Jolanki, O., Jylhä, M., & Hervonen, A. (2000). Old age as a choice and as a necessity: two interpretative repertoires. *Journal of Aging Studies, 14*, pp.359-373. DOI: 10.1016/S0890-4065(00)80002-X

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

K

Kaneva, N. (2011). Nation Branding: Toward an Agenda for Critical Research. *International Journal of Communication, 5*, pp.117–141. DOI: 10.32–8036/20110117

Kaneva, N., & Popescu, D. (2014). "We Are Romanian, Not Roma": Nation Branding and Postsocialist Discourses of Alterity. *Communication, Culture & Critique, 7*(*4*), pp.506-523. DOI: 10.1111/cccr.12064.

Kaneva, N., & Popescu, D. (2011). National Identity Lite: Nation Branding in post-Communist Romania and Bulgaria. *International Journal of Cultural Studies, 14*(2), pp.191-207. DOI: 10.1177/1367877910382181

Keller, M., & Kalmus, V. (2009) What makes me cool? Estonian tweens' interpretative repertoires. *Young Consumers*, *10*(4), pp.329-341. DOI: 10.1108/17473610911007157

Kerr, A. (2003). Genetics and citizenship. *Society*, *40*(6), pp.44-50. DOI: 10.1007/BF02712651

Kinnock, S. (2016, September 19). My cure for a divided Britain? A programme of managed immigration. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/sep/19/cure-divided-britain-managed-immigration-work-permits

Kilby, L., Horowitz, A., & Hylton, P., (2013). Diversity as Victim to 'Realistic Liberalism': Analysis of an Elite Discourse of Immigration, Ethnicity and Society. *Critical Discourse Studies*, *10*(1), pp.47-60. DOI: 10.1080/17405904.2012.736398?src=recsys

Kilby, L., & Horowitz, A. (2013) Opening up terrorism talk: the sequential and categorical production of discursive power within the call openings of a talk radio broadcast. *Discourse & Society*, *24*(6), pp.725-742. DOI: 10.117/0957926513503270

Kirkwood, S., McKinlay, A. & McVittie, C. (2013) The Mutually Constitutive Relationship between Place and Identity: The Role of Place-Identity in Discourse on Asylum Seekers and Refugees. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *23*, pp.453-465. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2141.

Kitzinger, C. (2005). Speaking as a Heterosexual: (How) Does Sexuality Matter for Talk-in-interaction? *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, *38*, pp.221-265. DOI: 10.1177/0261927X15586574?papetoc=

Krasner, S. (1999). *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Korkut, U. (2006). Nationalism versus internationalism: The roles of political and cultural elites in interwar and communist Romania. *Nationalities Papers: The Journal of Nationalism and Ethnicity*, *34*(2), pp.131-155. DOI: 10.1080/00905990600617698

Korobov, N. & Bamberg, M. (2004) Positioning a 'mature' self in interactive practices: How adolescent males negotiate 'physical attraction' in group talk. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*, pp.471-492. DOI: 10.3149/jms.1302.225

Korobov, N. & Bamberg, M. (2004). Development as micro-genetic positioning. British *Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *22*, pp.521-530. DOI: 10.1348/0261510042378218

Kyllästinen, E., (2017). Sovereignty Discourses Dimensions of the Contested Concept in the British Parliament since the European Integration. MA thesis, University of Helsinki. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/84363580.pdf

L

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Langlois, L. (2009). *Edward Heath and the Europeanisation of Englishness: The Hopes and Failures of a European English Leader*. In Reviron-Piégay, F. (ed.) *Englishness Revisited*, pp.174-188. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

László, S. (2013). Majority-Minority Relations in Romania: Discursive change without structural transformation. MA thesis, Budapest University. http://www.etd.ceu.hu/2013/laszlo_szabolcs.pdf

Lawes, R. (1999). Marriage: An Analysis of Discourse. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*(1), pp.1-20. DOI: 10.1348/014466699164004

Lawson, V., (2000). Arguments within Geographies of Movement: the Theoretical Potential of Migrants' Stories. *Progress in Human Geography*, *24*(2), pp.173-189.

Lazard, L. & McAvoy, J. (2018). Doing Reflexivity in Psychological Research – What's the Point? What's the practice? *Qualitative Research in Psychology* (in press)

Leach, R. (2011). *British Politics* (2nd edition). Coxall, B., & Robins, L. (contributors). Basingstoke: Palgrave.

LeBoeuf, M., (2007). The Power of Ridicule: An Analysis of Satire. *Senior Honors Projects*, *63*. Retrieved from http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/srhonorsprog/63

Leudar, I., Hayes, J., Nekvapil, J, & Baker, J. (2008). Hostility Themes in Media, Community, and Refugee Narratives. *Discourse & Society*, *19*(2), pp.187-221. DOI: 10.1177/0957926507085952

Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004) On membership categorisation: 'us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse & Society*, *15*(2-3), pp.243-266. DOI: 10.1177/ 0957926504041019

Light, D., (2007). Dracula Tourism in Romania: Cultural Identity and the State. *Annals of Tourism Research 34*(3), pp.746-765. DOI: 10.1177/1468797610382707

Light, D., & Young, C. (2009). European Union Enlargement, Post-Accession Migration and Imaginative Geographies of the 'New Europe': Media Discourses in Romania and the United Kingdom. *Journal of Cultural Geography*, *26*(3), pp.281-303. DOI: 10.1080/08873630903322205

Lindgren, B., Öster, I., Åström, S., & Hällgren, U. (2011). 'They don't understand…you cut yourself in order to live.' Interpretative repertoires jointly constructing interactions between adult women who self-harm and professional caregivers. *Graneheim International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, *6*(3), (online). DOI: 10.3402/qhw.v6i3.7254

Lindstrom, L. (1992). Context Contests: Debatable Truth Statements on Tanna. In Goodwin, C., & Duranti, A. (eds.) *Rethinking Context: Language as an interactive phenomenon*, pp.101-124.Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,

Literat, I. (2012). "Original democracy": A rhetorical analysis of Romanian post-revolutionary political discourse and the University Square protests of June 1990. *Central European Journal of Communication, 5*(8), pp.25-39.

Livezeanu, I. (1995). *Cultural Politics in Greater Romania: Regionalism, Nation Building, and Ethnic Struggle, 1918-1930*. New York: Cornell University Press.

Livingstone, S., & Lunt, P., (1994) *Talk on Television: audience participation and public debate*. Routledge, London, UK.

Lozovanu, D. (2012). Romanian-Speaking Communities Outside Romania: Linguistic Identities. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, *2*(6), pp.569-572.

Lumme-Sandt, K., Hervonen A., & Jylha, M. (2000) Interpretative repertoires of medication among the oldest-old. *Social Science & Medicine*, *50*(12), pp.1843–1850. DOI: 10.1016/S0277-9536(99)00421-9

Lynch, M. (2002). From naturally occurring data to naturally organized ordinary activities: comment on Speer. *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), pp.531-537. DOI: 10.1177/14614456020040040801

Lynch M., & Bogen, D., (1994). Harvey Sacks's Primitive Natural Science *Theory, Culture & Society*, *11*, pp.65-104. DOI: 10.1177/026327694011004003

Lynn, N. & Lea, S. (2003). 'A phantom menace and the new Apartheid': The social construction of asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom. *Discourse & Society*, *14*(4), pp.425-452. DOI: 10.1177/0957926503014004002

Lyons, K., & Wearing, S. (2008). Volunteer tourism as alternative tourism: Journeys beyond otherness. In Lyons, K. & Wearing, S. (eds.) *Journeys of discovery in volunteer tourism: International case study perspectives*, pp.3-11. Wallingford: CABI.

M

Macphee, G. & Poddar, P. (2007). Nationalism Beyond the Nation-State. In Macphee, G. & Poddar, P. (eds.) *Empire and After: Englishness in Postcolonial Perspective*. Oxford/New York: Berghahn Books.

Macri, G. (2011). Stories of Love and Hate. Images of 'Homeland' in the Identity Narratives of Romanians in Ireland. *International Review of Social Research*, *1*(2), pp.125-143

Mann, J. (2016, March 20). Britons and Europe: the survey results. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2016/mar/20/britons-on-europe-survey-results-opinium-poll-referendum

Marshall, B. (1992). *Teaching the Postmodern: Fiction and Theory*. London: Routledge.

Marshall, T. (1950) *Citizenship and Social Class: And Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Marx, K., & Engles, F. (1998). *The Communist Manifesto*. Pontypool: Merlin Press Ltd.

Matthews, J. & Travers, D. (2012). *Islands and Britishness: A Global Perspective*. Matthews, J. & Travers, D. (eds.) Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Maxfield, E. (2008). The European Parliament Elections in Romania, November 24th 2007. *European Parliament Election Briefing* (EPERN), *44.* Retrieved from https://www.sussex.ac.uk/webteam/gateway/file.php?name=epern-election-briefing-no-44.pdf&site=266

Maynard, D., & Kardash, T. (2007). Ethnomethodology. In *The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology*, Ritzer, G. (ed.), pp.1483-1486. Oxford: Blackwell.

Mazower, M., (2000). *The Balkans: from the end of Byzantium to the Present Day.* London: Phoenix Press.

McGuire, S., & Canales, M., (2010). Of Migrants and Metaphors: Disrupting Discourses to Welcome the Stranger. *Advances in Nursing Science*, *33*(2), pp.126–142. DOI: 10.1097/ANS.0b013e3181dbc624

McLennan, G. (2001) Thus: Reflections on Loughborough Relativism. *History of the Human Sciences, 14*(3), pp. 87-103. DOI: 10.1177/09526950122121014

Meer, N., Dwyer, C., & Modood, T. (2010). Embodying Nationhood? Conceptions of British National Identity, Citizenship, and Gender in the 'veil affair'. *The Sociological Review, 58*(1), pp.84-111. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2009.01877

Mendoza-Denton, R., & Hansen, N. (2007). Networks of meaning: Intergroup relations, cultural worldviews, and knowledge activation principles. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 1*(1), pp.68-83. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00010.x

Messick, D. & Mackie, D. (1989). Intergroup Relations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 40*, pp.45-81.

Mirela, O. (2012) Development Discourse in Romania: From Socialism to EU Membership. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, *13*(1), pp.66-82. DOI: 10.1080/15705854.2011.649167

Moran, M. (2014) *Identity and Capitalism*. London: Sage.

Moroşanu, L., & Fox, J., (2013). 'No smoke without fire': Strategies of Coping with Stigmatised Migrant Identities. *Ethnicities, 13*(4), pp.438–456. DOI: 10.1177/1468796813483730

Moroşanu, L. (2013a) Between Fragmented Ties and "Soul Friendships": Cross-Border Social Ties of Young Romanians in London. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies, 39*(3), pp.353-372. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.

Moroşanu, L. (201b3) "We All Eat the Same Bread": The Roots and Limits of Cosmopolitan Bridging Ties Developed by Romanians in London. *Ethnic & Racial Studies, 36*(12), pp.2160-2181. DOI: 10.1080/01419870.2012.696668?src=recsys

Moravcsik, A. (2014). *Recent Books: Western Europe: The Europe Dilemma: Britain and the Drama of EU Integration / The Trouble with Europe: Why the EU isn't working - how it can be reformed - what could take its place*. *Foreign Affairs, 93*, p.193. Retrieved from

https://search-proquest-com.lcproxy.shu.ac.uk/docview/1618199664/F05AD4C3ED424679PQ/2?accountid=13827

Musolff, A. (2004). *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe.* Basingstoke, England: Palgrave-Macmillan.

N

National Archives (n.d., a) *Policy, protectionism and imperial preference*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/cabinetpapers/themes/policy-protectionism-imperial-preference.htm

National Archives (n.d., b) Brave new world: *Postwar immigration*. Retrieved from http://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/pathways/citizenship/brave_new_world/immigration.htm

Njaradi, D. (2012). The Balkan Studies: History, Post-Colonialism and Critical Regionalism Debatte: *Journal of Contemporary Central and Eastern Europe 20*(2-3), pp.185-201. DOI: 10.1080/0965156X.2013.765252

O

Oakes, P. (1987). The salience of Social Categories. In Turner, J., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S, & Wetherell, M. (eds.) *Rediscovering the Social Group*. Oxford: Blackwell.

O'Brien, Z. (2016, May 22) Labour risks losing northern strongholds if party fails to tackle 'immigration worries'. *Daily Express.* Retrieved from http://www.express.co.uk/news/uk/672723/Labour-Jeremy-Corbyn-Voters-North

Orchestral Manoeuvres in the Dark (1981). *Souvenir*. Lyrics retrieved from http://www.omd.uk.com/discography/architecture-morality/

O'Neill, J. (1995) "I gotta use words when I talk to you": A response to Death and Furniture. *History of the Human Sciences*, *8*(4), pp.99-106. DOI: 10.1177/095269519500800406

Oprea, M. (2012). Development Discourse in Romania: From Socialism to EU Membership. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, *13*(1), pp.68-82. DOI: 10.1080/15705854.2011.649167

P

Paltridge, B., (2006). *Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum International Publishers.

Pantiru, S., & Barley, R. (2014) The acculturation process of Romanian immigrants in Great Britain: A mixed methods study. *Reinvention: an International Journal of Undergraduate Research*, *7*(1). Retrieved from http://www.warwick.ac.uk/reinventionjournal/issues/volume7issue1/pantiru/

Papadimitriou, D., & Phinnemore, D., (2008). *Romania and The European Union: From Marginalisation to Membership?* Oxon: Routledge.

Paraschivescu, C. (2011). How do the Romanians live the process of Transnationalism? Canada and the UK Compared. *Romanian Sociology*. *2*(IX), pp.28-50

Parker, I. (2013). Discourse Analysis: Dimensions of Critique in Psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 10*(3), pp.223-239. DOI: 1080/14780887.2012.741509

Parker, I. (1999) Against Relativism in Psychology, on Balance. *History of the Human Sciences, 12*, pp.61-78. DOI: 10.1177/09526959922120496

Parker, I. (1998). Against postmodernism: Psychology in cultural context. *Theory & Psychology, 8*(5), pp.621-647.

Parker, I. (1989). *The Crisis in Modern Social Psychology and how to end it*. London: Routledge.

Parker, I. (1990). Discourse: Definition and Contradictions. *Philosophical Psychology, 3*, pp.189-204.

Parekh, B. (2000). *Rethinking Multiculturalism: Cultural Diversity and Political Theory.* Basingstoke: Macmillan/ Palgrave Press.

Parliament Library, (n.d.) *Into Europe.* Retrieved from http://www.parliament.uk/about/living-heritage/transformingsociety/tradeindustry/importexport/overview/europe/

Parutis, V. (2013). Returning "Home": East European Migrants' Discourses of Return. *International Migration, 52*(5), pp.159-177. DOI: 10.1111/imig.12037

Paxman, J. (1998) *The English: A Portrait of a People*. England: Penguin.

Philo, D., Briant, E., & Donald, P. (2013). *Bad News for Refugees?* London: Pluto Press.

Phinney, J., Horenczyk, G., Liebkind, K., & Vedder, P. (2001). Ethnic identity, immigration, and wellbeing: An interactional perspective. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, pp.493-510.

Pomerantz, A., (1986). Extreme case formulations: A new way of legitimating claims. *Human Studies*, *9*, pp.219–230

Potter, J. (2005). Making psychology relevant. *Discourse & Society*, *16*, pp.739-747. DOI: 10.1177/0957926505054944

Potter, J. (2004) Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In Silverman, D. (Ed.) *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method and Practice*, pp. 200-221. London: Sage.

Potter, J. (2003). Discursive psychology: between method and paradigm. *Discourse & Society*, *14*(6), pp.783-794. DOI: 10.1177/09579265030146005

Potter, J. (2002). Two kinds of natural. *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), pp.539-542. DOI: 10.1177/14614456020040040901

Potter, J., (2000). Post-Cognitive Psychology. *Theory & Psychology*, *10*(1), pp.31-37. DOI: 10.1177/0959354300010001596

Potter, J., (1996a). *Representing Reality*. London: Sage.

Potter, J. (1996b). Discourse Analysis and Constructionist Approaches: Theoretical Background. In Richardson, J. (Ed.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research Methods for Psychology and the Social Sciences*. Leicester: BPS Books.

Potter, J., & Wiggins, S. (2008) Discursive psychology. In Willig C. & Stainton Rogers, W. (eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research in Psychology*, pp.72-89. London: Sage.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A., (2007). Discursive psychology: mind and reality in practice. In Weatherall, A., Watson, B. & Gallois,. C. (eds.) *Language, Discourse and Social Psychology*, pp.160-181. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Potter, J., & Hepburn, A. (2005) Qualitative interviews in psychology: problems and prospects. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *2*(4), pp.312-314.

Potter, J., Edwards, D., & Ashmore, M. (1995) Regulating criticism: some comments on an argumentative complex. *History of the Human Sciences*, *12*(4), pp.79-88. DOI: 10.1177/09526959922120504

Potter, J., Wetherell, M., Gill, R. and Edwards, D. (1990). Discourse: Noun, verb or social practice, *Philosophical Psychology*, *3*, 205-217.

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1995) Discourse analysis. In Smith, J., Harré, R., van & Langenhove, R., (eds.), *Rethinking Methods in Psychology*. London; Sage.

Potter, J., Wetherell, M., & Chitty, A. (1991). Quantification rhetoric—cancer on television. *Discourse & Society*, *2*(3), 333-365. DOI: 10.1177/0957926591002003005

Potter, J., & Wetherell, M. (1987) *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage.

Powell, E. (1968, April 20). Speech at Birmingham. Retrieved from http://www.enochpowell.net/fr-79.html

Preoteasa, I. (2002) Intellectuals and the public sphere in post-communist Romania: a discourse analytical perspective. *Discourse & Society*, 13(2), pp.269-292. DOI: 10.1177/0957926502013002410

Project on Ethnic Relations, (2000). *Roma in the Electoral Campaign in Romania*. Tirgu Mures, Romania. Retrieved from http://www.per-usa.org/1997-2007/romania.htm

Protsyk, O. (2010) *Representation of minorities in the Romanian parliament.* Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Retrieved from http://archive.ipu.org/splz-e/Chiapas10/romania.pdf

R

Razsa, M., & Lindstrom, N. (2004). Balkan Is Beautiful: Balkanism in the Political Discourse of Tudman's Croatia. *East European Politics and Societies*, *18*(4), pp.628-650. DOI: 10.1177/0888325404266939.

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N., (2001). *Self and Nation*. London: Sage.

Reviron-Piégay, F. (2009) Introduction: The Dilemma Of Englishness. In Reviron-Piégay, F. (ed.) *Englishness Revisited*, pp.1-27. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Ribes-Iñesta, E., (2006). Human Behaviour as Language: Some Thoughts on Wittgenstein. *Behaviour and Philosophy*, *34*, pp.109–121.

Romocea, O. (2014). Ethics and Emotions: A Migrant Researcher Doing Research Among Romanian Migrants. *Sociological Research Online*, *19*(4), DOI: 10.5153/sro.3489. Retrieved from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/19/4/16.html

Roeh, I. & Feldman, S., (1984) The rhetoric of numbers in front-page Journalism: How numbers contribute to the melodramatic in the popular press. *Text & Talk*, *4*(4), pp.347-368. DOI: 10.1515/text.1.1984.4.4.347

Roulston, K. (2008). Conversational interviewing. In Given, L. (ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopaedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, pp. 156-159. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE.

Roşca, L. (2013) From The Totalitarian Language To The Informative Discourse. A Romanian Media Discourse Analysis During The '90s. *Mass-Media Şi Opinia Publică*, *XXIV*(1-2), pp.21-39.

Rosie, M., MacInnes, J., Petersoo, P., Condor , S., & Kennedy, J. (2004), Nation speaking unto nation? Newspapers and national identity in the evolved UK. *Sociological Review, 52*(4), pp.437-458. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-954X.2004.00490.x

Ryle, G. (2000). *The Concept of Mind* (new edition). London: Penguin.

Rypi, A. (2012). Not Afraid at All? Dominant and Alternative Interpretative Repertoires in Discourses of the Elderly on Fear of Crime. *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention, 13*(2), pp.166-180. DOI: 10.1080/14043858.2012.729375

S

Sacks, H. (1995) *Lectures on Conversation.* Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell.

Săftoiu, R., & Popescu, C. (2014) Humor as a branding strategy in political discourse: A case study from Romania. *Revista Signos. Estudios de Lingüística, 47*(85) pp.293-320

Said, E. (1995). *Orientalism*. London: Penguin.

Salkie, R. (1995). *Text and Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Scannell, P., (ed.) (1991). *Broadcast Talk*. London: Sage.

Schama, S. (2009a). *A History of Britain: At the Edge of the World? 3000BC-1603AD*. London: Bodley Head.

Schama, S. (2009b). *A History of Britain: The British Wars 1603-1776*. London: Bodley Head.

Schegloff, E. (2007). A tutorial on membership categorization. *Journal of Pragmatics, 39*, pp..462-482. DOI: 10.1016/j.pragma.2006.07.007

Schegloff, E. (1997). Whose text? Whose context? *Discourse & Society*, *8*(2), pp.165-187. DOI: 10.1177/0957926597008002002

Schegloff, E., & Sacks, H., (1973) Opening up Closings. In Turner, R., (ed.), *Ethnomethodology: Selected Readings*, pp.233–264. Baltimore, Maryland, USA: Penguin.

Schinkel, W. (2010). The virtualization of citizenship. *Critical Sociology*, *36*(2), pp.265-283. DOI:10.1177/0896920509357506

Sculthorpe, T. (2016, June 22), You're not getting anything else! Cameron got the 'maximum' from his renegotiation and the EU has no more to offer after Brexit vote, Commission boss warns. *Daily Mail*. Retrieved from http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3654481/You-not-getting-Cameron-got-maximum-renegotiation-EU-no-offer-Brexit-vote-Commission-boss-warns.html

Select Committee on the Constitution (2016, May 25). *The Union and Devolution*. House of Lords, HL Paper 149. Retrieved from https://publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld201516/ldselect/ldconst/149/149.pdf

Sepi, A. (Nation Branding: the Case of Romania. Brief History And Possible Reasons For Failure. E/IR&CD, 10. Retrieved from http://www.culturaldiplomacy.org/pdf/case-studies/Andreea_Sepi_-_Nation_Branding_-_The_Case_of_Romania.pdf

Sherwell, P., & Squires, N. (2015, May 11) 'Migrant crisis is a security crisis' says EU foreign policy chief. *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/europe/eu/11597651/Migrant-crisis-is-a-security-crisis-says-EU-foreign-policy-chief.html

Shotter, J. (2012). Rhetoric and Argumentation. In Antaki, C. & Condor, S. (eds.) *Rhetoric, Ideology and Social Psychology: Essays in Honour of Michael Billig*, pp.43-56. London: Routledge.

Shotter, J. (2005). Moving on by Backing Away. In Yancy, S. (ed.) *Narrative Identities: Psychologists Engaged in Self-construction*, pp.150-171. London: Kingsley Publishers.

Shotter, J. (1993a). *Cultural politics of everyday life: Social constructionism, rhetoric, and knwing of the third kind*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Shotter, J. (1993b) *Conversational Realities: Constructing Life through Language*. London: Sage.

Shotter, J. (1992). Bakhtin and Billig: monological versus dialogical practices. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, *36*(1), pp.1-14. DOI: 10.1177/0002764292036001003

Shotter, J. (1975). *Images of Man in Psychological Research*. London: Methuen.

Shotter, J. & Lannamann, J. (2002). The Situation of Social Constructionism Its 'Imprisonment' within the Ritual of Theory-Criticism-and-Debate. *Theory & Psychology*, *12*(5), pp.577-609. DOI: 10.1177/0959354302012005894

Silverman, D., (ed.) (1997). *Qualitative Research: Theory, Method, Practice*.London:Sage.

Sindic, D., & Condor., S (2014). Social Identity Theory and Self-Categorization Theory. In Capelos, T., Kinvall, C., Nesbitt-Larkin, P., & Dekker, H. (eds.) *The Palgrave Handbook of Global Political Psychology*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2011). False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection and Analysis allows Presenting anything as Significant. *Psychological Science*, *22*(11), pp.1359-1366. DOI: 10.1177/0956797611417632.

Song, L. (2010). The Role of Context in Discourse Analysis. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, *1*(6), pp. 876-879. DOI: 10.4304/jltr.

Speer, S. (2002a). 'Natural' and 'contrived' data: A sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), pp.511-526. DOI: 10.1177/1461445602004004601

Speer, S. (2002b). Transcending the `natural'/`contrived' distinction: a rejoinder to ten Have, Lynch and Potter. *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), pp.543-548. DOI: 10.1177/1461445602004004101

Spivak, G. (1994) Can the Subaltern Speak? In Williams, P. & Chrisman, L. (eds.) *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory: A Reader*, pp.90-105. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Spoel P., Harris, R., Henwood F., (2014) Rhetorics of health citizenship: exploring vernacular critiques of government's role in supporting healthy living. *Journal of Medical Humanities, 35*(2), pp.131-147. DOI: 10.1007/s10912-014-9276-6.

Staeheli, L. A. (2011). Political geography: Where's citizenship? *Progress in Human Geography, 35*(3), pp.393-400. DOI10.1177/0309132510370671

Stainton-Rogers, P., Stenner, P., Gleeson, K., & Stainton-Rogers, W., (1995). *Social Psychology: A Critical Agenda.* Cambridge: Polity.

Stan, L. & Turcescu, l. (2007) *Religion and Politics in Post-Communist Romania*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steensig, J. (2012). Conversation Analysis and Affiliation and Alignment. *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal0196

Stokoe, E., (2012). Moving Forward with Membership Categorisation Analysis: Methods for Systematic Analysis. *Discourse Studies, 14*(3), pp.277–303. DOI: 10.1177/1461445612441534

Stoker, B. (1993). *Dracula* (new edition). Wordsworth: Hertfordshire.

Stryker , S., & Burke, P. (2000). The Past, Present, and Future of an Identity Theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*(4), pp.284-197.

T

Tănăsoiu, C. (2008) Intellectuals and Post-Communist Politics in Romania: An Analysis of Public Discourse, 1990–2000. *East European Politics and Societies, 22*(1), pp.80-113.

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. *Scientific American, 223*, 96–102.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J., (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In Austin W., & Worchel S. (eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*, pp. 33-47. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Taylor, C. (1992). The Politics of Recognition. In A. Gutmann (Ed.), *Multiculturalism and the Politics of Recognition*, pp. 25-74. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Taylor, S., (2006). Narrative as Construction and Resource. *Narrative Inquiry*, *16*(1), pp.94-102.

Tetlock, P. (1995). Social Psychology and World Politics. In Gilbert, D., Fiske, S., & Lindsay, G. (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Psychology* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

ten Have, P. (2002). Ontology or methodology? Comments on Speer's "natural" and "contrived" data: a sustainable distinction? *Discourse Studies*, *4*(4), pp.527–530. DOI: 10.1177/1461445602004004 0701

Thornborrow, J. (2001) Authenticating talk: Building public identities in audience participation broadcasting. *Discourse Studies*, *3*(4), pp.459-479. DOI: 10.1177/1461445601003004008

Tichindeleanu, O. (2010). Towards a Critical Theory of Postcommunism: Beyond Anticommunism in Romania. *Radical Philosophy*, (Jan/Feb). Retrieved from https://www.radicalphilosophy.com/article/towards-a-critical-theory-of-postcommunism

Tileagă, C. (2012). The right measure of guilt: Moral reasoning, transgression and the social construction of moral meanings. *Discourse & Communication*, *6*(2), pp.203-222. DOI: 10.1177/1750481312437443

Tileagă, C. (2011). (Re)writing biography: Memory, identity, and textually mediated reality in coming to terms with the past. *Culture & Psychology*, *17*(2), pp.197-215. doi:10.1177/1354067X11398315

Tileagă, C. (2009). The social organization of representations of history: The textual accomplishment of coming to terms with the past. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *48*(2), pp.337-355. doi:10.1348/014466608X349487

Tileagă, C. (2007). Ideologies of moral exclusion: A critical discursive reframing of depersonalization, delegitimization and dehumanization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*(4), pp.717-737. DOI: 10.1348/014466607X186894

Tileagă, C. (2006a). Representing the 'other': a discursive analysis of prejudice and moral exclusion in talk about Romanies. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *16*(1), pp.19-41. DOI: 10.1002/casp.846

Tileagă, C. (2006b). Discourse, dominance and power relations: Inequality as a social and interactional object. *Ethnicities*, *6*(4), pp.476-497. DOI: 10.1177/1468796806070719

Tismaneanu, P. (2015). *Rethinking Soviet Communism*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Todorova, M. (2010). Balkanism and Postcolonialism, or On the Beauty of the Airplane View. In Bradatan, C. & Oushakine, S. *In Marx's Shadow Knowledge, Power, and Intellectuals in Eastern Europe and Russia*, pp.175-196. Plymouth: Lexington Books.

Todorova, M., (2009). *Imagining the Balkans* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Todorova, M. (1994). The Balkans: From discovery to invention. *Slavic Review, 53*(2), pp.453-482. DOI: 10.2307/2501301

Tolkien, J., (1999). *The Two Towers* (new edition). London: Harper Collins.

Toró, T., (2017). Hungarian Minority Politics in Post-Socialist Romania: Interests, Strategies, and Discourses. *Acta Universitatis Sapientiae*: *European and Regional Studies*, *10*(1), pp.79-106. DOI:10.1515/auseur-2016-0022

Trandafoiu, R. (2013). *Diaspora Online: Identity Politics and Romanian Migrants*. Berghahn Books.

Triandafyllidou, A. (2000). The political discourse on immigration in southern Europe: a critical analysis. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *10*(5) pp.373-389. DOI: 10.1002/1099-1298(200009/10)10:5<373::AID-CASP595>3.0.CO;2-R

Turner, J., Hogg, M., Oakes, P., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford: Blackwell.

U

UK Government (2017, June). Rights of EU Citizens in the UK Policy Paper Factsheet. Home Office. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/622177/6.3545_HO_EU_Citizen_Rights_Policy_Factsheet_A5_FINAL_WEB_260617_2.pdf

UK Government (2006, August 22). *Accession Monitoring Report May 2004 – June 2006*. Home Office, Department of Work and Pensions, HM Revenue and Customs, and Department for Communities and Local Government. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/shared/bsp/hi/pdfs/22_08_06_migrantworkers.pdf

V

Välikangas, A. & Seeck, H. (2011) Exploring the Foucauldian interpretation of power and subject in organizations. *Journal of Management and Organization*, *17*(6). pp.812-827. DOI: 10.1017/S183336720000119X

Valkenburg, G. (2012). Sustainable technological citizenship. *European Journal of Social Theory*, *15*(4), pp.471-487. DOI: 10.1177/1368431011423605

van Dijk, T. (2000a). Ideologies, Racism, Discourse. Debates on Immigration and Ethnic Issues. In ter Wal, J., & Verkuyten, M. (eds.), *Comparative Perspectives on Racism*, pp. 91-116. Aldershot: Ashgate.

van Dijk, T. (2000b). *Ideology and discourse: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*. Retrieved from http://www.discourses.org/OldBooks/Teun%20A%20van%20Dijk%20-%20Ideology%20and%20Discourse.pdf

van Dijk, T. (1996). *Discourse, Power and Access*. In Coulthard, C., & Coulthard, M. (Eds.), *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*, pp. 84-104. London: Routledge.

van Dijk, T. (1992). Discourse and the Denial of Racism. *Discourse & Society*, *3*(1), 87–118. DOI: 10.1177/0957926592003001005

van Dijk, T. (1984) *Prejudice in Discourse: An Analysis of Ethnic Prejudice in Cognition and Conversation*. Amsterdam: J. Benjamins Co.

Veres, V. (2014). Identity discourses on national belonging: the Hungarian minority in Romania. *Romanian Journal of Political Science*, *14*, No(1), pp.61-86 Retrieved from http://real.mtak.hu/29508/1/Identity%20discourses%20on%20national%20belongingVV_edited_Final61-86.pdf

Verkuyten, M. (2005) Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*(2), pp.223-241. DOI: 10.1348/014466604X23482.

Verkuyten, M. (2003). Racism, happiness, and ideology. In van den Berg, H., Wetherell, M., & Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (Eds.), *Analyzing race talk: Multidisciplinary perspectives on the research interview*, pp. 138-155. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verkuyten, M. (2001) “Abnormalization” of Ethnic Minorities in Conversation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *40*(2), pp.257-278. DOI: 10.1348/014466601164849

Verkuyten, M. (1998). Self-categorization and the explanation of ethnic discrimination. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *8*(6), pp.395-407. DOI: 10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199811/12)8:6<395::AID-CASP475>3.0.CO;2-3

Vertovec, S. (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies 29*(6), pp.1024-1054. DOI: 10.1080/01419870701599465

Viney, W. (1993). *A History of Psychology*: *Ideas and Context*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

W

Ward, P. (2009). The end of Britishness? A historical perspective. *Journal of the British Politics Society*, *4*(3), p.3.

Webster, W., (2005). *Englishness and Empire: 1939-1965*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Weißbecker, E., (2017). A Discourse Analysis of the UK Referendum CAMPAIGN on EU Membership The Case of Michael Gove‘s “The facts of Life say Leave“ Speech. *IEP Research Paper*, *1*, pp.1-42. Retrieved from http://iep-berlin.de/wp-content/uploads/2017/04/Wei%C3%9Fbecker_Discourse-Analysis-of-the-UK-Referendum-on-EU-Membership_2.pdf

Weltman, D. and Billig, M. (2001). The Political Psychology of Contemporary Anti-Politics: A Discursive Approach to the End-of-Ideology Era. *Political Psychology*, *22*(2), pp.367-382. DOI: 10.1111/0162-895X.

Wetherell, M. (2007). A step too far: Discursive psychology, linguistic ethnography and questions of identity. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, *11*(5), pp.661-681. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2007.00345.x

Wetherell, M. (2003) Racism and the analysis of cultural resources in interviews. In van den Berg, H., Wetherell, M., & Houtkoop-Steenstra, H. (eds.), *Analyzing Race Talk: Multidisciplinary Approaches to the Interview*, pp.11-30. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretative repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse & Society*, *9*(3), pp.387-412. DOI:10.1177/0957926598009003005

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J., (1992) Mapping *the Language of Racism: Discourse and the Legitimation of Exploitation*. Brighton: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wetherell, M., & Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative repertoires., In Antaki, C. (ed.) *Analysing Everyday Explanation: A Casebook of Methods*. London: Sage.

Wetherell, M., Stiven, H., & Potter, J. (1987). Unequal Egalitarianism: A preliminary study of discourses concerning gender and employment opportunities. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *26*(1), pp.59-71.

Wiggins, S & Potter, J. (2003). Attitudes and evaluative practices: Category vs. item and subjective vs. objective constructions in everyday food assessments, *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*(4), pp.513-531. DOI: 10.1348/014466603322595257

Willig, C. (1998). Social constructionism and revolutionary socialism: a contradiction in terms? In Parker, I. (Ed.), *Inquiries in Social Construction: Social constructionism, discourse and realism*, pp. 91-105. London: SAGE. DOI: 10.4135/9781446217412.n7

Wilson, R., & Hainsworth, P., (2012). Far-Right Parties and Discourses in Europe: A Challenge for our times. European Network Against Racism. Retrieved from http://cms.horus.be/files/99935/MediaArchive/publications/20060_Publication_Far_right_EN_LR.pdf

Wintour, P. (2014, November 19). Labour will curb tax credits for EU migrants, says Rachel Reeves. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2014/nov/18/labour-clamp-down-in-work-tax-credits-eu-migrants

Wittgenstein, L., (1953). *Philosophical Investigations*, Anscombe, G (trans.). Oxford, UK: Basil Blackwell.

Wodak, R. (2015). *The Politics of Fear*. London: Sage.

Wolff, L., (1994). *Inventing Eastern Europe: the Map of Civilization on the Mind of the Enlightenment*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Wood, L. A & Kroger, R. O. (2000). *Doing Discourse Analysis. Methods for studying action in talk and text.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wooffitt, R., (2005). *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis*. London: Sage.

Wooffitt, R. (1992) *Telling Tales of the Unexpected: the Organisation of Factual Discourse*. Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf

Wrbuschek, M. (2009). Discourse Analysis and Social Critique. *Psychology & Society, 2*(1), pp.36-44.

Wright, C. (2007). Conserving Purity, Labouring the Past: A Tropological Evolution of Englishness. In Macphee, G. & Poddar, P. (eds.) *Empire and After: Englishness in Postcolonial Perspective*, pp.159-180. Oxford: Berghahn Books.

X

Xenitidou, M., & Morasso, S., (2014) Parental Discourse and Identity Management in the Talk of Indigenous and Migrant Speakers. *Discourse & Society, 25*(1), pp.100–121. DOI: 10.1177/0957926513508858

Z

Zerilli, F. (2013). Corruption and Anti-Corruption Local Discourses and International Practices in Post-Socialist Romania. *Human Affairs*, *23*(2), pp.212-229. DOI:10.2478/s13374-013-0120-x

Appendices Materials overview

Appendix i)	Ethics Approval
Appendix ii)	Ethics Application
Appendix iii)	Information Letter and Consent Form
Appendix iv)	Interview Schedule
Appendix v)	Advertisement poster
Appendix vi)	Interview Reflections
Appendix vii)	Receiving society voice data (b): *The Andrew Marr Show* interviews (x16)
Appendix viii)	Receiving society voice data (a): *Question Time* (debates) (x13)
Appendix ix)	Romanian mover voice data (interviews) (x10)
Appendix x)	Transcription notations used

Appendix i: ethics approval

Sheffield Hallam University

Our Ref AM/13-2014

Mr H W Lennon
3 Lavender Gardens
Heanor
Derbyshire
DE75 7NP

15th July 2014

Dear Henry,

Request for Ethical Approval of Research Project

Your research project entitled **"The Romanians are coming: A discourse analysis of UK-based identity and immigratory accounts"** has been submitted for ethical review to the Faculty's rapporteurs and I am pleased to confirm that they have approved your project.

I wish you every success with your research project.

Yours sincerely

Professor A Macaskill
Chair
Faculty Research Ethics Committee

Office address :
Business Support Team
Faculty of Development & Society
Sheffield Hallam University
Unit 4, Sheffield Science Park
Howard Street, Sheffield, S1 1WB
Tel: 0114-225 3308
E-mail: DS-ResearchEthics@shu.ac.uk

Appendix ii: ethics application

Sheffield Hallam University

RESEARCH ETHICS CHECKLIST (SHUREC1)

This form is designed to help staff and students to complete an ethical scrutiny of proposed research. The SHU Research Ethics Policy should be consulted before completing the form.

Answering the questions below will help you decide whether your research proposal requires ethical review by a Faculty Research Ethics Committee (FREC). In cases of uncertainty, members of the FREC can be approached for advice.

Please note: staff based in University central departments should submit to the University Ethics Committee (SHUREC) for review and advice.

The final responsibility for ensuring that ethical research practices are followed rests with the supervisor for student research and with the principal investigator for staff research projects.

Note that students and staff are responsible for making suitable arrangements for keeping data secure and, if relevant, for keeping the identity of participants anonymous. They are also responsible for following SHU guidelines about data encryption.

The form also enables the University and Faculty to keep a record confirming that research conducted has been subjected to ethical scrutiny.

- For student projects, the form may be completed by the student and the supervisor and/or module leader (as applicable). In all cases, it should be counter-signed by the supervisor and/or module leader, and kept as a record showing that ethical scrutiny has occurred. Students should retain a copy for inclusion in their research projects, and staff should keep a copy in the student file.
- For staff research, the form should be completed and kept by the principal investigator.

Please note if it may be necessary to conduct a health and safety risk assessment for the proposed research. Further information can be obtained from the Faculty Safety Co-ordinator.

General Details

(Table cells will expand as you type)

Name of principal investigator or student	Henry Lennon
email address	b3041382@my.shu.ac.uk
Course or qualification (student)	psychology PhD
Name of supervisor (if applicable)	Director of Studies: Dr Laura Kilby Supervisors: Dr Rachel Abbott, Dr Sonja Ellis
email address	dslkilby@exchange.shu.ac.uk
Title of research proposal	'Out of Control' vs. 'Being Free': Discourse Analysis and Accounts of European 'Migration' and 'Movement'.
Brief outline of research to include, rationale & aims (50 words). In addition for research with human, participants, include recruitment method,	In discursive psychology (DP), there is a small-but-growing field of research that studies the intersection of traditional social psychological topics (identity, group relations, prejudice) with political issues in talk and text (Wetherell, 2007; Goodman, 2010; Lynn & Lea, 2003). My PhD research aims to advance

participant details & proposed methodology (250 words).	understanding in this field by investigating how '(im)migration' and 'movement' are talked about in people's experiences of moving (EU migrants) to the UK as well as in media and political commentary. As a discourse-analytical approach, DP is based on understanding how language is used to achieve actions in specific social contexts (e.g. making requests, appearing indifferent, justifying one's views). By exploring how similar topics are talked about across different contexts (and by different speakers), my research aims to understand how migration/movement topics are being constructed and subsequently managed in the 'real world'. My methodology will involve talking to migrants (in a semi-structured interview setting) about their experiences of moving to/ living in the UK. It will also involve acquiring documents and other online material from publically-accessible domains (e.g. television extracts, legal documents). Participant 'criteria' for the interviews only require that they have moved from elsewhere in the EU to live/study/work in the UK. There are no requirements for specific age-groups, nationalities, occupations, etc. They will be recruited by online advertising both within the university and locally, and snowball sampling with relevant/appropriate contacts already held will be used. The estimated number of participants is around 10. The main theme underpinning the questions is an interest in exploring what how topics like 'Europe', 'UK', 'borders', 'control', 'freedom', 'multiculturalism', 'racism' and 'identity' are talked about, compared/contrasted, and negotiated in a conversational setting. This will shed light on how macro-discourses (e.g. government law, media coverage) can be used/reorganised in a micro-context by people experiencing movement/migration. The media and political document 'corpus' currently includes extracts from public debate (e.g. episodes of BBC's 'question time'), some television interviews (e.g. with newsreaders on 'Channel 4 news'), and documents detailing the parliamentary process of the Immigration Bill (2014)'s accession into law. All materials being used will be available for research purposes under current copyright legislation.
Will the research be conducted with partners & subcontractors?	**Yes/No** no (If **YES**, outline how you will ensure that their ethical policies are consistent with university policy.)

1. Research Involving the NHS or Social Care / Community Care

Question		Yes/No
1.	Does the research involve the NHS or Social Care/Community Care (SC) as defined below? • Patients recruited because of their past or present use of the NHS or SC • Relatives/carers of patients recruited because of their past or present use of the NHS or SC • Access to data, organs or other bodily material of past or present NHS patients • Foetal material and IVF involving NHS patients • The recently dead in NHS premises • Prisoners recruited for health-related research • Participants who are unable to provide informed consent due to their incapacity	no
2.	Is this a research project as opposed to service evaluation or audit? *For NHS definitions please see the following website* http://www.nres.nhs.uk/applications/is-your-project-research/	no

If you have answered **YES** to questions **1 & 2** then you **must** seek approval from the NHS or Social Care under their Research Governance schemes.

NHS https://www.myresearchproject.org.uk/Signin.aspx

If you are undertaking Social Care research in Sheffield you will require a favourable ethical review from a Faculty Committee but must use the Sheffield Council form for this. Full details from http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/caresupport/us/research. For other areas contact the relevant social services department directly for advice on procedures.

NB FRECs provide Independent Scientific Review for NHS or SC research and initial scrutiny for ethics applications as required for university sponsorship of the research. Applicants can use the NHS or SC proforma and submit this initially to the FREC.

2. Research with Human Participants

Question		Yes/No
1.	Does the research involve human participants? This includes surveys, questionnaires, observing behaviour etc. *Note* *If YES, then please answer questions 2 to 10* *If NO, please go to Section 3*	yes
2.	Will any of the participants be vulnerable? *Note* *'Vulnerable' people include young people under 18, people with learning disabilities, people who may be limited by age or sickness or disability from understanding the research, etc.*	no
3	Are drugs, placebos or other substances (e.g. food substances, vitamins) to be administered to the study participants or will the study involve invasive, intrusive or potentially harmful procedures of any kind?	no
4	Will tissue samples (including blood) be obtained from participants?	no
5	Is pain or more than mild discomfort likely to result from the study?	no
6	Will the study involve prolonged or repetitive testing?	no
7	Is there any reasonable and foreseeable risk of physical or emotional harm to any of the participants? *Note* *Harm may be caused by distressing or intrusive interview questions, uncomfortable procedures involving the participant, invasion of privacy, topics relating to highly personal information, topics relating to illegal activity, etc.*	no
8	Will anyone be taking part without giving their informed consent?	no
9	Is it covert research? *Note* *'Covert research' refers to research that is conducted without the knowledge of participants.*	no
10	Will the research output allow identification of any individual who has not given their express consent to be identified?	no

If you answered **YES only** to question 1, you **must** submit the signed form to the FREC for registration and scrutiny by the Chair. If you have answered **YES** to any of the other questions you are **required** to submit a SHUREC2A (or 2B) to the FREC.

3. Research in Organisations

Question		Yes/No
1	Will the research involve working with/within an organisation (e.g. school, business, charity, museum, government department, international agency, etc)?	no
2	If you answered YES to question 1, do you have granted access to conduct the research? *If YES, students please show evidence to your supervisor. PI should retain safely.*	
3	If you answered NO to question 2, is it because: A. you have not yet asked B. you have asked and not yet received an answer C. you have asked and been refused access.	
Note	*You will only be able to start the research when you have been granted access.*	

4. Research with Products and Artefacts

Question		Yes/No
1.	Will the research involve working with copyrighted documents, films, broadcasts, photographs, artworks, designs, products, programmes, databases, networks, processes or secure data?	yes
2.	If you answered YES to question 1, are the materials you intend to use in the public domain?	Yes. The publicly accessible documents forming the data corpus will be used within research parameters without breaching copyright law.
Notes	*'In the public domain' does not mean the same thing as 'publicly accessible'.* – *Information which is 'in the public domain' is no longer protected by copyright (i.e. copyright has either expired or been waived) and can be used without permission.* – *Information which is 'publicly accessible' (e.g. TV broadcasts, websites, artworks, newspapers) is available for anyone to consult/view. It is still protected by copyright even if there is no copyright notice. In UK law, copyright protection is automatic and does not require a copyright statement, although it is always good practice to provide one. It is necessary to check the terms and conditions of use to find out exactly how the material may be reused etc.* *If you answered YES to question 1, be aware that you may need to consider other ethics codes. For example, when conducting Internet research, consult the code of the Association of Internet Researchers; for educational research, consult the Code of Ethics of the British Educational Research Association.*	
3.	If you answered NO to question 2, do you have explicit permission to use these materials as data? *If YES, please show evidence to your supervisor. PI should retain permission.*	n/a; expert advice has already been sought by supervisory team and the research will not be in breach of copyright legislation or require explicit permission"
4.	If you answered NO to question 3, is it because: A. you have not yet asked permission B. you have asked and not yet received and answer C. you have asked and been refused access.	**A/B/C** n/a
Note	*You will only be able to start the research when you have been granted permission to use the specified material.*	

Adherence to SHU policy and procedures

Personal statement	
I can confirm that: – I have read the Sheffield Hallam University Research Ethics Policy and Procedures – I agree to abide by its principles.	
Student / Researcher/ Principal Investigator (as applicable)	
Name: Henry Lennon	Date: 08-07-2014
Signature:	
Supervisor or other person giving ethical sign-off	
I can confirm that completion of this form has not identified the need for ethical approval by the FREC or an NHS, Social Care or other external REC. The research will not commence until any approvals required under Sections 3 & 4 have been received.	
Name: Laura Kilby	Date: 14/07/2014
Signature: *Laura Kilby*	

Appendix iii: letter to participant and consent form

(Researcher) **Henry W. Lennon** (BSc, MBPsS)
PhD Student and Demonstrator
Oak Lodge,
37 Collegiate Crescent,
Collegiate Crescent Campus,
Sheffield Hallam University,
Sheffield | S10 2LD
Tel: (0114) 225 2219
Email: dshwl@exchange.shu.ac.uk

Dear Participant,

Thank you for your interest in taking part in my research. I am a research (PhD) student based at Sheffield Hallam University, and as part of my research I am investigating the lives and experiences of migrants from across the European Union who are living in the UK.

The research will involve taking part in an informal interview in order to explore your life as a 'migrant' (e.g. your occupation, reasons for coming, experiences since arriving here, aspirations for the future, etcetera). The interview would take place with me in a mutually-agreed location and time. As this is a research study, there is a proforma (see overleaf) that you will need to read and sign. At this point, you should know that your participation would be anonymised and there is no obligation to take part just because you have conveyed interest

By participating, it is an opportunity for you to reflect on your time in the UK: things you have enjoyed and value, things you dislike, things you miss, etcetera. It can be seen as a space where you can talk about your experiences freely about what is important in *your* life while here in the UK.

If you are interested and would like to take part, please read the proforma overleaf. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact either myself (details above) and/or my supervisor (details below).

Best Wishes,

Henry Lennon

Henry Lennon (BSc, MBPsS)

(Supervisor) **Dr. Laura Kilby**
Lecturer,
Southbourne,
37 Clarkehouse Road,
Collegiate Crescent Campus,
Sheffield Hallam University,
Sheffield | S10 2LD
Tel: (0114) 225 6504
Email: l.kilby@shu.ac.uk

Sheffield Hallam University

Participant Copy

Proforma: Ethics and Consent

To take part, you must be made aware of the nature of the study and provide informed written consent to confirm this.

The interview will be **recorded** using a digital recording device. You are not obliged to talk about anything private or uncomfortable; it is important that you talk about whatever **feels comfortable** and safe for you. The recording will be **transcribed**, meaning that it will be subsequently listened to and typed up to produce a textual document of the conversation.

All recordings made will be stored in accordance with the *Data Protection Act* (1998). Only myself and my supervisor will be able to listen to them. After the voice recordings have been transcribed, they will be deleted; this will occur at a maximum of eighteen months after the initial recording date. Any personal/identifying features in the recordings, such as your name, will be either changed or completely omitted to ensure you are **not personally identifiable**.

Participation is **entirely voluntary**. If you take part and then change your mind, you can withdraw your data for up to seven days after the interview. Although this research is being conducted over a three year period, you are invited to contact me directly to enquire about the current status of the research. I will be more than happy to talk to you about my progress and/or findings!

By signing and dating below:

- I understand that participation in this study involves being **audio-recorded**
- I understand that my data will be **anonymised** when it is transcribed
- I understand that the audio recording will be **stored securely**, will be confidential, being only accessible by the researcher and their supervisor, and will be **destroyed** after a maximum of six months
- I have been given the opportunity to ask questions
- I am happy to participate on a **voluntary basis**, and know I can withdraw my audio-record for up to seven days after taking part
- I am aware I am free to contact the researcher to enquire about the findings.
- I agree to take part in the study, and am happy for my anonymised data to be used in this study and any subsequent research.

Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix iv: interview schedule

Interview Schedule: The Experience of within-EU Movement to the UK

Basics

(Q1) Tell me about yourself...

- Age, nationality (region, language[s]?), background, occupation/trade, family, partner?
- Religion, interests, hobbies?

Pre-UK

(Q2) Tell me about the process leading up to your decision to come to the UK...

- What it spur-of-the-moment? Perhaps just 'wait and see'
- Perhaps something planned? A particular aim/job/place to go to; family/friends etc?

(Q3) What did you think about the UK before coming?

- What were you expecting? Any recommendations/warnings from friends etc.?

Settling in

(Q4) Can you remember any experiences you had upon (initially) arriving into the UK?

- Interesting/weird situations e.g. work, socialising? (Speaking English, cultural norms?)

(Q5) Can you think back to your experiences of establishing your 'roots'?

- What was your experience of finding accommodation, doctors, shops etc.?

Life now

(Q6) What do you 'do' at the moment?

- Job(s), hobbies? Do you enjoy what you do? What are your plans for the future?

(Q7) Where is 'home' for you?

- Has your experience of moving to the UK affected your thoughts/feelings?

(Q8) How do you find life here in the UK?

- What do you enjoy about being here? How do you feel about being away from home?
- Are there any parts about UK life that you find annoying/difficult to accommodate?

(Q9) What have been your experiences of meeting new people here?

- Making friends, meeting colleagues at work, interacting with strangers?

(Q10) What has your 'migration' enabled you to do; what opportunities have arisen?

- Jobs, relationships, friends, etc.?

Discussion points

(Q11) Consider these questions. If you have any thoughts/reactions, feel free to express them.

- Some say that migration leads to 'indigenous' people being marginalised, and to be successful, new arrivals must 'assimilate' and conform. How do you feel about this?
- Margaret Thatcher famously argued that a 'European identity' doesn't exist, as Europe could only be made up of separate countries. What does being 'European' mean to you?
- The front headline of a newspaper you buy reads: 'EU WANTS MIGRANTS TO TAKE OUR JOBS'. What are your thoughts/feelings about headlines/stories like this?
- Article 20 (p.56, para.1) of the Treaty of European Union (2012) states: "Every person holding the nationality of a Member State shall be a citizen of the Union." What nationality/ citizen identity is important to you? What do you 'call' yourself (e.g. French, European)?

Appendix v: advertisement poster

Research Opportunity

Talking about your experiences of migration to the UK

...Are you a Romanian migrant living in the UK?
...Are you over 18?
...Are you interested in talking about your experiences/views?

...then I would like to hear from <u>you</u>!

What is the study about?

This study is interested in exploring how people who identify as Romanian living in the UK talk about their experiences of movement. This will span personal reflections of decisions/expectations of movement, experiences of work/study, accommodation and acculturation, to talking more generally about the UK (e.g. media, politics).

What does participation involve?

Taking part involves a one-off interview, which will discuss topics such as:
What were your initial impressions upon arriving?
How have you found settling into your new accommodation, job, course, etc.?
What have you learned about yourself since moving?

Taking part is a chance to reflect on your experiences of movement and express any thoughts or feelings you may have about life in the UK. What is talked about in these interviews is being used as part of a PhD research project based on exploring how migration is talked about from a variety of perspectives. Anything you talk about will be kept confidential between the research team (myself and my supervisors). Your participation is voluntary and the research will only be used for research and teaching purposes.

Wait, I'm interested!

...then please get in touch! My details are provided below ((omitted)). If you know someone else who might be interested, feel free pass my details on.

Appendix vi: transcription notations used

Transcription notations were taken from Jefferson (2004) and adapted in similar vein to Griffin (2007a,b). See table v for details.

Table v: shows transcription notations used

Notation (and description)	Symbol (with example)
Micropause (<1 second)	(.)
Pause (>1second)	(1.5)
Emphasis (pronounced speech)	I <u>really</u> like it
Elongation (extended speech)	Ple::ase
Higher/lower intonation (raising/lowering voice)	hi↑gher, lo↓wer
Overlap (2 speakers at once)	I was sa[ying] [wha]t about
Latching (speaker starts as another finishes)	So cool= =yeah it was
Partial expression (speaker self-corrects)	Wha- what about that
Questionable content	I thought I would (fail)
Contextual information	((noise outside))
Question marks (noticeable inflection of tone marking query)	Are you coming or not?
Full stops (marks end of speech turn)	And that was it.
Speech marks (convey reported speech)	And she said “what about those ones?” I then said

Appendix vii: interviewer reflections

Below is a reflective response I wrote to a series of quotes taken Roulston's (2008) entry on conversational interviewing. It can be read as a supplementary material to the reflexive section in Chapter V.

Roulston: "conversational interviewing foregrounds aspects of sociability, reciprocity, and symmetry in turn taking found in mundane conversation."

Me: "I did not merely interview them, but rather, got to know them between informal conversation and traditional interviewing. For example, I often related to them as a student attending university, one which involved movement from home/the known; as a young person who shares similar European (cultural, philosophical) values; as an acquaintance who was interested in their experiences; as someone who has experienced movement, distanced relationships, or barriers to (efficient) communication. When explicitly invoking 'interviewerness', this was for the sake of using questions to guide the interaction. Otherwise the conversation was itself negotiatory as it involved my interpretations of their stories, experiences etc. So sometimes the speaker transitions are not clear-cut, as the questions ended up being pre-ambled, re-worded (and sometimes changed), jumbled around (based on topic flow), omitted, or even made-up spontaneously in order to meet the demands of the interaction"

Roulston: "facilitate a research environment in which participants feel free to participate in extended discussions of research topics in a less hierarchical environment than that convened in structured interview settings."

Me: "This manifested, for example, by my occasional continuers or responses that foregrounded my interpretation. Sometimes, some topics due to their 'place' in the interaction necessitated some context in order to 'fill in' a justification for it (e.g. relationships), thus invoking a situation where my personal identity would become used to maintain the sense of openness and participatory reflection."

Roulson: "the qualitative interview has been described variously as a "guided conversation," a "conversation with a purpose," a "professional conversation," and a "directed conversation."

Me: "participants took part knowing the topics would be based on their movements, perceptions, etc. The conversational elements

embedded within such interactions are supplementary to the environment, and helped situate the interview as less formal, but nonetheless the purpose cannot be dissolved overtly, as it is omnirelevant vis-a-vis the interviewer's discretionary power to ask questions."

Roulston: "rapport building is not necessarily facilitated in the talk *prior to* a conversation but might be thought of as being produced *by* good conversation"

Me: "by occasionally aligning with participants on delicate topics (once they finished), or feeding back impressions/ feelings/ interpretations of events etc, rapport was established ensuring that questions being asked were from someone who was interested, engaged, and compassionate, rather than just committed to data collection per se (which might have conveyed a detachment and therefore perhaps discomfort, prejudice, etc.)"

Roulston: "In everyday life, initiating conversations with strangers is a delicate task"

Me: "I treated these interactions very carefully, working towards ensuring that the participant knew that I was aware of the political and sociocultural context of the interaction; I was aware of my own identity as a young white British working-class man. My alignment with participant experiences...were also managed in relation to the possibility of being seen as personally critical or oppositional. This is very reminiscent of Condor's (2000) classic 'delicate' management of Englishness.

Roulston: "conversational interviews with strangers must be handled with sensitivity"

Me: "This involves engaging in relational interaction, whereby I may align/build on interviewee accounts to realise common understandings of identity positions and experiences."

Roulston: "researchers facilitate the kind of small talk familiar to conversationalists who have just met; for example, in Western societies, this could include observations concerning travel, weather, or occupations"

Me: "Prior to all interviews, I chatted to participants and offered them a coffee in the cafe area. Several were happy to do so, and this was a useful means of establishing some common ground prior to the interview."

Roulston: "Conversational interviewers strive to create a friendly and informal atmosphere in which participants are respected as equal partners

who are free to share their understandings concerning the research topic."

Me: "This [astmosphere] was achieved by asking questions about their background, 'trajectory', etc. prior to asking about 'immigration' as a topic more generally. My identity as an informed researcher was sometimes invoked/oriented to, both by myself (usually to situate knowledge as relevant/ legitimate) and participants (where knowledge may be oriented to as assumed), sometimes lending to the open, conversational nature of the interview."

Roulston: "conversational interviewers are open to new directions in the talk provided by participants and are likely to respond in an open and authentic way to questions that interviewees might pose to them."

Me: "I was keen to move into the directions posed by participants when available (e.g. talk of interests /hobbies, travelling experience, friendships, national identity, family, etc)."

Roulston: "The interviewer's ability to pose questions, seek further explanation, and initiate topics as part of his or her research agenda, then, tends to produce a more asymmetrical relationship than one might see in ordinary conversation between equals."

Me: "This is something I am very conscious of when reflecting on the interviews. Whilst I aspired to conduct the interview as conversationally and openly as possible (sometimes even 'biasing' [in another tradition's terms] the participant's answers), naturally there were many moments where some participants looked to me to continue the interaction by asking more questions. Of course, this constructed a distinctive power dynamic that highlighted the asymmetry of interviewer-interviewee interaction – because they did not initiate talk, they were waiting to answer my talk. That said, there were other moments where, whether by topic of conversation or through the chemistry of the relationship, aspects were very relaxed and the shadow of recorded interaction seemingly melted away."

Roulston: "there are both benefits and limitations to this approach to data generation"

Me: "In a nutshell: (+) in-depth exploration of individual cases; (+) a means of breaking down power dynamics; (+) also possible to redress insider/outsider nature of inquiry; (+) a democratised means of researching topics by situating more scrutiny on the interaction, rather than just participant answers. (-) sometimes talk can restrict and even distort interpretation; (-) never truly conversational due to the 'purpose'; (-) speaker identities (and

language) may sometimes struggle to align, and without substantive prior history, can make a 'relaxed' atmosphere more challenging and less leisurely."

Roulston: "A friendly and skilled interviewer facilitates an in-depth exchange with research participants"

Me: "In retrospect, whilst possessing the former in abundance, the latter seemed to be lacking... often, my questions pre-ambled, were perhaps asked too quickly/on the spot without enough clarity; others were a little detail-specific, when in hindsight such answers were not consequential for their story. Skill is needed to negotiate the role carefully, whereby power is exercised cautiously and in accordance with the needs of the moment. So, while ethical issues were addressed concisely, the study aims may have been too detailed/ obscure to the participant."

Roulston: "inviting reciprocity by openly responding to questions and comments from interviewees, and treating conversational partners sociably—with respect, care, and intensive listening"

Me: "As I just pointed out, of course here it is a very real possibility that I 'biased' participant answers in places. The perfect interview questions do not always lend themselves to conversation in relation to sequence. Accordingly, for example, I may have focussed on the 'type' of visa's attained by participant, which were perhaps overlooked by participants but sensitive to me due to studying the changing legal context."

Roulston: "some methodologists have referred to data generated in such exchanges as more authentic than those derived in more structured formats, others have critiqued this view of interviewing as naive and simplistic, instead emphasizing the manipulative potential of conversational interviewing. In generating disclosure from their participants via casual, friendly, and informal interview formats, researchers may be accused of manipulating their participants for personal gain"

Me: "Of course, my primary criteria was that participants were happy to reflect on the phenomenon of 'being' Romanian in the UK. Arguably, I may not have heard some stories due to my approach. For example, through my conductance of interviews in English, and the schedule's latter focus on current affairs (not specific but topical), participants may have not been given a chance to talk about something else that may have been important in their lives, but simply not asked due to my own lack of awareness. Of course these characteristics play to my agenda as a researcher, but I resolved this by 'opening up' as a researcher and relating to the

participant in ways beyond the usual conventions of being a 'neutral' researcher. Associated with a critical humanism, I outwardly endeavour to expose the taken-for-granted-ness of public discourse and focus on practices embedded within Romanian accounts managing such discourse."

Roulston: "Furthermore, data generated via conversation provide much potential for manipulation by researchers as they code, analyze, interpret, and represent speakers' words"

Me: "That said, this is a process sensitive to the workings of all qualitative researchers, which is where transparent and rigorous procedures must be employed."

Roulston: "When is it appropriate for a researcher to contribute personal accounts and views to the interaction?"

Me: "This was treated as an interactional issue, and decided in the moments where they felt 'right'; in hindsight, these weren't always right, but CI is not a science; it is an art."

Roulston: "What are the implications of a researcher's contributions to the talk for what participants say next?"

Me: " Such moments are shaped by the co-constructive practices of all of its participants as a basic assumption, although my interest in this is side-stepped for this study in favour of other concerns"

Roulston: "Given that speakers' talk routinely includes slips and repairs, what features of talk should be transcribed and how should talk be edited for final reports?"

Me: "this is a methodological question answered in relation to the level of analysis; using 'soft Jeffersonian' (e.g., includes pauses, emphasis, overlap, silence) I took the view that my own contributions should be documented by not analysed so as a to not distract from my core aims"

Roulston: "How much of a researcher's contribution to the generation of the talk should be included in reports?"

Me: "While it is documented in the appendices in more detail, for analytic purposes my concerns are with the interviewee's accounts"

Appendix viii: receiving society voice data (b): Andrew Marr Show (interviews) (x16)

See table vi for details concerning the speakers, dates and pages taken from the interview extracts for TAMS data.

Table vi: displays the Andrew Marr Show interview extract details

Interviewer-Interviewee	**broadcast on**	**No. pages taken from interviews**
Andrew Marr - Nigel Farage	(4th April, 2014)	2
Sophie Raworth - Nigel Farage	(3rd March, 2013)	1
Andrew Marr- Nigel Farage	(2nd March, 2014)	2
Andrew Marr - Nigel Farage	(6th October, 2013)	1
Andrew Marr - Douglas Carswell	(12th October, 2014)	2
Eddie Mair - Iain Duncan Smith	(17th February, 2013)	5
Andrew Marr - David Cameron	(5th January 2014)	4
Andrew Marr - David Cameron	(11th May 2014)	3
Andrew Marr - Theresa May	(11th November, 2012)	2
Andrew Marr - Theresa May	(6th October, 2013)	2
Sophie Raworth - William Hague	(3rd March, 2013)	3
Andrew Marr - Yvette Cooper	(24th November, 2013)	2
Andrew Marr - Ed Miliband	(22nd September, 2013)	2
Jeremy Vine - Chuka Umunna	(15th December, 2013)	1
Andrew Marr - Nick Clegg	(17th November, 2013)	2
Andrew Marr - Nick Clegg	(12th January, 2014)	2

Andrew Marr: Now he's been widely abused, egged and ridiculed, but Nigel Farage's insurrection against mainstream politics hasn't faltered. But there seem to be plenty of bad apples in the garden of England and tough choices ahead for UKIP's saloon bar revolutionary. Mr Farage joins me now. Mr Farage, do you think women should be banned from wearing trousers?

Nigel Farage: No.

(...)

Andrew Marr: Alright well let me ask you about something that you said yourself in an interview in the Guardian. You said that people should be worried if Romanians moved into the same street as them, and you wouldn't say the same thing about Nigerians presumably or Chinese or anybody else?

Nigel Farage: Well the question was, the question was you know "If a whole load of Romanian men moved in next door to you, would you be concerned about it?" Perhaps you would, yes.

Andrew Marr: Why?

Nigel Farage: Because you know that what has actually happened is we've opened up the doors to 4 countries that haven't recovered from communism and I'm afraid it's become a gateway for organised crime. Everybody knows that. No-one dares say it.

Andrew Marr: But I mean most Ukrainian people are presumably law abiding, god fearing, hardworking people like most Poles who've come here and so on?

Nigel Farage: Yeah. We should be able, when we decide who comes to live and work in our country, to choose not just the quantity of people that come but the quality of people as well, and any normal country would do that.

Andrew Marr: We had 4 million people come in, according to the latest figures, under the last Labour government. What happens to Britain if there's another 4 million people coming in?

Nigel Farage: Well I think it becomes a more divided society. I mean you know that's what I see. I see anger amongst our young, who find it much more difficult to get jobs than they used to. I see a lot of people who've suffered wage compression over the course of the last 10 years. They're taking home the same or less money and yet the gas bill's gone up, and that has certainly provoked a feeling that we've got a very distorted labour market. And we have divided

communities. I mean, look, we are not against immigration. We want good, positive immigration. But let's=

Andrew Marr: =Really?

Nigel Farage: Yes of course, but let's do it the way the Australians do it. Let's have a points system. Let's have people who come here that have got skills; that want to integrate into our society and will be of benefit to us. What we've currently got, and what is not being discussed at all in these European Elections, is the fact that we have an open door to 485 million people, any of whom can come – regardless whether they've got good things to 5 bring or not.

Andrew Marr: A lot of people have felt there is a whiff of racism about your party. You're saying this week that will be blown away forever?

Nigel Farage: Yes, I mean I have never believed in the past in positive discrimination. I've believed in treating everybody equally. You know I've never gone for all female shortlists or whatever. But to see what's written every day, describing my party as being racist and homophobic, we will deal with that head-on this week. And what you'll [see]

Andrew Marr: [Are] there things in the way the party organises itself and in the party's rulebook that need to change to help that process?

Nigel Farage: No. No the rulebook is very, very clear. I mean you know there are, as I mentioned earlier, former BNP activists in the Labour Party, there's a former BNP activist standing for the Conservatives in a couple of weeks' time. You know we've got rules to prevent all of that. Sometimes people don't quite tell us the truth and, yes, we need to put more resource and more money into making sure this can't happen again, but it is not representative of our party.

Andrew Marr: Well no other party leader has had to describe his members or some of his members as "idiots".

Nigel Farage: No, well no other party leader is taking on the establishment. You know we have three political parties who signed us up to a political union in Europe. That is where most of our laws are made. We have open borders which has had a very damaging effect on millions of ordinary families in this country and I'm taking on the establishment and they're fighting back. ((continues))

Sophie Raworth: Now the Liberal Democrats were jubilant after holding onto Chris Huhne's seat at the Eastleigh by-election on Thursday, but the pictures that dominated the papers afterwards were of Nigel Farage, the UK Independence Party Leader, celebrating in style. They may not have won Eastleigh, but UKIP's strong showing in a constituency where they had little track record has given them a boost. So after winning 28 per cent of the vote and pushing the Tories into third place, was it rather more than a protest vote? Well Nigel Farage joins me this morning. Good morning. You must be kicking yourself this morning because potentially if you had stood, I mean you could be sitting here as UKIP's first Member of Parliament?

Nigel Farage: Well we had a very good candidate in Diane James. There's no evidence I would have got any more votes than her

Sophie Raworth: But a lot of them, you know yourself, there was a big element of protest vote, wasn't there? I mean a lot of people were doing it, were voting UKIP because they wanted to stop other parties?

Nigel Farage: It's a rejection of our current political class who when it comes to really tough issues like open door immigration and the prospect of Romania and Bulgaria having full access to Britain next year, all they want to do is sweep it under the carpet. We're prepared to talk about it.

Sophie Raworth: Right, so your next challenge - the May elections ((continues))

Andrew Marr: UKIP's Leader, Nigel Farage, describes his party as "the biggest threat to the political establishment seen in modern times", but it's still a party without a single MP and, under our first past the post system, it may struggle to win seats at the next General Election despite opinion poll ratings in double figures. Mr Farage joins me now. Welcome. That is in a sense the problem, isn't it – that you're likely to do well in the wrong election? You'll do well in the European Elections where you've said yourself you don't really have any influence in the European Parliament, but to pull this country out of the EU you need to do well in the Parliamentary Election.

Nigel Farage: Well everybody said that in 2009. ((continues))

(...)

Andrew Marr: What about immigration? You've had a week in which immigration figures have been bouncing back up again. Is that in a way an even bigger issue for you than the EU?

Nigel Farage: Well I think that the British public now understand that we cannot have our own immigration policy; that it's utterly meaningless to set targets of tens of thousands a year, whatever you choose. We can't have any control over who comes to Britain all the while we're Members of the European Union and it's as simple as that. And I think the real concern is that if you look at the Mediterranean, you look at the Eurozone, you see how badly they're doing, there's nothing we can do to stop many hundreds of thousands of more people coming to Britain if they need to.

Andrew Marr: Why is this a problem in the sense that we're seeing you know skilled people coming from Poland and France, all around me I hear French voices, German voices? These are people with huge amounts of skill and energy helping our economy to grow. If they weren't here, we wouldn't be growing so well.

Nigel Farage: I mean the truth about open door immigration is that not only do we not choose the number that come. We also don't choose the quality. Whilst you're quite right – there are many, many people that have come from Eastern Europe who are working damn hard and if I you know was Romanian, I'd be here in Britain. Of course I would 5 because the minimum wage is nine times as high. But we also let in people who are not benefiting our economy and, frankly, to have a massive oversupply of people earning minimum wage, qualifying almost immediately for in work benefits, changing our communities in many cases where people are saying goodness me, is this the town that I know, is this where I grew up? And I think really the question here, it isn't just about money. It isn't about whether the [GDP's]

Andrew Marr: [It's ab]out nostalia?

Nigel Farage: No, I think it's about community. I think it's about a sense of who we are as a people, you know, and what we belong to. I toured the whole of England last year in the run-up to the English County Elections and I met people everywhere who said, "Nigel, we've never had a problem with immigration. You know it jollifies the place and the food's better and that's great. But how many people can we actually take? What chance have our kids got of getting jobs? You know why am I, you know whether I'm driving a lorry, whether I'm working in a factory, why am I finding that my take home pay is less than it was five years ago?" And that is be[cause]

Andrew Marr: [That] may be because of economic failure, which is being helped [by]

Nigel Farage: [It] is because we have a distorted labour market. We have a mass oversupply of unskilled, semi-skilled and in some cases skilled labour. It's driven down wages and it's hurt those at the bottom of society most.

Andrew Marr: So if (.) In UKIP's world would there be a complete ban on people coming in from the rest of the EU?

Nigel Farage: Not a complete ban on people coming. Of course not. We'd operate a work permit 6 system and a work permit [scheme]

Andrew Marr: [Because] you've talked about Australia, haven't you?

Nigel Farage: Yes! And I'm not against…let me make this [clear]

Andrew Marr: [And in] net terms, they have got higher immigration than we've got and proportionally they've got higher immigration than we've got=

Nigel Farage: =Yes=

Andrew Marr: =under the Australian system which you want for us?

Nigel Farage: But they're quite a big country. There's quite a lot of room. If you travel round London and you travel round this country on the motorways and the underground system, you know=

Andrew Marr: =Without offending Australians watching, most of it is sand.

Nigel Farage: Well a lot of it is sand, but you can build things on sand. I mean that happened in Dubai and elsewhere. What the Australians have is quality control. What I would like to see us get to is a situation where we've sorted out who is here legally, who is here illegally – and that's a big problem that isn't even being discussed at the

moment – and on an ongoing basis to have an immigration policy based on quality control. Surely that makes sense?

Andrew Marr: Does it mean perhaps that you have to kow-tow a little bit to the liberal media because I'm sure some of the things that were said, that you wouldn't actually be personally outraged about, but you have to pretend to be outraged because that's what the media want.

Nigel Farage: What it means is that we have got to focus on our key questions. Look, we are challenging the liberal elite, the media, the middle class on major issues like immigration, the Romanian and Bulgarian entry next year. You know, we are not here trying to win friends amongst the liberal elite but we are here to focus on our main policies and Godfrey's problem was he kept making comments about women. That's not part of our manifesto.

Andrew Marr: No, indeed. Turning then to the policies that are part of your manifesto, let's talk about immigration since Theresa May is going to be joining us later on. In Nigel Farage world, what should she be bringing forward to deal with the issue of immigration right now. 2

Nigel Farage: Well, I think what's really interesting is that at the three big speeches, Labour, Lib Dem and Conservative, not one of them mentioned the fact that we're opening the doors to Romania and Bulgaria next year. Now Theresa May this morning in the Sunday Times is saying she'll deport foreign criminals. Well, can she tell us please what she's going to do about Romanian criminals and can she tell us what she's going to do about the fact we're opening up the door next year to more foreign, sadly Romanian criminals. So the honest truth is I'm challenging them and saying, are you prepared to do anything.

Andrew Marr: Do you feel that you can't actually do anything while we are part of the European Court of Human Rights=

Nigel Farage: =I think there are two things. Firstly as part of the ECHR, there isn't much we can do. But secondly, as a member of the European Union we cannot control our own borders and that's what really, when the referendum comes, I think that will be the central issue. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Now then, 6 weeks ago the then Conservative MP Douglas Carswell cast a cloud over David Cameron's summer when he defected from the Tories and joined UKIP. Two days ago, he won a by-election in his old seat of Clacton to become UKIP's first elected MP. Welcome Mr Carswell. Tomorrow morning you're back in the House of Commons again, now sitting on the opposition benches. Presumably the first thing that you'll be doing is looking around for other people who might make the same journey as you?

Douglas Carswell: Well the first thing I want to do is push forward Zac Goldsmith's excellent Recall Bill. I believe in recall so strongly. I recalled myself and there's a good chance we can get that onto the statute book. I want to build a coalition across the House and see if we can make that happen.

(...)

Andrew Marr: Yes. But if you take something else that Nigel Farage said – and we exactly understand what he was saying – he said on a train he was appalled by the number of foreign languages he was hearing around him. He seems to at the very least have a very different tone from Douglas Carswell.

Douglas Carswell: I would never (.) I'm comfortable with Britain as it is. I put it like this during the campaign when I was asked this question by people in Clacton. There is a doctor in my constituency who was born in Romania and people queue up outside her surgery to get to see her every day. That is the issue – the fact they have to queue. I think actually we could do with some more skilled doctors in our corner of Essex. We need an Australian-type system that would allow that.

Andrew Marr: So you have a more inclusive approach perhaps than what people think of as being the traditional UKIP view?

Douglas Carswell: Look, anger and pessimism are not nice things and they can only animate and motivate people for a short period of time. What we need is sunshine. We need optimism and we need a vision. The reason why some people feel pessimistic is because our political leadership in Westminster has failed to offer an optimistic, inclusive alternative.

Andrew Marr: Yes.

Douglas Carswell: I think UKIP can do that. UKIP can be the force for change that this country so desperately needs.

Andrew Marr: I don’t know if you heard the weather forecast, but it wasn’t sunny. Douglas Carswell, thank you very much indeed for joining us. ((continues))

Eddie Mair: The government got a bloody nose in the courts this week over some of its Back to Work programmes and what became known as the "Poundland case". Undeterred, it's determined to tweak the benefit system further in preparation for the arrival of who knows how many Romanians and Bulgarians next year. As from January 1st, there will be no restriction on how many choose to come to the UK to seek work and claim benefits like anyone else who lives here. The Prime Minister this week said that he feared people might come to Britain to "take advantage of us" and added that there's "a lot more to do to make sure we're not a soft touch". Well the Work and Pensions Secretary, Iain Duncan Smith, is here. Good morning to you.

Iain Duncan Smith: Good morning.

(...)

Eddie Mair: Let's turn to Romanians and Bulgarians. The Mail today says there's a secret Chequers summit planned for Thursday on scroungers and illegal immigrants. The Prime Minister will be there, George Osborne will be there, the Chief of Staff at No. 10 will be there, the polling guru Lynton Crosby will be there.

Iain Duncan Smith: Yeah.

Eddie Mair: And I searched the article. I didn't see your name. Are you in on this secret meeting or?

Iain Duncan Smith: Well I have to tell you that I've already had a meeting with the Prime Minister and the team of people last week about coordinating this and I had a separate meeting with the Home Secretary. She, myself, Eric Pickles and others are all discussing how to make sure that there are no loopholes and that we close down as many as possible.

Eddie Mair: So what have you come up with?

Iain Duncan Smith: Well exactly let's get the position right. We have under benefits a thing called "habitual residency" tests, which we apply to anybody coming in whether they be from Europe or elsewhere, and it is the idea that are you here genuinely to be a resident or are you simply coming here to get hold of benefits. My Job Centre staff have a lot of flexibility as to how they apply that. They look at things like leasing arrangements, they look at the time they've spent here, what kind of work they've taken up.

Eddie Mair: Sure, this is how the system works at the moment. I'm talking about how do you close the loopholes?

Iain Duncan Smith: *(over)* Exactly my point. Well what I'm trying to say to you is we are able to be 6 reasonably tight with these people. What we can do, and it's what we're doing, we're looking at the way we apply some of those benefits - for example whether or not they are contributory benefits or not, whether we can enlarge that process; and whether or not those individuals, we can lengthen the time that we look at in terms of their leasing arrangements - for example is it feasible for us to look at whether somebody has a leasing arrangement lasting nine months, a year, rather than just a matter of months. So these are areas we're tightening up before this starts next year and I believe we will be able to tighten this up. We have, I must say though Eddie, we have one big battle here. It's all to do with the European Union. They are [already]

Eddie Mair: [Take] on Europe again.

Iain Duncan Smith: Well of course, I love to do that. They're already trying to infract me over the strength of our position on the habitual residency tests. They're trying to say that we don't have a right to have any kind of test. So that's a big battle that I'm having with the Europeans. But it's not just us though, I have to say. You know people like the Dutch and the Scandinavians are all on our side. So there's a big fight. We think, all of us - those Northern European countries - we need to tighten up. So we've got a number of countries on our side and I think we will be able to tighten up and make those regulations much tougher for people coming in just to take advantage of our benefit system.

Eddie Mair: Well, look, I might suggest some helpful possibilities to you …

Iain Duncan Smith: *(over)* Always ready to hear=

Eddie Mair: =in just a moment, but I'm interested. We know the government hasn't released any figures for the=

Iain Duncan Smith: =Yeah.

Eddie Mair: estimates of Romanians and Bulgarians who might come here. It's one thing not to release them, but have they been compiled?

Iain Duncan Smith: Not to my knowledge.

Eddie Mair: You haven't seen any statistics?

Iain Duncan Smith: No, no, no, I've asked whether or not there is any reasonable or rational figure that can be gained. And to be honest with you, the last government got it so badly wrong, it just shows you that estimating the numbers coming through is incredibly difficult.

Eddie Mair: Is it pointless?

Iain Duncan Smith: I think it is pretty pointless trying to estimate it because the last government said there'd only be a few thousand and we ended up with some couple of million people actually coming in from different countries. Can I say that if you look at where the Romanians have gone already, you get a better picture. For example, the majority of the Romanians have settled at the moment in Germany and ironically in Spain where I thought there was a real problem with jobs, but they're settling in Spain.

Eddie Mair: Nicer weather.

Iain Duncan Smith: Well probably better weather. I don't know about the benefits, but the Spanish 8 government is trying to work with us now to tighten that up. So the majority have shown that they wanted to go to Germany and Spain. We are ready though to make sure that they can't come here and claim benefits. And can I just say one thing. The last government did not - and this is important - they did not record which migrants coming in here were then receiving benefits. We're going to record that now, so we will know exactly how many people are here and if they get access to benefits who they are, and then we'll be able to tighten up on it.

Eddie Mair: In your opinion, are Roma potentially more of a problem than other Romanians and Bulgarians?

Iain Duncan Smith: No, I don't look at any one sub-category of groups of people. I just look at people coming in who we think don't and shouldn't have a right to claim benefits because they've made no contribution to the tax bill, national insurance bill. So that's really the guiding figure I have. I don't sub-divide any particular group.

Eddie Mair: Because you'll remember President Sarkozy in France managed to repatriate dozens of Roma. Don't you fancy that?

Iain Duncan Smith: Yeah, I'm not in France and I'm not President Sarkozy. My view on life is very simple: that we make sure that our door is shut to those who want to come and claim benefits and is open to those who want to come and contribute and help work and make this economy good and strong. And you know there is good economic reason for some migration coming in and it's important to notice that we've actually approached this on a wider range. The Home Secretary, through the changes that we've made, has already cut net migration by a quarter, so that's really important. So we've begun to get a grip of what was a system completely out of control under the last government, and that's the key thing. I wouldn't start picking on individual groups. I don't think there's point in that. 9

Eddie Mair: Alright, so you're going to make sure that the only people who are here are the people who should be here. What about what they can (.) well not only what they can claim, but what they can send back home when they're here.

Iain Duncan Smith: Yeah.

Eddie Mair: David Blunkett, former Home Secretary, thinks it's crackers that taxpayers are funding child benefit for children who don't even live in this country. Are you going to stop that?

Iain Duncan Smith: Well I love (.) I'm very fond of David Blunkett and I love it when he expounds about how terrible it is when he sat for thirteen years and did absolutely nothing [about it].

Eddie Mair: [Whatever], let's talk about the policy.

Iain Duncan Smith: Well you know let's be clear about this. Labour criticises us. They did absolutely nothing to cut net migration. So I'm happy to take this question.

Eddie Mair: Child benefit.

Iain Duncan Smith: Let me explain what the reason is here. Under the European Free Movement rules, that if an individual comes to work in another member state then what happens is the child provisions for that state are then netted out against what they would receive in their own home country; and if it's a higher figure, the net figure is then transferred across to their family in that country. Do I agree with that? Absolutely not. Does the government agree with that? No. Our problem is we will have to change that by 10 speaking and going very strongly in terms of the commission to say this is really absurd now that people will come over simply to attract a benefit which is higher than theirs. And so there's a big issue here for us, for countries that have big and good support for children, like we do and Germany does. You know there is a sense (.) we're discussing with them about how we can change that, so we're already on that case and we're trying to reverse and to change that process.

Eddie Mair: It's going to be part of David Cameron's big [European]

Iain Duncan Smith: [Absolutely], it's critical to this. And I have to tell you, the Prime Minister's very strong on this one. And I made this point to him the other day when we were speaking - this is completely crackers - but of course this is what we inherited after thirteen years of a Labour government that let the floodgates open to everybody coming in who wished to.

Eddie Mair: Turning to the attitude you think this might portray or perhaps betray about the British government's view of Romanians, I mean the leaders in Romania say look we are European citizens and they wonder why they are being singled out.

Iain Duncan Smith: They're not actually being singled out because this rule and the changes that we make to our habitual residency tests and the tightening up that we're talking about would apply to everybody, and this is a whole process of saying, look, people shouldn't use the Free Movement rules just to travel around looking for the best benefit that they can get. And that's the critical bit that the commission's got to understand. That's why when you asked me the question about the Roma, etcetera, I don't see it like that. I see it simply on this basis - that social security and welfare has never been in the province of the European Union and now they're trying to reach in to make that happen, so they can take control of it - and we should say no, this is set by national government.

Eddie Mair: Have you considered just using Britain from the Free Movement directive?

Iain Duncan Smith: No because what happens then, of course, we are beneficiaries as much as anybody else is about many British people going to work abroad. So it's getting the balance right. We want people to be able to travel to work, but we don't want them to be able to travel to take benefits, and so it's locking the door to people's access to benefits simply because that's all they wanted to come here. And I think most people - most British people certainly and I suspect most Germans, most Swedes, most Danes - would nod their heads in agreement with me when I say that because that's what we get from their governments when we talk to them. They're all kind of in agreement something needs to change. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Prime Minister, welcome.

David Cameron: Good morning.

Andrew Marr: Can I start by asking about immigration. You were kind of quite severely criticised by Vince Cable on this programme, over the language on immigration, but I put it to you that the biggest problem we have, is that we have no idea of the numbers we're taking about. You must have some notion of how many Bulgarian and Romanian immigrants are likely to come in over the five years and so on. But until you give us that figure, we can't really have a sensible conversation about it, can we.

David Cameron: Well, I don't agree with that, I mean we're not making a forecast because I think it's unlikely we'd get that forecast right. Because remember, it's not just Britain that's had to lift its controls at the end of seven years of transitional controls, they're also being lifted in France and in Germany and eight other European countries; so to try and make a forecast I think would be wrong. I think my job, what's much more important is to put in place the measures that make sure that people who do come here are coming here to work and not to claim benefits. And that's what I've done.

Andrew Marr: I'd like to come on to the benefits thing but just on the forecasts, I mean it would be completely bonkers, given the effect on schools, on welfare bills, on the NHS, to have no idea of the numbers coming in. So you must have a number, you must [have]

David Cameron: [I don't] have a number=

Andrew Marr: =You've no idea how many=

David Cameron: =I haven't made a forecast, because, as I say, you'd be trying to forecast how many people will come to Britain, rather than to the other eight European countries. The last forecast, that was made by the last Labour government at the time of Poland's accession to the EU, where they put in no transitional controls, was a ludicrous forecast of 14,000 and it turned out that over a million people came. I don't want to repeat that mistake. I believe in learning from that mistake, having transitional controls for as long as possible. Looking when future countries join the European Union, having transitional controls that either go on much, much longer or actually having a test, so that if their wages are much lower, then perhaps you delay entry to our labour market for far, far longer, until that changes.

Andrew Marr: Migration Watch, who did get it much righter last time round, this time say about 50,000 a year, they think – so a quarter of a million people over five years. Is that ludicrously too high, ludicrously too low?

David Cameron: I mean, you're going to try and tempt me in to making a forecast – I'm not going to make a forecast. My job, I think, is to put in place

proper controls, so people can't come here to claim benefits. To put in proper controls so we investigate that people aren't being paid less than the minimum wage, to make sure we deal with illegal immigrants, to make sure that if people can't sustain themselves here, they are removed from our country – all those steps we'll be taking.

Andrew Marr: Is it acceptable therefore that Romanians or Bulgarians or anybody else working here, who have maybe four or five children back home, not in Britain, can claim child benefit in Britain and remit the money straight back to=

David Cameron: =Well, I don't think that is right and that is something I want to change. It is something, it is a situation that I inherited. I think you can change it. I think it will take time because we either have to change it by getting agreement with other European countries and there are other European countries, who like me, think it's wrong that someone from Poland, who comes here, who works hard and I am absolutely all in favour of that – but I don't think they should be paying, we should be paying child benefit, to their family back at home in Poland. To change that you've either got to change it with other European countries at the moment or potentially change it through the Treaty change that I'll be putting in place before the referendum that we'll hold on Britain's membership of the EU, by the end of 2017.

Andrew Marr: What about the measure to charge people for emergency NHS treatment? That's, as many people say, bureaucratically impossible and yet you're committed to it I think.

David Cameron: No, we should do it. I think that you know=

Andrew Marr: =Are you sure you can do it?

David Cameron: Yes, we can, we can. Look. People – our NHS is a national treasure. We can all be incredibly proud of it and it's right that we all pay in to it and everyone here has access to it for free but people who come to our country, who don't have the right to use it, should be charged for it and we're putting that in place.

Andrew Marr: The immigration cap, I think 75,000 - again, Vince Cable and others, plenty of others, including in your own party say, trouble is, it's illegal, you wouldn't be able to do it. 3 David Cameron: Well, first of all we have an immigration cap which is for non-EU migrants=

David Cameron: =well, just to explain to the viewers at home, migrants from outside the European Union, who are coming here for economic reasons, we have a cap on that which Labour opposed; they never put in place and we've put in place. But what, what we're looking at for the future is as new countries join the EU, what sort of arrangements can we put in place for them and also, as we re-negotiate our position in Europe, can we have tougher measures on migration in=

Andrew Marr: =So it's not a current cap. It's not a cap for Bulgarians and [Romanian]

David Cameron: [these are a]ll what was being referred to, these are all options for the future, as we re-negotiate our position in the EU.

Andrew Marr: Would you agree, that as you look at our relationship with the EU, the free movement of peoples inside the EU has become, possibly the key issue to discuss.

David Cameron: Well, I think that there are good parts to movement within the EU. There are many British people who take advantage of going to live and work elsewhere and Britain has benefited and will continue to benefit from people with skills, coming to Britain and contributing to our economy but I think what has got – I think two things have gone wrong. One is movement to claim benefits and we need to crack down on that. There is a problem there. I think secondly what's gone wrong, and I don't think the people who founded the EU, ever believed this was going to happen, is the scale of the movements have been so big. As I said, when Poland and the other eight countries… Hungary and others, Latvia and Lithuania, when they joined the European Union and Britain didn't, under Labour put any controls on at all, one and a half million people initially came from those countries to Britain, that is a massive population move and I think we need proper and better controls. So I think it is an issue, it's an issue I want to address in the re-negotiation that we take [part in]

Andrew Marr: [There] must be different rules before the next group of countries accede=

David Cameron: =On, on that, that is absolutely achievable because every time a new country joins the European Union, there is actually unanimity, there has to be unanimity around the council table, in Europe, about what the arrangements are. So Britain will be able to insists, for future countries joining, we'll be able to insist on a tougher, a more robust regime.

Andrew Marr: Broadly speaking, do you think immigration at the levels we've seen over the last ten years has been good for Britain or bad for Britain?

David Cameron: Well it's been too high. Look, I'm in favour of managed migration. Migrants bring a benefit to Britain, they come here, they work hard, they contribute. Many of them become British citizens, but the fact is that over the last decade it's been too high. We saw net migration, for the decade under Labour of 2.3 million people; that's two cities the size of Birmingham, the scale was too big, the pace was too fast and it wasn't properly managed and thought through. Peter Mandelson said, I think it might have been on this programme, Peter Mandelson said the last Labour government sent out search parties to look for migrants to come to Britain. But the real key here Andrew is actually not just our immigration policy, there's a three-sided coin here. Immigration, welfare and

education, if get our education system right, if we get our welfare system right, we'll be able to get more British young people in to the jobs that have been made available and that will reduce the pull factor into the UK of people who want to come here to work.

Andrew Marr: As you know, net immigration is actually going up at the moment. 186 thousand last year, up from the previous year.

David Cameron: Well it's, it's down almost a third since I became Prime Minister, so I said we wanted to get net migration down=

Andrew Marr: =To tens of thousands.

David Cameron: I said we want to get it to the tens of thousands, we're not there yet, but it has to come down by just less than a third and we need to do more. We've done a lot. We've done things like closing down bogus colleges. When I became Prime Minister, there were a lot of bogus colleges that were attracting people in to Britain, claiming to be students, who were actually going to work. Now, I don't blame those people, of course, if you haven't got the money, you're living on the other side of the world, of course you want to come to Britain, but it's got to be managed.

Andrew Marr: If I go to America, I get a slip of paper and have to tear off part of it and they know when I leave again.

David Cameron: Yeah.

Andrew Marr: We don't have that system. It's very, very hard for us to measure who goes out and that's a really big problem.

David Cameron: Again, absolutely right. We're putting that in place, so as well as proper entry controls, you need proper exit controls, so you can see who's gone and we are putting that in place=

Andrew Marr: =When will those be?

David Cameron: That will be over the next couple of years, what is known as the e-borders scheme and linked to the e-borders scheme, these exit checks they will be put in place.

Andrew Marr: Okay, let's turn to Europe ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Now the Prime Minister faces an insurgency over Europe both inside the Conservative Party and from UKIP. The real question for millions of voters is whether they can trust David Cameron to negotiate a transformed relationship within the EU and give Britain a referendum. What exactly are his demands? Are they realistic? And is this, as he says, "one last chance for our European future"? Good morning, Prime Minister.

David Cameron: Good morning.

Andrew Marr: Let's talk largely, if you don't mind, today about Europe since it is the big issue in front of people's minds at the moment. ((continues))

(...)

David Cameron: But again this is a very optimistic outlook because you know UKIP are saying put up the barriers, we can't succeed and compete in the modern world, let's give up on Europe altogether. Labour and the Liberals seem to me basically to be saying there's not really anything wrong with Europe. ((Marr tries to interject)) We are the only party with a very [clear]

Andrew Marr: [Now] you'll be surprised to hear that I'd like to talk about your views more=

David Cameron: =Yeah, absol[utely]

Andrew Marr: [Okay] well let's move on=

David Cameron: =and a plan perhaps to sort this out.

Andrew Marr: You also mentioned an end to benefit tourism. Now the EU has more or less accepted a three month moratorium on people coming into this country before they can claim benefits. Organisations like Migration Watch have said no, no, no, five years before people can claim benefits if they're coming to this country. Is that the kind of thing in concrete terms that you want when you say "I want an end to benefit tourism"?

David Cameron: I think there are two parts to this. One is we need to make sure that the freedom to move to work is about that – it's to go and get a job, not to claim – and so I would like to see longer periods in terms of before you're allowed to claim any benefits.

Andrew Marr: How much longer?

David Cameron: Well let's look at what is possible, but certainly longer than what we have today.

Andrew Marr: Several years?

David Cameron: Longer than what we have today. But there's another very important element to this, which is today if you travel and work from another European country into Britain, you can then claim child benefit and other benefits for your family back at home even though actually they're not living in the UK and going to UK schools and all the rest of it. And under the current rules, it seems extremely difficult, if not impossible, to change that. Now I haven't met anybody who thinks this is sensible=

Andrew Marr =That is a big demand.

David Cameron: so that is again a really big change

Andrew Marr: But on the general principle of the free movement of people - Nigel Farage talking about four hundred million people could come here after your job and all the rest of it – you have no proposals to end the free movement of people?

David Cameron: I think free movement within the European Union is important, but it needs to be returned to the original concept, which was the freedom to be able to go and work in another country. Now many British citizens go and work in other European countries. Other European citizens come to work here. Freedom to apply for a job to go and work in another country, that is one thing, but I think what we've seen recently is something else.

Andrew Marr: So free movement of people would stay after the referendum in the way that you've described it. Let me turn to something else which is related to that, which is the expansion of the EU because the borders are always moving east, and Britain has been among the countries for instance supporting the accession of Turkey to the EU. Now you want longer transitional controls, but, as the name suggests, they are just transitional controls. So David Cameron could negotiate this deal successfully, have a successful referendum, and then a few years down the line we could have everybody currently working in Turkey free to come and work here.

David Cameron: Well I've argued very clearly that we need longer transitional controls and possibly transitional controls agreed on a totally different basis. You get these big migratory flows when you have countries with very different levels of income, so the massive move that there was from Poland and the other countries that joined in [2004]

Andrew Marr: [And] including Bulgaria and Romania.

David Cameron: was based on the fact that the income levels were so different. So you could have transitional controls that say, for instance, you don't have the freedom to move and get a job in another country until, say, your level of income per capita is at a certain level. Now that would be a way of avoiding some of the difficulties we've had in the past. Again you know=

Andrew Marr: =Do you think that's sellable?

David Cameron: Yes I think it is because all future accessions, new countries joining the European Union, they have to be agreed by unanimity, so you have a block, you have a very clear say about that issue. And again you know I am I think quite rightly responding to what has happened in Europe in recent years.

Andrew Marr: Sure.

David Cameron: You know the fact that after 2004 you know about a million people move from parts of Eastern Europe to Britain – I think net now about 700,000 – that has changed our country, it's changed our political culture, and it's right that politicians and prime ministers=

Andrew Marr: =For better or for worse?

David Cameron: I think a lot of the people who've come have contributed a huge amount in terms of working in our economy, but I think it's absolutely right to grip this issue and have a plan for sorting it out. Let me make one last point because I think again this is something that the Conservatives and I totally understand and I think the other parties are forgetting. Immigration policy is meaningless on its own. It's got to be accompanied by welfare reform, so it pays for people in our own country to work rather than not to work, and it's got to be accompanied by very robust educational reform, so actually we're producing from our schools and colleges people who've got all of the skills necessary to compete in today's world. And what you can see with this government is a long-term economic plan that includes schools and skills being the best in Europe for our young people and also a welfare revolution in fact which is [about]

Andrew Marr: [Which] is tougher?

David Cameron: Well it is, I mean it already is. We [have]

Andrew Marr: [I kn]ow.

David Cameron: we are seeing Some people would say tough, but actually there's a very compassionate side to it. We're seeing at the moment around a hundred people every week coming off benefits and into work simply because of the welfare cap, because the welfare cap is

working in terms of encouraging people to go out to work and to help provide stability and se[curity]

Andrew Marr: [Okay], I'd love to talk about welfare, but today I want to try and concentrate on Europe if you don't mind. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: My next guest, Theresa May, enthused the Tory conference with her tough words about immigration. She was widely applauded for refusing an American demand that a British internet hacker should be extradited. This week's police commissioner elections are close to her heart, but they haven't excited very much enthusiasm around the country. She's also been toying with the idea of a single big inquiry into the child abuse stories (real and imagined) which have made so much mayhem, including of course at the BBC. Home Secretary, welcome. Perhaps I could start by asking you about the BBC? What's your reaction to last night's news and how serious do you think the crisis is? I mean what needs to be done next?

Theresa May: Well I think it was the right decision that George Entwistle took last night to resign.

Andrew Marr: Let's turn to immigration. David Cameron famously said he wanted it to be down to tens of thousands. You're nowhere near that. It's still enormous compared with his ambition. And I think the number of people as it were who've absconded, we don't know where they were who've come into this country is something like the population of Iceland. There is a real problem of grip here, isn't there?

Theresa May: On the (.) First of all in relation to the tens of thousands, that is still our aim - that we will get migration down to the tens of thousands. In the last figures, which were to the end of last December, we saw the first significant fall - 30,000 fewer net migrants - first significant fall for many years. And if we look at the visas situation to June of this year, June 2012, we see a significant cut in the number of visas, particularly in students - 90,000 down just by actually getting out abuse of the system. So there's more work to be done. There is=

Andrew Marr: =There's a huge amount more work to be done.

Theresa May: There's a huge amount more work to be done and there is more work to be done on enforcement. We're stepping up our enforcement activity. So we are acting across the board on this, but we still have that intention. Immigration has been good, but it needs to be controlled and that's what we're doing.

Andrew Marr: The archive is getting bigger though, isn't it, of the cases that haven't been resolved?

Theresa May: We are stepping up our (.) There are some issues to deal with in the UK Borders Agency, but we are stepping up our enforcement activity. We are now you know removing more people, we are getting more people on planes to countries where they should be

rather than here. But this does take time. This is not something that you can wave a magic wand and suddenly it changes overnight.

Andrew Marr: Yes. Do you think there is a realistic practical chance of delaying the arrival of Romanian and Bulgarian free migration to this country? Yvette Cooper, your opposite number, said that Labour would support you on that, but the legal position vis-à-vis the EU is very, very difficult to turn round.

Theresa May: Well I'm looking at free movement generally across the EU.

Andrew Marr: Yuh.

Theresa May: ((coughs)) Originally it was free movement of workers. It's been extended through gradually over the years and I'm looking at this in three areas. First of all, there is a growing group of countries in the European Union who are very concerned about the 8 abuse of free movement. That's looking particularly at issues like sham marriage, forged documents and so forth, and we're working together to reduce abuse of free movement. I will be looking at the transitional controls on Romania and Bulgaria end December 2013. I will be looking at what we call the pull factors - what is it that attracts people sometimes to come over here to the United Kingdom - so looking at issues about benefits and access to the health service and things like that. And then we're doing a wider piece of work across matters relating to Europe more generally but including free movement about that balance of powers between us and the EU.

Andrew Marr: But it's really quite soon now that the Bulgarian and Romanian issue will be tested by people arriving at our airports and our ports and the question is are you going to be able to stop them coming in?

Theresa May: There are no further transitional controls that we can put on=

Andrew Marr: =So the answer is no=

Theresa May: =but the transitional controls end in December 2013, but that's where the importance of looking at some of the issues about what it is that is attracting people to come here in terms of things like our benefit system and access to the National Health Service is so important. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Right. Nigel Farage was raising the subject, not surprisingly of the Romanian and Bulgarian influx as he sees it, coming. Is there anything you can do to, we've delayed it for a few years but now it's going to happen next year. If like other come that will blow out of the water all your statistics on immigration won't it?

Theresa May: Well what we're doing in relation to Romanian and Bulgarians who may come here after the transitional controls are lifted, but more generally, is exactly the sort of issues that we've just been talking about. So we are looking at reducing what I call the pull factors, the factors that might lead somebody to want to come here. So that we are tightening up on the benefit system, so looking at the qualifications, the criteria for somebody to actually have access to benefits=

Andrew Marr: =Mr Farage says that London is in the grip of a Romanian crime wave. Do you think that's exaggerated or scare mongering.

Theresa May: Well we've been doing some work, our UK Visas section has been doing some work with the Metropolitan police in recent months and over the last 18 months, something like a thousand foreign criminals, just over a thousand foreign criminals have been deported, removed, as a result of the work which has been a closer integration between the Metropolitan police and UK Visas and we're now extending that over the country. About a third of the population of London are foreign nationals and about a third of the crime is committed by foreign nationals. But we're taking greater powers to be able to remove people from the country.

Andrew Marr: What about these notorious vans that have been going around, or highly controversial vans I should say, saying basically go home. Are they going to stop – is that a pilot scheme that's now finished or are we going to see more of those?

Theresa May: That was a pilot scheme. That scheme has now finished. We now need to evaluate it to see what the impact was. The purpose was to encourage those who are here illegally to go home voluntarily and obviously 5 there is a benefit to government if people do that. But what I'm clear about is [that]

Andrew Marr: [It w]as heavily criticised for the tone. I'm just wondering whether you've, as it were taken that lesson and said yes, okay, we've moved on from that. We don't go back to that.

Theresa May: Well, what we do is evaluate and once I've seen the results of that evaluation, we can make a decision about the impact of those vans. I think from the public's point of view, I think what they want to see is a government that is clearly doing everything it can to remove people from this country who have no right to be here, who are here illegally and that's what we are doing.

Andrew Marr: Do you think it worked so far? There's been a lot of criticism saying these vans didn't work anyway.

Theresa May: Well, I'm waiting to see the evaluation.

Andrew Marr: Okay.

Theresa May: I'm not going to pluck an answer off the shelf, I need to see proper work that says what was the impact of these and then we can look at that carefully and in a very considered way. ((continues))

865
866 Sophie Raworth: Now the civil war in Syria has been raging for two years now.
867 The UN believes some 70,000 people have died and a million
868 have fled the country as refugees. Last week America
869 announced they were giving $60 million in what they're calling
870 "non-lethal aid" to Syrian opposition groups - the first direct
871 supplies to the rebels. But what the rebels really want are
872 weapons, so will they get them? Well I'm joined now by the
873 Foreign Secretary William Hague. Good morning.

874 William Hague: Good morning.

875 (...)

876 Sophie Raworth: But look at what UKIP (.) I mean they got a lot of (.) Well you
877 know some of the vote was protest, but a lot of people seem to
878 have been drawn to UKIP because of the issue of immigration -
879 the fears particularly about the number of Romanians and
880 Bulgarians who are going to be coming to this country as of
881 next year. You've got figures, haven't you? You've got
882 estimates. How many do you actually think are going to be
883 turning up or is it all scaremongering?

884 William Hague: No, we don't have estimates on that. What we do have=

885 Sophie Raworth: =There's no government estimate?

886 William Hague: The figures are the figures that came out this week - that
887 immigration is down by a third after a completely open door
888 policy operated [by the]

889 Sophie Raworth: [I'm talk]ing about Romanians and Bulgarians.

890 William Hague: Yes, I know, but there are no secret estimates of that. We do
891 have the actual figures of what's happening to immigration and
892 it's coming down, thanks to the policies of the government.
893 Now in a by-election, of course, people can have a bit of an
894 indulgence, but a general election is a choice. And at the next
895 general election, do people want a government that has really
896 brought down immigration, this one, or a Labour government
897 that threw open the doors completely?

898 Sophie Raworth: Okay, let me just ask you two points there. Okay, first of all,
899 Romanians and Bulgarians - are you saying to me you have
900 absolutely no idea; there are no assessments, you have no clue
901 how many people, because obviously Migration Watch are
902 saying quarter of a million people over the next five years? 9

903 William Hague: I don't think anybody can give you an accurate forecast [of that]

Sophie Raworth: [That's ra]ther worrying, isn't it?

William Hague: because the European Union, of course a fundamental principle of that is the free movement of people and British people benefit enormously from that. So yes we will have that, but we will also be careful to make sure that benefit tourism comes to an end. That has to be tackled so that people are not drawn to one … not drawn to our country or any country in particular just by being attracted by the benefit system.

Sophie Raworth: So Migration Watch's figures, so you think they're just (.) it's impossible to guess; it's nonsense to?

William Hague: I think it is guesswork.

Sophie Raworth: But that is really worrying. So you have no clue how many people are going to come to this country as of next year?

William Hague: I'm saying that it would be guesswork to come to such a figure. The important thing is to make sure that people are not drawn artificially into the United Kingdom from any of the countries of the European Union. Most Romanian and Bulgarian people who live in other countries don't live in Britain. That's not where their diaspora has gone over recent years. That can be of some reassurance to people. But of course there isn't a (.) there's no magical secret figure. What we should continue to do is to bring down the total of immigration into this country, which we are doing=

Sophie Raworth: =And put people off coming (.) and put people off coming? There's a story in one of the papers this morning saying that you know new immigrants will potentially have their access to the NHS limited. Is that the kind of thing you're looking at?

William Hague: Well it's important there aren't artificial perverse incentives, if you like, for people to come to the UK - to come for that reason.

Sophie Raworth: So you are looking at that?

William Hague: So yes we are looking in government at what more we can do to make sure that is controlled, that that is fair across Europe. And I think people would expect us to do that; that's absolutely right - again something that never happened under the last government. And the next general election will be a choice between tackling these sorts of things or the last government that never did any of it.

Sophie Raworth: And benefits as well - you'd curb benefits for new immigrants?

William Hague: Well benefit tourism can't be allowed. We are of course getting the whole benefit system under control. We've introduced

(against Labour opposition) the cap on benefits, so that no family on benefits can receive more than the average household can receive by going out to work. These are our essential reforms. Our reforms of housing benefit, essential reforms of the benefit system. The next general election is a choice between do you want to go back to Ed Balls running the economy and no discipline on these things at all, or do you want yes the difficult challenges, the hard work that we're having to put in to make these changes? And I think people want those changes. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Two years ago Labour set up what it called a "heavyweight independent review" of policing. At that time, the Shadow Home Secretary said the review was Labour's response to the Government's "cack-handed reforms". Yvette Cooper told her party conference in 2011 that the Tories were taking a "reckless risk" with a fight against crime by cutting budgets. Well the results of Labour's police review, headed by the former Met Chief Lord Stevens, will be made public this week, and Yvette Cooper joins me now.

Yvette Cooper: Good morning.

(...)

Andrew Marr: Jack Straw said that Labour in government made a spectacular mistake on the number of people coming in from the EU, not introducing more controls and so on. Do you agree with that?

Yvette Cooper: Well Ed Miliband and I have already said it was the wrong thing to do not to have those transitional controls in place. I think it was a concern. There were obviously mistakes made about you know the impact in terms of the numbers, but also, you know, we should also have done more about things like the impact on the labour market as well.

Andrew Marr: Sure. Under Labour, I think two and a half million or so people came in. Was that too many people? You said in the past the rate of increase was too fast, but was it too many people overall during that period?

Yvette Cooper: What we said is that as a result of things like the lack of transitional controls=

Andrew Marr: =You're going to have to yes or no on this, I'm afraid=

Yvette Cooper: =the pace of immigration was too fast, the level of immigration was too high=

Andrew Marr: =It was too high, so too many people – right=

Yvette Cooper: = and so it was right (.) that's why we've supported measures to bring immigration down.

Andrew Marr: And if David Cameron goes back to the EU and says he wants to change the rules on welfare and so forth to try to stop the number of Romanians and Bulgarians coming in at the beginning of next year, will Labour support him on that?

Yvette Cooper: Well we already said last year that there were changes the Government could make already within the existing rules and changes that they should argue for across Europe as well to make

sure that the system is fairer. I do think when people are coming to this country, they should be contributing, and so we've already said there are changes you could make to jobseeker's allowance so people can't come and claim jobseeker's allowance straightaway. If the Government had done that nine months ago when we suggested it, you could have had more progress made on this right now. It's important to recognise that most people who come to this country do come to work and to contribute. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Now you're always criticised for not having enough policies. Yesterday you announced a policy on immigration which would allow, as I understand it, big companies, bigger companies who need specialised workers from abroad, from India, often computer people, to bring them in, as long as they create an apprenticeship for each job that they bring in. Is that right?

Ed Miliband: Well, let me set out what we're going to do. In our first year in office, we will legislate for an immigration bill which has secure control of our borders, cracks down on exploitation, of workers coming in, undercutting workers already here and says to big companies that bringing people from outside the EU, that they can do that within a cap, but they've got to train the next generation. I think that's the right approach. Why is it so important? It's about making our economy really work for working people in our country and training up our people, that is the way to tackle the standards of living issues that so many families are facing in this country. So it's part of the focus of our conference of how we change our economy.

Andrew Marr: Would your policy cut immigration?

Ed Miliband: I do want to get low skill immigration down and therefore overall immigration down yes. And I think that's important=

Andrew Marr: =Are you concerned about the number of Romanians and Bulgarians who will be coming in very soon?

Ed Miliband: Well, obviously there are always issues about that. But that's going to be happening. But let me make this point about how we get low skill migration down. Look, one of the issues we've got as a country is that too often, governments of both parties have turned a blind eye to the fact that the minimum wage is not being observed, recruitment agencies are only hiring from abroad. All of those practices that we all know go on – you know, I think there are two prosecutions since 2010 for failing to pay the minimum wage, but we're going to change that. At the moment the maximum fine for not paying the minimum wage? Five thousand pounds. If you engage in fly tipping, it's fifty thousand pounds. What kind of set of priorities is that? We're going to change that in this country. We're going to crack down on those kind of practices by employers which frankly many, many good employers abhor just as much as you and I.

Andrew Marr: You used a slightly strange word about the minimum wage originally, you said you were going to strengthen it. That seems to mean enforcement. Are you also going to raise the minimum wage?

Ed Miliband: Well it starts with enforcement, that's important but I think we also have to look at this issues as we face the issue that in this country, thirty eight out of thirty nine months that David Cameron has been Prime Minister, prices have risen faster than wages. That's the issue that we're facing. ((continues))

Jeremy Vine: Point taken, you say it's the wrong kind of growth. I, just, just on another story, looking on the papers at the moment which is migration and you had David Davies, earlier saying, something needs to happen with this January 1st deadline, the Bulgarians, the Romanians coming. Do you believe that needs to be stopped.

Chuka Umunna: Well, look, we were very clear and we raised this issue with the Home Secretary over eight months ago, that you have to have proper transitional controls in place and so will happen in respect of people coming in from Bulgaria, Romania, wanting to claim out of work benefits, housing benefits, job seeker's allowance for example; so will that come in and will the restrictions they're talking about coming in in January, no indication so far. To the extent that people do come in and they can show that they can work and bring economic activity here. Are appropriate measures being implemented to stop them undercutting British workers, but also to stop them being exploited by employers, for example, by ensuring you have proper enforcement of the national minimum wage and increasing the fines twofold as we've suggested. Now we haven't seen action on that front from the government, but can I just say, er, you know - a word of caution here, we've got to be clear - of course we need a properly managed migration system, but equally migration's brought a lot of benefits for our country so let's ensure that we have a properly balanced debate when it comes to talking about these issues.

Jeremy Vine: Chuka Umunna, Shadow Business Secretary, thank you very much indeed.

Chuka Umunna: Thank you. ((end))

Andrew Marr: Now the political marriage in Downing Street has seemed a little bit prickly this week with the Prime Minister musing wistfully about the clarity of single party government, while his deputy, Nick Clegg, insists that compromise in politics, as in life, can be good for everybody. Are there real differences, especially on the economy, which would make it difficult for them to work together? Well Nick Clegg is with me now. Good morning.

Nick Clegg: Good morning.

(...)

Andrew Marr: Okay. Let's jump to yet another subject - one that's home for you, as it were, which is the Roma controversy on the streets of Sheffield.

Nick Clegg: Yeah, yeah.

Andrew Marr: Now there's been criticism of David Blunkett's intervention, but clearly there are problems on the streets. Shouldn't you be doing more to encourage Roma families and other families when they come into this country to learn about how people live - putting out the dustbins, dealing with waste, dealing with sort of how they treat their children in the streets - those kind of things, basic stuff?

Nick Clegg: Yes of course, but that is best done of course by the communities themselves with the work, with the assistance of course of local authorities and indeed local politicians. But my simple view is this - that we cannot you know go back to the bad old days where one community or another is vilified across the country. But equally when communities live side-by-side in a particular part of the country, as is the case in Page Hall in Sheffield, you know what might seem like uncontroversial and rather sort of ordinary behaviour to one community might be very unsettling to another=

Andrew Marr: =Yes.

Nick Clegg: and they have a duty to understand what the impact of their actions is on other people.

Andrew Marr: It's the effect of multiculturalism, but=

Nick Clegg: =Well it's also (.) it's an old-fashioned idea of civility where people are sensitive to the effects of their actions.

Andrew Marr: I want to distinguish between Roma and Romania and Bulgaria=

Nick Clegg: =Indeed.

Andrew Marr: But there's a huge new migration wave just about to happen at the end of this year. There have been calls in the House of Commons for special new emergency legislation to stop it and the Labour politician, Frank Field, has said that something needs to be done to stop this; and there's something approaching hysteria in parts of the Conservative family about this. Can't you do anything at all?

Nick Clegg: Well I think it's very important to remember that the lifting of the restrictions which hitherto have stopped Romanian and Bulgarian individuals from coming into this country to work, which we're lifting, we're lifting at the same time as all other countries in the European Union. And there are many other countries in the European Union, particularly in the south of Europe, where there are large settled Bulgarian and Romanian ((Marr tries to interject)) Can I explain why that's important?

Andrew Marr: Well I do understand what you're saying, but every time this kind of issue comes up politicians say it's alright, not that many people are going to come, and every single time they've been wrong.

Nick Clegg: Well I didn't say that, which of course is what the Labour Government said last time.

Andrew Marr: Yes.

Nick Clegg: But why I think it's so different to last time is that the Labour Government lifted those restrictions, in a way that Jack Straw and others now say is a mistake, and they did it with I think only Sweden and Ireland. In other words, the only countries which a number of citizens from Central and Eastern Europe could go to were Britain and a couple of other smaller economies=

Andrew Marr: =*A*nd as far as you're concerned=

Nick Clegg: =So it is different this time. I don't know=

Andrew Marr: = Free movement of people remains essential to our membership of the EU and you're not going to put up any new barriers?

Nick Clegg: I think many (.) hundreds of thousands of British people benefit by going to live and work abroad elsewhere in the European Union. This is a two-way thing. I understand the concerns. We're very vigilant about this, we're not making wild predictions one way or another about what's going to happen, but I do want to point out that it's quite different, the circumstances are quite different to last time=

Andrew Marr: =Okay. ((continues))

Andrew Marr: Now Nick Clegg has been firing up the rhetoric against his Conservative Coalition partners. It's part of a strategy whereby the Liberal Democrats gradually cleave from the Tories as pre-election warfare begins. Relations on both sides of the coalition are already fractious, I think you'd say, so how do the Tories and Lib-Dems manage the tricky task of exposing their differences while at the same time governing together for the next 16 months? Nick Clegg joins me now. And that really is the question of course, Nick Clegg. Can I start talking about some of the welfare issues=

Nick Clegg: =Sure.

(...)

Andrew Marr: So you've made it clear already that in terms of benefit tourism, you're prepared to be pretty hardline, you're prepared to endorse some of the things that Iain Duncan Smith is saying. But when it comes to free movement, you have no truck with any attempt to stop that=

Nick Clegg: =Yes and there are many reasons for that.

Andrew Marr: Vince Cable said on this show a little while ago that it was actually illegal, it couldn't happen for that reason. Would you agree with that?

Nick Clegg: I think the principle that people can move around the European Union to look for work is a principle which is a founding principle of the European Union for very good reasons - because if you want a single market, if you want more jobs to be created in the world's largest borderless single market, you need to give people the right to look for work. By the way, by some estimates two million Brits live and work in other European Union countries, so if we were to say to Finnish engineers or Dutch accountants or German=

Andrew Marr: =Or Romanian workers, yeah.

Nick Clegg: You've all got to leave, what is that going to mean for all the Brits who live in southern Europe if they're retired or live and work in other parts of the European Union? I don't think by entering into a tit for tat war given this is a two-way street across the European Union, that we will serve our national interests. And at the end of the day what I care about is I don't sort of love the European Union because it's called the European (.) I care massively about Britain, I care about what's right for Britain. I care about what's right about creating jobs in Br[itain] and you don't create jobs in Britain or safeguard prosperity by basically saying that you're going to cower behind the battlements and somehow turn your back on the rest of the world.

Andrew Marr: [Right]

What about parliamentary democracy? Is it right that peers are stopping a measure designed to give the British people the power of choice? Is it right that MPs are getting together to stop the British Parliament having a red card? I mean in the end we are a parliamentary democracy. That is what everything is founded upon. If the parliamentary democracy is not able to stop proposals coming in from the EU, what point is there voting for you, what point is there voting for the House of Commons?

Nick Clegg: Well, look, the vast bulk of legislation and regulation is still domestically generated, but what happens is that democratically elected governments get together in the European Union and thrash out amongst themselves rules which they think would help them collectively. Because there are a whole bunch of things - whether it's dealing with cross-border crime or whether it is dealing with environmental issues, climate change - that we can't deal with on our own. Look there's a fundamental insight into all of this: do you believe in the kind of world that we live in now where you have global economic forces, you have environmental destruction which crosses borders, you have crime which crosses=

Andrew Marr: =Lots of people would say no I don't.

Nick Clegg: Well I tell you what I believe, I'll tell you what I believe: is in this world you get more done by doing things together than you do apart. By the way, we're going to have an identical debate north of the border in the referendum in Scotland.

Andrew Marr: Sure.

Nick Clegg: Do we believe that the family of nations that make up the United Kingdom - as I fervently believe - can do more things, good things together rather than falling apart?

Andrew Marr: Okay=

Nick Clegg: That is a basic principle which will be at stake in the European elections in May and indeed in the Scottish referendum in Nov[ember] and where the Liberal Democrats stand and where I stand is very clear - we do more and we do better things together than apart. Andrew Marr:

Andrew Marr: [Okay]

I would now like to move on because we've done immigration, we've done Europe. ((continues))