THE UNIVERSITY OF HULL

Displaying Families: exploring the significance of 'display' in a city that is increasingly culturally diverse

being a Thesis submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy in the University of Hull

by

Julie C. Walsh, B.A. (Hons) MSc

September 2015

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Today, I was in the park with my two year old son, stood next to a Kurdish man with two children. He was pushing one child in a swing and the other was sat in a pushchair besides them, eating an ice-cream. We chat a little and, afterwards, I wonder if this is how he would be with his children in Kurdistan, if he intentionally does what he sees some British dads doing and what indigenous Hull people think of him and his family.[1]

(field diary, 10th October, 2011)

This observation was the starting point for the questions mooted in this thesis. In 2001/2002, a group of approximately four thousand young, Kurdish, male asylum seekers were dispersed to Kingston upon Hull, a city in the north of England (Lewis *et al.,* 2008). As a community development worker in the city, I worked with these relatively unsupported men as they 'resettled' in a predominantly white British city (ONS, 2003). I also worked with the mostly white, British indigenous population, as they struggled with the influx of arrivees that, at the time, gathered in groups, in public spaces and were from an unfamiliar culture. In the intervening years, Hull's population has continued to become more culturally diverse, with migrants from a wide range of countries arriving in the city (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a) with connectivity and cohesion between communities consistently requiring promotion and support (Craig *et al.*, 2005) (chapter two). Ten years on, my observations of the now settled, Kurdish refugees, as well as migrant families from other cultural backgrounds, reflect those noted in my field diary.

Parallel to these local demographic shifts, immigration increased in "political salience" (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 2) and a number of significant developments and policy shifts occurred relating to immigration and minority ethnic communities in the UK (chapter four). There was, for example, a tightening of asylum legislation (Finney & Simpson, 2009) and, simultaneously, the free movement of citizens from EU member states was permitted, resulting in the growth of EU populations in the UK and Hull (Migration

---

[1] Field diary entries are identifiable by the use of *"bradley hand font"* and participant accounts by the use of `"courier new font"`.

Yorkshire, 2014b). As a consequence of these combined political and demographic changes, I began to consider the impact policy developments might have on public opinion but, also, if a cross-cultural understanding of "family" could have positive implications for community connectivity.

For these reasons, this research is timely and Kingston upon Hull provides an opportunity to explore the significance of "family" in cross-cultural connectivity and cohesion. More specifically, this study uniquely sets out to empirically test and expand Janet Finch's (2007) concept of "displaying families" within the context of this increasingly culturally diverse city.

<u>Academic Rationale</u>

In 2007, Finch introduced the concept of "display" as a new way of understanding "family". She does so by building on Morgan's earlier argument that the modern family is no longer the "fixed" concept of a nuclear family, consisting of biological parents and their children living in one household, but it is fluid, diverse and multifaceted. The concept of family has, instead, become a set of "practices" that are "done" which take on meaning, associated with family, at a given point in time (Morgan, 1996; Morgan, 2011a, 2011b). Finch, however, expands and argues that families need to be "displayed" as well as "done", as "the meaning of one's actions have to be both conveyed to and understood by relevant others if those actions are to be effective as constituting 'family practices'" (2007:66). She further argues that, if "family practices" aim to legitimise contemporary family, "display" is necessary if family participants are to convey "these are my family relationships and they work" (2007: 73).

Subsequent applications of theory have focused on the significance of "display" within individual families, but also with a wider "public" audience (chapter three). Examples include Almack's study of lesbian parent couples (Almack, 2008a), James and Curtis' (2010) consideration of eating practices in relation to both "display" and personal life, Philip's (2013, 2014) study of fathering post-divorce and Carter *et al's*. (2015) study of couples living apart. This study has a broader focus and adds to the academic debate by considering if, how, when and why migrant families "display" when living in a growing

multi-cultural community, where they potentially seek legitimacy from host, home area and transnational audiences. This exploration of "family display", thereby, gives a pertinent, new perspective on migrant integration.

Further, this study uniquely responds to scholarly calls to consider the role of "audience" in "family display" (chapter nine); Dermott and Seymour, for example, argue that the audience response to "display" is significant, stating that audiences are not passive and are, in fact, "participants in the creation of 'displaying families'"(2011: 15). In addition to this, Haynes and Dermott acknowledge the impact of audience on "family display", claiming that "audiences can inadvertently require familial displays that would not otherwise take place" (2011: 159). Furthermore, although Finch (2011) argues that "family display" is primarily concerned with those within the family, others posit that the role of the external audience is significant (Roth, 2011; Gabb, 2011; Carter *et al.*, 2015). This innovative study makes the role of the "audience" the subject of empirical investigation and, thereby, engages with these questions. In addition, by researching how the indigenous audience receives migrant "family display" and what meaning they attach to it, conclusions can then be made relating to the impact of display on community cohesion.

The Research Question, Aims and Objectives of the Study

The Overarching Question

How, when and why do migrant people in Hull "display family", both locally and transnationally? How is *display* interpreted by the local community and does this have implications for community cohesion?

Aims and Objectives of the Study

Aim One: To understand how, when and why migrant people in Hull "display family", both locally and transnationally.

Related Objectives:

- To understand how migrant families *display* in the public arena;
- To understand if and how migrant "family display" changes with context, for example, in transnational communication, when in the presence of indigenous populations or when in the presence of co-located members of their home area networks;
- To understand if and how migrant "family display" changes over time, for example, at different stages in their migration story, if a family member leaves or arrives, or when family children start school.

Aim Two: To understand how *display* is interpreted by the local community.

Related objectives:

- To explore how indigenous people describe migrant "family display";
- To explore what meaning indigenous people give to migrant "family display";
- To understand what factors influence indigenous interpretations of migrant "family display".

Aim Three: To explore if local community interpretation of "family display" has implications for community cohesion in Hull.

Related objectives:

- To explore how all families, migrant and indigenous, interact at sites of public "family display";
- To understand if and how individual indigenous responses to migrant "family display" correlate with individual opinion towards migrants in the city.

Overview of the Thesis

The thesis is structured in the following way:

Chapter Two: The Changing Demographic Landscape of Hull

This chapter is dedicated to introducing Kingston upon Hull and explaining the significance of conducting research in this particular location. Characteristics of the city

germane to the research question are outlined and historical and contemporary context is provided. A brief summary of reports relating to migration in the city is also presented, and, subsequently, a gap in literature identified.

Chapter Three: The Sociological Shift in Approaches to the Family

In this chapter, Finch's (2007) concept of "family display" is located within the broader field of family sociology. The basic framework provided by Finch is detailed, supported by subsequent applications of the theory. A review of related literature is also presented and emerging themes and critiques of "family display" are identified. Within this, areas of resonance and possible gaps in literature are highlighted, so as to provide an academic rationale for the research question, but also to further refine the field of enquiry.

Chapter Four: The UK's History of Immigration and Race Relations

In this chapter, prevalent discourses relating to immigration and race relations in the UK are outlined, with a view to identifying factors that may influence relationships between indigenous and migrant populations. Overall, it is asserted that, at the time of the fieldwork: discourse presented immigration as a *problem* to be controlled (Robinson, 2010); race relations policies were inadequate and required assimilation to white Christian norms (Finney & Simpson, 2009) and Islamophobic narratives presented Islamic populations as "dangerous" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009).

It is further argued here, that policy debates, media representation and economic climate can shape attitudes towards immigrants, race and national belonging (Mulvey, 2010). Consequently, this chapter outlines how political and media constructions of acceptable migrant behaviours have the potential to influence the way migrant people display family but also how indigenous audiences receive, interpret and judge migrant "family display" (Finch, 2007).

Chapter Five: Linking "Family Display" and Cohesion

This chapter builds on the literature previously discussed, it introduces knowledge from transnational family studies and develops an argument for exploring the link between

family, "family display" and improved community cohesion in Hull. Literature is presented relating to the "othering" of BME families and the creation of the legitimate familial norm as "Anglo-ethnic" (Chambers, 2001: 125). It is asserted that this may limit migrant families displaying that they "work" (Finch, 2007; Heaphy, 2011), but that the transnational family, and "family display" in transnational spaces, has the potential to challenge these norms (McSherry, 2001). Building on this and the scholarly contention (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002; Heath *et al*, 2011; Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004) that migrant populations *do* engage in activities that connect them to the host community, it is argued that the function of "family display" in achieving connectivity requires further exploration.

Chapter Six: Methodology

In this chapter, the emancipatory methodological approach adopted in the study is outlined; that being a participatory family research perspective. The decision to adopt a mixed methods approach is justified and the research design is explained in detail, as are ethical issues and the approach to data analysis. This chapter also incorporates a number of additional issues for consideration, namely, the researcher's insider/outsider position, challenges of working with interpreters, challenges of working with family young, plus issues concerned with researcher safety. Here, a brief summary of the research participants is also provided, which is supported by more detailed description in the appendices.

Chapter Seven: Transnational "Family Display"

In this chapter, interrogation of migrant family accounts reveals that "family display" does play a significant role in the maintenance of kin relationships across national borders, particularly in the case of intergenerational bonds. The evidence presented affirms aspects of "family display" as defined by Finch (2007), but also introduces original aspects, namely "enablers of display"; the channels that allow participant families to select and display elements of their family life. In the transnational context, these are revealed to be, access to affordable technology and engaging in transnational visits.

The findings presented also reveal more troubling aspects of transnational family relationships. Cultural variations in perceptions of familial legitimacy, for example, can impact, both positively and negatively, on a UK based migrant family being perceived as legitimate transnationally. Further, participant families do not have equal access to "enablers". Consequently, some families are more likely to display successfully in the transnational context.

Chapter Eight: Local "Family Display"

The focus shifts in this chapter to migrant family accounts of "family display" in Kingston upon Hull. Analysis again affirms elements of Finch's original framework, but also expands scholarly understanding of "family display". It is argued, for example, that display is important to migrant families for reasons beyond those identified by Finch (2007), that is: to meet familial needs, by developing *family-like* links with both migrant and indigenous groups; to avoid inter-cultural conflict; to promote community connectivity as the *other*; to reflect local, State defined familial norms. As such, it is asserted that "relevant others" include non-kin co-resident members of the home area network and local indigenous populations. Further, it is concluded that "family display" is important to "frontiering" and "relativising" - processes of transnational family making (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002; Heath *et al.*, 2011)

Here, analysis also reveals previously unidentified "tools of display" (Finch, 2007), but again supports the influence of "enablers of display", as initially identified in chapter seven. Those that impact on the *local* "family displays" intended for the indigenous audience include: the ability to speak the language of the host country; the presence of family young and work and study providing an inter-cultural forum. By drawing on theories of intersectionality (Collins, 1990; Taylor *et al.*, 2010), analysis further reveals, however, that the confluence of "enablers" and the characteristics of the family as a whole, can both enable or disable local migrant "family display". It is concluded, therefore, that migrant families do not experience the same levels of agency in local "family display".

Chapter Nine: The Role of Audience in "Family Display"

This chapter brings together the data presented in chapter seven and eight with the accounts of indigenous research participants as the audience of "family display". In response to discussions set out in chapter five, it is contended that migrant "family displays" are most successful in achieving cross-cultural connectivity and minimising their position as *other*, when they mirror "Anglo-ethnic" norms (Chambers, 2001). This is, however, also dependent on "enablers of display" being available to the migrant family. By contrast, when "enablers" are absent or limited, or displays are located within contrasting culturally located norms, negative dominant discourses *can* eclipse the success of migrant "family display" with indigenous audiences.

Here, in response to scholarly enquiry, it is further argued that migrant families *are* subjected to the gaze of multiple audiences (Seymour, 2011) beyond biological kin, including "abstract audiences" such as the State (Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Carver, 2014). Further, audiences can have conflicting display "requirements" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159). Consequently, if indigenous, white British audiences are not the intended audience of migrant "family displays", they can be misinterpreted in a predominantly white city. In addition to this, migrant families can also chose to "resist" indigenous display requirements. On these occasions, "family display" can result in conflict between communities.

Overall, this chapter concludes that audiences external to the family do respond to migrant "family display". Those families closest to the Anglo-norm have more agency to display successfully (white Western migrant families), whilst those subject to multiple negative discourses (Asian Islamic migrant families) are least likely to achieve community connectivity, or promote cohesion, via display.

Chapter Ten: The Significance of "Family Display" in Kingston upon Hull

This chapter returns to the specifics of the full research question and draws on the data discussed in previous chapters in order to present evidenced conclusions. Initial discussion concentrates on evaluating Finch's (2007) concept within this particular context. Beyond this evaluative approach, new features of "family display" illuminated

in the study are also presented. Here, attention is also given to elements of the research question that relate to the role of the audience in "family display" and what factors impact on audience interpretations of the displays they witness. Finally, the chapter considers the impact of family and "family display" on connectivity between diverse communities resident in Hull and concludes by presenting relevant policy recommendations.

Chapter Eleven: Conclusion

In this final chapter, broad conclusions are presented relating to the significance of the study beyond the specific context of *migrant* family display and audience responses in Kingston upon Hull. The fields considered include family sociology, migration studies and social policy. In addition to this, areas for future research are identified and the thesis ends by providing information to outline context at the time of submission (September, 2015).

CHAPTER TWO: THE CHANGING DEMOGRAPHIC LANDSCAPE OF HULL

The research presented was conducted during 2012/2013 in Kingston upon Hull, which is a northern UK city, located on the bank of the River Humber. In this opening chapter, significant features of this research location are described, with a specific focus on the changing ethnic demographic of the area. The reasons these changes have occurred will be identified and the demographic landscape of Hull, at the time of the study, will be described. Further, a brief overview of the literature available, specifically relating to migration in Hull and race relations, will be discussed and gaps in knowledge identified.

At the time of the fieldwork, Kingston upon Hull, more commonly known as Hull, was estimated to have a population of 257, 600 people (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b).   The port enjoyed expansion and prosperity during the C19th industrial revolution. Since this time, the decline of the industries served by the city's docks, combined with the collapse of the fishing industry in the 1970s (Sheahan, 2011), has led to Hull facing a number of socio-economic difficulties. Indicators such as levels of unemployment and crime, and the availability of housing are unfavourable in many areas of the city. Consequently, the majority of the city's twenty-three council wards have a low score in the multiple indices of deprivation, only a small number have an average score and none achieve a high score (Open Data Communities, 2014).

As a port, the city has a history of transmigration in the C19th, with many European travellers passing through the docks *en route* to America, Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand (Foner, 2009; Evans, 2011b). A number of these travellers remained in the city and by the C20th, Hull had a small, settled Jewish community. By the start of the C21st, however, this community was negligible (Lewis, 2005) and the city's population was mostly white and British-born (ONS, 2003).

New Migrant Populations in Hull Post 2000

Between 2001 and the present day, migrant populations in Hull have grown significantly. The 2001 UK census shows only 3.1% (approximately 7,388) of people living in Hull to have been born outside the UK (ONS, 2003). Since this time, Hull has become a

destination for a variety of migrants; it is a dispersement area for asylum seekers[2] (Lewis *et al.,* 2008) and a resettlement location for UN Gateway refugees[3] (The Refugee Council, 2015). Further, the eastwards expansion of the European Union, in 2004,[4] resulted in citizens of the new member states accessing the UK labour market (McCollum & Findlay, 2011a, 2011b). There has consequently been a significant increase in the number of European Union economic migrants entering the city[5] (Wilkinson, 2008a: 70).

The 2011 census revealed that the number of people born outside the UK, living in Hull, had risen to 8.5% (approximately 21,800) (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a) and, in 2008, approximately sixty different languages were spoken in the city by seventy different nationalities (Greene *et al.,* 2008). That trend has continued and statistics show that, in 2013, between 2100 – 3200 new migrants arrived in the city.[6] Further, there is a fairly predictable flow of 600 - 1000 workers arriving in Hull each year from non-EU countries, with 620 arrivals in 2013, the top country of origin (hereafter referred to as COO) being China (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b: 2). Since 2004, Workers Registration Scheme figures show that many migrants in Hull have arrived from accession countries, predominantly Poland and Lithuania. In 2013, the main COO for economic migrants and, in fact, all migrants to the city, remained Poland, with a total of 1600 arrivals (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b: 3). As a university city, Hull also has a large number of international students registered at Higher Education institutions. In 2012 – 2013 this figure totalled 3640, nearly three-quarters of whom came from outside the EU (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b: 2).

---

[2] In April 2000, the National Asylum Seekers Support Service (NASS) was established, one of its main functions being the management of the national dispersal scheme. Under the scheme, all new asylum seekers in the UK are transferred to a different region chosen by the Home Office (BBC News, 2001).

[3] Hull is a resettlement location for UN Gateway Refugee families; the UN selects 750 people a year that are long term residents of refugee camps. They are resettled permanently in participating countries. Since 2004, Hull has housed approximately 90 families a year (The Refugee council, 2015a).

[4] In 2004, eight countries became accession states to the European Union (known as the A8 countries); the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia (Panorama, 2005).

[5] Until April 1st 2011, A8 citizens entering the UK were required to register with the Workers Registration Scheme (WRS) on arrival. The total number of WRS registrations between May 2004–March 2009, was 927,870 (McCollum & Findlay, 2011: 8).

[6] These were migrants defined as 'long-term migrants', that is, those expected to stay more than a year (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b: 2).

The number of people in the city seeking asylum varies. In November 2014, Home Office statistics show that 267 asylum seekers were residing in Hull, awaiting a decision on their claim (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b). A large cohort of Iraqi Kurds were dispersed to Hull in 2001 (*The Guardian*, 2006), but asylum seekers in the city originate from a diverse range of countries. Figures relating to asylum seekers and those granted refugee status are, however, difficult to monitor; once a person seeking asylum is granted "leave to remain",[7] they may choose to stay in Hull or move to another area, thus there is no means of knowing whether these people are in Hull or not. Further, it is difficult to know how many of those that have been refused "leave to remain" continue to live in Hull whilst remaining below the radar of official statistics.

The Geographical Spread of Migrant Populations in Hull

A further indicator used to assess migration is the number of children in local schools that have English as an Additional Language (hereafter referred to as EAL). Unfortunately, the figures available in Hull do not identify the nationality of pupils, but school intake figures do give an indication of the areas in which migrant populations are concentrated. In 2012, at the time of the fieldwork, 10.3% of primary school pupils in Hull were designated as having EAL (2255 of a total of 21, 846) (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b: 3). They were not evenly spread across the city, there being a clear concentration of school children with EAL in the central west areas of the city; the seven primary schools in this vicinity having a school population ranging from 36% - 61% EAL. Although other primary schools throughout the city were teaching a number of EAL pupils, in most cases, this was less than 5%. The exception to this pattern was Victoria Dock Primary School, based in a new build, fairly affluent area in the east of the city, which had 28% of pupils with EAL (Hull City Council, 2012). This trend is also reflected in the Hull Local Migration Profile for November 2014 (Migration Yorkshire, 2014b), which indicates that Hull's migrant population are mostly concentrated in the Myton, Newland, Avenue and University local authority wards, illustrated in the following, fig 1.

---

[7] If an application for asylum in the UK is not rejected, there are various awards the applicant may receive: "leave to remain" allows a person to stay in the UK for five years, after which their case will be reviewed; "indefinite leave to remain" allows people to permanently resettle in the UK and is awarded to those granted refugee status by the United Nations Gateway project, or sometimes people that successfully reapply for asylum after their initial five year period of leave to remain; occasionally applicants are granted discretionary leave to remain, and this is rarely for more than three years (Gov.UK, 2012; UKBA,2012).

Fig 1: Map of wards and neighbourhoods in Kingston upon Hull

(Hull City Council, 2015c)

It should be noted that Hull is traditionally divided into east (East, Park), west (Riverside, Wyke, West) and north Hull (Northern and North Carr). These are divisions used by both the NHS and Hull City Council. For the purposes of understanding analysis, there is not an area known as south Hull.

Studies of Migration in Kingston upon Hull

At the outset of the study, a review was conducted of academic work relating to recent migration in Hull. There was, however, limited literature available on this subject. Glossop and Shaheen (2009) had conducted a comparative study between EU migration in Hull, and a second UK city, Bristol, but the focus was on the occupational skill level of migrants. No specific reference is made, in available literatures, to migrant *families* or the concept of *Displaying Families* (Finch, 2007) in the city.

Searches also identified that, although there are reports that relate to migrant populations in the area, most consider the situation of those migrants living in Hull, the East Riding and the Humber Sub Region, (Craig *et al.,* 2008; Lewis *et al.,* 2008; Wilkinson, 2008a, 2008b) rather than specifically considering those living within the boundaries of the city of Hull.   Furthermore, these reports mainly document the inadequate service provision and the poor living and working conditions experienced by migrants in the region. In 2005, however, Craig *et al.* produced the report, *At a Turning Point? The State of Race Relations in Kingston Upon Hull* (Craig *et al.,* 2005), which revealed that, in 2004, The Government Office for Leeds and Yorkshire identified Hull as *the* Local Authority in the region where it had the greatest concern for race relations. Further, a 2003 report by the Leeds Office for the Commission for Race Equality described race relations in Hull as "being in a time warp" (Craig *et al.,* 2005: 27).   Despite this period of significant demographic change, there have not been any further reports directly relating to this subject.

Conclusion

Kingston upon Hull is a post-industrial city where indigenous people continue to encounter a range of socio-economic challenges. Since the year 2000, this mostly white, British-born population have also experienced a fairly conspicuous shift in the ethnic make-up of the central west areas of the city, with Eastern European and Kurdish populations, in particular, having a visible community presence.   Whilst a small number of reports focus on the social conditions experienced by migrant groups in Hull and outlying areas and one considers race relations in the city, there are significant gaps in literature. This research goes some way to addressing these gaps; with a specific focus on "family display" (Finch, 2007), the study explores the perspective of migrant families, responses of local populations and the role of family in developing positive relationships between the two.

CHAPTER THREE: THE SOCIOLOGICAL SHIFT IN APPROACHES TO THE FAMILY

The premise of this study is concerned with the significance of displaying family within Kingston upon Hull, a city that is becoming increasingly culturally diverse. "Family Display", as a concept developed in recent years, is grounded in a long history of academic debate. Here, in order to provide context, a brief history of literature related to the broader area of family sociology is provided. Drawing on Finch's seminal article, published in 2007, key elements of the concept are outlined. As *Displaying Families* was only introduced to the "sociological toolkit" in 2007 (Finch, 2007: 65), development of the approach is still in the early stages. Nonetheless, the concept has gained significant academic attention and at the time of writing is recorded as being cited by others 292 times (Google Scholar, 14h September, 2015). Here, consideration is given to scholarly applications that support, expand and critique *Displaying Families*. Subsequently, characteristics of display, additional to those defined by Finch, are discussed and themes in this body of literature are identified.   As a result, aspects of the concept relevant to the research question that require further interrogation are established.

The Sociological Shift from Family as a Functional Unit to a Family Practices Approach
In order to outline *Displaying Families* (Finch, 2007) it is necessary to explain the academic context. Finch's concept is located within an understanding of *family* as:

> Generally based on marriage, intimate partnerships, biological descent, and adoption. It is a small group of people who share a distinct sense of identity and responsibility for each other.   Commitment to family members generally outweighs commitment to others.
>
> (McKie & Callan, 2012: 215)

This is, however, a contemporary definition, inclusive of a variety of intimate relationships, whereby the dominant characteristic perceived as familial is the feeling of responsibility and commitment that members have towards each other. By contrast, in 1950s Britain the dominant understanding of *family* was, instead, restricted to the biological and physical boundaries of the family home, whereby a married man and woman lived with their biological children, usually economically supported by the man,

with the woman providing the domestic and emotional labour of child rearing (Young & Willmott, 1973). In line with the functionalist principals of Talcott Parsons, the construct of *family* was defined as "natural" and one which supported reproduction, heterosexuality, gendered roles and socialisation of children (Parsons, 1956).

During the 1970s and 1980s, however, feminist approaches dominated, rejecting the ideal of the heteronormative family as "natural". Scholars argued that this definition of family was, instead, a site of conflict (Laing, 1969) and a "social", patriarchal construct which perpetuated age and gender inequalities and that should be challenged and deconstructed (Oakley, 1976). During the 1990s, academic debate relating to *family* developed further and the "Individualisation Thesis" began to dominate; prominent scholars asserted that the traditional ideal of *family* was now dated and that the role of *family* in society was seen as less important. Adults were no longer bound by the obligations of marriage and the associated "forever", romantic love and were, instead, involved in creative relationships that they had the ability to change and end, as personal needs developed and changed (Giddens, 1992; Beck & Beck-Gernsheim, 1995; Bauman, 2003). During the 2000s, however, the "relational" school of thought emerged; as critics of the "individualisation" approach, scholars (Jamieson, 1998; Mason, 2004; Smart, 2007) argued that, although *family* now took various forms and encompassed "a whole range of permutations and living arrangements" (Gillies, 2011: 4.1), the influence of *family* or *intimacy* had *not* seen a demise. Carol Smart (2007), consequently, developed the concept of "personal life" with the aim of expanding the discussion of intimate relationships to those beyond the *family.*

Parallel to these sociological developments, David Morgan, writing in 1996, developed his influential "family practices*"* approach. Morgan draws on the debate of the previous two decades and agrees that the biological and functional 1950s associations with the *family* are outdated; the modern family is no longer the fixed concept of a nuclear family, but it is fluid, diverse and multifaceted (Morgan, 1996). For him, like the relational scholars writing in the following decade, family *is* an embedded concept, but no longer refers to a group defined via biology or co-residence. He argues, instead, that *family*, linguistically, in contemporary Britain now "represents a quality rather than a

thing" (Morgan 1996: 186) and should be used as an adjective, rather than a noun: "*family* life", "*family* processes", "*family* events" and "*family* practices" (my emphasis) (Morgan, 2011b: 5). Via the "doing" of "family practices", which Morgan defines as the "little fragments of daily life which are part of the normal taken for granted existence of practitioners" (1996: 190), families are able to represent the *family-like* quality of their relationships. Through these processes and "practices", or the "doing" of family, individuals and groups of individuals are able to show what and who is *family* (Morgan 1996).

Janet Finch and "Family Display"

In 2007, Janet Finch published her influential article *Displaying Families* in the journal *Sociology.* Finch agrees with Morgan's "family practices" approach, but she expands, arguing that families need to be *displayed,* as simply *doing family* is not enough (Finch, 2007). Instead, people also need to define and shape their family through demonstration (Finch, 2007: 69) and, for her, "the meaning of one's actions have to be both conveyed to and understood by relevant others if those actions are to be effective as constituting 'family practices'" (Finch, 2007: 66). Finch argues that the reasons for this are that contemporary family: often extends beyond the household and is no longer defined by those that live in the family home; family is now more fluid than in the past, with family members and relationships changing over time; intimate relationships are subject to change as the relationships they support, or no longer support, are also changing (Finch, 2007: 67-73). In this atmosphere of fluid familial intimacies, the function of display is essential for family participants to convey that "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73).

For Finch then, the principal aim in *Displaying Families* was "to open up this aspect of family life for debate within the relevant sociological research community and to encourage others to refine the concept as well as use it" (Finch, 2007: 66). That said, a number of factors are identified as being central to the concept. Firstly, Finch argues that "family display" is relevant to *all* families, not only those that are non-conventional and may, consequently, feel the need to show that their family "works". Instead, for her:

In a world where families are defined by the qualitative character of the relationships rather than by membership, and where individual identities are deeply bound up with those relationships, *all* relationships require an element of display to sustain them as family relationships.

(Finch, 2007: 71)

She asserts that it is more useful to think about "degrees of intensity" in display. The example provided is of a full-time mother returning to paid employment; at this time of changing maternal roles, all family members may feel the need to display that their family "works" more than they do at other times (Finch, 2007: 72). For Finch, for *all* families, there are certain circumstances where the need to display becomes more acute.

Further, although discussion becomes "necessarily more tentative" when considering how display is "done" in practice, Finch puts "the focus firmly on social interaction, and particularly the processes whereby social meanings are conveyed" (Finch, 2007: 73). She argues that two areas of social interaction are significant: direct interaction between family members establishing family relationships and the social interaction required for individuals to receive feedback on their "family display" (Finch, 2007: 73-74). By way of an example, Finch draws on Smart and Neal's study of fathering post-divorce; via direct interaction with his children, a father is able to display family and build new *family* relationships. Via social interaction with, for example, his former mother-in-law, he can receive positive feedback on these displays and, thus, affirmation that he is a "good father", thereby reinforcing to him that his relationship with his children is still "father-like" (Smart & Neal, 1999: 79, cited in Finch, 2007: 74). The first type of interaction, then, allows family members to display that their relationships are high quality, whilst the second allows individuals to receive affirmation that their family "works".

In addition to this, Finch also posits that, although *display* resonates with concepts of *performance* (Goffman, 1959) and *performativity* (Butler, 1990), it is different. Family Display is not, for example, solely concerned with *direct* interaction and is supported by "background features that we might define as "tools" of display" (Finch, 2007: 77), such as, photos, domestic artifacts, heirlooms and narratives. Drawing on Finch and Mason's

work on inheritance, she argues that family members are able to use inherited items as a public display of the family relationship between those that are alive and those that have died (Finch & Mason, 2000, cited in Finch 2007: 77). Consequently, for Finch, family relationships can also be displayed in the absence of significant individuals.

Overall, Finch presents the academic community with the basic framework for a new approach, which is potentially "an activity characteristic of contemporary families [...] as well as an analytical concept" (Finch, 2007: 78). She invites others to refine this concept, whilst also raising questions about "how display works" in practice:

> What forms of direct social interaction are used to convey the meaning that this is a 'family like' relationship? [...] In specific situations, whose feedback is important in reinforcing that these relationships are accepted as family like by others not directly involved in them? When can that feedback be indirect and implicit, and when must it be direct and explicit to be effective?
>
> (Finch, 2007: 75)

Many academics have referred briefly to this new approach in their analysis of pre-existing empirical data (examples include: Forsberg, 2009; Luzia, 2010; Backett-Milburn *et al.,* 2010; Neill, 2010; McDermott *et al.,* 2011*;* Nanson *et al.,* 2011; McLaughlin & Clavering, 2011; Herrera, 2011; Evans, 2011a; Davies, 2011a, 2011b; Philip, 2013; Halder & Engebretsen, 2013; Carter *et al*., 2015; Castren & Widmer, 2015; Dermott & Pomati, 2015). A number have, however, explored, refined and applied the concept with more rigour (examples include: Almack, 2008; Smart, 2008; James & Curtis, 2010; Heath *et al*., 2011; Jones & Hackett, 2011; Seymour & Walsh, 2013; Sirriyeh, 2013; Carver, 2014), as have those contributing to Dermott and Seymour's (2011) edited collection of essays, *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. The following discussion considers scholarly critiques, areas in which the approach can be expanded and identifies the emerging themes in literature.

<u>Testing the Concept: Why Display Matters</u>

The Fluidity of Family over Time

Writing in 2007 and later, in 2011, Finch argues that one reason families display is the "fluidity of families over time"; families are now more diverse and need to redefine what *family* means more regularly (Finch, 2007: 69; Finch, 2011). Scholarly applications of the theory support this; Philip (2013), for example, discusses the restorative role that displays can have when familial relationships are redefined between fathers and their children, post-divorce. By being seen to "put their children first" (2013: 416) fathers are able to display that, despite the change in their family structure, their relationships with their children are still a priority and of high quality. Further, Almack identifies that display is also present when a child is born to a lesbian couple and, as they become same-sex parents, their relationship with their extended biological family must be reconfigured. This change "requires outward displays of family for lesbian couples and those engaged with their wider social network" (Almack, 2011: 117). Here, examples of display include the distribution of birth announcement cards, familial responses to the news of the birth and a grandparent displaying photos of the same-sex couple, and their baby, in their home. These illustrations show how "family display" *can* support "the continually evolving nature of the relationships" (Finch, 2007: 69). That said, Almack's application of "family display" also highlights the fact that the rejection of displays can, for same-sex families, undermine the legitimacy of their new family (Almack, 2011). The implication that "family display" can result in negative outcomes will, however, be discussed in more depth later in the chapter.

This study examines if the "fluidity of family over time" is a driver of "family display" and, if so, what impact this has on the displays of migrant families in Hull. Migrant families, for example, may experience "fluidity" that is specific to them being migrants such as family members leaving, or arriving in the country. It should, however, be acknowledged that migrant families may display family as a result of changes in their family that are unrelated to their status as *migrant;* family break-ups, for example, or children leaving home.

Family Does Not Equate Exclusively to Household and Kinship

Finch further argues that families display, because family no longer "equates to household" (Finch, 2007) and, as a consequence, relationships must be regularly redefined.   By way of an example, she draws on Smart and Neale's study of families after divorce:

> Co-parenting […] significantly disrupts expectations that 'families' can be defined easily by boundaries, certainly not the contours of the nuclear family, because the divorced parent is in a 'chain of relationships' with different individuals and across households.
>
> (Smart & Neale, 1999: 72, cited in Finch, 2007: 68)

Later studies go on to analyse behaviours within divorced families (Philip, 2013, 2014; Castren & Widmer, 2015) and support Finch's assertion; Philip, for example, draws on empirical data and identifies the importance of school parents' evenings for divorced parents as they provide an opportunity when "co-parental relationship could and ought to be demonstrated" (Philip, 2014: 220), or displayed, as familial and as "working" (Finch, 2007).

It is argued here, that Smart and Neal's description of divorced families living in a "chain of relationships across households", resonates with Bryceson and Vuorela's definition of transnational families, as those that "live some or most of the time separated from each other, yet hold together and create something that can be seen as a feeling of collective welfare and unity, namely 'familyhood', even across national borders" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 3). Indeed, Finch acknowledges that the concept of "family display" may contribute to understanding the global movement of people as geographically, displays of family "may extend across countries and continents through patterns of migration" (Finch, 2007: 68). This study will consider the function of migrant "family display" in maintaining a sense of *familyhood*, not only across households, but also across countries.

"Family Displays" Beyond Kinship

A number of scholars (Almack, 2011; Sirriyeh, 2013; Sharma & Guest, 2013) expand on Finch's argument and assert that "family display" is not only important because family

does not "equate to household" (Finch, 2007), but also because family does not exclusively equate to kinship. Almack, for example, draws on the work of Weeks *et al*., which focuses on the creation of *family-like* bonds within same-sex communities (Weeks *et al*., 2002), that is, "relationships based on friendships which become 'family-like' in terms of levels of commitment and support" (Almack, 2011: 111). Similarly, Sharma and Guest (2013) argue that "family display" assists the development of relationships within "church communities [which] may act as a surrogate family" for university students away from the familial home (2013: 70). For these scholars, although the concept of "family display" applies to respondents showing commitments to families of origin, there are also display functions relating to the demonstration of these "families of choice" (Weeks *et al.*, 2002; Almack, 2011).

Heaphy (2011) supports this expansion of the concept, claiming that "'family display' should not privilege family relationships over and above other 'relational displays' and that "family display", as a concept, can add to our understanding of what family is and what relevance 'display' has to other relationships" (Heaphy, 2011: 20). Finch responds to this stating that the original article was concerned with biological family and "any extension of the concept of display to other types of relationships would require different theorising, albeit possibly with some common elements" (Finch, 2011: 202). Scholars of transnational family studies do, however, liken the way that migrants create relationships in their new host country to the way that lesbian and gay people create "families of choice" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002; Reynolds & Zontini, 2014). This implies, then, that there *may* be display functions in the way that migrant families establish *family-like* relationships when away from their homeland. Indeed, Sirriyeh (2013), in her study of unaccompanied child asylum seekers, supports this; for the young migrant people in her study, for example, "kinship status in relationships was displayed, particularly in the use of naming to mark proximity" and referring to people as "like-a-mum" or "like-a-sister" (2013: 8). As a consequence, stronger *family-like* attachments were established. This research with migrant families will, then, provide an opportunity to examine the tension between Heaphy and Finch's perspectives and explore if "family display" is important because family does not exclusively equate to kinship.

"Degrees of Intensity"

Finch posits in her original article that although display is more relevant to non-conventional family relationships, all relations require an element of display to sustain them. She argues, instead, that it is more relevant to look at "degrees of intensity" within all families, that is, episodes when "family relationships" need to be defined or displayed more strongly (Finch, 2007: 72). Subsequent applications of "family display" support this; Haldar and Engebretson (2013), for example, note that when school children in Norway are asked to complete a teddy diary[8] at home, it is "the unique and extraordinary things that repeat themselves in the teddy diaries: the unique child, the extraordinary events […] all of them are an expression of individualism" (2013: 12). As families are aware that other parents and teachers at the school will see the contents of the diary, this could be interpreted as a time of "intensity" when *all* families involved are driven to display their "living ideals" (Haldar & Engebretson, 2013: 10).

For Almack, however, "intensity" of display is more present at times of uncertainty and when the contours of the family are unclear. The birth of a child to a lesbian couple, for example, "represents one such instance, [as] a point at which recognition and validation of the familial relationships between the baby and the parents' families of origin are sought" (Almack, 2011: 110). This is further supported by Haynes and Dermott (2011) in their discussion of "family display" and "mixedness" in families; when a mixed-race child moves into a predominantly white area, there may be a period of "intensity" when they feel driven to display their connection with, and allegiance to, their siblings. For Haynes and Dermott, however, "mixedness" does not result in an *extended* period of "intensity" in display and they argue that "mixed need not be assumed to be a constant salient identity" dominant in an individual's self-definition (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 158). Brahic similarly argues, in her study of bi-national couples, that "binationality" becomes normalised over time, but that there remains episodes when this element of the couple's identity *is* salient (Brahic, 2013). Instead, Brahic argues that it is useful to

---

[8] The "Teddy Diaries" are used in Norway as "a common tool for bridging the transition between family and school among pupils entering their first year. Each school class is provided with one teddy, which is to visit every child's home, and is accompanied by a diary in which the teddy's experiences in the children's homes are to be recorded. The entries in the diary are then shared with others in the class, as well as with the families who subsequently receive the book and teddy" (Haldar & Engerbretson, 2013: 4; Halder & Waerdahl, 2009).

focus on *moments* when individuals *choose* to display their mixed or binational family, for example, at the birth of a child (Brahic, 2013) or when display is *forced* on them by external observers. Haynes and Dermott refer to these occasions as, "'moments' of significance" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159).

A migrant family moving between locations is, therefore, potentially more likely to experience change and uncertainty than indigenous families. Indeed, Euteneuer and Uhlendorff (2014), identify immigration as a phase in the life course where "processes of reflection and negotiation are particularly significant" (2014: 4). As such, these families may experience more periods of "intensity" and, thereby, be more likely to display family.   As with mixed families in Haynes and Dermott's (2011) study, they may not, however, see being a *migrant* family as a constant, salient aspect of their individual identity, but they may experience "moments" of display (Haynes & Dermott; 2011). The study unpicks this further in order to identify when/if there are "moments" when migrant families feel *incited to* display their family relationships (Finch, 2007).

Testing the Concept: Questions about Process

"Tools" of Display

A number of scholars (Almack, 2011; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Doucet, 2011; Reynolds & Zontini, 2014) consider and support Finch's claim that "family display" is supported by "background features that we might define as 'tools of display' e.g. photos, domestic artifacts, heirlooms and narratives" (Finch, 2007: 77). In relation to transnational "family display", Reynolds and Zontini (2014) state that transnational families have "long since relied on displaying families through the use of visual artefacts, such as photographs and videos, to maintain social connections among geographically dispersed family members" (2014: 255). Further, Almack, in her study of lesbian parents, states that one grandmother displayed her new family through the use of photos (Almack, 2011: 114), whilst Kehily and Thomson affirm that the public display of ultra sound images of an unborn child is a "tool" used by pregnant women to display family to an external audience (Kehily & Thomson, 2011: 76). In terms of the use of narratives, Doucet (2011) further supports Finch, and by drawing on her study of men who are the main carers of their children, she identifies "heroic narratives" as a masculinised "tool" of display that

allows these men to *display* that their family "works" (Doucet, 2011: 85). In the context of this study it should, however, be noted that "tools" such as heroic narratives may be used differently, dependent on the type of migrant being interviewed; an economic migrant may provide a different narrative to a political migrant such as an asylum seeker or refugee.

Further applications of Finch's theory highlight additional *"tools"* for display, such as eating and naming practices. Eating practices, then, allow families to display intimacy to *family-like* members; Sirriyeh's (2013) study, for example, of unattended child asylum seekers in foster care, concludes that "food was a means of establishing an 'early win' and communicating care and affection" (2013: 12). Similarly, Rees *et al.* (2010), in their study of food in foster families, acknowledge that "mealtimes allow families to enact and display family life" (Rees *et al.,* 2010: 2). As food and eating are also associated with cultural tastes, traditions and ritual (Slater *et al.,* 2015), cooking and eating practices may be employed by research participants as a "tool" to display a variety of aspects of their migrant family and, as such, this area will be given careful consideration in the study.

Naming practices are, by contrast, a "tool" of display that allows families to display their identity externally; Zittoun, writing in 2004, argues that "when giving a child their first name, parents are defining to the world what they want the identity of their child to be, as well as saying to the world what type of child they want to be parents to" (Zittoun, 2004: 143). This assertion resonates with the concept of display*.* Indeed, Finch, writing in 2008, concludes that the naming of children, the retention of a given name, or the change to a partner's surname, are "tools" which are "available to assist the process of displaying families" (Finch, 2008: 722). Within migrant families, then, the choice of name can be a "tool" to display cultural links, traditions and heritage, because families are "social actors choosing and using particular names to convey social meaning in particular circumstances" (Finch, 2008: 722). When considering naming practices, it should also be recognised, then, that a migrant family may choose to give their child an indigenous name at birth, possibly as a strategic means to build connections with the host community.

These applications of "family display" do, therefore, provide a framework from which to consider the "tools" of both transnational and local "family display". Migrant families are, however, likely to employ a diverse range of "tools" of display and the examples cited here, are by no means exhaustive. This study will, then, interrogate the lived realities of migrant families in Hull and will consider the range of *"tools"* available to participant families.

Emerging Themes in "Family Display" Literature

Previous sections of this chapter have focused on the sociological background to "family display" and where applications of the theory have agreed with, or added to, Finch's original concept. The following sections will consider these aspects in more detail, review elements of Finch's concept that scholars have critiqued and identify where the literature review has revealed that "family display" has additional contributions to make to discourse.

<u>The Role of the Dominant Norm in "Family Display"</u>

Finch, in developing the concept of "family display", draws on Morgan's notion of "doing family" (Morgan, 1996). Both these approaches are grounded in a similar assertion that family is no longer a fixed concept and, instead, it is now "fluid, diverse and multifaceted" (Morgan, 1996). This suggests that "family" has few fixed, common influences that shape structure, supported by Finch's suggestion that display is a very normal requirement of *all* families if they are to claim, "these are my family relationships, and they work" (Finch 2007: 73).

Heaphy, however, critiques this, asserting that Finch and Morgan's perspective puts "aside important normative questions about how families *should* be organised" according to dominant discourse (Heaphy, 2011: 21). "Family display", for him, is not just a result of the fluidity and diversity of contemporary families, but it is also relational. As such, powerful societal constructs result in some families being required to display more in specific contexts, with those that conform to the conventional norm being more likely to be accepted as legitimate. Heaphy argues, then, that social researchers "should ask what the requirement to display reveals about the flow of power with respect to

relational life" and what power dynamics demand a form of display (Heaphy, 2011: 20). Finch, however, responds to Heaphy, claiming that his critique does not devalue the concept of "family display". She argues, instead, that these questions relating to "flows of power" are not relevant to "family display" and that they should be analysed using alternative sociological "tools" (Finch, 2011: 202).

Applications of theory do, however, support Heaphy's critique and highlight areas where societal dominant discourse does influence "family display" (Nordqvist, 2010; Kim, 2011; Krisite & Buckman, 2011; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Short, 2011; Doucet, 2011; Gabb, 2011; Carver, 2014; Lowson & Arber, 2014; Dermott & Pomati, 2015). Social class and the influence of the State are examples of such dominant codes of influence. Kehily and Thomson (2011), for example, not only consider the influence of gender on shaping expectations of motherhood, but also class; magazine portrayals of décor in baby rooms result in class-based aspirational "family displays" that speak to "wider social formations that point to the link between notions of taste, social class and cultural capital" (Kehily & Thomson, 2011: 75).

Dermott and Pomati (2015), in their study of good parenting, also indicate that State authorities can influence "family displays"; they refer to expectations imposed by the UK State education system and assert that parental behaviours are shaped by the "dominance of a culture of intensive parenting in which parents are expected to engage in a range of child-centred activities on a regular basis" (Dermott & Pomati, 2015: 13). Further, for Short, in Australia, State legislation has also influenced "family display" (Short, 2011); same-sex families, as argued by Heaphy, were required to display more than conventional families. Changes in legislation, however, granted lesbian couples legal parenting rights and both women are now named on their child's birth certificate. As a result, these State changes in legislation have made "the need for 'display' less intense" (Short, 2011: 121), as there has been a legislative shift in what is perceived as acceptable family.

Further applications of the concept of "family display" indicate that dominant discourse relating to family in the UK is also shaped by cultural, gendered and heteronormative

expectations. Kristie and Buckham (2011), Kim (2011) and Carver (2014) all acknowledge that what is perceived to be successful "family display" is shaped by the cultural expectations of either the family of origin, or the cultural location of the audience. Carver (2014), for example, reviews the process of migrant family members applying for immigration visas in the UK. British legal representatives "translate" the familial norms of an applicant's COO to match the "family displays" required by the UK Border Agency[9] (Carver, 2014). Here, then, literature reveals the influence of both the State and culture in shaping familial norms and "family displays".

Studies also indicate that displays are shaped by societal, gendered parenting expectations; those concerned with fathering, post-divorce or separation (Doucet, 2011; Philip, 2013, 2014), show that "family displays" are shaped by a father's need to be seen as the providing, "heroic" father (Doucet, 2011) that is "putting the children first" (Philip, 2013: 416). By contrast, Lowson and Arber's (2014) study of mothers that work night shifts shows that women in the study, despite working long, unsociable hours, are concerned with "maintaining continuity for their families […] to enable 'display' of successful and normative gendered patterns of domestic responsibility" (2014: 241). Here, then, by showing the display difficulties faced when gendered parenting expectations are challenged, studies again highlight the influence of dominant societal expectations on "family display".

Nordqvist, in her study of lesbian parenting, also asserts that societal heteronormativity shapes "family display". She draws on the parental desire that donor-conceived children will physically resemble the non-biological, as well as the biological mother and argues that, in so doing, these same-sex families display in a way that mirrors and, thus, reproduces a heteronormative construct. This example highlights that "a biogenetic, and heterosexual family ideal [is] thus highly influential in how conception and family [are] imagined among these couples" (Nordqvist, 2010: 1134). Gabb expands and asserts that heteronormativity not only shapes displays, but it is also *reproduced* by "family display". For her, concepts of legitimate family, for both lesbian couples and

---

[9] In 2014, The UK Border Agency (UKBA) was the British Government agency responsible for handling visa applications for people wanting to visit, work, study or settle in the UK. In November, 2014, the UKBA changed its name to the UK Visa and Immigration agency (Gov.UK, 2015g).

those observing family life, are strongly influenced by the expectation of male/female and father/mother figures.   As a result, same-sex "family displays" are viewed through this lens and when, for example, women are out with their children in public, it is often assumed that the women are sisters.   The prevalence of such assumptions, despite same-sex couples engaging in public "family display", highlights that the heteronormative stance is difficult to challenge (Gabb, 2011: 41).   Here, then, as Heaphy suggests, families that are able to conform to expected heteronormativity are able to achieve legitimacy more easily than others.

Despite Finch's rejection of Heaphy's argument, the examples provided here indicate that "family display" *is* influenced by intersecting factors that create a dominant discourse of *normal* family.   As Heaphy also argues that those families most able to display in a way that reflects these cultural ideals of *normal*, are most likely to be "recognised, validated and legitimated" (Heaphy, 2011: 30), there is a powerful incentive to display family in a way that reflects these norms.   Finch, however, rejects this idea that "displaying family is equivalent to making claims for respectability and conventionality" (2011: 203).   She asserts, instead, that the concept of "family display" affords more "creativity", allowing contemporary families to display what is meaningful to them about their specific relationships (Finch, 2011) and, for Seymour (2015), potentially amend discourses.   The evidence provided here indicates, however, that the tension between perspectives is unresolved and requires further exploration in this study.

The Seeking of Familial Legitimacy

Writing in 2011, Finch rejects the idea that "family display" is particularly relevant to non-conventional families seeking "respectability and conventionality" from those external to family (Finch, 2011: 203).   Instead, Finch believes that "family display" is relevant to *all* families and is associated with familial legitimacy for those *internal* to family (Finch, 2007: 70).   Heaphy, however, disagrees and builds on his argument that conventional families, that is, those that fit the cultural ideals of *normal* are more likely "to be recognised, validated and legitimated" (Heaphy, 2011: 30).   In addition to this, he also asserts that the demands for *family display* will differ between types of family and

will be required more in specific contexts, for example, mixed, lesbian and lone families, where the demand or desire to be recognised as legitimate is stronger. Here, these assertions are both tested and supported in scholarly applications of theory (James & Curtis, 2010; Nordquist, 2010; Almack, 2011).

Almack's (2011) study of lesbian couples having their first child provides an example of when "family display", linked to gaining familial legitimacy, is prevalent within non-conventional family forms. Here, one woman's biological mother initially displayed photos of her daughter, the new baby and the donor father, thereby reproducing heteronormative *family* to onlookers and delegitimising the same-sex family construct to both those within it and the external audience. The daughter challenged her mother who then displayed a photo of her daughter and the baby. It was only when the mother displayed a photo of her daughter, her partner and their child, that the daughter felt that her mother had legitimised the family to both those within it and the external audience (Almack, 2011). This example highlights the role of "family display" in seeking legitimacy for family members, but also indicates that dominant discourse associated with *normal* family strongly influences what family members may choose to display and to what they, consequently, give legitimacy.

For Heaphy (2011), these examples are more than a family, or family member, experiencing what Finch refers to as periods of "intensity of display" (Finch, 2007). Instead, Heaphy claims that "family display" is more common amongst non-conventional "types" of family who desire validation as "normal". As such, they display in-line with the dominant discourse associated with family, thereby making "family claims that are more or less readily recognised and validated according to […] interlinked cultural ideals of "'normal', 'proper', and 'good' families" (Heaphy, 2011: 21). For Chambers, however, the dominant Western typology of family is white, heterosexual and biologically connected and those that do not fit into the normative model are *other* (2001: 115). Consequently, according to Heaphy's assertion, if migrant families are required to reproduce the dominant norm in order to gain familial legitimacy, lack of familiarity with, or an inability to conform to the cultural norm, may result in migrant families being unable to gain the sought after legitimacy.

The Restorative and Educational Function of "Family Display"

Applications of Finch's concept also reveal that "family display" has a restorative and educational function both for families and members of the wider community (Almack, 2011; Ryan-Flood, 2011; Short, 2011; Hughes & Valentine, 2011; Valentine *et al*., 2014). Almack, for example, considers this educational function of display when lesbian couples, as first-time parents, "come out" to wider networks (Almack, 2011). Liz Short, in a commentary on Almack's (2011) study of first-time lesbian parents, argues that when these parents "come out" to broader networks, "family display" provides an opportunity for same-sex families to educate others in a "heteronormative world" in how to relate to them:

> They need to navigate territory and lesbian mothers 'show', 'signpost', 'mark-out', and give cues about how to relate to them as family (Short 2007a; 2007b) – 'displaying' who is family and that the family 'is' family, assists this navigation.
>
> (Short, 2011: 119)

Ryan-Flood (2011) agrees, but adds to this, stating that, by giving "cues", lesbian parents albeit sometimes through the reproduction of displays that mirror heteronormativity, not only educate others, but potentially ward off negativity. For this scholar, "display, on this occasion, also serves as an educational and protective tool which guards against homophobia" (Ryan-Flood, 2011: 123).

Hughes and Valentine, in their study of internet gambling behaviours, introduce the idea that "family display" also has a function in rebuilding intimate relationships within a family. When a gambler begins the process of recovery, for example, other family members may *display* family via the offer of practical support; by helping the gambler access support groups, manage debt *etc.,* the gambler's significant others are "displaying family" (Hughes & Valentine, 2011). The recovering gambler, by "doing" (Morgan, 1996) more things with their children and by "doing" more social activities, is also able to display intimacy with family and rebuild their new identity. For the authors, "it is therefore not surprising that the practices of display emerge as central to some of the strategies for recovery as identified by gamblers and their significant others" (Hughes & Valentine, 2001: 139). Valentine *et al.* (2014) add to this discussion; for

them, "family displays" can have a similar restorative function when family members display public approval of intimate relationships that they, or the wider extended family, have not previously supported. A family member may, for example, display family by attending an inter-faith wedding, or by walking in the street with their gay son and partner as they are holding hands (Valentine *et al.*, 2014: 67)

In Hull, then, both indigenous and migrant "family display" has the potential to educate *all* families in ways of relating to one another. The restorative function of display may also be significant in rebuilding or maintaining intimate relationships, either transnationally or in the context of reunification, where family members have been absent or continue to live transnationally. It is, however, the broader restorative and educational function of "family display"*,* between migrant and indigenous populations, that will be given the most attention in order to explore if the concept can add to our understanding of race relations within the city.

The Role of the Audience in Display

In 2007, Finch explicitly acknowledges the role of audience, stating that "the meaning of one's actions have to be both conveyed to and understood by relevant others if those actions are to be effective as constituting 'family practices'"; "they need to be linked to the wider system of meaning" (Finch, 2007: 66 - 67). Scholarly consideration of the concept of "family display" has resulted in a call for further research looking at the role of audience (Dorrer *et al.,* 2010a; Roth, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Haynes & Dermott, 2011), particularly in terms of who counts as the "relevant others" and if "external others may play a part in confirming display" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 13). That said, in 2011, although accepting of the need for more "investigations into the more public dimensions of display" (Finch, 2011: 204), Finch continued to emphasise that, for her, "family display" is primarily concerned with conveying meaning to those within the family and not audiences external to the family unit. Applications of the concept do, however, challenge Finch's assertion and indicate areas where audiences external to the family unit do impact on "family display".

The Wider Community as the Audience

A number of studies highlight the fact that non-specific members of the wider community, beyond intimate family members, do influence and shape "family display". Carter *et al.,* (2015) in their study of couples that live apart, but are together, suggest that in the absence of co-residence, these couples are driven to show the wider community that their family "works". They do so via public "family displays"*,* such as *displaying* their relationship status on the social networking site, *Facebook.* Furthermore, for Smart (2008), the choices made by same-sex couples in relation to civil partnership celebrations are also influenced by assumed public, or audience responses. Some couples, for example, choose minimalist, private celebrations, so as to not reproduce heteronormativity, preferring "a lack of display and a quiet commitment to lesbian or gay lifestyles". Others, however, choose large, highly public events that proclaim "that homosexual love should be displayed and widely admired or understood" (Smart, 2008: 772). Smart asserts, then, that these same-sex couples are potentially using display with political intent and consciously constructing their "family display*"* with the wider audience in mind.

Roth (2011), in her study of transnational motherhood, further identifies that the external audience is significant, because the success of "family displays" is dependent on audience interpretation; Romanian migrant women, for example, display their transnational maternal relationships via the use of technology, holiday visits and sending money home; ways that do not comply with dominant discourse associated with family. These displays are potentially problematic as the audience does not interpret them as familial and, thereby, successful, "regardless of the intention of actors" (Roth, 2011: 11.4).

Abstract Audiences Such as the State

Studies also reveal that, as asserted by Dermott and Seymour, "abstract participants such as the State" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17) are significant audiences and do shape "family displays". Dermott and Pomati (2015) and Gillies (2011), for example, highlight the role of UK government policy in defining what is perceived to be appropriate parenting and the subsequent impact this has on shaping the "family

displays" required by the State. Others document the role that the State audience has in "confirming display" as successful (Dorrer *et al.*, 2010b; Dermott & Seymour, 2011); Dorrer *et al.,* for example, in their study of children's care homes, discuss the role of audience, as, "In care homes, surveillance is imposed to make sure children are cared for and society is protected" (2010b: 291). Social care professionals, then, observe *family-like* displays, such as structured meal times and, thereby, assess the effectiveness of the system based on their interpretation of these displays. The role of audience in "confirming display" is further affirmed in Carver's (2014) consideration of the "family displays" required of migrant families applying to the UK Visa and Immigration Service. Here, families are required to display in line with specific requirements if the State, as the audience of their displays, is to confirm them as successful and potentially grant the family an immigration visa.

Multiple Audiences

Applications of "family display" indicate that, as Dermott and Seymour (2011) assert, "the requirement to display family may involve a wide range of potential audiences that are not restricted to family members (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17). Lowson and Arber, in their study of women working night shifts, provide an example, claiming that "women in the study appear to be 'displaying' to themselves, their families, the researcher and to other people" (Lowson & Arber, 2014: 241). Different multiple audiences may, however, *require* displays of a specific type and displays may also be interpreted from multiple audience perspectives and understandings. Seymour (2011) acknowledges this in her study of spaces which are both the home and workplace, such as hotels, where "family display" "can be read as having multiple meanings depending upon the relevant others who make up the audience" (Seymour, 2011: 173). Here, she considers the role of audience and the dualism created in such spaces, stating that "displaying families in this context [hotels] becomes a complex mix of presentation and reticence" (Seymour, 2011: 161).

Finch emphasises that "family display" is primarily concerned with conveying meaning to those within the family (Finch, 2011), but the examples provided here indicate that the role of the external audience *does* require further investigation. This study will be

the first to conduct empirical research with a specific focus on the role of audience. Focus will be given to a number of questions: Which audiences of "family display" are significant to migrant families in the study? How do "abstract" audiences such as the State impact on migrant "family display"? How do migrant families negotiate "family displays" being observed by multiple audiences, if they are to avoid costly, unsuccessful "family display"? How is migrant "family display" received by an indigenous audience? How do audience "family display" requirements impact on migrant families and can a family achieve legitimacy in this context?

Different Types of Display

Finch implies that "family display" reveals the positive nature of family relationships (Finch, 2007: 70). Earlier sections have, however, introduced the idea that there may be a negative angle to display; the demand for, and the incentive to display, may vary between family *types* and certain types of display may be more valid or legitimate than others (Heaphy, 2011). Gabb examines this in more detail and argues that different factors that "may shape and/or inhibit" can also result in "family display" being either omitted or misinterpreted (Gabb, 2011). She then goes on to argue that, in order to identify when this occurs, "we should not only focus on displaying families but should also be mindful of what is happening at the edges and behind the scenes of the narrative of display" (Gabb, 2011: 39). Finch (2011) acknowledges this critique, stating that "my article did not explore, to any depth, the possibility of unsuccessful or misrecognised displays. This is an area which would repay further development" (Finch, 2011: 202). This following section considers where scholarly application of the concept of "family display" has raised further questions relating to the significance and definition of unsuccessful *displays*, negative *displays* and misinterpreted *displays.*

Omitted Displays

Gabb's consideration of "family display" focusses on "different factors that may shape and/or inhibit "family displays" and the effect on in/visibility" (Gabb, 2011: 38). Within this, she identifies occasions when such factors result in a family, or individuals in a family, omitting "family display". An example of this would be when the dominant norm of heteronormativity results in teenage children of same-sex parents choosing not to

display family in order to avoid homophobic bullying (Gabb, 2011: 43). Almack provides a further example, referring to an occasion when a lesbian woman in her study did not display her role as a social mother to her family, in order to avoid the pain of unsuccessful display, that is, rejection as a legitimate family (Almack, 2011: 109). For Smart, this is supported in her study of family secrets and memories, where she found that external factors "shape" what families often choose to display and they, thereby, present "a specific face to the world […] [that] will not be the full story of the kinds and quality of relationships going on behind the façade" (Smart, 2011: 539). For these individuals, the incentive to display correctly or successfully has resulted in specific types of "family display" being avoided.

Culturally specific, unconventional displays may, then, be equally problematic or "troubling" (Gabb, 2011). Indeed, Heath *et al.* (2011) posit that "migrant families may have good reason not to engage in overt displays of family, if it brings unwelcome attention in its wake" (2011: 3.16). If the aim of "family display" is to achieve legitimacy with both the indigenous and transnational community, migrant families in this study may, then, omit certain types of cultural display when they are in public spaces and display differently in the private domain.

Unsuccessful, Rejected, Negative and Misunderstood Displays

Applications of "family display" also refer to occasions when displays are unsuccessful, received negatively or misunderstood (Jones & Hackett, 2011; Gabb, 2011; Almack, 2011)**.** When, for example, family members do not respond positively, or at all, to birth announcement cards sent out by same-sex couples, "family display" is rejected and does not result in those involved being allowed to successfully show that "this is my family and it works" (Finch, 2007: 73). Jones and Hackett (2011), in their study of adoptive kinship, give a further example of when display is received negatively. Adoption practices currently promote the maintenance of links with birth parents and, as such, adoptive families are *required* annually to display the Christmas cards received from biological parents. Although the family in question did this in previous years, one particular Christmas, the adopted daughter evaluated these displays as intrusive, negative and a display that might threaten the stability of her adoptive family and

consequently asked that they not be displayed (Jones & Hackett, 2011). In this definition, the negative "family display" is one required by an external influence, implemented by some family members, but then rejected owing to the *cost* to the individual involved. For the adoptive child, these displays did not signify, "these are my family relationships" (Finch, 2007). This resonates with the experiences of migrant families that may be required to display family in-line with external influences, such as the State (Carver, 2014) or their transnational family, but at a cost to themselves.

Scholars also identify occasions when "family display" is troublesome due to audience misinterpretation (Gabb, 2011; Roth, 2011). Gabb, for example, considers when lesbian mothers are mis-identified by audiences as sisters. Although the two women are showing "this is my family and it works" via public familial activities, the audience do not have the tools to realise that two women with a child are a family. Although the intimacy between the two women is acknowledged, the audience conclude that the *family-like* relationship they observe is "sisterly" (Gabb, 2011: 44).

Roth, in her study of Romanian migrant mothers living geographically separate to their children, similarly reports that these mothers send remittances home and maintain regular contact with their children. These displays may not, however, be successful with either transnational or local audiences, because they are not recognised as familial and "certain relationships can be considered by observers to be so far from their preconceived notions about family life, that they might refuse to recognise certain acts as constituting displaying of the family" (Roth, 2011: 11.4). Instead, as Heaphy argues, the displays described by both Roth and Gabb are rejected or misinterpreted, because "alternative or critical displays of family are weak displays within our culture with potential audiences for those displays unwilling to receive, interpret and validate them as desirable alternatives to family" (Heaphy, 2011: 37). As such, it is important to acknowledge throughout the study, that both the migrant and indigenous community may not have the knowledge or desire to recognise and, therefore, validate either community's "family displays".

Dermott and Seymour argue, then, that "family display" does not always reveal the positive nature of family relationships, it may not always be "successful" and "if 'display' is not successful then the cost may be high" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 109): for a same-sex couple that does not receive familial recognition of the birth of their new born child, the consequence is emotional rejection for both the women and the child involved and their new family is not given legitimacy (Almack, 2011). If Romanian migrant mothers are not recognised as providing for their families, the consequence is limited intimacy with their children, compounded by a rejection of their maternal validity by external audiences (Roth, 2011). The cost of unsuccessful "family display" for migrant families is, therefore, potentially high; it is not only possible that successful "family display" may have a central role in migrant families being accepted by the transnational and host audience, but a migrant's legal status may also depend on successful "family display". Certain types of "family display" may be required, for example, of migrant families, such as proving to the Home Office that the migrant family is "genuine" (Carver, 2014).

Conclusion

Throughout the last sixty years, sociological approaches to understanding the family and the "tools" used in order to do so have developed, changed and expanded. In 2007, Janet Finch, writing in *Sociology,* added to this field of study by introducing the concept of "family display". Here, Finch provided the basic framework for the creation of a broader concept and invited the academic community to explore and expand her proposition.

Upon reviewing the concept and responses from the academic community, it is clear that "family display" has provoked considerable attention, questions and challenges. Applications of the theory have supported aspects of Finch's initial assertion; "family display" does occur when families experience change over time, when adult intimate relationships shift and when *family* live across households. There is also evidence to suggest that families experience occasions when the requirement or desire to display is more intense. Furthermore, "family display" does materialise through social interaction and the use of "tools" such as narratives, photographs and symbolic actions such as

knitting baby clothes (Almack, 2011). These conclusions are, however, by no means exhaustive and require further exploration in order to refine the detail of Finch's suggestions, as well as to expand academic understanding of how "family display" is realised.

Critiques have also responded to Finch's invitation and posed pertinent questions. Heaphy, for example, challenges several aspects of the concept as, for him: "family display" is applicable to *all* families, but the discourse associated with family results in some families being required to display more than others; the restrictive definition of *normal* family, within discourse, means that there are some families that will struggle to gain recognition as legitimate; "family display" should be expanded to include display of other *family-like* relationships within intimate networks (Heaphy, 2011). Gabb also indicates important areas for further consideration, arguing that Finch initially focuses on the positive impact of showing that "this is my family and it works", but attention should be given to times when "family display" is omitted, rejected or misunderstood (Gabb, 2011). For Gabb, these areas are central in revealing the incentives driving "family display" and the broader implications of "family display" as a new concept.

The role of the audience in "family display" also receives significant attention in the literature reviewed. Although Finch acknowledges that it is an area that requires further exploration, she is reticent to accept the audience as significant, focusing more on the responses of those internal to the *family*. Scholars, however, call for this area to be researched further, arguing that the external audience is important in shaping who and what should be displayed, as well as playing a role in confirming displays as successful (Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Heaphy, 2011; Gabb, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011). Questions are further raised as to whom constitutes "relevant others" and how audience requirements impact on displays when multiple audiences are present (Seymour, 2011).

Overall, this chapter reveals important areas for consideration during the research process and, as the first study completed with the purpose of exploring "family display"*,* methods have been selected with the specific aim of further testing, stretching and

expanding the concept. In addition to this, by working directly with the audience of display the research interrogates the role of audience in display and tests Finch's assertion that "family display" is primarily relevant to those individuals internal to the family. In so doing, this research again provides the first opportunity to gather data concerned with the role of key people observing "family display" and the influence of broader multiple audiences, such as the State, transnational family and local indigenous residents. Finally, by drawing on Heaphy's assertion that the activity of "family display" is not only limited to immediate family relationships, the research applies the lens of "family display" as a concept, to a broader, culturally changing environment, with a view to understanding the processes behind race relations and the creation of cohesive communities.

CHAPTER FOUR: THE UK'S HISTORY OF IMMIGRATION AND RACE RELATIONS

This study considers migrant "family display" within a UK city, where migrant groups potentially seek legitimacy from both host and transnational audiences. The research is also concerned with indigenous responses to migrant "family display" and if this has implications for building cohesive communities. In this chapter, historical context is provided relating to the history of immigration in the UK and, parallel to this, the UK government's historical and current approaches to the management of *race relations;* the dynamic between socially, culturally and politically diverse communities*.* It is argued here, then, that context can influence public opinion towards migrants. Although the focus of this thesis is the early C21st, responses to immigration during the C20th impact on later discourses. As such, a summary is provided of germane developments during the first half of the C20th and discussion becomes more detailed in sections referring to the period post-1979. As fieldwork was conducted from October 2012 to October 2013, information is provided up to and including this time frame.

The Perceived Problem of Migration in the UK

Immigration has economic, social and cultural benefits for the UK; migrants bring diverse perspectives and cultural knowledge to a community and they also fill labour gaps and provide employers with greater choice in the labour market (Home Office, 2008). Between 2001–2011, EU migrants contributed more than twenty billion pounds to UK public finances (UCL News, 2014). There are, then, periods when immigration policy has been used to the advantage of the UK economy's labour demands, examples of which are provided throughout this chapter (Foot, 1965; Solomos, 2003; Consterdine, 2014).

Scholars posit, however, that political parties and the press change their stance towards immigration during economic downtimes; they compete to harness nationalistic and anti-immigration sentiment in order to distract populations from the country's social problems and more stringent immigration control is advocated (Foot, 1965; Brown, 1995; Kundnani, 2007; Finney & Simpson, 2009; Jones, 2014). It is further argued that "the role of policy, language and symbols can combine with media discourses to create a dominant approach to the treatment of an issue" (Mulvey, 2010: 438). At times, this

has led to certain migrant communities being "scapegoated" (Greenslade, 2005) and/or labelled as "bogus" (Mulvey, 2010: 443). Detail presented here builds an argument to support these views, whilst also acknowledging the influence integration policy can have on public opinion towards immigration and, consequently, *community cohesion*.[10]

The Early C20th and the Advent of Immigration Control

Prior to the start of the C20th, immigration to the UK supported the industrial revolution and was not controlled in UK policy. 1905, however, saw the passing of the first overt piece of British immigration control policy - the *1905 Aliens Act*[11] (Foot, 1965: 99). At this time, the UK was experiencing economic downturn, unemployment and poverty. Foot (1965) contends that the immigrant community, particularly those of Jewish origin, were blamed for the social problems experienced by indigenous populations; negative press representation of Jewish settlers combined with trade union pressure resulted in a government focus on immigration control, which resulted in the passing of the 1905 Act (Foot, 1965; Brown, 1995). A key provision of the Act was that aliens could be refused permission to enter Britain if they did not have the means to support themselves (Solomos, 2003: 42).

This Act is an historical benchmark, signalling the beginning of immigration control, the start of an immigration discourse and the targeting of a specific group of migrants.

Immigration Control and the Rise of Nationalism

The second Act controlling immigration was passed at the outbreak of the First World War, when government priority was to foster nationalism and support for the war (Foot, 1965: 103). At a time when the political atmosphere from *all* parties was one of "xenophobia", immigration politics took a jingoistic shift (*ibid*) and the *1914 Aliens Restrictions Act* was passed in the space of a day, virtually unopposed by any political party (Brown, 1995: 5). This act allowed that, "in time of war or imminent national

---

[10] *Community Cohesion* is the term given to race relations by the New Labour Government in the early years of the C21st (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 13).

[11] The main provisions of the legislation were: (a) that aliens could be refused permission to enter Britain if they did not have, or did not have the means to obtain, the means to subsist in adequate sanitary conditions; (b) that an alien could be expelled from Britain without trial or appeal if he or she was found to be receiving poor relief within a year of entering Britain, was found guilty of vagrancy or was found to be living in insanitary conditions due to overcrowding (Solomos, 2003: 42).

danger or great emergency to impose restrictions on aliens" (Foot, 1965: 101), the intent being to defend the country, not to control immigration *per-se*. The post war coalition government, however, went on to pass the *1919 Aliens Restriction Act,*[12] in order to extend the provisions of the *Aliens Restriction Act, 1914,* for one year (Solomos, 2003: 43). Although this was perhaps justifiable in times of conflict, in peacetime, *all* governments renewed this Act on an annual basis and these immigration powers remained in place for fifty years. The Act served as an ongoing legislative symbol of nationalism and xenophobia (Foot, 1965: 106-123).

Anti-Semitism and the Role of Race Relations

Despite the growth of immigrant populations in Britain, between the 1850s and the end of the Second World War, no official provision was made for supporting positive race relations, or to meet the social and welfare needs of migrant and indigenous groups in the areas where migrants settled (Brown, 1995; Solomos, 2003). Anti-Semitism, then, became more prevalent during this period (Foot, 1965: 109). During the 1930s, when the great depression caused extreme poverty and tested attitudes towards immigrants, the British Union of Fascists (BUF), a party with extreme anti-Semitic views (Miles & Phizackleas, 1979: 56), were able to gain significant support[13] in areas of London where social problems were acute (Hill & Issacharoff, 1971: 44).

The Labour Party, Communist Party and trade unions did form a united front to defend the Jewish communities (Miles & Phizackleas, 1979: 62) against the BUF and attitudes towards immigrants were not universally negative. During the Second World War, the right to asylum, as outlined in the 1905 Alien's Act, was mostly honoured and public sentiments towards Jewish immigrants shifted, as they were victims of Britain's enemy (Foot, 1965: 115). As such, there is much evidence of State and public support for asylum throughout this period (Dallal, 2004); around 25,000 Austrian and German Jews were given asylum (Foot, 1965: 111) and more than 9,500 Jewish children from Nazi

---

[12] This act, in essence, said: "an alien can be refused entry into the United Kingdom at the discretion of an immigration officer; that, in general, he shall not be allowed into this country for more than 3 months unless he holds a Ministry of Labour permit to work or has visible means of financial support; and that any alien can be deported either by the courts or by the Home Secretary when he deems it conducive to the public good" (Foot, 1965: 107).

[13] At this time the BUF numbered around 10,000 (Miles & Phizackleas, 1979: 36).

occupied Europe were given refuge as part of what was to become known as the *Kindertransport* (The Kindertransport Association, n.d). Nevertheless, the treatment of Britain's Jewish communities and the rise of anti-Semitism highlights how attitudes to both immigration and specific groups can be affected by unmanaged social problems and a confluence of political, populist and media influences (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010).

Post-War Britain and Immigration

In order to meet post war labour shortages, the Labour government of 1945-1951, supported by the Conservative opposition, actively recruited migrant labour (Brown, 1995: 7). State sponsored schemes, such as the Polish Resettlement Corp and Voluntary Workers Schemes, led to approximately 220,000 displaced Eastern Europeans settling in Britain by 1949 (Solomos, 2003: 50).

The *British Nationality Act of 1948* clarified that citizens of the British Colonies "were allowed to enter Britain to seek work and settle here with their families" (Pilkington, 1984: 14). Members of the Commonwealth took full advantage of the beckoning labour market in Britain (Kundnani, 2007: 19). It is estimated that by 1971 the total number of people of New Commonwealth origin - mainly from India, Pakistan and the Caribbean Islands - had reached 1.4 million, 28% of whom were children born in the UK (Pilkington, 1984: 14). It is argued in the following sections that responses to these new arrivals laid the foundations for the immigration and race discourses of the early C21st.

Immigration Politics and the Focus on Race and Assimilation.

During the 1950s' growing economic prosperity and national self-confidence, opposition to immigration control dominated in mainstream political parties. It was also during this period, however, that less prevalent immigration politics *began* to adopt a race focus (Foot, 1965; Solomos, 2003: 53). The *1949 Royal Commission of Population*, for example, welcomed immigration "without reserve" in order to meet the labour shortages of the period, but with the caveat that migrants were "of good stock and were not prevented by their race or religion from intermarrying with the host population and becoming merged into it" (Brown, 1995: 8). Here, rather than tackle the social and

welfare needs resulting from the nation dealing with the arrival of New Commonwealth immigrants (Foot, 1965: 133), the commission focused on control of *specific* "coloured" immigrants and scapegoated them as the cause of social problems (Solomos, 2003: 53).

The Labour Party Shift to Immigration Control and the Events at Smethwick

During the 1960s, mainstream political stances towards immigration shifted again, this time to secure votes at the polls during a period of economic downturn and high unemployment. As in other similar periods, the government focused on social problems associated with immigration and the far Right returned to their previous anti-immigration policies (Foot, 1965: 135). Consequently, in 1961, a bill was introduced by the Conservative government, aiming to control the immigration of all Commonwealth passport holders (Solomos, 2003: 57).

The Labour Party initially opposed what became the *1962 Commonwealth Immigrants Act*, claiming that "every Commonwealth citizen has the right as a British subject to enter this country at will" (Foot, 1965: 170). After the 1964 general election, however, they changed their stance, following the controversial election campaign in Smethwick, which "had a profound impact on both the local and national political scene" (Solomos, 2003: 59). Here, the Conservative politician, Peter Griffith, campaigned against Labour's Patrick Gordon Walker, calling for an immigration ban with a focus on black immigrants (Foot, 1965: 25-53). In October 1964, Griffith took what had been a safe Labour seat from Walker with a 7.4% Labour to Conservative swing [14] (*Ibid*: 50). In an environment where the social impact of immigration had not been tackled by successive governments, anti-immigrant posturing was seen to bear fruit. As such, the incoming Labour government recognised the public sensitivity around immigration and publicly shifted their stance to pro-immigration control (Foot, 1965: 183). For Brown, this was a clear example of political willingness to "pander to racist ideas about immigrants in order to win votes at a general election" (1995: 16).

---

[14] The national swing from the Conservatives to Labour was 3.5% and in the Midlands the swing from Conservative to Labour was lower at 2% (Foot, 1965:50).

Immigration Policy, Coloured Immigration and Creation of the *Other*

Following the Labour victory of 1964 all political parties supported immigration control (Solomos, 2003: 59-62). Despite immigration figures from the Commonwealth falling[15] (Brown, 1995: 18), the Labour government passed further control legislation, which continued to target and, thus, *other* coloured immigrants and settled black and minority ethnic communities (hereafter referred to as BME communities). The *1968 Commonwealth Immigrant Act*, for example, stated that "immigration controls would not apply to any would-be settler who could claim national membership on the basis that one of their grandparents had been born in the UK" (Gilroy, 1987: 45). Consequently, relatives of New Commonwealth immigrants, who had only arrived in Britain in the previous 20 years, were obstructed from entering the country, whereas those from the white Old Commonwealth were less affected; *immigration* had become synonymous with *black immigration* and this policy was indeed "condemned by *The Times* as 'a shameful colour ban'" (Weber & Bowling, 2008: 365).

During this period, parliament did make some provision for race relations and passed the *1965* and, subsequently, *the 1968[16] Race Relations Acts* (BBC On This Day, 2012). Solomos argues, however, that these Acts were largely symbolic and inadequate and there was "little evidence of significant advances against entrenched forms of race inequality" (Solomos, 2003: 78). This is supported by the fact that, parallel to the passing of these Acts, the Conservative Minister, Enoch Powell, became prominent in immigration discourse, with his 1968 *Rivers of Blood* speech in Birmingham receiving the most coverage. Here, he predicted unavoidable race violence, warned that white British people were becoming "strangers" in their own country (Channel 4 News, 2008) and called for control of black immigration (Gilroy, 1987: 48). This anti-immigrant sentiment was also reflected in public opinion; a poll conducted immediately after Powell's 1968 speech showed 74% of people agreed with his opinions (Ostow *et al*. 1991: 223), thus indicating widespread anti-black sentiment.

---

[15] In 1964, 66,000 Commonwealth migrants entered Britain. In 1967, this number was 3,807 (Brown, 1995: 18).

[16] The 1965 Act made it illegal to refuse housing, employment or public services to people because of their ethnic background. The 1968 Act encompassed the 1965 Act and tightened race discrimination law (BBC On This Day, 2012).

Powell's opinions were, by and large, rejected by mainstream politicians and they resulted in his dismissal from the Conservative Shadow Cabinet, a move supported by the national press (Channel 4 News, 2008). During the 1970s, however, *all* mainstream political parties continued to promote the stringent control and monitoring of immigration. The implementation of the *1971 Immigration Act*, for example, consolidated the details of the 1962 and 1968 Acts (Flynn, 2002), affirming that non-white Commonwealth members were excluded from entering the UK. For Kundnani, this consolidation resulted in "a new racism [being] introduced into the structures of the State, through immigration laws that implicitly defined Britain as white" (Kundnani, 2007: 22).

The Creation of the 'Black Mugging' Crises and the Scapegoating of Settled Communities

For Brown, this "racist offensive […] across British society" (1995: 19) provided the foundation of race relations in 1970s Britain and subsequent years.   Scholars contend that an on-going barrage of negative media representation (Greenslade, 2005) and anti–immigration political discourse had a major impact on public opinion (Mulvey, 2010).

For Hall *et al.* (1978), the race-based immigration discourse of the 1960s, the social impact of the 1970s economic recession and media representation of young black men in the 1970s, resulted in the creation of a "moral panic"[17] (Cohen, 1972: 28). In August 1972, the press referred to a stabbing in London as "a mugging gone wrong"' (Hall *et al.,* 1978: 3). Prior to this date, "mugging", was not a crime categorisation in the UK, as this was an American term (*Ibid*). *Muggings,* however, received unprecedented coverage in the British press and by March 1973, the headline in many national papers was "London muggings up by 129% over 4 years" (*Ibid*: 8). Although this was misleading, as *mugging* had not previously been recorded as a crime, owing to intersecting public, press and police discourses (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010), the public demanded tougher sentences for *muggings.* As a consequence, when, in the same month, the judiciary tried three Handsworth youths for their involvement in a *mugging*, these youths of

---

[17] A *moral panic* is a period when "a condition, episode, person, or group of persons emerges to become defined as a threat to societal values and interests" (Cohen, 1972: 28)

mixed ethnic origin received unprecedented sentences in order to deter future attacks (Hall *et al.*, 1978: 8).

Mugging reappeared in the newspaper headlines in 1974, with much reference to areas heavily populated by black immigrants, namely Clapham and Brixton, which again implied a race element to the crimes. At the same time, the Brockwell Park incident occurred, where conflict between white and black youths resulted in a white youth being stabbed. This located "black crime […] in the inner-city 'ghettos'" and revived the previous "moral panic", but with a focus on black young men (*Ibid*: 329).

Contemporary scholars argued that the *mugging* issue was a result of disaffection, unemployment and a need to create a black youth identity. Further, although white youths were also involved in the incident, the general public drew on media representation and concluded that all *mugging* was carried out by blacks and all victims were white (*Ibid:* 330). During the economic crises in 1970s Britain, young black men, as settled migrants, became the scapegoat and provided "the arena in which complex fears, tensions and anxieties, generated by the totality of the crises […] [could] be most conveniently and explicitly projected" (Hall *et al.,* 1978: 333).

Race Relations and Settled Black Communities

During this period, the government failed to take affirmative action to manage race relations in Britain's communities (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 29). Instead, institutional approaches focused on *managing* black communities, via targeted community initiatives and the heavy policing of urban "trouble spots" (Hall *et al.,* 1978: 333). This was often counterproductive; just as the "moral panic" around mugging institutionally justified a strategy of heavy policing, the black community increasingly began to report what was perceived as police oppression and, in response, there was an increase in grassroots black militancy (Hall *et al.,* 1978).

The 1970s was also characterised by the growth of right wing racism, manifesting itself in the successes of the National Front Party in the council elections of 1976 (Brown, 1995: 20) and in its most violent form in the primarily (though by no means exclusively)

working class, skinhead phenomenon. It should be noted, however, that in response to this, a progressive anti-fascist and anti-racist alliance was mobilised across Britain, most notably in the Rock Against Racism movement and the Anti-Nazi League (Manzoor, 2008).   For its part, by failing to implement effective integration strategies, the government, *de facto*, contributed to intensified division between Britain's diverse communities - a theme mirrored in later years (Kundnani, 2007).

The Thatcher and Major Years: 1979 – 1997

<u>Making the Link between Immigration and National Cohesion</u>

The late 1970s was, then, one of heightened race issues, whereby the "muggers" crises fostered racism and discourse linked anti-immigration sentiment with the settled black community and social unrest (Hall *et al.,* 1978). All political parties assertively promoted control of "coloured" immigration and this issue was high on the political agenda (Brown, 1995: 20). In the pre-election period of 1979, the Conservative Party Manifesto committed to further tighten immigration controls and their leader, Margaret Thatcher, emphasised that this was necessary to counter the threat "posed to British social and cultural values by the black and ethnic minority people already settled in Britain" (Solomos, 2003: 64). In 1979, amidst economic turmoil, rising unemployment and industrial unrest, these discourses resonated with the British public and Thatcher was elected as the new Prime Minister. During the subsequent Conservative government of 1979–1997, the clamour for effective immigration control remained central to political debate (Brown, 1995: 20-24).

Scholars contend that it was during this period that arguments for immigration control were first overtly linked to existing migrant populations and the perceived need to protect national identity (Solomos, 2003: 64); there developed a "new racism" whereby,

> in place of overt statements of racial superiority came the idea of innate cultural
> differences between ethnic groups [settled or new]; immigration by people of a
> different ethnicity threatened the cultural identity of the nation and had to be
> halted in the name of national cohesion.
>
> (Kundnani, 2007: 43)

This following section considers how approaches to immigration and race relations, during the 18 years of this Conservative government, contributed to this "new racism".

In 1981 the *Nationality Act* was passed, further restricting the entry of Commonwealth dependants into Britain by redefining categories of British Citizenship and the associated right of abode (Brown, 1995: 20). The Act was ostensibly introduced in order to preserve race relations, as the Conservatives claimed that the UK government could not maintain adequate living conditions and positive community relations for more migrants. For Solomos (2003), however, the creation of new *types* of British citizen continued the racially discriminating provisions of existing immigration legislation; this Act, for example, continued to protect old, white Commonwealth members, whilst depriving citizens of Asian origin the right to live in the UK (Solomos, 2003: 65). Further, associated parliamentary debate referred to the "problem" of the "black and ethnic minority". In so doing, British identity was defined along "racial lines" (*ibid*: 64) and BME groups positioned as the problem *other.*

Extending Immigration Control: Asylum Seekers and Refugees as Problem Migrants
When the Conservatives took office, asylum seekers were "the only significant group of immigrants [still] able to gain access [to the UK] (Brown, 1995: 21). It was during this period that this group were initially presented as "problem" migrants and Thatcher's tenure saw "Britain acquiring one of the worst records in Europe in its treatment of asylum seekers" (*ibid*). Although the number granted refugee status by the Home Office fell during the 1980s,[18] it was during the 1990s that immigration control overtly targeted asylum seekers. This became a prominent aspect of the Conservative's legislative political agenda and two significant pieces of legislation were introduced; the *1993 Asylum and Immigration Appeals Act* and the *1996 Asylum and Immigration* Act (Solomos, 2003: 68).

The 1993 Act introduced the "third country rule", whereby, if a ship or aeroplane transporting an asylum seeker stopped in another country on its way to the UK (touches

---

[18] Between 1984-1986, immigration officers accepted, for asylum, only two hundred and forty for every one million of the UK's inhabitants, as compared with nearly five thousand for Sweden and four thousand for Denmark and Switzerland (Brown, 1995: 21).

down in an airport or docks in a port), the UK authorities deemed that the asylum seeker could have sought asylum in that country, potentially making their claim in the UK invalid. This rule consequently reduced the number of successful asylum applications (Brown, 1995; Solomos, 2003).

The *1996 Asylum and Immigration Act* tightened controls even further, introducing a '"White List' of countries in which there was deemed to be no serious risk of persecution" (Solomos, 2003: 68), thereby allowing the UK government to assume that any asylum application from these countries was unfounded. Brown (1995) and Solomos (2003) argue that as a consequence of these measures, people were refused entry to the UK that genuinely required sanctuary from persecution.

For their part, the Labour Party opposed the Conservative government's more overtly race based legislation (Brown, 1995: 19-21). Nevertheless, the discourse attached to the asylum legislation implied that fraudulent applications for asylum were widespread, generating a pervading narrative of asylum seekers as *unworthy* migrants, a narrative which Mulvey asserts became stronger during the early C21st (Mulvey, 2010).

1979 – 1997: State Imposed Segregation of Communities

Race relations legislation, prior to this period was, then, limited and predominantly "symbolic and inadequate" (Solomos, 2003: 78). Although this Conservative administration implemented immigration control based on "the strain that the admission of a substantial number of immigrants can place on existing resources and services" (Leon Brittan, *Hansard*, vol.83, 1985, col, 893, cited in Solomos, 2003: 65), they did not strengthen existing Race Relations Acts or implement a pro-active integration strategy.

The Labour Party, in opposition, were comparatively progressive, but their "calls for action to promote race equality and positive action were politically marginalised", as were calls to strengthen race relations legislation (Solomos, 2003: 193). Instead, during the 1980s, the Conservative governments implemented a series of *multiculturalist* policies (Uberoi & Momood, 2013). Ideologically, these policies emphasised individuals' ethnic identities and instead of "disappearing into a melting pot, immigrant groups [...]

help make up a 'mosaic' or 'salad bowl'" (Bartram *et al.,* 2014: 103). Lord Scarman's inquiry into race related disturbances in 1981, however, targeted BME communities and recommended programmes to combat "ethnic disadvantage". These were subsequently funded and implemented *within* communities (Sivanandan, 2006). The Conservative implementation of policy was, then, *laissez faire* and critics argue that it effectively separated minority and white communities (Allen, 2007; Cameron, 2011b). For Kundnani, however, this was driven by English superiority and the desire to keep Englishness separate, thereby "preventing any one group's militancy from infecting the others" (Kundnani, 2007: 45). Consequently, this had long term ramifications for cohesion, promoted Britishness as white and resulted in the division of "different ethnic groups into distinct cultural blocs" (*ibid*).

The Promotion of Britishness as White

For Kundnani, the creation of blacks as the *other* was part of Thatcher's overall strategy to create *Britishness* as white (Kundnani, 2007: 42). Solomos further argues that the Conservative, *laissez faire* approach to race relations was intentional and allowed the government to continue blaming BME populations for race tensions, allowing "the idea of blacks being the 'enemy within' and a threat to social stability to become more deeply rooted" (Solomos, 2003: 66). By controlling immigration, associating social problems with settled migrant communities and refusing to see the United Kingdom as a "multinational state", the Conservatives replaced this lost identity with "this conservative English Identity […][which] replaced the sense of citizenship that the downsizing welfare state could no longer embody" (Kundnani, 2007: 43). The politics of race, immigration and nationhood continued to distract the public from wider social issues.

The Criminalisation of Asian Youth

During the 1980s, negative discourses associated with immigration, race and BME communities in the UK developed further. Between 1981 and 1985, conflicts broke out between the police and black youths in Brixton, Bristol and Toxteth. Conservative academics, writing in the then influential publication, the *Salisbury Review,* attributed

these disturbances to a black "innate cultural propensity for disorder" (Kundnani, 2007: 43).

At this time, however, young Asian men were viewed differently; grounded in the accepted wisdom that Asian family controls and the Muslim community would inhibit law breaking, Asians were perceived as "primarily law abiding and/or victims of crime, especially racial violence" (Webster, 1997: 66). For Webster, however, the 1970s scapegoating of young black males provided a framework that allowed a later discourse to develop associating young Asian men with "criminality, drugs, violence and disorder, and that the roots of this alleged criminality lay in generational tensions brought by the breakdown of Asian family controls on young people" (*Ibid:* 65).

During the 1980s and 1990s, Asian communities were experiencing high levels of unemployment, low educational achievement and a demographic boom that made Asian youth more visible (Webster, 1997). Parallel to this, political and media discourse blamed migrant communities for the country's social problems (Brown, 1995; Solomos, 2003; Kundnani, 2007). In an environment with limited integration measures, there was, then, a consequential increase in the majority white public's fear of *the other* and an increase in racist attacks. In response, the Asian youth developed strategies, including informal vigilantism, which created safe areas for Asians.   As a result, however, white communities saw themselves as victims of racism and white people, the police and local services, perceived Asian self-defence and territorialism as street disorder and criminality (Webster, 1997: 77).

In the summer of 1995, then, when race riots broke out in Brixton and Bradford, the police force and press blamed the breakdown of parental and community controls within the black and Asian community (Webster, 1997: 66). Asian elders, aware of the changes Westernisation and secularisation were having on Islamic culture and identity, accepted this police discourse in order to reassert their authority on the young (Webster, 1997: 68). This strategy was, however, problematic; many parents withdrew from both the police and the elders as all Asian youth and, thus, their children, were racialised and criminalised. Asian youths further withdrew from their parents, elders

and the police as "they were caught in an apparent identity crises, falling between the cultures of their parents and British society, such that neither commanded authority" (Kundnani, 2007: 46). There was precious little by way of State intervention to tackle the Asian community's underlying issues of youth unemployment and low educational achievement (Webster, 1997: 68) and, instead, the riots of 1995 effectively sealed this *Asian criminal* label and perpetuated the Conservative rhetoric that black and ethnic monitories presented a *danger* to national cohesion.

The Position at the End of the C20th

It is argued here, that by the end of the C20th, immigration and race had become increasingly prevalent as an issue in the UK. This was reflected in politics, media and public opinion and, although the prevalence of the issue ebbed and flowed, a number of patterns developed. In summary: political parties shift their stance on immigration in order to win electoral votes (Foot, 1965; Brown, 1995, Solomos, 2003); outside of pre-election periods, political approaches to immigration change to meet demands for labour or to create a specific public response, such as nationalism (Foot, 1965; Brown, 1995; Solomos, 2003); particular groups are blamed by politicians and the public for social problems created by a lack of race relations policy and economic/social factors (Greenslade, 2005; Kundnani, 2007); "coloured" migration is presented as more problematic than white migration and, thus, immigration is also a race problem, affecting both new and settled communities (*ibid*); British national identity is promoted as white (Solomos, 2003; Kundnani, 2007).

By the end of the C20th, migration was established within discourse as a 'problem', as "policy, language and symbols" combined "with media discourses to create a dominant approach to the treatment of [the] issue" (Mulvey 2010: 438). These themes provided a framework for immigration and race discourses in the C21st. The following sections will consider how these themes have impacted on the period post 1997.

1997 – 2010: The New Labour Era

After eighteen years of Conservative government, the New Labour Party took office in 1997 (Geddes & Tongue, 1997). In the preceding eighteen years, the Labour Party had

taken a stance accepting of immigration control, but had rejected control based on racial categories (Solomos, 2003: 69).   During the subsequent thirteen year Labour term, immigration maintained a strong presence on the political agenda and a number of themes prevailed.

Firstly, according to Kundnani (2001) and Sharma (2008), it was during the New Labour Period that the previous criminalisation of Asian Youth (Hall *et al*., 1978) extended to Asian communities, whether settled or new. Consequently, a new group of "problem" migrants, positioned outside of British citizenship was created (Kundnani, 2007). For Pantazis and Pemberton (2009) and Allen (2007), this occurred parallel to the growth in Islamophobia, which they posit gained momentum during this period and located Britain's Islamic populations as the "'new' suspect community" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009: 646).

Secondly, in response to social unrest between Britain's Asian and white communities the New Labour government *did* implement an integration strategy. It is argued here, however, that this policy scapegoated Asian communities (Kundnani, 2001; Kundnani, 2002), was pro-assimilationist in nature and conflated anti-terrorist measures with community cohesion. (Karla & Kapoor, 2009).

Finally, for Finney and Simpson, the New Labour government perpetuated the earlier message that some immigrants are, and should be restricted, whilst others are more desirable (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 56 -57). By 2001, for example, the UK government were simultaneously managing and restricting asylum applications,[19] whilst also planning schemes promoting economic migration from the European Union[20] (Flynn, 2002). Government policy implied, then, that EU economic migrants were "worthy" and asylum seekers problematic. Scholars consequently argue that the latter were vilified

---

[19] The government's 1998 White Paper on immigration, *Firmer Faster Fairer* (Home Office, 1998), acknowledged the process of seeking asylum as flawed and inefficient. The Conservative Party's *white list* was abolished and restrictive practices were imposed on asylum seekers; vouchers were issued instead of cash benefits, enforced dispersal was implemented outside London and there was an increase in detentions and deportations (Solomos, 2003: 71).

[20] Notably, in 2004, the UK government allowed citizens of the A8 countries access to the UK to fill labour gaps. Between 2004 and 2011, WRS registrations from these countries totalled 1,033,915 (McCollum & Findlay, 2011: 5). Also See footnotes 4 & 5.

(Burnett & Whyte, 2004; Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010). The following section considers these issues in more detail.

New Labour Years and Islamic Asian Communities

During the first five years of the C21st, three significant historical events had a profound impact on race relations policy and people living within UK communities: the 09/11/2001 bombings in New York, the 2001 disturbances in the north of England and the London bombings of 07/07/2005. Although, in 1997, immigration was not a top ten issue in any major opinion poll (Saggar, 1997: 156), by 2007, a Mori poll found that one in five people in the UK thought that migration was the biggest political issue for them (Home Office, 2007b: 32). As this change occurred against the back drop of these events, the following section will review government, press and public responses to these events and consider the impact on policy, communities and public opinion within the UK.

The Rise of Islamophobia

In 1997, The Runnymede Trust published the report, *Islamophobia: a challenge for us all*, which described the growing reality of anti-Muslim and anti-Islamic hostility in Britain as "more explicit, more extreme and more dangerous" than it had ever been (The Runnymede Trust, 1997: 1). Mulvey argues, however, that after the 09/11 bombings, Islamophobia escalated and British Muslim communities became subject to attack as the *other* (Mulvey, 2010: 448). Indeed, for Pantazis and Pemberton, at this time, Islamic communities became the "'new' suspect community" (2009: 646), that is:

> A sub-group of the population that is singled out for State attention as being problematic. Specifically in terms of policing, individuals may be targeted, not necessarily as a result of suspected wrong doing, but simply because of their presumed membership to that sub-group. Race, ethnicity, religion, class, gender, language, accent, political ideology or any combination of these factors may serve to delineate the sub-group.
>
> (*ibid*: 649)

The growth of this discourse is located in a number of factors, for example, legislative responses to 09/11,[21] and the rising Western discourse of the *War on Terror*.[22]   For Worley, in this period, the proliferation of islamophobia was aided be the "deracialisation" of language, which enabled "practitioners and policy actors to avoid 'naming' which communities they are referring to, even though the reference points are clear" (Worley, 2005: 487). A 2002 article by Norman Lamont, for example, does not *directly* name Muslims as the group he accuses of not assimilating to British values, but references to the *Satanic Verses* indicate that these cultures are, in fact, Muslim (Allen, 2007: 1.4). These factors, combined with those described in the following paragraphs, have resulted in British Muslim communities, either settled or new, being perceived as more than a problem and as a group to be feared (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009).

The 2001 Disturbances

Amidst the rise of Islamophobia, between April and July of 2001, Oldham, Burnley and Bradford saw violent confrontations between young Asians and the police (Kundnani, 2001). In response, the Labour government commissioned the Community Cohesion Review Team, chaired by Ted Cantel, to consult with multi-ethnic communities and to identify the issues that needed to be addressed in order to develop "confident, active communities and social cohesion" (Home Office, 2001a: 5). The Denham Report, *Building Cohesive Communities,* was published later in 2001, which made recommendations based on Cantel's findings. In 2007, the resulting community cohesion policy document, *Our Shared Future* (Home Office, 2007b), was published, outlining the government's response to race issues in the UK and introduced a policy of *community cohesion*.

For Kundnani (2002), the riots resulted from a complex mix of social issues; in 2001, UK Asian communities faced unemployment, lack of community representation, cultural protectionism and forced segregation. Further, the criminalisation and scapegoating of

---

[21] *The Terrorism Act* was passed in late 2000. Immediately after the 09/11 attacks, amendments were made to the Act, furthering the powers of the legislation. The Home Secretary presented the Act as a matter of urgency and it was passed by December 2001 (*The Guardian*, 2009).

[22] The "War on Terror" discourse refers to the idea that the proliferation of international terrorist organizations and the increase in international terrorist activity since the 1990s has led to a new security environment that has replaced the Cold War as the principal conflict threatening the integrity of Western liberal states (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009: 650).

Asian youths during the 1980s and 1990s had led to young Asians being "cut adrift and left alone to make sense of the conditions which surround them" (Webster, 1997: 80). Consequently, when racist attacks on Asian communities were not dealt with appropriately by the police, the result was that second and third generation Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men reacted to hopelessness and a lack of representation and support from their own people, as well as from the authorities (Kundnani, 2001).

The Denham Report, however, targeted Asian communities, blaming self-imposed segregation, a lack of conformity to a common, implied *British* identity and a lack of community leadership (Home Office, 2001b). Trevor Phillips, the then Chair of the Race Equality Commission, supported these claims, arguing that tolerance of diversity had led to isolated communities "in which some people think separate values ought to apply" (Kundnani, 2007: 123). For Sharma, this response to the "disturbances" was misplaced and "multiculturalism was suddenly held responsible for isolation, segregation, [and a] lack of citizenship and national identification" (Sharma, 2008: 2).

Although the dominant, albeit *laissez faire*, *multiculturalism* of the 1980s and 1990s *had* promoted the "celebrating of difference" (Banarjee & Linstead, 2001: 683) and maintenance of distinct cultural groups, thus avoiding forced assimilation (Kundnani 2002), a unified British identity was now advocated. For Amin, during this time, New Labour claimed that large sections of settled Muslim communities had "failed to embrace this [white British] normative ideal of rights, responsibilities, social values and a stake in society" (Amin, 2006) - that "stake" being legitimate *British-ness.* The new policy was to call for a successful display of British citizenship both within "segregated" communities and to the wider UK population.

Kundnani argues that this approach allowed the government to side step acknowledging or tackling the underlying social issues that led to the disturbances whilst, as in earlier years, blaming immigration and immigrant communities for the social problems that the government had not confronted. Instead, the Asian community were portrayed as a national *problem*, both as the cause of social unrest and as potential terrorists (Kundnani, 2001).

Community Cohesion: An Assimilationist Policy

For Karla and Kooper, the political rhetoric running concurrent to the publication of The Denham Report, reveals *community cohesion* to be an assimilationist policy in the guise of the language of "community" (Karla & Kapoor, 2009). Ministers, for example, proposed "an oath of allegiance and English Language test for immigrants" (Kundnani, 2002: 1) and David Blunkett, the then Home Secretary, promoted the adoption of "British social values" and "norms of acceptability" by BME communities (Womack, 2001).

This rhetorical focus on *active citizenship* was further enforced in policy and practice. From 2002, applicants for British citizenship had to pass an English language test, later a British knowledge test was introduced and eventually ceremonies were held for conferring citizenship (Mulvey, 2010: 443). Further, in 2006, Phil Woolas, the then Communities Minister, publically called for a Muslim teaching assistant to be dismissed because she wore the niqab at work (Barkham, 2008; Slocock, 2008).   The confluence of these measures and actions gave a clear message to immigrants, ethnic minorities and other British citizens; ethnicity should be "banished in the public sphere of school, work and politics" (Kundnani, 2002: 2), *Britishness* is white and Christian and all people in the UK should act in a *British* way.

Linking Cohesion, Assimilation and Terrorism

By the time the 07/07 bombings in London were carried out by British-born Muslims, *multiculturalism* had been subject to intense public and political criticism and commentators used the attack "as a springboard from which to espouse their arguments against multiculturalism" (Allen, 2007: 1.8). It was in this period that Trevor Phillips, the then Chair for the Commission for Racial Equality, publicly linked *multiculturalism,* the expression of ethnic identity and terrorism (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 94). In the pre-emptively named *Sleepwalking into Segregation* speech, Phillips initially spoke of the 07/07 bombings, but then went on to speak about his perspective on race problems within the UK:

Residentially, some districts are on their way to becoming fully-fledged ghettoes - black holes into which no one goes without fear and trepidation and from which no one ever escapes undamaged […] we are becoming strangers to each other and we are leaving communities to be marooned outside the mainstream.

(Phillips, 2005, cited in Gillan, 2005)

For Finney and Simpson, Phillips presented the message, later repeated in the media, "that Britain's minorities were wilfully separating and that this had led to conflict and would continue to do so if not reversed" (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 95). By linking the Islamic terrorism of 07/07, Asian youth involvement with the 2001 disturbances and the segregation of Britain's communities, Phillips also implied that *all* Asians are Muslim and, in turn, *all* Muslims are potential criminals and/or terrorists. Speaking as the Chair for the Commission for Race Equality, Phillips gave State legitimacy to these sentiments and consequently legitimised others that held similar or more extreme opinions (Finney & Simpson, 2009: 15).

In the same year, the 2007 *Report of Community Cohesion: Our Shared Future*, was published, providing a framework for Labour's future integration strategy. Although the report acknowledged that Britain's communities were segregated due to wider social issues, it recommended that community cohesion be achieved via a move away from segregation and through the promotion of British citizenship, thereby building "a national sense of belonging, and moving the debate on from focusing on what migrants should and should not do, to focusing on what all members of the population share" (Home Office, 2007b: 63). Although the language and tone of the report distanced it from Cantel and Denham, in the period prior to the report being published, Blunkett had defined the "British Social Values" and "norms of acceptability" (Womack, 2001) that the government required "members of the population [to] share" (Home Office, 2007b). Further, Phillips had implied that a failure to assimilate to these norms and values should be viewed as "suspect".

The Resulting PREVENT Strategy

In April 2007, the government also published the counter-terrorism strategy, *PREVENT - Preventing Violent Extremism: Winning Hearts and Minds* (Home Office, 2007a), which aimed to stop "violent extremism and discourage people from being terrorists" (Verkaik, 2010). The main focus of *PREVENT* was to engage with Muslim communities that "share core British values [...] [and] to challenge robustly the ideas of those extremists who seek to undermine our way of life" (Home Office, 2007a: 4). Critics of *PREVENT* argue that the single focus on Muslims implied to *all* UK residents, including Islamic communities, that the State saw Muslims as the main and only potential terrorist threat in the UK (Khan 2009: 3; Engage Online, 2010). References to "British values" and "our way of life" also implied that it was necessary for Muslim communities to assimilate to *British* norms in order to avoid suspicion of involvement with terrorist activity.

A 2010 government inquiry into the strategy also criticised the mechanisms of the strategy's implementation, as it was managed by the Office for Security and Counter-Terrorism but implemented via the Department for Communities and Local Government (Home Office, 2010). This made boundaries between community cohesion and crime prevention blurred (Engage online, 2010) and resulted in many Muslims believing that "the purpose of the PREVENT programme was to 'spy' on Asian communities" (Verkaik, 2010) and to "engineer a 'moderate' form of Islam, promoting and funding only those groups which conform to this model" (Home Office, 2010: 4). This inquiry, therefore, concluded that *PREVENT* alienated Muslims whilst failing to manage the political and social economic causes of fundamentalism (Home Office, 2010). Further, by treating all Muslims as potential terrorists, the strategy simultaneously fuelled Islamophobia and created anger from the community the government were aiming to work with (Khan, 2009).

Overall, whilst failing to tackle the social and economic problems faced by these communities and the concomitant segregation, government rhetoric throughout the first ten years of the C21[st] resulted in Asian and Muslim culture and, therefore, Asians and Muslims themselves, being perceived as both unacceptable and potentially threatening.

The Creation of Asylum Seekers as "Bogus" Migrants

The *1951 Geneva Convention* formalised the right to sanctuary, stating that all people have a right to claim asylum if they are persecuted on religious and political grounds (Mulvey, 2010: 440). Despite this, the process of seeking asylum was subject to some immigration control during the Conservative term of 1979-1997 (Brown, 1995: 21). Mulvey contends, however, that it was during the New Labour period that asylum was most problematised (Mulvey, 2010). Greenslade (2005) supports this assertion and claims that, during this period, asylum seekers were subject to discourse that created them as a scapegoat and cast them "as interlopers who have little or nothing in common with settled migrant communities" (Greenslade, 2005: 5).

The Labour administration did indeed pass six substantive acts of parliament (Mulvey, 2010: 439), all with a focus on keeping asylum seekers out of the country and making their experience difficult if they did arrive. It was during this time, for example, that asylum seekers were detained in centres upon arrival and the government made numerous attempts to limit the right to appeal (Stevens, 2004). *The Asylum and Immigration Act 2004* introduced measures to prevent some groups of asylum seekers getting financial support[23] and, in 2005, asylum seekers were no longer granted "indefinite leave to remain". Instead, they are now granted "limited leave to remain"[24] for five years (Mulvey, 2005: 454) after which a permanent decision about their future is made. Although these policies were challenged and not always successful, for Stevens, "they remained both policy goals and important symbols in presenting a constructed image of long appeals processes due to illegitimate applicants 'stringing out the process'" (Stevens, 2004: 616).

For Greenslade and Mulvey, this policy message, combined with press coverage of asylum, has resulted in the perception that asylum seekers are bogus, dishonest, outsiders unwilling to assimilate (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010). In 2007, for example, the then Home Secretary, John Reid, was quoted in *The Independent on Sunday* celebrating the fact that the government had "thrown out" a record number of assumedly "bogus" asylum seekers. He then goes on to conflate the issue with "illegal

---

[23] In the *Asylum and Immigration Act 2004*, the removal of support from families was presented as an incentive for them to return voluntarily to their COO (Mulvey, 2010: 442).
[24] See footnote 7

immigrants" and states "it is unfair that foreigners come to the country illegitimately and steal our benefits, steal our services like the NHS and undermine the minimum wage by working" (Morris, 2007). Later in 2008, Phil Woolas, the then Minister of State for Borders and Education supported Reid, claiming that "most asylum seekers, it appears, are economic migrants" and that "the system is played by migration lawyers" (Barkham, 2008). Here, the political discourse from senior Cabinet Minsters supports the perception that asylum seekers are "bogus" and "undeserving".

For Greenslade, this discourse was supported by asylum having a "disproportionate" amount of coverage in the popular press (Greenslade, 2005: 3). Further, the popular press published mythical stories relating to asylum seekers, for example, that they have stolen and eaten swans from public parks; a symbolic act that implies disrespect for royalty and the *British* way of life (*ibid*: 25). This not only positions the asylum seeker as a threat to the *British norms* discussed throughout this chapter, but, despite their plight, creates the asylum seeker as an *undesirable* migrant.

New Migrants and Social Housing

Prior to 2007, new EU migrants in the UK had received "relatively positive press and were perceived as hardworking" (Robinson, 2010: 59). In 2006, however, the numbers of European Union migrants entering the UK were becoming visible in communities,[25] and, in Barking, residents blamed these immigrants for local housing shortages. Consequently, the British National Party (hereafter referred to as the BNP) won eleven of thirteen contested seats in Barking, on the issue of immigration and housing shortages (BBC News, 2007). Barking was Margaret Hodge's constituency and, as the then Industry Minister, she wrote an article in *The Observer*, claiming that migrants in her constituency of Barking *were* given priority when social housing was allocated and she advocated a policy "where the legitimate sense of entitlement felt by the indigenous family overrides the legitimate need demonstrated by the new migrants" (Hodge, 2007). This resonates with the events at Smethwick in 1964; in light of the BNP gains it would seem that Hodge was aiming to secure right-of-centre votes by expressing these opinions (Peaker, 2007).

---

[25] See footnote 5

Prominent politicians, such as Alan Johnson, the then Secretary of State for Education and Skills and MP for west Hull, rejected Hodge's claims, stating that there was no evidence to suggest immigration was causing problems with social housing (BBC News, 2007). Further, housing experts claimed that the majority of migrants were legally unable to access social housing and that the real issue was that housing stock did not meet the national demand (Peaker, 2007). In reality, in 2008, less than 5% of social lettings in England were to foreign nationals and less than 1% were to migrant workers from EU accessions states (Roney, 2008).

Despite these counter-arguments, Robinson argues that the publishing of the article prompted a "moral panic" (Cohen, 1972) as "the exaggeration and distortion generated by the moral entrepreneurs in the media and politics [was] raising public concern to a level disproportionate to the actual challenge faced" (Robinson, 2010: 61). The period after her article was published was followed by a media "frenzy" and newspaper headlines such as "more than a million immigrants live in homes paid for by the taxpayer" (*The Mail*, 9 April 2008, cited in Robinson, 2010: 60). There was also a new heightened concern about immigration and social housing, with a Mori poll for the Commission for Integration and Community Cohesion showing that "'settled communities' […] were found to frequently believe that immigrants and minority ethnic groups [were] getting special treatment in the allocation of public services such as housing" (CICC, 2007, cited in Robinson, 2010: 62).

For Robinson (2010), then, by 2010, the EU newcomers joined other immigrants in the UK as a convenient, established "folk devil", already historically scapegoated as "bogus" (Greenslade, 2005; Womack, 2001) and held responsible for numerous social problems. As a result, Hodge's "populist discourse dominated discussion not because it was right, but because it sounded right" (Robinson, 2010: 64).

The 2010 Coalition Government

New Migrants and Welfare Tourism

In September 2008, the global banking system collapsed and the UK was one of many countries affected by a subsequent global recession (Jones, 2014). During this economic

crisis, in August 2010, a coalition government was formed in the UK between the Liberal Democratic and Conservative Parties. Immigration control continued to be a key issue in the pre-election period, with EU migrants targeted as the new "folk devil"; the Conservative Party, who went on to win the most parliamentary seats, promised "an annual limit on immigration, new curbs on unskilled workers, and 'transitional controls' on new European Union members" (*The Telegraph,* 2010).

When, in April 2011, David Cameron, as Prime Minister, gave his first public speech on immigration he promoted a policy of control. Asian and student immigration was referenced, but the focus was on EU migrants; Cameron criticised the Labour government, claiming that "mass immigration went unmeasured" (Cameron, 2011a). In reality, all immigration, other than that of EU origin *was* subject to control by the Labour government. Now in opposition, however, and seeking electoral support, Labour conceded and stated that there should have been a transitional period of greater control for A8 migrants (workpermit, 2011). In doing so, they implied to the electorate that EU immigration was a "problem".

In 2011, and the subsequent fieldwork period (October 2012–October 2013), the narrative of the problem migrant was reinforced in political (Mulvey, 2010) and press discourse (Greenslade, 2005). Amidst economic recession and high unemployment, EU migration and a lack of assimilation were blamed for the UK's social problems; in the same immigration speech Cameron stated that:

> Significant numbers of new people arriving in neighbourhoods, perhaps not able to speak the same language as those living there, on occasions not really wanting or even willing to integrate, has created a kind of discomfort.
>
> (Cameron, 2011a)

In the following period, however, the focus of the problem shifted to the so called *benefit/welfare tourism* of EU migrants.

During 2012, prominent Conservative politicians, including Theresa May, the then Home Secretary, drew public attention to EU migrants claiming benefits in the UK (Wintour,

2012). The implication was that this was a problem that needed resolving. Popular press perpetuated this, coining the phrase *benefit tourist* and by the end of the 2013, papers were reporting articles entitled, "We can't afford benefit tourists" (Patel, 2013) and "Migrants from poorer countries could be banned from Britain to curb benefits tourism" (Chorley, 2013). Here, policy converged with press representations and immigrants were scapegoated for bigger social problems present in communities and the country (Greenslade, 2005). As such, like other groups before them, EU migrants were presented as "bogus" and "unworthy".

<u>Muscular Liberalism</u>

Negative narratives associated with Islamic communities also continued during the coalition government's term of office. In February 2011, Cameron delivered a speech to the Munich Security Conference, which focused on terrorism and the management of fundamentalism (Cameron, 2011b). Here, Cameron stated that previous approaches to integration and terrorism had been "soft" and that the coalition aimed to be tougher and exercise a "muscular liberalism" (Cameron, 2011b). This approach, like the Labour Party's *PREVENT* strategy, was criticised for conflating terrorism with cohesion (BBC News, 2011). Cameron suggested, for example, that Islamic community groups that were not implementing strategies to prevent "home-grown" extremism should have funds linked to cohesion initiatives removed (Cameron, 2011b).

Representatives of the British Islamic Communities condemned Cameron's suggestion that Muslim groups did little to tackle extremism as "deeply irresponsible" (Wintour & Percival, 2011). Although Trevor Phillips had conflated the same issues four years earlier, he also criticised Cameron for combining integration and terrorism in the same speech (*ibid*). As with *PREVENT*, this punitive targeting of Islamic communities alienated Muslims and fuelled Islamophobia (Panatazis & Pemberton, 2009). Further, by referring to Muslims as "they" and stating that, "at stake are not just our lives, it is our way of life" (Cameron, 2011b), for Klug, Cameron evinces "an almost unbearable sense of insecurity about being British today" (2011: 17). The speech, then, perpetuates Britishness as being white and Christian and Asian/Islamic communities as the "dangerous/suspect" *other* (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009).

Amidst this atmosphere, on May 22nd, 2013, an off duty soldier, Lee Rigby, was murdered in Woolwich by two British-born Muslim converts of Nigerian heritage. Although not linked to an established organisation, these men claimed to have committed the act, because "Muslims are dying daily by British soldiers" as a consequence of British military involvement in Iraq and Afghanistan since 2001 (*The Times*, 2013). The Muslim Association of Britain issued an immediate condemnation of the attack (Janmohamed, 2013) and, in a public statement Cameron described the attack *as* "a betrayal of Islam and the Muslim communities that give so much to our country" (*The Telegraph,* 2013). Nevertheless, fuelled by the anti-Islamic rhetoric of the previous twenty years, in the following month, there were two hundred reports of hate attacks on Muslims and mosques. Graffiti reading "Islam evil" and "terrorist inside" was, for example, sprayed on a mosque in Greater Manchester (Palmer, 2013) and a Somali community centre was fire bombed in Grimsby, North East Lincolnshire (Pitt, 2013). Although this murder was brutal in nature and the backlash isolated, this public response does indicate widespread anti-Islamic feeling towards the wider British Islamic community.

The C21st, *Xeno-Racism* and the *Problem* Immigrant

Burnett and Whyte (2004) opine that whilst some migrants are perceived as more "problematic" in discourse than others, narratives surrounding asylum and Islam promote a wider racism. For them, the narrative of the UK being "swamped" by asylum seekers "enabled all non-Western foreigners to be drawn into a great big racist melting pot. The new racism reserves its most poisonous venom for Muslims but [there is] also a more widely targeted xeno-racism" (Burnett & Whyte, 2004: 1). For Spencer (2007), this "xeno-racism" reaches beyond "non-Western foreigners" and he contends that, when large numbers[26] of people from the EU came to live and work in the UK, "any positive language regarding the need for, and benefits of economic migration in the early 2000s was consistently drowned out by negative language concerning asylum seekers, and was later superseded by the language of harm" (Spencer 2007: 359). Indeed, although white migrants *do* escape the racism targeted at those that are identifiable as *other* due to their skin colour, white migrants do not escape prejudice.

---

[26] See footnote 5

For Mulvey, then, post 2004, "misunderstanding of migrant types and hostility towards them changed to encompass economic migration, previously quietly encouraged" (Mulvey, 2010: 450). Consequently, when EU migrants were presented as *welfare tourists,* both in terms of benefits and social housing allocation, the population willingly accepted the discourse of the "bogus" immigrant (Greenslade, 2005; Robinson 2010).

Conclusion

This review of immigration, race relations and integration policy, between 1900 and 2013, reveals several themes relevant to the research question. In the UK, the global movement of people has become more prevalent as a result of individuals following labour market opportunities, government managed migration schemes to meet labour needs and because people require sanctuary from persecution. Attitudes towards migrants and particular groups of migrants have, however, shifted and changed, dependent on a complex causal relationship between political, public and media influences. Since the late 1970's, however, immigration has predominantly been perceived as a "problem" that should be *controlled*. That said, the focus and perceived scale of this "problem" is dependent on the economic climate and the political desire to gain votes and/or stimulate nationalism.

The race relations and integration policies implemented to manage the arrival of immigrants in UK communities have, on the whole, been inadequate and have moved from multiculturalist to assimilationist in approach. The former promoted the celebration of cultural difference, whilst the latter requires migrant and minority communities to mirror state defined *Britishness*; white, Christian values and behaviours. Consequently, both migrant and indigenous populations have received confusing messages, resulting in prejudice and conflict between these communities and, sometimes, authorities.

It is argued, here, that immigrants can be convenient scapegoats for social problems and, thus, provide a focus for a nation's fears and insecurities (Mulvey, 2010; Greenslade, 2005; Cohen, 1972). As discourse developed during the second half of the C20th, immigration control became race focused, providing a framework to scapegoat black, and more latterly, Asian migrants (Webster, 1997; Kundnani, 2007). In the late

C20th, asylum was also problematized and asylum seekers and refugees were positioned as the "problem" (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010*).* There have, consequently, been times in the last century that some migrants are seen as more *worthy* or genuine than others (Robinson, 2010). Most recently, a new xeno-racism has emerged, whereby immigration *per se* is portrayed as *the* problem. As such, white EU migrants have been scapegoated for the social problems caused by the global banking crises and few migrant groups are portrayed as worthy (Spencer, 2007) in either policy or the media.

Alongside these developments in a post-imperialist Britain, politicians and citizens have struggled to identify what, in a global world, constitutes "British" (Klug, 2011). As a consequence, nostalgic nationalistic sentiment has influenced immigration discourse; those that do not, or cannot comply with the white Christian norms required of pro-assimilationist policies are located outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007). Further, the consistent implication, in both policy and press, that there is a link between terrorism and Britain's Islamic people, infers that those that do not assimilate are also "dangerous" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009). By the late C20th and early C21st, this struggle for national identity has not only impacted on immigration, but also affects settled communities of British-born ethnic minority groups. New Labour's focus on citizenship and their rejection of the displays of Islamic or Asian cultural norms has, then, led to migrant and minority ethnic groups becoming disenfranchised and disadvantaged.

Discussion in this chapter has provided a context for understanding the lives of British-born people and newly arrived migrants and the factors that might influence the relationship between the two. Further, this historical review of UK race and immigration discourse gives a strong sense of how shifting policy debates, media representation and economic climate, can shape attitudes towards immigrants, race and national belonging. As this study is concerned with how, when and where migrant people "display family" in Hull, it is contended here that these political and media constructions of acceptable migrant behaviour have the potential to influence the way migrant people "display family". Further, immigration discourse also has the potential to influence the way

indigenous audiences receive, interpret and judge migrant "family display" (Finch, 2007).

CHAPTER FIVE: LINKING "FAMILY DISPLAY" AND COHESION

In chapter three, literature is introduced in order to frame the research question in relation to the sociology of family. Beyond testing, exploring and expanding Finch's concept of "family display" (Finch, 2007), the study also examines if migrant "family display", and indigenous audience interpretations of these displays, has implications for the development of cohesive communities in Hull. Chapter four, then, provides context and introduces relevant literature concerned with the history of race relations and immigration in the UK. Additional literature is introduced here, which links these bodies of work. Scholars of Transnational Family Studies (hereon after referred to as TFS) (Heath *et al.*, 2011; Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002; Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004), for example, outline the strategies migrant families employ when settling in a new country. Discussion draws on this and argues that "family display" may be a tool employed by migrant populations when creating *family-like* bonds, either with members of the co-resident migrant population or the indigenous community. Discussion further encompasses issues associated with indigenous audience responses to display; drawing on Chambers' analysis of representations of black families in America (Chambers, 2001: 125), it is argued that the portrayal of migrant and BME populations, in UK policy and media, may impact on local responses to migrant "family displays" and, ultimately, the development of cohesive communities.

"Family Display" and the Development of Cohesive Communities

The Definition of Cohesive Communities in this Study

During the last decade there has been an era of "new migration", resulting from a rise in asylum seekers entering the UK, large scale economic migration facilitated by increasing global mobility and changes in EU policy allowing the free movement of labour (Zetter *et al.,* 2006). Immigration has, then, become an issue of "political salience" (Bartran *et al.,* 2014: 1) and, for Zetter *et al.,* this rapid increase in migration has also led to "significant issues in the social relations between settled communities and new migrants" (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 2).

As discussed in chapter four, a number of approaches have been adopted in managing these "social relations". "Multi-culturalism" refers to the *laissez faire* approaches of the

1980s and 1990s, whereby policies were implemented with the rhetoric of celebrating difference and managing diversity. According to critics, however, the result was politically imposed segregation, the perpetuation of inequality and migrant groups being excluded from mainstream British dominant culture (Solomos, 2003; Kundnani, 2002; Kundnani, 2007). By comparison, "Community Cohesion", a more recent policy approach instigated by New Labour, focused on assimilation; in political pursuit of a unified British identity, BME and migrant populations were expected to conform to British norms in terms of dress, language and behaviours (Sharma, 2008). Most recently, in 2011, a "Community Integration" policy was introduced by the Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition government and, at the time of writing, a newly elected Conservative government continue to adopt this policy. This approach is much like that of New Labour, in that it is pro-assimilation, but the prevention of extremism is also fully incorporated into the same policy (Gov.UK, 2015a). These approaches have, however, been subject to criticism and "in some instances these critiques include accusations of ethnocentrism and racism, particularly towards non-white Muslims" (Bartram *et al.,* 2014: 1).

Ulrich Beck, in his discussion of the modern world, offers an alternative approach to cohesion; he argues that sociological approaches to modern life need to change, because the early C21st is, in fact, characterised by an atmosphere of "cosmopolitanization", whereby the global movement of people *undermines* localised notions of identity (Beck, 2012: 7). Instead, the pro-assimilationist "nation building" policies of the UK need redefining as they are currently "provincial and out of date" (Beck, 2012: 7). Strategies should move beyond ethnocentric policies and adopt what Beck refers to as a "world building" approach, whereby "codification of self and other undergo transformations" (Beck, 2012: 12) and cohesion is promoted as borders between communities diminish.

The term *cohesion,* then, has both political (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 5) and academic associations and it is necessary to clarify the meaning of *cohesive communities* in the context of the study. Here, *cohesion* refers to "establishing good community relations" (Zetter *et al.* 2006: 4), grounded in understanding, learning and meaningful connection

between migrant and indigenous groups. More specifically, *cohesion,* in terms of the study, rejects the assimilationist requirements of recent UK government policy, and refers to a concept of *cohesive communities* that embraces "world-building" ideals (Beck, 2012). The definition used here, then, is:

> Based not on an uncritical annunciation of the dominant white culture … [but] based on the multicultural nature of UK society, that reflects the contribution to it of a diverse range of communities and ethnicities over the past 1000 years.
>
> (Wilkinson, 2011)

The Role of Family in Cohesion

At the outset, this study posits that migrant families and migrant "family display" have the potential to influence the creation of cohesive communities in Hull. In the following section, literature is presented to support this assertion. Indeed, Vertovec, as a scholar of TFS, argues that, as an actor-centred approach, TFS acknowledges "the place of people as their own agents of change" (Vertovec, 2004: 973). As such, this approach assumes that migrant families are not necessarily lamenting or grieving their past lives and that they are, instead, active in the construction of their new global family and identity and able to "maintain ties to multiple locations" (Heath *et al.,* 2011: 3.1). Bryceson and Vuorela expand, stating that this agency also impacts on the creation of new culturally diverse communities, as assertive "interaction of network members in transnational spaces contributes to the making of local hybrid forms of culture" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 21).

Accepting that migrant families can influence the creation of new identities and cultures, it is argued, here, that they also have the agency to display family in a way that has the potential to assist the building of cohesive communities. This builds on Bryceson and Vuorela's contention that migrant families engage in a process of "frontiering", which they define as "the ways and means transnational family members use to create familial space and network ties in terrain where affial connections are relatively sparse" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 11). "Family display", then, may be one process involved in "frontiering"; migrant families, for example, may display in line with particular familial

norms (see later section in this chapter relating to family as discourse) in order to be accepted and recognised as "legitimate" family (Finch, 2007) by a specific audience. Alternatively, migrant "family displays" may have an educational function (Short, 2011; Ryan-Flood, 2011) and expose audiences to diverse familial norms. Either way, "family display" has the potential to promote connectivity and/or understanding between communities.

Heath *et al.* (2011) also support the premise of the study and link migrant "family display" *to* processes that contribute to the development of *cohesive communities.* Discussion is grounded in Levitt and Glick Schiller's assertion that migrant families are engaged in practices that they define as "ways of being" or "ways of belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1006). Heath *et al.,* link "ways of being" to Morgan's (1996) *family practices* approach[27] and they go on to link "ways of belonging" with Finch's concept of *"*family display*"* (Finch, 1997). It is this second concept that is useful here; "ways of belonging" are defined as "practices that signal or enact an identity which demonstrates a conscious connection to a particular group" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1010). Like "family display" this concept is concerned with the processes "by which individuals, and groups of individuals convey to each other and relevant audiences that certain of their actions do constitute doing family things" (Finch, 2007: 67). Both "ways of belonging" and "displaying" are, then, relational and concerned with linking, or connecting, individuals to others (Heath *et al.,* 2012: 3.8). In the context of this research, the recognition in TFS that migrant families *do* demonstrate "ways of belonging" in order to signify attachment to a particular group also implies that "family display" may have significance in the creation of identity, relationships and *cohesive communities* for migrant families in Hull. This, then, is the starting point of this doctoral study.

It is further contended, however, that "family display" may have a negative impact on cohesion; although Bryceson and Vuorella argue that "frontiering" activities allow

---

[27] "Ways of being" refers to "the actual social relations and practices that individuals engage in rather than the identities associated with their actions" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1010). Heath *et al.,* compare "ways of being" with Morgan's "family practices" approach (Morgan, 1996); *family practices,* like "ways of being", refer to "practices [which] are little fragments of daily life which are part of the normal taken-for-granted existence of practitioners" and they are not linked to expressing aspects of identity (Morgan, 1996: 190).

migrant families and indigenous populations to create boundaries between what is "acceptable and unacceptable" (2002: 12), they also warn that these processes may be "conflict-ridden" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 11). If "family display" is an activity of "frontiering", indigenous and migrant "family displays" may, for example, differ, dependent on their concept of "legitimate" family (Finch, 2007) (see later section relating to family as discourse). Indeed, as argued by Gabb, "family display" can have both positive and negative consequences and result in successful or unsuccessful displays (Gabb, 2011); migrant "family displays" that do not reflect indigenous familial norms may receive a negative response and potentially emphasise, rather than bridge difference. Although migrant families may engage in such displays as an assertive expression of their COO and, as Beck argues, global families can "become settings in which the cultural wounds […] are endured and fought out" (Beck, 2012: 10), other factors may also restrict, or influence, migrant "family displays". Heath *et al.*, for example, acknowledge that migrants will have different levels of agency, dependent on the circumstances of their movement to, and stay in, the host country (Heath *et al.*, 2012: 2.2). Consequently, some migrant families may be unable to display family freely. In a culturally diverse environment, then, the potential outcomes of "family display", in terms of cohesion, are complex and require investigation.

Beyond Biological Kinship

A review of relevant literature also highlights that display may have a role in the development of *family-like* relationships for migrant families. As discussed in chapter three, Finch claims that "family display" is not relevant to relationships beyond the family (Finch, 2011). Heaphy, however, challenges this and argues that "family display", as a sociological tool of analysis, should not privilege biological forms of family, but should also be applied to *family-like* relationships beyond biological kin (Heaphy, 2011). Heaphy's assertion is further supported by a number of other scholars that have applied the concept of "family display" to studies of *family-like* connections, namely, Almack, (2011), Surriyeh (2013) and Sharma and Guest, (2014) (chapter three).

This links, then, with discussions in TFS; according to Bryceson and Vuorella, for migrant families living away from their homeland, non-kin bonds *are* significant and their

"family's community identification is inextricably linked to its extra-familial networks " (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 19). Here, the concept of "relativising" is introduced and refers to the processes migrant families engage with in order to create:

> An imagined community with shared feelings and mutual obligations … [and] the selective formation of familial emotional and material attachments on the basis of temporal and spatial need-related consideration.
>
> (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 14)

Bryceson and Vuorella, therefore, contend that migrant families *do* create *family-like* bonds, which "provide vital mutual support for the realisation of family and individual welfare". (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 19). In the absence of biological family, then, transnational families have a more fluid concept of family; in the same way that same-sex families create "families of choice" (Weeks *et al.,* 2001) when biological ties may not provide familial support, migrant families create what Bryceson and Vuorella refer to as "frontier networks" (2002: 19).

Drawing on Heaphy's argument that the concept of "family display" should be applied to relationships beyond kin (Heaphy, 2011), this study asserts that "family display" may be a useful tool for understanding the processes of "relativising" and the creation of *family-like* networks. As such, there is the potential that the study of "family display" will add to academic understanding of how migrant populations express connectedness with others within the co-resident migrant population. Further, it is important to note that *family-like* displays may also stretch beyond migrant communities and foster wider kinship ties with the local community. In both these circumstances, "family display" has the potential to impact on the creation of more *cohesive communities.*

The Power of the Dominant Norm

The Family as a Discursive Construct

Analysis in this thesis considers *family* to be a discursive construct. Foucault, for example, defines knowledge and power, or "truth", as being historically constructed by powerful institutions such as religion, education and governments. For him, these "constructed" forms of knowledge create a discourse; the perceived and accepted

"right" way of talking about, and understanding, a particular subject or truth" (Foucault, 1978). More recently "political rhetoric, academic knowledge and popular media texts" (Chambers, 2001: 26) have claimed a dominant and influential role in modern culture, resulting in earlier forms of "truth" being suppressed and these institutions now being regarded as the reliable producers of knowledge.

Chambers argues that the dominant discourse relating to *family* in the West is maintained and upheld across these contemporary institutions which, thereby, control the way *family* "can be discussed and how ideas about the family get put into practice and used to regulate people's conduct" (Chambers, 2001: 26). Further, because *family*, as a discursive construct, exists across a vast range of institutions, it provides an area of commonality and, therefore, the societal expectation of what is normal and how to behave is heavily focused on *family* (Chambers, 2001: 26). It is argued here, that how, when and where migrant families *display family*, and which discourse is adhered to, will potentially affect indigenous responses to migrant communities and not simply individuals within them.

According to Chambers (2001), then, there are active processes within modern society that reproduce the dominant Western typology, or discourse of family, as white, heterosexual and biologically connected. In doing so, however, discourses also *other* those that do not fit into the normative model (Chambers, 2001: 115). Media (TV) representations of family in shows such as *The Cosby Show*, for example, superficially represent the black American family. They do so, however, by mirroring white American family norms; amidst a 1980s moral crisis relating to fatherless families in the contemporary African American community, the Cosby family offered an acceptable, mainstream portrayal of a black American family with the class position and cultural capital of Anglo families. In the words of Chambers, "this family's cultural legitimacy is produced through their embrace of Anglo-ethnic culture as an acceptable norm within their lived experiences, values and styles of living" (Chambers, 2001: 125). Here, black people are represented but black culture is not, thereby excluding and "othering" those families that continue to conform to the familial expectations of black culture, or alternative models of family. It is important to acknowledge, however, that this analysis

is restricted by the focus on American culture and also limited by only analysing media influences on the creation of discourse. Whilst the media does contribute to the construction of discourse and the process of "othering", it is also important to recognise that discourse is also affected by policy, statute, education and other State mechanisms.

Culturally Located Familial Discourse

It is argued here, that in the context of migration, the influences that contribute to the production of discourse related to family and, thus, the process of "othering", will differ in each host country and COO. As Ribbens McCarthy and Edwards assert, "every discourse – including the discourse of family studies – represents a view *from somewhere,* understood as a standpoint that then implicates issues of power and inequality" (2011: 59). What is, consequently, seen to be an acceptable *family practice*, or "family display"*,* will also differ dependent on both the family and observer's COO. This is, however, problematic; migrant families, for example, may be new to a country and unable to display successfully, because they assertively continue to maintain the norms of their homeland or, because they are unfamiliar with the local discourse.

Further, dominant political and media discourses, at the time of the fieldwork, presented immigration as problematic and required migrant and BME populations to conform to ideals of *Britishness* in order to be acknowledged as "legitimate" in the UK (chapter four). It is contended, here, that these discourses have the potential to influence indigenous opinion towards migrant families (Mulvey, 2010). As a consequence, one *other* (Chambers, 2001), or in Finch's terms, "non-conventional family" (2007:71), less able to successfully display (Heaphy, 2011), is potentially the global or transnational family. Further, taking into account the current pressures to conform to *Britishness* (chapter four), the requirement to display family in line with British family discourse, may be strong, with serious implications if not received as successful by indigenous populations.

Transnational Family and Challenges to Discourse

Heath *et al*. claim, however, that the transnational family has the potential to challenge the Western dominant familial discourse (Heath *et al.,* 2011: 1.8), which is imbued with

"societal expectation of what is normal and how to behave" (Chambers, 2001: 26). Further, the family can act as a "boundary object", that is, an "object which holds ... different meanings in different social worlds, yet [is] imbued with enough shared meaning to facilitate translation across those worlds" (McSherry, 2001: 69). "Family display" in Hull, therefore, has the potential to provide an opportunity for migrant and host populations to acknowledge similarities and bridge differences, grounded in their shared knowledge of the intimacy of family.

Chambers adds to this argument and claims that, "given that the family has no fixed meaning and takes on meaning as an object of knowledge within discourses, it is unstable and continuously being reshaped within particular historical contexts" (Chambers, 2001: 26). Indeed, it is *because* concepts of family *are* socially constructed that they are also flexible and changeable. For Giddens, modern life supports this; within a social environment where diverse types of family structure, such as single parents, divorced families and same-sex parents are more prevalent and (Giddens, 1992), consequently, already challenging discourse, there is also more opportunity for this "reshaping" to occur.

It is argued here, then, that by mirroring other cultural familial expectations, whilst also displaying those of their COO, migrant families have the potential to reshape the discourse of family into one which reflects a hybrid mix of cultural practices and displays (Chambers, 2001: 123). As a result, family as discourse may become less located within a specific culture, instead, becoming reflective of many "cultural contributions from British-based Afro-Caribbean, Asian, Irish and so forth" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 5). In so doing, this could result in a move away from the "nation building" view of society, described by Beck, to a more inclusive "world-building" perspective (Beck, 2012). Indeed, for Heath *et al.*, transnational families are "entities at the borders of discourse, that is, entities which set up borders in themselves, but do not presuppose that a border is also an enclosure" (Strathern, 2003: 46, cited in Heath *et al*. 2011: 1.8). Transnational families, then, and "family display", potentially provide a site for cultural differences to be challenged and a new set of "knowledge" or "truth" (Foucault, 1978) to be created within a community.

Conclusion

This chapter sets out the argument for exploring the possible link between family, "family display" and improved cohesion between migrant and indigenous communities in Hull. By drawing on the assertion in TFS (Vertovec, 2004), that migrant families are active agents in the creation of their new identities and communities, it is argued that migrant families may engage in "family display" in order to connect positively with both host and co-resident migrant groups. Although scholars have developed concepts that relate to the resettlement process experienced by families new to a country, namely "frontiering", "relativising" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002) and "ways of belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1010), further research is required; this study aims to expand academic understanding of the role of "family display" as a possible strategy used by migrant families to promote *family-like* bonds and community "belonging".

Broader issues related to cohesion in the UK are also identified in this chapter; attention is given to the role of dominant representations of family, immigration and BME populations, the impact this may have on local discourses and, consequently, audience responses to migrant "family displays". Building on this discussion and Heaphy's assertion that "family display" privileges conventional families (Heaphy, 2011), it is opined, here, that cultural discourses may *other* migrant families in the UK and, thereby, impact negatively on the success of migrant "family display" and, thus, cohesion. If acceptable familial norms are culturally located, for migrant families to be recognised as legitimate they either have to display in a way that mirrors local norms or discourses associated with family need to be reconfigured.   This study, then, aims to interrogate the role of *family* as a "boundary object" (McSherry, 2001: 69) and explore the role of "family display" in challenging dominant familial discourses. Overall, then, this thesis contributes to knowledge and expands sociology by considering the role of family in the creation of cohesive global communities, thereby illustrating the importance of the familial construct in the sociology of "cosmopolitanization" (Beck, 2012).

CHAPTER SIX: METHODOLOGY

Discussion in previous chapters sets out the research question and presents related literature. Here, the methodological approach underpinning the research is discussed, as is the design of the study,[28] the choice of methods employed and the process of data analysis. Further, the research sample is explained, ethical issues considered and the role of the researcher discussed.

Methodological Approach

Methodologically, this research is emancipatory, conducted from a participatory family research perspective (hereafter referred to as PFR) and, as advocated by scholars of childhood and family studies, executed via the use of ethnographic mixed methods (Gabb, 2008; Jamieson *et al.,* 2011). Findings were analysed using cross sectional and thematic analysis, whereby coding focused on the identification of themes and sub-themes in the data (Aronson, 1995).

<u>The Participatory Family Research Perspective</u>

The PFR perspective is an "emancipatory methodology"; that is, research which "seeks to empower the subject of enquiry … [and] recognizes [the] power imbalance in research and aims to empower respondents through research" (Jupp, 2006: 4). In summary, this participatory approach is characterised by:

- The rejection of traditional quantitative techniques in favour of a qualitative mixed methods approach;
- A focus on the experiential aspects of method including participatory techniques;
- A recognition of the role of power in the research relationship;
- The recognition of social variables in research;
- The recognition that family young offer valuable insights.

(Gabb, 2008)

---

[28] Throughout this chapter, a number of documents referred to are marked with an asterisk. This indicates that, due to word count restrictions, they will be available at the Viva Voce rather than included in the appendices.

A PFR perspective is, then, grounded in interpretivism; it rejects traditional, positivist approaches to knowledge where researchers are viewed as objective and knowledge is based in scientific facts that can be tested to create universal laws, resulting in a "body of knowledge whose validity is conclusive" (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1993: 5). PFR draws, instead, on the assertions of feminist methodology that while quantitative research associated with positivism is presented as "neutral and uninfluenced by class, race, gender, nationality or politics" (Rose, 1983: 76), in reality, these methods distance the researcher from the subject, objectify the researched and strengthen the hierarchical nature of the researched/researcher relationship (Eichler, 1991). Instead, feminist scholars assert that "each step in the scientific method is profoundly affected by the values, opinions, biases, beliefs and interests of the scientist" (Bleier, 1986: 3). Via reflexivity[29] and self-awareness the researcher can, however, admit subjectivity, share information with participants and continually reassesses their position (Williams, 1993). Researchers should, then, admit subjectivity, recognise that their values and beliefs will affect their perspectives and employ qualitative methods that privilege participant experiences (Eichler, 1991).

Building on these interpretivist principles, PFR is concerned with the study of the *family*, but recognises that family forms are diverse and multifaceted, whereby whom and what constitutes family varies between research participants (Morgan, 1996; Finch, 2007). Further, there is recognition, here, that social variables *are* significant and that participant "circumstances affect family norms and practices" (Gabb, 2008: 15). As such, qualitative approaches that explore *experiences* are privileged and mixed methods approaches are advocated, as they lend themselves "more readily to the messiness and particularities of family relationships and everyday intimate life" (*Ibid:* 29).

A central aspect of the PFR approach is the recognition that children are active agents whose perspectives make a valuable contribution to research on the family (Christensen & James, 2000; Punch, 2002; James & James, 2008). As such, the methodology is mindful of the multiple power dynamics within families, for example, those between family

---

[29] *Reflexivity* refers to the process whereby the researcher continually re-examines their approach to work and the theoretical perspective from which they are working.

adults, adult researchers and family children (Gabb, 2008: 20). In line with interpretivist traditions, other variables, such as gender, remain salient in this approach. Participatory qualitative methods are promoted here, then, not only when working with children, but with *all* family members, as they challenge the "hierarchical relationship between the researcher and participants" and build a partnership among *all* concerned in the research process, whether adults or children (*Ibid:* 40).

PFR, as an emancipatory stance is further relevant to this study; as a white woman academic, studying migrant and indigenous families in a traditionally white working class city, it is essential that power inequalities between the researcher and the researched are acknowledged. Further, it is inevitable that, when working with families, children and young people, that power dynamics will exist in terms of age, gender and occupational status. It is also important to acknowledge that, as a mother of young children, resident in the geographical area where the study was conducted, I also have my own values, beliefs and subjectivities relating to the research question. As such, I believe that an emancipatory stance that acknowledges and challenges unequal power relations between participants, as well as between the researcher and researched, is the most appropriate to the research question and my personal ethics. Throughout this study, then, research methods were selected in-line with the PFR perspective and are discussed in more detail in later section.

Although the methods used for primary research were qualitative in nature, valued lived experience and provided an empowering environment for participants (Ramazanoglu, 1992: 209), secondary research was also conducted. Quantitative information was studied, so as to provide the context within which participant accounts were analysed. This included census data, school intake figures and records relating to migrant groups known to be living in the country. By using quantitative methods in order to influence social change, whilst rejecting positivism, the methodological approach remained within an emancipatory framework (Jayaratne & Stewart, 1991).

Ethnographic Approaches

Ethnographic approaches to social research also reject the positivist thesis that knowledge is based in scientific fact (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995). Instead, ethnography is concerned with research methods that offer insights into the human experience through the first-hand experience of the researcher in the field (Walcott, 1995: 68) or through "thick description" (Geertz, 1973). Hammersley and Atkinson expand on this and describe ethnography as:

> The ethnographer participating, overtly or covertly, in people's daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions – in fact collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the focus of the research.
>
> (Hammersley & Atkinson, 1995: 1)

For proponents of ethnography, then, this approach allows social scientists to be attentive to and to gather everyday information (Walcott, 1995: 81) in order to draw large conclusions from small, but very densely textured facts (Geertz, 1973: 28). This approach is appropriate to family research, because research with families is different from other forms of social inquiry, as what is significant to the researcher "may be so taken for granted that they are unremarkable to participants themselves" (Jamieson *et al.,* 2011: 5). Consequently, ethnographic approaches are adopted in this study in order to capture the subtle detail of everyday family life. The specific methods adopted are discussed throughout this chapter.

A Mixed Methods Approach

A mixed methods approach was employed in order to explore the research question and the complexities of family life (Gabb, 2008: 167; Backett-Milburn *et al.,* 2010) whilst also meeting the diverse needs of the research sample; methods were required to engage with adults, young people and children, both as individuals and as a family unit whilst also accommodating societal inequalities such as race, culture, age and gender. It was also essential that differing levels of competency in speaking and reading English were accommodated.

Research methods were also required to gain an understanding of the group behaviours of families in public and private spaces, the interaction between families and the motivation behind "family displays". Furthermore, the study also considered the role of the "audience" in "family display", how the "audience" interacted with migrant families and the impact this then had on building cohesive communities. Methods, therefore, supported observation of families in the city, as well as engagement with people that observed family life.

Further, family studies, by their intimate nature, constitute "sensitive research" and methods were, therefore, "developed to suit requirements of each situation" (Gabb, 2008: 22). As a consequence of the multi-dimensional nature of this study a "portfolio of tools" (Clark & Moss, 2001: 54) were used, allowing for data to be gathered in an appropriate way and for participants to contribute in a way that was meaningful and relevant to the research question.

The Research Design

The data collection phase of this study was conducted between October 2012 and August 2013. The fieldwork was conducted in two cycles, with cycle one focusing on migrant families living in Hull, followed by cycle two, which focused on members of Hull's indigenous audience and included contextual interviews.

Cycle 1: Family Case Studies

When working with migrant families in the study, a family case study approach was adopted. Family research is unique, in that much of what is significant is not recognised as such by participants. This case study was, therefore, designed "to facilitate investigation of the tacit everydayness of families' lives" (Jamieson *et al.,* 2011: 5). This supported an exploration of "family display"*,* which involved 'teasing' out understanding and differentiating between nuanced conscious and unconscious familial behaviours that took place in both the private and public sphere. The case studies approach was adopted, because it not only incorporates mixed methods, but because it can also reveal relational and "contextual dynamics of a particular case [and] can identify multiple perspectives and understandings of the same case" (Gabb, 2008: 60). Here, then, ten

case studies were used to gather the multiple realities of those involved in each family unit, with a focus on the nuanced mechanisms of display.

These case studies were conducted in three-stages; in stage one, a family focus group was held; stage two was initiated at the end of stage one, which involved the family completing a "scrapbook" during the following six weeks. Analysis of the scrapbook, the focus group data and field observations then informed stage three; semi-structured, one-to-one interviews with individual family members.

This three-staged approach was designed to accommodate methodological concerns highlighted by scholars of family research. For Jamieson *et al.* (2011) there are three main areas to consider here:

- Recognition of familial hierarchies in terms of gender and age and how this impacts on who *speaks* on behalf of the family;
- Recognition of the valuable and differing perspective that children can give in family research;
- Recognition that interview constructs can impact on the data collected, for example, a couple interviewed together can change the responses given by participants.

(Jamieson *et al.* 2011: 4)

Further, Gabb asserts that, when undertaking research with families:

- Researchers must assess the vulnerability of the group and avoid causing physical and psychological distress;
- Participatory approaches are particularly useful when empowering children.

(Gabb, 2008)

The initial focus group, then, allowed me to gain an understanding of family dynamics by meeting members of the family unit at an "interactive social event", thereby providing access to "detailed articulations of individual and collective points of view and the insight they afford into the processes and practices of arriving at/failing to establish

a consensus " (Gabb, 2008: 56). Consequently, I was able to assess any acts of "family display" throughout the session, whilst also guiding discussion towards the family's collective view point of how and why they, as a group, show "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73).

This initial session also served a practical function; family members were able to ask research related questions where necessary, in the presence of an interpreter. Further, the initial meeting gave me an opportunity to develop rapport and assess issues of vulnerability and safety before face-to-face interviews were held.

At the end of the focus group session, if families agreed to construct a scrapbook, they were given an empty notebook, pens, glue and scissors and I offered to reimburse any photographic/printing costs.[30] Families were also given instructions,* explaining that the scrapbook should incorporate anything they felt represented their family, that the family had ownership of the scrapbook and that any content would remain confidential. Although all family members were asked to contribute, ensuring that entries were dated and named, the management of its production was allocated to family children. This joint family product was then used to prompt discussion during the later semi-structured interviews.

In total, six scrapbooks were completed and five[31] of these were compiled during December and, thereby incorporated the Christmas period. This was fortuitous, as Christmas, as a research period, is "one that could involve the doing and denial of a range of 'traditional' things and could bring differences in family practice into focus" (Muir & Mason, 2012: 2.3). Consequently, this provided an opportunity for comparative analysis of "family display" during a culturally specific period. The prime purpose of the scrapbook was, however, to encourage family young to engage with the research process. Although issues germane to research with children are given attention later, it

---

[30] Participants in research can be unenthusiastic when asked to use cheap disposable cameras (Bloustein & Baker, 2003). Participants were, therefore, advised to use existing photographs, images or drawings and associated costs were reimbursed.

[31] I was only able to complete nine of the ten family group interviews before the Christmas holidays, therefore, the tenth family did not receive their scrapbook until January. Only six of the families then went on to complete the scrapbook, reporting that they didn't have time to engage with this participatory method, an issue raised by Muir and Mason (2012: 2.5).

is necessary to provide an outline here; scholars of childhood and family studies recognise children as active agents making valuable contributions to research on the family (Christensen & James, 2000; Jamieson *et al.,* 2011). It is argued, however, that children occupy "a subordinate and marginal position *vis-à-vis* adults and therefore researchers" and in the research interface (Christensen & James, 2000: 6). As such, Punch explores methods that challenge this hierarchy and identifies that participatory methods, including visual techniques, have been particularly useful in empowering children (Punch, 2002).

In practice, six scrapbooks were completed, three by children aged seven plus, and three by family adults. Although I could not be sure that equal control of the scrapbook remained with these children, I feel that the act of entrusting the task to them did encourage their involvement; during the semi-structured interview, the children brought their knowledge to the research table and spoke enthusiastically about the scrapbook and their family. Here, "both researcher and researched [are] recognized as active participants in the collection of data, necessitating the acknowledgement of the issues of power, control and authority in the research process" (O'Kane, 2000: 138). As a result, the adult–child power constructions within the research relationship were challenged.

So as to avoid any sense that the child's view of their family construct was being privileged, I explained to family adults why the scrapbook was being used to engage family children. Further, adult participants were given the choice to contribute to the scrapbook and to comment on how the contents were affected by the child-focused nature of the method. Where scrapbooks were completed by family adults, although very young children *were* involved, contents were openly directed by their parents. On these occasions the scrapbooks gave family adults ownership of the semi-structured interviews and, as such, proved useful in reducing the power dynamic between the researcher and researched.

It should be noted, however, that the scrapbooks were not used as data, but as an interview elicitation tool (Pink, 2001: 5). Their prime function was, then, to give

interviewees some control of the interview relationship and to provide a loose structure to stage three of the case study.

Stage three consisted of semi-structured interviews with individual family members; sixteen adults and four children (see section relating to the research sample). This interview approach was selected, as it produces high quality, rich data whilst ensuring a structure that assists future comparative analysis (Gillham, 2005: 70-71). By drawing on the research question, observations, the family focus group discussion and, where available, the scrapbook, I was able to direct each interview with developed, topic-focused questions, within an allocated amount of time. The unstructured aspects of the interview, however, allowed questioning to be open and the relationship between the interviewer and interviewee to be responsive and interactive, facilitating clarification and exploration (*Ibid*). Further, the one-to-one environment allowed the pressure of pre-existing familial hierarchies to be reduced. By positioning the interview at the end of the case study process, I was also able to ask further questions, validate previous data and begin to test theories.

Cycle 2: Audience Semi-Structured Interviews

The main objective of this second cycle of fieldwork was to examine the role of "relevant audiences" in "family display" (Finch, 2007). More specifically, I wanted to understand how indigenous people describe migrant "family display", what meaning they attach to it, what factors shape these responses and if this correlates with individual opinion towards migrants in Hull. This was achieved by engaging with nineteen indigenous participants using semi-structured interviews; a non-directive approach which focuses on a topic via an informal, two-way interaction that allows the interviewee to give "very detailed descriptions of particular phenomena" (King & Horrocks, 2010: 183).

The method was selected for a number of reasons; structure was required in order to build on the data already gathered and to ensure interviews remained "relevant to the goals of the research project" (Evans & Jones, 2011: 850). Practically, in terms of the number of interviews to be conducted and the volume of data in the study, structure

also ensured that data could be gathered in the time available and that the subsequent comparative analysis was manageable (Gillham, 2005: 49).

By contrast, the informal, non-directive aspect of the semi-structured interview allowed the relationship between myself and the interviewee to be responsive and interactive, thus permitting clarification and exploration of the topics discussed (Gillham, 2005: 70). This was key, as the issues considered here, were both complex and potentially sensitive and, on occasion, exposed racist opinions. Due to the conversational nature of the interview, I was, however, able to talk with participants about difficult issues, whilst also making them feel at ease and respected, thereby allowing the interview to continue in a meaningful way.

As all participants involved in the audience interviews were adults over 18 and they were not interviewed as part of a family unit, some of the power issues considered earlier in relation to family case studies are not salient. That said, as a researcher, I did continue to be in a position of power (Jupp, 2006). The emancipatory methodological approach, the semi-structured nature of the interview and a provision of participant choice in the research venue did, however, go some way to challenging this power dynamic.

Contextual Interviews

Interviews were also conducted with eleven people that could have an impact on migrant family life, including the News Editor of the local newspaper, a local authority cohesion specialist, a community cohesion police officer, professionals working in education and representatives from other children's services in Hull. Interviews were, again, semi-structured, which allowed me to ask pre-prepared, focused questions but also allowed both myself and the participant to clarify and explore issues that arose (Gillham, 2005: 70). By cross-referencing data from these interviews with that from other sources, I was able to obtain a picture of strategic approaches to cohesion as well as an awareness of the issues that affect migrant families in the city. These interviews also gave further insight into how "family display" is received and shaped by both the local community and service providers.

<u>Throughout the Fieldwork Period</u>

Participant Observation

In order to observe *everyday* public familial activities, ethnographic approaches were employed; "observation" was conducted throughout the fieldwork period and recorded in a daily field diary. Gabb defines "observation" as being carried out by a "distanced professional researcher that sits apart from participants and records the activities of the research subject" (Gabb, 2008: 47). In line with this, I identified a number of areas where family life could be observed and comparative analysis conducted. Regular visits were made to two of the city's busiest family parks: East Park and Pearson Park. Trips were also made to a variety of supermarkets of diverse origin and walks were taken in neighbourhoods throughout the city. I also attended events such as school fetes, escorted my own children to child-centred activities and attended annual cultural events in the city.

Maintenance of a Reflexive Diary

As a local parent, my social location within the group being researched facilitated close observation of family life in Hull. It was, then, essential to maintain a reflective field diary in order to acknowledge and, therefore, reduce the impact my personal position might have on data gathered. As a further measure, I observed family life in unfamiliar locations, thereby creating distance between myself and the subject matter. By comparing these observations with those made in more familiar environments, I feel I was able to minimise the subjectivity experienced in spaces I knew both socially and geographically. The impact of my personal identity, the role of reflexivity and related ethical considerations are discussed in more depth later in this chapter.

The Research Sample

This study was conducted in the UK city, Kingston upon Hull. The experiences of migrant families living in the city were documented via family case studies with ten self-selecting families (appendix one). In order to ensure that these families had only recently experienced the process of settlement as immigrants, they were required to be primary migrants that had moved from their home country to the UK, post-2000. Participant families lived in a variety of geographical locations throughout Hull, although more were

residents of west Hull, which reflected the concentration of migrant populations. Families were also from a selection of countries – Kurdistan (1), Slovakia (2), Nigeria (1), Poland (2), Malaysia (1), Bangladesh (1) and China (1) - and had different immigration motives as economic migrants, refugees, students and asylum seekers. One family was mixed, that is, a primary Kurdish migrant that had children with a British-born citizen. All but one family had biological children and nine of the families had children living in the family home, their ages ranging from six months to eighteen. Four of the families in the sample were single parent households, the resident parent being the mother.

In order to consider the role of "audience" in "family display", the study also comprised of nineteen semi-structured interviews with self-selecting people that observed *family life* in Hull (appendix two). The sample represented a diverse range of professions; health professionals, bus drivers, local authority leisure service employees, shop workers, retired people, social workers and unemployed people. Again, in order for comparative analysis to be conducted, these individuals resided and/or worked in geographical locations throughout Hull and were from diverse backgrounds in terms of cultural heritage, class, race, gender and age.

Eleven contextual/audience interviews were also conducted with people observing family life (appendix two). These participants differ, in that I directly contacted them and asked if I could interview them, because of their professional role. As such, these participants represented their profession, were interviewed in their work spaces and although they worked in Hull, did not necessarily reside in the city. Professions represented included a journalist, educational staff, an Imam, a police officer and a local authority cohesion specialist.

Participant Recruitment

It should be noted here, that as the study seeks to identify the social processes which occur in cross-contextual settings (Mason, 1996), methods were used in order to recruit a *diverse,* but not necessarily *representative* sample.

Recruiting Migrant Families

Research participants were involved on a voluntary basis and were, therefore, self-selecting. In order to facilitate this, several issues were considered during recruitment; Edwards, for example, posits that, as a white academic, she experienced difficulties in recruiting black women participants, because they felt threatened by a white institution taking an interest in their lives (Edwards, 1996: 85). Although the families I hoped to work with were not solely black, I was aware that migrant families may be suspicious of the motives of researchers and that the topic of migration may be sensitive for both migrant and indigenous participants. Cannon *et al.*, however, experienced success in recruiting black people through social networks and face-to-face contact (Cannon *et al.*, 1991). Similarly, Almack identifies that "word of mouth", and the associated link of trust, is useful in recruiting participants for research on sensitive topics (Almack, 2008b: 3.3). Consequently, a selection of recruitment methods were employed to access a diverse range of participants that may otherwise exclude themselves from research.

Written adverts were displayed in areas accessed by members of the public, including shops, doctors' surgeries, schools, leisure centres and community spaces.* As resources did not allow for adverts to be translated, recruitment methods were also employed to reach those families that could not read English or might be suspicious of research. Therefore, participants were also recruited via my own existing social and professional networks, including local children's centres, contacts within primary school settings, the Humber All Nations Alliance, the Haven Asylum and Refugee Support Group and Hull University Graduate School.

Whilst recruiting participants, I was also mindful that recruitment via networks can result in one type of participant being recruited (*Ibid:* 3.2). In this case, recruitment via professional contacts could have resulted in all participant families being those experiencing problems and accessing services for information or support. Further, this method could also have excluded the most marginalised members of the community, who fail to access local service provision. By employing a variety of recruitment methods and reviewing the source of volunteer participants, I endeavoured to avoid this situation. As a result, although three participant families were, or had been supported

with specific problems by the agency through which they were recruited, the remaining seven were not. I feel that recruitment via networks, did, for one particular participant family, instil their confidence in the research and, rather than exclude, this approach to recruitment allowed them to be heard.

Recruiting Audience and Contextual Participants

Research participants observing family life were also recruited via a variety of methods. Posters were again displayed in public spaces such as supermarkets, launderettes, schools and leisure centres and, consequently, some participants were self-selecting.* I did, however, target individuals to ensure that audience members included men, women, parents and non-parents, as well as people from a variety of ages, professions, geographical locations and educational backgrounds.

Here, my personal identity gave me privileged access to participants (Plummer, 1981); owing to my position in the local community as a resident, as a mother of young children accessing services and as an individual with professional links to a number of sectors, I was able to successfully recruit audience members via pre-existing networks and word-of-mouth. This was also the case when recruiting individuals providing contextual interviews. I had, for example, a previous working relationship with the News Editor of the Hull Daily Mail and the Cohesion Specialist at Hull City Council. The latter, therefore, introduced me to the city's community cohesion police officer and the Imam at a local mosque.

Working with Interpreters

As primary migrants, participant families in this study had differing levels of competency when speaking and reading English. To limit participants to those with sufficient competence in speaking English would, however, have excluded people with valuable insights into family life, making the research less valid. Further, competency in speaking and reading English is not evenly distributed throughout migrant groups and can be determined by socio-economic and educational background, age and gender (Baker *et al.,* 1991). This was reflected in the participant families recruited; interpretation was required by three families and, for two of these families, it was adult family women, not

in paid work, that were the least able to speak English. Consequently, to exclude those that did not speak English would have reinforced the gendered hierarchies that exist within families (Jamieson *et al.,* 2011; Gabb, 2008).

Interpretation and translation costs, at the time of the fieldwork, were costly at £25 an hour for interpretation and £18 for every one hundred words translated in the written form.[32]   Although I secured a £500 grant towards these costs, I directed funds towards providing interpretation in focus groups and interviews. Consequently, publicity/briefing materials could not be translated into languages spoken by potential participants. Posters were, however, distributed in 'plain English'* and recruitment was conducted via word of mouth and existing networks to ensure that those unable to read English were made aware of the study. Further, briefing documents were discussed verbally at the initial family focus groups and, when necessary, in the presence of an interpreter, ensuring that participants fully understood the research.

According to Edwards (1998), when the researcher and interviewee do not share language competencies and when an interpreter is present in the research dynamic, difficulties can arise which may affect the quality of data gathered. Potential issues include:

- The interpreter does not understanding their role in terms of confidentiality, which might concern participants and limit the information they share;
- The interpreter does not adequately understand the research question, thereby affecting their translation;
- No direct translation is available or the translation is affected by the interpreter's own subjectivities;
- The researcher may miss subtle nuances, such as the specific word the participant chooses to use or when a specific mannerism reinforces a point;
- A third person in the research dynamic interferes with the development of rapport;

---

[32] Interpretation and translation costs provided by Hull City Council's Interpretation and Translation Service (date of communication, January, 2013)

- Where some participants speak English, the above factors disadvantage participants where an interpreter is used.

(Edwards, 1998)

Although it was important to acknowledge these issues, the use of interpreters was unavoidable and, therefore, strategies for minimising difficulties were established. Edwards argues that the choice of interpreter has a significant effect on the research; although community members and family members can potentially offer interpretation, this is problematic as the individual may have an existing reputation, either good or bad, that affects the data shared. The research could also impact on the individual's position in their community or family and they may also *gate keep* information when translating, in order to protect their community or family (Edwards, 1998: 199). For these reasons, only interpreters trained by Hull City Council's Interpretation and Translation Service were used in this study. This ensured a level of professional training, neutrality, objectivity and distance.

In order that data was valid and comparable, by drawing on the experiences of other researchers, I developed strategies that ensured consistency when working with interpreters. Edwards suggests that researchers such as Phillips have taken a position of control when working with interpreters, ensuring that the interpreter is "invisible" in the research process; the interpreter translates directly, in the first person, and does not apply their interpretation to the questions and answers. In addition to this, the researcher, interpreter and participant sit in a triangular position, with the interviewer making direct eye contact with the interviewee, in order that the two create a link and avoid a relationship between the interpreter and the interviewee. The interpreter is also directed to use the same intonations as the researcher/interviewee. This approach sees the interpreter as an "agent for transferring messages" (Phillips, 1959: 188, cited in Edwards, 1998).

Edwards critiques this approach, advocating an alternative model that makes the interpreter more visible. She focuses on the researcher and interpreter spending time to develop a relationship that acknowledges the role of the interpreter. She goes on to argue that the interpreter is, in fact, not invisible and that the reflexive approach

employed by feminist researchers should be extended to examine the role of the interpreter. Adaptations she suggests include the interpreter translating in the third person and taking independent action within the research environment (Edwards 1998: 203).

Although the role of the interpreter is considered in my reflexive accounts and I agree with Edwards (1998) that the interpreter is not invisible, it was not possible in this study to build a relationship between interpreter and researcher. Firstly, each of the three families that requested an interpreter spoke a different language, so three different interpreters were used. Although I was able to request that the same interpreter attend each session during the family case study and, therefore, provide consistency for participant families, this was the only time I had contact with them. As interpretation is costly and budgets were limited, I was not able to meet interpreters for additional meetings outside the interview. For these reasons, the interpreter–researcher relationship functioned as that advocated by Phillips (1959, cited in Edwards, 1998).

The Interpretation and Translation Service at Hull City Council were, however, happy to supply interpreters with a written briefing document prior to the interviews.* The aim of this was to ensure that interpreters understood the research question and my preferred approach in the sessions. As suggested by Baker *et al.* (1991), a debrief session also took place after each interview which gave myself and the interpreter an opportunity to ask further questions. On reflection, although I sensed that the interpreters did follow my instruction to repeat questions and answer *verbatim,* I had no way of checking this. Further, when interpreters were used, participants had less time to share their experiences, as every question/response was repeated and the length of the interview was restricted to the hour for which the interpreter was booked. That said, participants did appear comfortable in the presence of the interpreter and expressed that they were familiar with this mode of communication. Despite the concerns expressed by Edwards (1998), I feel that this was a pragmatic approach to facilitating the involvement of migrant family members with whom I did not share a language.

Research with Family Children

As previously discussed, it is no longer assumed that adults represent and speak for children. Instead, scholars in the field of childhood studies argue that children are agents in their own right that make a significant contribution to knowledge (Christensen & James, 2000; Punch, 2002; James & James, 2008; Jamieson *et al*., 2011). Family case studies in this research, therefore, included young people, children and adults.

When conducting research with children there are, however, specific issues to consider, some of which are also discussed earlier in the chapter; child-centred research must, for example, recognise the power constructions that exist between children, adults and, thus, researchers, when building rapport, selecting research methods and developing modes of dissemination (Mayall, 2000; Punch, 2002). Further, researchers should be aware that participatory techniques are found to be effective when engaging and empowering children (Punch, 2002; James & James, 2008; Gabb, 2008). For these reasons, during the case study, the production of the scrapbook was entrusted to family young in order to shift the production of knowledge away from either the researcher or adults in the family.

For James and James, further measures should also be taken if research with children is to be meaningful; if the researcher is to "hear", rather than just "listen" to children, they must also consider societal power dynamics when developing ways of communicating (James & James, 2008: 17). For O'Kane, providing child-centred information is central to this (O'Kane, 2000: 151). Briefing documents for research participants were, therefore, produced in easy-to-read, age appropriate formats.* This information was also explained to children verbally, at both the focus group and interview stage and, although parents were required to give consent for their children to be involved, children were also asked to verbally give their individual consent.

Family case studies were also designed so that I was able to meet all family members as individuals, away from the power dynamic of the familial group. In the interests of challenging the power dynamic between the researcher and the researched, *all* participants, *including* children, were given the opportunity to make various research

decisions. All interviews were, for example, held in a venue chosen by the participant and I was mindful to ensure that children, in particular, felt comfortable in the interview space; in one-to-one interviews, the four children interviewed chose where to sit, I asked them where I should sit and, if appropriate and if it was the child's preference, interviews were held in the family home. Further, family young also chose a trusted adult that remained close by during the interview.

There are also a number of ethical issues to consider when working with children and families, such as informed consent and disclosure of sensitive information. These are discussed in the ethics section of the chapter.

The Position of the Researcher and Reflexivity

Methodologically, this study is grounded in the belief that "each step in the scientific method is profoundly affected by the values, opinions, biases, beliefs and interests of the scientist" (Bleier, 1986: 3), but that, via reflective practice, researchers can recognise this and minimise the impact on their research (Stanley & Wise, 1993: 200). Jamieson *et al.,* with a focus on family research, further posit that, as we all have intimate relationships, we are all familiar with the research topic and, therefore, bring preconceived ideas and judgements to the research table. Consequently, in researching families, "the requirement for self-reflexivity may be heightened" (Jamiesen *et al*., 2011: 5). Throughout this research, reflexive processes were, therefore, paramount and documented in a daily field work diary. This ensured that I explored the motives behind practical choices, personal responses and the implication this then had for the "knowledge being produced" (Edwards & Ribbens, 1998: 4).

It is appropriate, then, to detail aspects of *my* background that may have impacted on perspective and approach; I am a white, British-born mother of two young children, with a white British-born partner, researching migrant families in the community that I have lived in for twenty years. During the last ten years, I have been involved in child-focused family activities such as visiting the park, accessing swimming sessions, attending play groups and doing the school/nursery run. I am also familiar with a number of local families and accepted as a person that is present during these times. This position also

affords me maternal knowledge, cultural milieu and social capital which was "invaluable" when building rapport with children and families (Gabb, 2008: 21); how babies are weaned, how it feels when a two year old refuses to sleep and what games a nine year old might enjoy playing. In this way, I was an "insider"; someone known in the local community with privileged access to participants, sources and networks (Plummer, 1981, cited in Almack, 2008b).

The position of "insider" can be problematic and Kong *et al.* (2002) question whether researchers should be part of the communities they study, as this may work to obscure rather than discover knowledge (Kong *et al.,* 2002). Researchers may, for example, fail to ask exploratory questions because of assumed knowledge and their own pre-existing values and opinions. In order to challenge and acknowledge these concerns, I only worked with participants that were not known to me and I conducted and compared observations made in both familiar and unfamiliar spaces. By reflecting regularly on the impact my knowledge of the community may be having on the research, I was able to develop and change my practice accordingly.

In contrast to this, aspects of my identity may also have positioned me as an "outsider" (Almack, 2008b); an individual that may be treated with suspicion and perceived as lacking understanding. Indeed, my position of "insider" was challenged by my new identity as an academic researcher, a transition that can automatically position a researcher outside a/the community they were once inside and potentially restricts their access to information (Edwards & Ribbens, 1998). Further, prior to embarking on this study, professionally, I provided support to local families, including migrant families. As such, a power dynamic already existed between myself and those that knew me in this professional context. It was, therefore, necessary to be clear to research participants that I had become a researcher and that I was no longer part of a service that represented a State authority; I could neither offer their family support nor impose sanctions.

Finally, research participants were from a diverse range of cultural backgrounds. As a white woman researcher, it was, therefore, important to acknowledge arguments by

Black feminists that "white women cannot possibly understand and represent black women's subjectivity and social positioning" (Edwards, 1996: 83). Edwards (1996), in recognition of the limitations the "outsider" status may impose on the researcher, challenges the notion that he or she should restrict their work to participants that match their own personal biography (*Ibid*). More specifically, she argues that the feminist recognition of the role of the researcher's identity and the related importance of reflexivity, mean that the right choice of methods make it "possible for white women to take part in dialogue and to gain the 'wisdom' necessary […] and shift to see black women's social location and identity in their own terms" (Edwards, 1996: 86). Similarly, if these feminist approaches are applied to other areas of researcher/researched difference (in my case as an academic or professional worker), as Edwards argues elsewhere, "there are strong arguments that racial and other differences between researcher and interviewee can lend a particular insight" (Edwards, 1998: 199). Taking these factors into account, it was essential to ensure reflexivity was present at the point of entry into the field and when making research choices. By recognising the importance of the knowledge, preconceptions and personal identity traits brought to the study, I was, therefore, able to minimise the impact on the knowledge produced.

All researchers in the field are required to make a decision whether to reveal or withhold details of their personal biography. Feminist methodology advocates disclosure of such information in the interests of reciprocity and in order to challenge the power between the researcher and the researched (Eichler, 1991; Williams, 1993). Whilst in the field, I felt comfortable revealing some aspects of my personal biography, such as talking about my children, my extended family and the places I have worked. As asserted by Almack, this sharing of biographical information was useful in developing rapport with research participants (Almack, 2008b: 4.8). I did, however, feel that the sharing of more intimate information could blur the nature of my relationship with participants. I am, therefore, more inclined to agree with Ribbens' (1989) argument that revealing personal information, as a person living in the locality, can be problematic. It was important, then, that participants did not see me as a friend during the field work phase, as I felt that this could make participants vulnerable to disclosing things they might later regret sharing. In addition to this, I also felt that there were occasions when safety and personal privacy

required consideration; I did not reveal my home address to participants or use my personal mobile phone number in communication. Issues of researcher safety are discussed in more depth later in the chapter.

Ethical Considerations

Informed Consent

According to Gabb, when conducting research with families, the main ethical concerns are, "informed consent, respect for privacy, subject integrity, avoidance of exploitation and betrayal, protection from harm and the potential negative effects of the research on participants" (Gabb, 2008: 24). The following section considers these areas in relation to this study, acknowledging that some aspects related to research with children have been discussed previously.

Researchers should gain informed consent from research participants; this refers to a process whereby participants agree to be involved in a piece of research, based on being fully informed of the research subject and process, what will be expected of them and what involvement means for them (BSA, 2002). Briefing/consent documents were produced incorporating this information. Included within this, participants were given: contact details for the researcher; information relating to the storage of the data gathered; information about the protection of their confidentiality and they were also asked to give permission for the interview to be recorded, with the *caveat* that they could stop the interview, or recording, at any point.*

When a potential participant showed interest in the research, they were provided with this written briefing/consent document. This document was produced in an easy-to-read format, taking into account generational and language competency issues and, when required, documents were explained by an interpreter. These briefing documents were also discussed at the initial meeting with participants and again, where necessary, I was able to check in the presence of an interpreter that participants understood the materials. Participants were then asked to sign the briefing/consent document, a copy of which they retained. In order to check individuals were consenting outside of the family group environment, consent was verbally checked at the later one-to-one

interview. This process was mirrored with indigenous audience participants and those involved with contextual interviews. Although parents of children and young people under eighteen were required to give formal consent, these young people were also asked to give their own verbal consent and they were provided with an age appropriate briefing document.*

As discussed earlier, during the field work period, I observed families in Hull in a variety of public environments such as shops, play groups and in local parks. There are issues relating to informed consent to be considered here, as this research was methodologically emancipatory, whereby the role of power within the research dynamic is acknowledged (Gabb, 2008). The individuals "observed" in these local environments did not, however, agree to be involved in the research. Whilst accepting that it was not possible to gain agreement from all participants in these settings, prior to commencing field observations, ethical clearance was sought from the University Ethics Committee* and I applied for and received enhanced Criminal Records Bureau clearance (CRB).[33] These measures reinforce the ethics of this approach as well as confirming my suitability to conduct the research. Further, I ensured that individual identities were protected in both field diaries and subsequent written work.

Data Storage and Confidentiality

Further ethical issues to consider include storage of research data and maintenance of participant confidentiality; any electronic research data is stored on my personal university computer and protected with a secure password. As data may be used in future journal submissions, it will continue to be stored in this way for a period after the completion of the study. Paper copies of any information are stored in a lockable filing cabinet, again on university premises for the duration of the doctoral research. Where electronic copies of documents have been made, hard copies have been shredded. All identifiable data, such as signed consent forms and transcriptions of interviews, are stored in a lockable filing cabinet in the post graduate offices at the university. Access to all research data is limited to myself and transcripts have only been discussed with my

---

[33] Until 1st December, 2012, people working with children or vulnerable adults could apply to the CRB, a government agency, for a certificate detailing their suitability for working with children or vulnerable adults (Gov.UK, 2015c).

academic supervisors in supervisory sessions. Upon request, participants also have access to their own data although none have made this request. In terms of maintaining participant anonymity and confidentiality, the identity of all participants has been protected by the use of pseudonyms. When working with case studies, this becomes complex. Nevertheless, anonymity is protected here, by changing demographic details, using pseudonyms and, where possible, as advised by Gabb, individual accounts and family narratives are separated (2008: 59). Identifying characteristics have been changed in the thesis and other academic writings, although those characteristics necessary for comparison and analysis have not been changed.

Researching Sensitive Topics

By the nature of their circumstances, there is the potential for migrants to have a range of vulnerabilities, some clearly evident, some not so. As Gabb asserts that research with families, children and young people is also often concerned with sensitive topics (Gabb, 2008), vulnerabilities may be enhanced. Guidelines for working with sensitive groups include measures such as:

- Ensuring that all participants know how the information is used and that their anonymity will be protected if possible;
- That participants are aware of procedures around the disclosure of sensitive information from the outset of the process;
- That participants should have access to relevant support mechanisms;
- That participants should have a contact number they can use in order to complain if they desire.

(Gabb, 2008: 21-24)

Provision of information and protection of anonymity are addressed via the processes of informed consent. In terms of Gabb's second point, participants were made aware, from the outset, of the limitations of confidentiality in the research and that anything they shared would remain confidential and anonymous, unless I felt that a child was in danger or an adult a risk to themselves. Having worked with migrants, families, children and young people for several years, I felt experienced and able to deal with any disclosures made. Further, during field work, I was sensitised to potential issues and engaged with

participants bearing their potential vulnerabilities in mind. Prior to conducting fieldwork, I updated my knowledge of support services in the city, should I need to share this information with participants and briefing materials included information on how participants may raise a concern or complaint, should they have any. In practice, no complaints were made and, although some participants did talk about traumatic experiences in their lives, and on one occasion I did pass on contact details for support services, the situation did not arise where I had any major concerns.

Safety Issues for the Researcher

In recent years, there has been a growing awareness of the risks involved in social research, "for researchers, for their employers, and those people who agree to take part" (Craig *et al.,* 2000: 1). Consequently, mechanisms such as the University of Hull Ethical Approval process acknowledge some of these issues and aim to ensure that appropriate procedures are followed; processes for gaining consent and recruitment are checked, as are the measures taken to ensure researcher safety and protection of vulnerable participants.* The specifics related to this research project are detailed below.

As family relationships are not only sensitive, but notoriously volatile, measures were taken to ensure both my safety and that of the participants, especially as the nature of being *observed* also had the potential to increase volatility. Further, with audience interviews, discussions relating to opinions towards migration in the city are also potentially sensitive. Initial focus groups with families were conducted within rooms in public buildings, including voluntary sector and public sector offices. These sessions only took place at times when other people were present in the building and the room was organised in such a way that, if necessary, it was easy for both the researcher and participant to leave easily. As advised by Craig *et al.* (2000: 2), other people working in the building were also made aware that group interviews were taking place.

In terms of audience interviews, owing to the sensitive nature of issues discussed it was important that I knew the environment in which I was interviewing and, for this reason, a number of locations were selected throughout the city where I might meet participants. Ease of access for participants was also a priority, as was protection of

participant anonymity. Audience interviews were, again, conducted during daylight hours and participants, therefore, identified their preferred venue from a number of options, which included quiet areas in community parks, quiet times in cafes and coffee shops, youth centres, community centres and children's centres.

A number of one-to-one family interviews were also conducted in the homes of participants as this was more convenient for those families with caring responsibilities for young children. As Craig *et al.* assert, when interviews are conducted in residential settings, researchers should take appropriate safety measures (Craig *et al.,* 2000). As such, interviews only occurred when I had met and developed a relationship with the family. Further, when both family one-to-one interviews and audience interviews were conducted, a *call-in* procedure was used, whereby a third party was made aware of where and when the interview was taking place. If I had not *called* by a certain time, the third party would make contact with me and, although this did not occur, if it had been necessary, they would alert authorities.

Craig *et al.* also consider the impact of race, culture and gender on researchers' safety and argue that "lone female researchers are, in general, more vulnerable than lone males …[and] certain more orthodox cultures may find women researchers unacceptable and react with hostility" (Craig *at al*., 2000: 4). As this research was involved working cross-culturally and was conducted by a woman, these issues were clearly salient. Although guidelines recommend that risk is reduced by matching race and gender of participants and researcher, the lone nature of PhD research did not allow this. Instead, during contact with *all* participants, migrant and indigenous, I dressed appropriately and cultural traditions and behaviours were observed. Further, lone interviews with male participants were avoided in residential settings.

As a local mother and resident, conducting potentially sensitive research, I was also mindful of being visible within the community. I was, however, able to minimise any risk to myself and my family in several ways; by building rapport with individuals and families involved and by not sharing personal details such as my home address and personal mobile phone number. As discussed by Stanley and Wise (1991), display of personal

details on research publicity can result in unintended consequences in the form of unwanted contact from both research participants and other members of the community. As such, a research email address was created and a mobile phone sim card was purchased for the sole purpose of research communication. In terms of recruitment publicity, I disclosed only my forename, thereby minimising the potential for identification of further personal details. In practice, Hull is a small city and I met participants in a number of public venues when out with my family. They took an interest in my children and my life and, as such, I shared some information, such as my children's names and ages, but I was still able to withhold specific private details of my life such as my address, phone number and personal connections.

Data Analysis

In this study, data was analysed both during and after completion of the data gathering stage using manual techniques rather than a computer programme. From the outset of the first cycle of research, all interviews were transcribed *verbatim* as soon as possible after each interview was completed. At the end of cycle one, family case studies data was reviewed a number of times. After this initial process of data "saturation" (Richards, 2005), a primary set of "index" categories were systematically and consistently applied to the data set in order to chart a number of loose themes (Mason, 1996: 111). These themes, combined with those identified via "observation" informed the structure of subsequent audience and context interviews.

Throughout cycle two, *verbatim* transcriptions were also completed. Once both research cycles had been conducted, all transcripts and field diaries were revisited so that I was able to "saturate" (Richards, 2005) myself with the data set. As a result, further codes and categories were identified and systematically applied to *all* research data. This "cross sectional indexing procedure", although lengthy, allowed for thorough analysis of mixed qualitative data sets which resulted in the data being organised in such a way that allowed for "the retrieval of sections of text, or elements of data, for the purpose of some form of further analysis or manipulation" (Mason, 1996: 111).

Once this phase of analysis was complete, data within each category was further interrogated and codes were both combined or "split" (Dey, 1993: 131). Data within a coding category was then analysed further and dominant themes identified with an emphasis on cross sectional comparison (Mason, 1996: 111). Here, factors such as participant socio-economic status, age, gender, geographical residence and migration status were considered. At this stage of analysis, the most dominant codes and themes were identified and privileged in the thesis, whilst others were deleted or reserved for future publications. This process was, then, grounded in the application of "thematic analysis". This led to the emergence of results that focused "on identifiable themes and patterns of living and/or behaviour" (Aronson, 1995: 3.0), the aim being to develop generalisable concepts or theories. Conclusions drawn from this analytical process were further affirmed via a process of triangulation; as the study was conducted using a mixed methods approach, during analysis different data were compared and "brought to bear on the research question" to test the validity of findings (Richards, 2005: 148).

The results of this analysis are presented throughout the thesis.

Conclusion

This study is, then, grounded in an emancipatory methodology and conducted from a PFR perspective. In this chapter, the methodological approach is justified and the choice of research design is explained. A brief description of the research group is provided and recruitment processes described, as are ethical issues and the process of data analysis. Throughout, a number of additional issues for consideration are presented and discussed; the researcher's insider/outsider position, challenges of working with interpreters and issues concerned with researcher safety. In the following chapter, the migrant families involved in the migrant family case studies will be briefly introduced and the initial phase of research findings are presented.

CHAPTER SEVEN: TRANSNATIONAL "FAMILY DISPLAY"

This initial findings chapter will focus, perhaps surprisingly, on transnational "family display". This is because examination of the research data reveals this to be significant in answering why, how and when migrant groups *display family*. The findings presented here, then, explore why and how "family display" manifests when family members are driven to show, "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73) across international borders. In doing so, the discussion contributes to academic understanding of the ways "family display" occurs in practice, as discussed in chapter three, but also reveals additional facets of the concept; "enablers of display" are introduced and examples of "troubled" displays explored. This chapter is presented first, because understanding how migrant "family display" occurs in different contexts, underpins discussion in later chapters.

Differentiating between a "Family Practice" and a "Family Display"

It is necessary here, to clarify the difference between *Doing Family* (Morgan, 1996; Morgan, 2011b) and *Displaying Family* (Finch, 2007) as revealed in this thesis. As detailed in chapter three, Morgan argues that individuals now express family relationships, not via biology or co-residence, but through the "doing" of "family practices", through which families are able to represent the *family-like* quality of their relationships (1996: 186). For Finch, however, families also need to be *seen* to be engaged in these practices if the relationships concerned are to be recognised as familial. This is achieved via "family display":

> The process by which individuals, and groups of individuals, convey to each other and to relevant audiences that certain of their actions do constitute 'doing family things' and thereby confirm that these relationships are 'family relationships'.
>
> (Finch, 2007: 67)

In this thesis, two types of "family display" are identified; those which are obviously such and those which are more subtle and might, on the surface, appear as a *practice*. During analysis, then, each display is assessed individually.

The first type occurs when UK based family members selectively present information to those in the COO to prove that their migrant family "works". Saman, for example, a Kurdish refugee, settled in the UK, receives a gift of gold earrings form his brother in Kurdistan. The earrings are for Saman's dual-heritage daughter, Macey (age four), and he ensures that she wears them and that his brother knows this, as he is aware that this gift of gold symbolises kinship in his COO; Saman is selectively displaying to his brother that his dual-heritage niece follows Kurdish familial norms.

The second type of display is more subtle and primarily serves to maintain and build relationships with significant family members in the COO, thereby displaying that their relationship is still high quality and familial; Lenka regularly talks to her mother on Skype, often whilst she is preparing the family dinner. This is a display because of the reasons it occurs:

```
If I don't ring [Skype] my mum at least twice a week,
she will be mad.  She will be worried something happens
to me, so I got really, really regular contact with my
mum.
```

<div align="right">(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

For Lenka and her family, this regular display of an *everyday* activity simultaneously confirms to her mother that she is an important part of their life – my transnational family works - whilst displaying that their life is unproblematic and the family is functioning well – my UK based family works. Here, when family members live geographically apart, what might be a "taken for granted" (Morgan, 1996: 190) *practice* when families are co-resident, becomes a *display.*

Why Display Matters to Migrant Families in Hull

Migrant Families as Unconventional: Family Extends Beyond National Borders

For Bryceson and Vuorella, migrant families *are* unconventional because they live geographically separate from their families of origin and have a more "elastic relationship to their place of origin" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 9). They argue, then, that families maintain transnational relationships via the processes of "relativising", that is, the "ways individuals establish, maintain and curtail relational ties with specific family

members" (*ibid*: 14). This is supported in participant accounts, as narratives relating to families of origin are *consistently* embedded within migration stories; all participant families, with the exception of Justina, report regular interaction with family members in other countries as a central element of their *lived realities*, with contact varying from "`once a month`" (Zack), "`two, three times a month`" (Hiwa), "`a few times a week`" (Magda) and "`every day`" (Sana). Data presented shows, then, that one of the "ways" UK based families maintain these "ties" is by displaying to those in their COO that, although they live in a new country, their unconventional family relationships still "work" (Finch, 2007: 73).

Contact with transnational family is, however, influenced by family history. The Malaysian family, for example, do not consider it unconventional that family members live geographically apart; Zack has worked internationally for twenty years and Ella completed both her Bachelors and Masters degrees at international institutions. Consequently, this family are comfortable with familial models that incorporate global movement, because they have accumulated "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013: 703). As such, accounts indicate that Ella and Zack do display family, but they only call home once a month, as their transnational family relationships require less attention, because "`we're used to being apart`" (Ella). Notably, Justina's story differs to that of the other participants in that she is an asylum seeker, has only one living relative in Nigeria and she is unsure of their whereabouts. Further, as she lives in fear of the people that trafficked her to the UK, she minimises her connection with her COO. This inhibits Justina's transnational "family displays" and, as such, her narratives provide unique insights.

<u>"Family Display" as Reassurance when Family Extends Beyond National Borders</u>
Finch (2007) and other scholars (Philip, 2013, 2014; Castren & Widmer, 2015) argue that one reason "family display" matters is because "households cannot adequately 'define my family'" (2007:69) and, instead, the contemporary family is often involved in a "chain of relationships" across households (Smart & Neale, 1999: 72). Finch further posits that transnational "family display" may occur, because these "chains" can extend

"geographically across continents through patterns of migration" (Finch, 2007: 69). Participant accounts show that this is the case for migrant families in Hull.

For some, displays are driven by families having "a distinct sense of identity and responsibility for each other" (McKie & Callan, 2012: 215). It is, for example, important to Fillip and his transnational family members, that they maintain regular contact:

```
To help [family in Slovakia] and show them our support
and that they are really important for us and they are
still really a strong part of our life.
```
                                             (Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

Similarly, although Momo's family in Bangladesh are "`economically   quite alright and don't need any help in that way`", he feels that:

```
There  is  a  mental  obligation  -  giving  them  support,
stopping with them, that kind of stuff.  Emotional stuff.
```
                          (Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse of Bangladeshi international student)

As such, "family displays" are grounded in the participant's desire to show that, despite being in another country, they can still fulfil care-giving familial roles.

That said, the incentive to display family transnationally extends beyond emotional familial obligation and adult participants also display in order to reassure parents in the COO that they are *safe.* Sylwia states:

```
My parents accept the fact that I'm going to stay, but I
have to call them twice a week.  If I don't call, they
call my eldest daughter and ask her 'Is she alright?'  I
have to make sure that I find the time to call them.
```
                                                (Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant)

Further, Momo explains that:

> If I don't call them, they get tense about if I'm alright?
> Then they ring me straight away -'What happened to you?'
> I just give them, peace of mind.

>   (Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse of Bengladeshi international student)

For many of those interviewed, then, what might otherwise be seen as a *family practice* (Morgan, 1996), becomes a "family display"; a weekly telephone call, for example, is either implicitly or explicitly required by those living in the COO. Indeed, UK based families are mindful to maintain contact, because of their particular circumstances and to show respect for their parent's concern. As a consequence, despite family members being in a "chain of relationships" (Smart & Neal, 1999: 72) across *national* borders, family members can be reassured that their relationships remain high quality, they "work" (Finch, 2007: 73) and are, therefore, "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011).

The Fluidity of Family over Time

Analysis further reveals that participant families do display family transnationally, because of "the fluidity of family over time"; during specific periods of their migration story, families experience periods of change when it is necessary to redefine their membership and show family members that their transnational "relationships thus configured do really 'work'" (Finch, 2007: 70).

The Stages of Transnational Separation

For Fillip and Hiwa, transnational communication with their families was more frequent in the initial period of migration, when new relationship structures were being negotiated:

> When we [first] came here in England, we try to go home
> as often as possible, maybe three times a year for, two,
> three weeks, and we tried to ring every week, to ask,
> 'are you alright, is everything OK', […] and now we are
> here for eight years, it's a little bit cooled down.

>   (Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

```
It's changed.  When I first came, my contact was more
frequent, through the telephone, but after I got my
papers and things [refugee status], it settled down. They
were less concerned about the situation because I was
some kind of settled.
```

(Hiwa, father, Kurdish Refugee)

Here, both participants recognised the need to affirm their relationship with their parents and maintained more frequent contact over this initial, but lengthy, period of uncertainty. This, however, extends beyond transnational families providing long-distance care via verbal communications and/or visits (Baldassar *et al.,* 2007: 139); participants are displaying the significance of their relationships by committing both the time and the finance to ringing and visiting home *more* regularly.

Lenka and Sylwia report a similar shift in their "family displays". Like Fillip, one way they display and, thus, maintain the quality of their family relationships, to both the immediate and wider family, is via regular visits to the COO (*ibid*), including the annual summer vacation (see later section for more detail). At the time of the interviews, both Lenka and Sylwia's families had engaged in these displays since relocating to the UK eight years previously, but were, for the first time, considering taking their annual summer holiday elsewhere:

```
I was thinking, first time ever, I might go with my
parents somewhere else, like Spain.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

```
This year, I think maybe I not go on holiday to Poland.
My plan is Cornwall!
```

(Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant)

Although Lenka still plans to spend her vacation with her parents, and Sylwia plans to visit Poland outside of this annual holiday period, both women feel that the need to display to the *wider* family has diminished and it is now adequate to display their relationships to their *immediate* family.

For these participants, the desire and requirement to display that their "relationships thus configured do really 'work'" (Finch, 2007: 70) has reduced as they have become more settled or, for Hiwa, legally secure in their lives. These initial phases of heightened display are, then, time limited, albeit sometimes for a period of years. As such, the period of arrival/settling in the UK might be perceived as an extended period of "intensity" for transnational family members, that is, a period "when the need to display becomes more intense, at least for the moment" (Finch 2007: 72). These displays are, however, located within the families' identity as relatively new migrants. Like mixed families, then, rather than experiencing "intensity", they experience "signal moments'" when displays are required, because their unconventional status as "mixed" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 158) or, in this context, migrant, is more salient. Indeed, once the family's status as a transnational family is normalised - as with the bi-national status of families in Brahic's study (2013) - the need to display reduces.

The Birth of Family Young

Family relationships are also displayed in order to develop and maintain new familial relationships when children are born to either the participant family or to a significant family member living in the COO. For Hiwa and Sana, the recent birth of their son, Aso, has influenced the contact they have with Hiwa's parents in Kurdistan. As the latter are now grandparents and need to *reconfigure* (Finch, 2007: 70) their relationship with both Hiwa and, in turn, Aso, contact via Skype has become more frequent and the focus of their relationship has shifted to their new grandchild:

```
They are more concerned with Aso […] Hiwa's father, Aso's
grandfather, he is always just come to see Aso.  They
are not concerned with Hiwa!
```
                        (Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee)

Ruta's (age fourteen) account further supports this; her transnational communications have increased since her niece was born in Poland so that she can establish her relationship as an aunt: `"yeah, just, like, more in touch with family, so I see the children"`. Via Skype, the sending of photographs and an increase in visits to Poland, Ruta is able to display and thus develop her new relationship with both her sister and the new family member.

119

The birth of family children does not, however, signal an isolated period of increased display; again, it is not a period of "intensity" (Finch, 2007: 66). It is, instead, a *trigger* for an ongoing shift in the pace of transnational "family display"*;* Saman and Rachel have children that are now aged two and three, but since their birth, family in Kurdistan call Saman, `"every day"` and `"when they ring, they don't want to talk to Saman, they want to talk to Macey[child]"` (Rachel, mother, white British partner of Kurdish refugee). For *all* migrant participants, then, the birth of children *does* require the development and maintenance of new familial relationships across national borders. In the same way that display occurs when a child is born to same sex couples (Almack, 2011), amidst *these* unconventional, transnational circumstances, "family display" is triggered in order to support "the continually evolving nature of [the family] relationships" (Finch, 2007: 69).

The role of display in maintaining these *reconfigured* relationships is prominent in migrant family accounts and is discussed later in the chapter. Here, however, focus shifts to *how* transnational displays occur in practice.

How Migrant Families Living in Hull Display Family Transnationally

Beyond "Tools": Introducing "*Enablers of Display"*

Interrogation of the data reveals that "family display" is also supported by what is referred to here as "enablers of display"; the channels that allow participant families to select and display elements of their family life, in order to affirm that their migrant status does not inhibit the *legitimacy* of their family or the *quality* of their transnational familial relationships.

Technology and Maintenance of the 'Everyday'

Throughout the interviews, participants confirm Heath *et al.'s* assertion that the use of technologies *is* widespread in maintaining links with transnational family members (Heath *et al.,* 2011: 4.4). It is argued here, however, that access to affordable technologies also *enables* regular transnational "family displays".

Although some participants prefer one particular mode of communication, all use a mixture of technologies; telephone, text, email, Skype and Facebook being the most popular.[34]   Overall, Skype and/or Facebook are used by all participant families, apart from the few occasions where individuals experience barriers to access and alternatives are used; Bai telephones his parents, as they do not ″have broadband available″ and Magda uses the telephone as her mother does not have good IT skills: "how can I put it? She's not familiar with all these internet and computer things".

Although Bryceson and Vuorella assert that the financial cost of accessing these technologies can be prohibitive for migrant families (2002: 18), with the exception of the noted examples, all UK based participants are IT literate and have an internet connection available in their homes. Consequently, being able to access these technological "enablers″, not only displays familial financial security, but also provides opportunities for participants to display family as an iterative process of transnational reassurance.

As migrant families choose when they access these technologies and what aspects of their lives they subsequently share, they are able to consciously construct what they display. Ivana, for example, sends photo texts to her mother and mother-in-law, allowing them glimpses of almost idyllic family life:

> Fillip's mum, she loves cooking […] so I was doing cake
> with Teresa (age four), so I take picture I send to her,
> specifically to her, because I know she would love. I
> text her -'we were baking together' - it was perfect.
> It was nice and she was, like, 'Oh my girls!'(laughs)

(Ivana mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Ivana carefully selects the content of this communication and chooses images of activities which she knows will be approved of by transnational family members. In so

---

[34] The Chinese family explained that, in 2010, the Chinese government restricted the social networks and technologies their citizens were allowed to access. This family, therefore, used Chinese State sponsored alternatives; QQ International (alternative to Skype) and Renren (alternative to Facebook).

doing, this communication simultaneously develops the relationship between grandparent and grandchild and allows Ivana to *display* the importance *she* places on her relationship with her mother-in-law.

In contrast, for Lenka, technology *enables* her to display her transnational familial bonds, as she is able to include her mother in significant, but *everyday* aspects of her and her children's life:

```
I may just go with one of them to hospital and straight
away I will just give ring my mum -'they are at hospital'
[…] When Matus had problem with his appendix, I always
let her know what's happening.
```
(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

The telephone, as an accessible and affordable mode of communication, allows these two family members to reassure one another that their relationship remains conventionally familial; Lenka displays the significance of her immediate family's relationship with her mother by choosing to make the phone call in her time of need, which, in turn, allows the Slovakian based grandmother to show concern for her grandchild and support her daughter.

Skype and Facebook provide alternative technological "enablers", as once a family has paid a monthly internet connection fee, access to both is unlimited. Although Facebook is less intimate, as it facilitates group communication, rather than one-to-one interaction, it allows Zack and Ella to engage in frequent visual updates of their own and their Malaysian based family's lives:

```
Even though they are in Malaysia and we are here, they
know what we are doing.  We try to update our status,
what we have done in the weekend and we are notified, so
all the time we look for what they are doing in Malaysia.
It's like an automatic way to communicate for everybody.
```
(Zack, father, Malaysian, spouse to Malaysian international student)

As Ella and Zack's "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013: 703) reduces their self-perception of being an unconventional family, Facebook meets their display needs; they are able to share select visual representations of their "working" family with a broad group and simultaneously be reassured of the well-being of family members in Malaysia.

For other families, however, Facebook alone does not meet their display needs and its use is supported by Skype, as this "enabler" allows regular and lengthy communication, thereby simulating closer geographical proximity; Ivana, recounts `"Skypeing"` her mother for an `"hour and a half"`, Hiwa jokes about how frequently Sana Skypes her mother, and Lenka describes talking to her mother on Skype as `"like we will be having coffee"`.   Here, family members are *enabled* to regularly express the high quality of their familial, in this case, mother and daughter relationships.

Skype also allows migrant families to frequently display visual details of the *everyday*. Sylwia, for example, uses Skype to give her parents, in Poland, a tour of her newly decorated home and Lenka uses this medium to share day-to-day troubles and joys:

```
I can be doing my cooking and I just have my laptop on
the table […] or, sometimes, I will show something with
the children, like Dominik's chicken pox […] so they're
just little things, like, we got a new guinea pig.
```
                           (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Further, Sylwia explains that Skype *enables* her to include her Poland based daughter in more exceptional family activities:

```
On Christmas Eve, around the table, and I will switch on
the laptop and the Skype and, of course, second daughter
is important, so she's at the table with us! (laughs)
```
                                (Sylwia, mother, Polish Economic Migrant)

Lenka and Sylwia, then, use Skype as a forum to display these select, sometimes significant, "fragments of daily life" (Morgan, 1996: 190). Consequently, for both these women, this technology allows them to strengthen transnational relationships, whilst showing that their families are not only coping but are, in fact, 'working'.

Transnational Visits: Both a "Family Display" and an "Enabler of Display"

Scholars of TFS (Baldassar *et al*., 2007; Brahic, 2015) identify that visits, either to the COO or to the migratory country, are central to maintaining transnational family life. This study further reveals that transnational visits can be a "family display" and/or an "enabler of display"*;* the act of visiting family members is public, costly and time consuming and can, in itself, be a "family display"*,* indicating to both family members and the wider audience that, despite geographical separateness, these relationships remain important. Analysis further reveals that the familial visit also *enables* display by providing migrant families with the opportunity to present their "working" family and affirm familial relationships.

Participant families do not, however, have equal ability to participate in transnational visits (Baldassar *et al.,* 2007: 155). For families with a relatively small distance to travel, available finance and few visa restrictions, transnational visits are an important element of their "family display". Families of EU origin are, for example, allowed free movement between the UK and their homeland, and have access to relatively cheap and accessible flights.[35] Consequently, Fillip, Ivana and their children visit Slovakia every summer, whilst Lenka, who works in education, takes her sons to the COO for the entire school summer holiday.   Similarly, although Sylwia only visits Poland `once a year`, her children visit more regularly:

```
Ruta and Lech, they are always going to Poland in the
school holidays, for six weeks, and they're staying with
their older sister.
```

<div align="right">(Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant)</div>

For families from the EU, relatives in the COO also enjoy free movement and are able to display the quality of their transnational relationships by visiting the UK. The success of these displays is evident in the pride expressed by Fillip and Sylwia when talking about family visits and Lenka consciously links the frequency with which family members visit, to the quality of her relationship with them:

---

[35]Migrants from the A8 countries are not subject to visa restrictions and are allowed "free movement" between the UK and their homeland (Heath *et al*., 2011: 2.2). Due to relatively large populations and the consequential high demand for flights to these countries, A8 migrants can also access comparatively cheap, accessible flights.

```
My two sisters come - I think we've got really close
relationship and there is always, once or twice a year,
somebody coming.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Some EU family members *do* experience barriers to travelling; Sylwia's parents don't visit, "because of their age" and Lenka's mother will not travel, because of being "afraid of what can happen". Nevertheless, this group of migrants are able to engage in transnational visits as a "family display" and further benefit from the displays the visit can *enable.*

Some participants' families are less able to display family via transnational visits. Those with freedom to travel, but where finance is limited or airfares are comparatively expensive, indicate that they *try* to visit the COO but they do not expect reciprocal visits from transnational family members. Momo and Nawa, for example, reside in the UK within the conditions of Nawa's student visa,[36] and Momo works in the UK in a professional career. As such, they are allowed to travel, and have financial means to do so "once a year", but do not anticipate any visits from their families based in Bangladesh. Similarly, Bai's family have "leave to remain"[37] in the UK and can, therefore, travel. Although it is financially difficult for them to visit home, Bai explains that they "try to once a year", but understand that their parents in China "are too old" to reciprocate the visit. On occasion, financial circumstances inhibit travel entirely; Ella's student visa allows her family to travel to Malaysia but the cost of flights is prohibitive: "I already told them I won't come back [...] it's too expensive". For these families, although travel is not restricted by their legal status in the UK, the transnational family visit does not and cannot have a significant role in their "family displays".

---

[36] Citizens of non-European Economic Area countries, wishing to study in the UK, must apply for a Tier 4 student visa. To be granted the visa, individuals must have been accepted on a course, pass a test in speaking, reading and writing English and they must also have enough money to support themselves. They can be joined by their spouse, but all family members, including the student, must leave the UK once their course is completed. For PhD students, this is as soon as they have submitted a thesis (Gov.UK, 2014d).

[37] Bai applied for a tier 2 visa as a sponsored worker in the UK catering industry, prior to March 2011. As such, once he had resided in the UK for 5 years, he and his family were able to apply for, and were granted, indefinite leave to remain in the UK; they are free from immigration control and have no restrictions on their work or length of stay in the UK (Gov.UK, 2014c).

For other families, visa restrictions limit those living in the UK and/or the COO from visiting transnational relatives. Both Hiwa and Saman indicate that their families based in Kurdistan have not visited the UK, because `it's very, very difficult to get visa for them to come` (Hiwa). This is partly because of `too much cost` (Saman), but also because there's,

> `too much headache […] you have to, in here, send a visa form with, like, guest letter.  It just take too much.`
>
> (Saman, father, Kurdish refugee)

Further, although Hiwa was granted "indefinite leave to remain" in 2002,[38] he and Sana are recently married and Sana does not yet have this status.[39] Consequently, he explains:

> `I've not been to Kurdistan for two or three years now. I am writing for Sana's visa.  When it come through, we [the family] will go back.`
>
> (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee)

Here, the conditions of existing visas, and the bureaucracy of applying for new visas, inhibit familial visits to and from the COO. Due to this, or financial restrictions, four of the ten participant families have been unable to visit their COO since migrating, two `try` to do so on an annual basis and five of the above have not had any visits from those in the COO. All of these families originate from areas outside of Europe. By comparison, for all four participant families of EU origin, family visits, either to or from the COO, are a common mode of "family display".

Participant families able to visit transnational family members are, then, provided with an opportunity to display family; the visit is also an "enabler of display". This is illustrated by way of the activities families engage in during visits; *all* participants able to travel, report that the main purpose of the visit is to `just spend most of the time as possible with them (family)` (Fillip) and to `get together`

---

[38] See footnote 7.

[39] As Hiwa's wife, Sana is currently in the UK on a "family of settled person" visa. This initially entitles her to stay in the UK for a period of two and a half years, after which she can apply to settle and for a UK passport which would make travel easier for the family (Gov.UK, 2014a).

with family and friends" (Bai). By doing so, participants show family members that their relationships are important. Lenka and Fillip reinforce this message by paying "for a nice meal" (Fillip) or taking "them out somewhere nice" (Lenka). As such, the family visit *enables* participant families to display to those in their homeland that their family also 'works' financially.

Display is also *enabled* during these visits, because family members participate in what would usually be regular family activities. Momo, for example, accompanies his parents on a family trip that they make weekly:

> I born in Takka, but we have a village home[40] where my family from, so normally, when I visit home, I try to visit village home with parents.
>
> (Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse to Bangladeshi international student)

Similarly, Matus describes the time he spends with male family members when he visits Slovakia:

> When my cousin's there, he takes me out to play football […] he usually has matches so we go and watch him with my grandad and uncle.
>
> (Matus, age ten, Slovakian economic migrant)

In both these examples, those involved (Momo, Matus' grandfather and cousin, and Matus) are *doing* what grandfathers, cousins and sons *do*. Momo, however, consciously makes an effort to participate in this particular activity and Matus' male relatives actively involve him in their *everyday* routines. As such, and because geographical distance would normally interfere with this, these are "family displays", not only to one another, but also to the wider audience.

---

[40] Momo explains that the "village home" is where both his mother and father grew up, but they migrated to the city before he was born. The village still holds symbolic significance for the family.

<u>"Tools" of Display</u>

Finch argues that "family display" is supported by "background features" that might be defined as "tools of display" (Finch, 2007: 72). Here, analysis considers the "tools" of *transnational* display and *tests* scholarly assertions that these "features" include items such as photos, domestic artefacts, heirlooms and narratives (Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Almack, 2011; Doucet, 2011). This section further considers the additional "tools" of transnational display adopted by migrant families in the study and the frequency with which they are employed.

Keepsakes, Heirlooms and Artefacts

Although Reynolds and Zontini (2014) assert that transnational families display family through visual artefacts, the majority of migrant participants do *not* have artefacts or objects in their homes that they associate with their transnational families. Ivana, Lenka and Sana do, however, identify items that are intimate reminders of their families in the COO. Sana has `"clothes and pictures"` that she keeps, although they are not displayed publicly and serve simply as a personal reminder of home. By contrast, Lenka has several ornamental keepsakes in the family home and she is able to reflect on their significance:

```
I've got recipe book of my dead grandma.  Every time I
hold it, I think, 'that's my grandma's' […] You know
them plant on the windowsill?  They're not something I
want to have in my house, but the boys, they were out
with my sister and she bought one for her and one for
me, so I feel attached to that thing cos it's from my
sister and I tell her I have them out.
```

<div align="right">(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Further, Ivana identifies physical keepsakes, such as a `"candle holder"` placed on the table, but also refers to artefacts that are linked to familial traditions:

```
When Spring came, my mummy used to take these golden
flowers in vase, so my mummy taught me to do this [points
to vase of flowers on the table].
```

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Although the artefacts in these examples are not obviously familial, they *are* known as such by participants and family members visiting from the COO. Further, although Ivana does not like the plastic flowers from her sister, she displays them publicly and has told her sister this, thereby displaying the significance of this sibling relationship to both the wider audience and her sister.

Analysis also reveals that these objects are used as "tools" to display family to family children; Lenka, for example, explains that:

```
The kids know the things on the window are from home,
and I keep saying, this is from Martina, my sister, this
is from grandma, this is from that grandma, this is from
when you were ill, grandma sent it.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant).

Similarly, Ivana reminds her two boys that their aunt bought the plastic flowers as a gift for them. These symbolic items are used, then, to prompt conversations that connect children with their absent transnational families.

The presence of such objects is not, however, widespread in participant families and there is limited evidence to support their function in transnational "family display"*,* in the way Finch (2007) or Reynolds and Zontini (2014) suggest. During the fieldwork, I was invited to visit all but one of the family homes. These were, on the whole, sparse with few domestic or decorative objects. Analysis indicates, however, that this does not denote a lack of transnational links and may be grounded in a number of reasons. Heath *et al*., for example, report that migrant groups bring few personal items with them when initially emigrating (2011: 3.15), owing to practical reasons or because they are fleeing persecution. Further, as migrant families, participants mostly rent property; all have moved homes frequently since leaving their COO and others anticipate relocating again in the future. This is certainly the case for: Nawa and Momo, who share a rental property

with other students and plan to move home once Nawa's study is complete; Justina, as an asylum seeker only has access to items that meet her family's basic needs via NASS;[41] Hiwa and Sana have only recently made the decision to marry and settle in the UK. As such, the families in the study, with the exception of Lenka, Ivana and Magda, have not been in a position to gather "keepsakes" and, therefore, have little opportunity to "display family" via material objects.

Sending and Receiving Family Photographs & DVDs

A number of the families interviewed report *sending* photographs of UK based family members to those in the COO. This can be unprompted but is sometimes at the request of those in the homeland. Saman's family members, for example, ask for photos, because "`they want to see them [Saman's children]. Every time anybody's going back, I have to send a photo for them to see`" (Saman, father, Kurdish refugee). Fillip, by contrast, *chooses* to send images of the family, "`when we have pictures`" (Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant) and Ella is pro-active in creating a "`photo book for my parents, of Anna's developments […] so my parents should look at Anna's changes`" (Ella, Malaysian, international student).

Family members living in the COO also send family photographs to those living in the UK. Saman and Rachel report that family members in Kurdistan regularly send both photographs and DVDs of significant events they want to share with their family in the UK, "`like, any wedding, they take a video camera […] there's about one every week!`" (Rachel, mother, British partner to Kurdish refugee). Similarly, Ruta and her family receive many photographs of Alycia, her niece living in Poland, and they "`have three albums of pictures of her because my sister is taking and sending them`" (Ruta, Polish economic refugee).

Participants do not, however, speak about photographs being displayed publicly in the COO and I only noted two photographs on display when visiting participant homes. These are displayed in Sylwia's house, are of her two geographically distant

---

[41] See footnote 2.

grandchildren and she proudly shows them to me at the end of our first interview. On this occasion, Sylwia does use photographs to publicly display her transnational family relationships, in a way that resonates with Almack's description of photographs being a tool of "family display" in the extended family of same-sex couples (Almack, 2011). This is, however, an isolated example. Instead, accounts show that photos exchanged are most frequently of, or for, children, with the main function being to maintain inter-generational relationships with those geographically separate.

For Ella and Sylwia's family, the exchange of photographs is driven by the desire for family adults to be involved in a family child's development, as they would be if co-resident. For Saman and Rachel's transnational family members, photographs sent to Kurdistan are a display intended to reassure that the UK based, dual-heritage family is "working". Kurdish relatives reciprocate in order to display that they value the family in the UK, whilst ensuring that they are exposed to Kurdish norms. The accounts provided imply that the drive to maintain relationship can result in the exchange of photographs, at times, being unduly excessive. This aside, it seems that the giving and receiving of family photographs is intended to help transnational families maintain a sense of family hood; this act is a "tool" of transnational "family display" among family members rather than a "tool" for displaying to a wider audience.

The Sending & Receiving of Gifts from the UK to the COO

Participants identify the sending and receiving of gifts as a way of displaying family, the intention being to show transnational family members that they remain important. In the Chinese family, Bai gathers what might be seen as typical, although costly gift items and sends impromptu packages to family, including, "`some perfumes and some nice drinks for my dad and some luxury goods`".   Similarly, Lenka and Magda send their parents unprompted gifts of perfume and aftershave, with Lenka explaining that, "`my dad really like nice perfume, so I always buy him some`" (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant).

Although there is significant literature concerned with migrants sending remittances to family in the COO (Taylor, 1999; De Hass, 2005; Anton, 2010; Bartram *et al.,* 2014), this

is not prominent in participant accounts and is not significant in the sample's "family display". The participants cited above are, however, economic migrants, their initial move to the UK instigated by the drive to improve their incomes. In reality, Bai works long hours, Chyou is not in paid employment and Magda and Lenka are single parents and, thus, one income households. Nevertheless, although they do not report sending cash gifts, the expensive gifts they send, primarily as a sign of affection, also allow them to construct a "family display" that implies that their economic migration is financially "working".

That said, Lenka also sends items home that she would 'pass on' if she and family members were co-located:

```
 The clothes after Dominik, I don't give them to charity,
 because my sister has a boy and it's very easy to send
 them.
```
<div align="right">(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Although this might be a "family practice" (Morgan, 1996) in the context of co-location, because Lenka consciously saves the clothes and then pays the postage to send these "hand-me-downs" - a cost which is potentially more than the value of the clothes - this becomes an act of "family display" that affirms the high quality of her relationships with both her sister and nephew.

Both Nawa and Zack's families are in the UK with the purpose of study. Zack does report sending gifts home, but they are "souvenirs for my nieces and nephews" that reflect his family's recreational activities in the UK and have little financial value. Nawa, alternatively, shows her affection for her family by sending gifts that reflect her reason for being in the UK, but that are also useful to her particular family, including:

```
Some study equipment for my dad, for study purposes.
Practical stuff I sent for my sisters, so this is,
necessary things, and helpful things.
```
<div align="right">(Nawa, Bangladeshi, international student)</div>

These participant families indicate that their families in the COO are located within the upper classes and, for them, their children are in the UK for a limited period, gaining educational qualifications. Consequently, neither UK based family is driven to demonstrate economic success, whilst access to "souvenirs" or "study equipment" indicates that their family is succeeding in line with their migrant expectations; they are studying, whilst enjoying the tourist elements of being away from home.

Sending and Receiving of Gifts from the COO to the UK

Family members based in the COO also send gifts to their family members living in the UK. These gifts are, however, more likely to be linked to the migrant family's cultural origins and can be divided into two types. The first type is rooted in the homeland, but not associated with what might be seen as culturally specific displays of family. Zack reports that family members might send `a rare Malaysian food that we cannot get here` (father, Malaysian, spouse to international student) whilst both Sylwia and Magda have received foods such as `"Polish sausages"` (Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant). Similarly, Ella's mother sends Anna, her granddaughter, Malaysian clothes that might be worn on festival days: "`what we call, erm, traditional clothes`" (Ella, mother, Malaysian international student). Here, although these items serve as a reminder of the cultural origins of the families in question, they are also souvenirs of the homeland and, it would seem, the primary intent of the gifts is to affirm transnational relations as familial.

The second type of gift sent from the COO *is* associated with culturally specific "family displays". Lenka, for example, recounts a Slovakian Easter tradition whereby family men and boys "`playfully tap`" girls in the neighbourhood with sticks and, in return, they are sprayed with perfume. As family men in Slovakia make these sticks for young boys, and Matus and Dominik's father is not in their lives, Lenka's brother-in-law assumes this role and "`he's making and sending a fresh one every year for my boys`" (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant).

Saman provides a further example of this type of display when he explains why his brother in Kurdistan has sent gold earrings to his daughter, Macey:

```
He give gold, because gold is special in my country […]
for girls, not for everybody, just for family. It's like
how family love you.
```

(Saman, father, Kurdish refugee)

As both the "stick" and "gold" are understood as culturally specific "tools" of "family display", the cultural and the familial intent are difficult to separate. Despite this, Saman and Lenka's relatives *do* send these gifts to display their familial connection to the children in question. Further, this is recognised by the children's parents and, consequently, relayed to the children. The complexities of these cultural displays are discussed in more depth later in the chapter.

"Degrees of Intensity" in Transnational Display

Transnational "family display" is, then, a regular feature of migrant family life in Hull. The following sections build on discussion relating to why and how transnational "family display" occurs and shifts the focus to specific displays. Here, the data reveals that the families interviewed do experience what Finch refers to as "degrees of intensity"; episodes when family relationships need to be defined or *displayed* more strongly (2007: 72). These periods of "intensity" can, however, be divided into two distinct types: positive life events, such as births, marriages and celebrations, and times of crises, such as illness and death. Although Baldassar *et al.*, assert that these occasions *are* times when transnational family members are most likely to visit either the COO or the migratory country (2007: 139), these scholars do not discuss this within the context of "family display".

When Couples Marry

Previous studies have identified birth (Almack, 2011) and marriage (Smart, 2008) as a period of "intensity" for same sex couples, due to their unconventional familial construct. For migrant families, unconventional in their geographical separateness (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 9), birth and marriage are also imbued with normative familial expectations. The two participant families that married post-migration (Ivana/Fillip; Sana/Hiwa), report this as a time when their transnational families influenced resultant displays. Ivana and Fillip, for example, chose to marry in Slovakia,

```
because family wanted us to - to see us in a nice dress
and they wanted to celebrate and it would be very
expensive to invite them here to pay all the tickets,
and family and friends are there. Everyone can go to
church.  Everyone can come who wants.
```

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Although these reasons are enmeshed in practical considerations, the couple chose to return home, not necessarily because they wanted to, but because this is what their family wanted. For Ivana and Fillip, then, the marriage ceremony provides an opportunity to show central family members that their opinions are influential in their lives. Further, this is also an opportunity for the couple to show a large number of transnational family and friends that their marriage is "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) within Slovakian - norms.

Sana and Hiwa provide further insight into marriage-related familial expectations that extend *beyond* the wedding ceremony. Hiwa explains why, despite having lived in the UK for eleven years, he returned to Kurdistan to find a wife:

```
That's part of the life in our culture - a man has to
marry and I couldn't find a suitable wife in here [……]
because in our culture the marriage is very important.
It's for life, nothing else.
```

(Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee)

Consequently, Sana and Hiwa met and embarked on an arranged marriage organised "between the family networks" (Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee). For Hiwa, despite his intention to stay in the UK for the long term, the choices he makes relating to marriage are heavily influenced by culturally located ontological expectations. As with Fillip and Lenka, then, marriage as a period of "intensity" provides an opportunity for Hiwa to display to his family in Kurdistan; as a British citizen, choosing to settle in the UK, his ontology remains Kurdish and his new UK based family will "work", because it is grounded within a Kurdish framework.

When Children are Born either in the Country of Origin or the New Country

Participants report that display occurs when a child is born post migration, as family members from the COO visit the UK to offer their support during the post-partum period. For Ivana, this is a Slovakian cultural norm and she sees this as `automatic in our culture`. Similarly, Hiwa explains Kurdish familial norms surrounding birth:

> `In Kurdistan members of family would stay with Sana for`
> `40 days and they don't let her to do anything. They`
> `would do everything for her to make sure that she get`
> `totally recovered.`

(Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee)

For EU migrants, the ability to move freely and access to comparatively affordable air travel, makes it easier for families to display appropriately when a child is born in another country. Ivana, for example, reports how both her mother and mother-in-law came for extended periods when her children were born:

> `Fillip's mum came for 4 weeks to help and then my mum`
> `came here for a longer time to help […] I know many`
> `people, if they had a baby, somebody came automatically`
> `to help to recover from labour and to help with the`
> `child.`

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Similarly, Lenka, also Slovakian, explains that her sister visited the UK `for three weeks` when her son, Dominik, was born, whilst Ruta reports that when her niece was born in Poland, she and her brother, Lech, visited their new family member as soon as possible: `She was born in June and we went on 11`th` July`.

Where free movement is not possible for family members, subsequent barriers to "family display" present difficulties during periods of "intensity". Here, Hiwa and Sana explain that their family based in Kurdistan did not visit when Aso was born due to the bureaucracy they might face:

```
For European countries it is easier, because from the
airport there are issues about people coming in
illegally, so it is more control and quite difficult to
get visas for Britain.
```

(Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee)

Sana and Hiwa's family, as a result, are not able to display in the same way as EU citizens, or in the way that they might choose to. Although Sana explains that the time around birth, "`is quite difficult […][because] you are alone here, away from family`", she and Hiwa have no choice but to accept that this cultural norm will not be realised. It is, instead, "`some kind of luxury that we don't have here`" (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee) and, thus, transnational family cannot visit and Hiwa must return to work.

Where travel is possible, then, birth provides an opportunity for close family members to *display* their relationships to both the new parents - the immediate family – and others that are aware the visit is taking place - family and friends based in the UK and the COO. Such times do, however, bring the geographical separateness of the family to the fore and where "family display" is prevented, as with Hiwa and Sana, this not only impedes the maintenance of cultural familial norms, but results in those based in the UK lacking the necessary support. Despite this, family members understand that this is not practically possible and, consequently, there appears to be no long term impact on family relationships.

Illness and Death

Research participants indicate that the *most* intense periods of transnational "family display" occur when a family member is ill or a close relative dies. This is so much so, that participant families from outside of Europe, with less ability to travel, are aware of and plan for the fact that "`an emergency`" (Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant) would require their return to the homeland. There are, however, different levels of illness or *crises* and, consequently, varying levels of display required. Several families, for example, send relatively inexpensive or unavailable medicines to their COO when a family member is suffering with a minor ailment; Nawa sends "`medicine available here what is not available in my country`" (Nawa,

Bangladeshi, international student), whilst Lenka sends cold and flu medicines to her mother in Slovakia:

```
They  cost   £1,  here,  in  pound  shop.  Five  Euros   in
Slovakia!   So she always telling me, 'can you send me
one or two of them hot drinks,' so I send about five,
because I just feel that that's the way how I can help.
```
<div align="right">(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Further, a grandmother in Slovakia displays her familial relations to her young grandson, Vilam, by developing creative, child appropriate displays:

```
What we started to do, it's like a little trick, because
sending parcels and letters is very expensive when he
was very poorly last year, my mum felt very sorry for
him,  so  she  said,  'I  would  be  so  happy  to  buy  him
something and give it to him', and I say, 'OK.  I'll buy
it here', and I pretend to post it.  There is no stamp
[…] but then he knows that Grandma sent him something.
```
<div align="right">(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Here, Vilem's grandmother is driven to display her care for him as he is unwell. She and Ivana employ a strategy they have developed to circumnavigate barriers to transnational display and, together, they ensure that Vilem knows that he is in his grandmother's thoughts. These displays are, then, prompted by minor familial illness and they serve to reassure that geographical distance alone does not compromise family relationships.

When illness becomes more serious, the requirement for display intensifies and participants report varying levels of success when negotiating this across international borders. Ella, for example, migrated four years after her mother suffered a stroke and she speaks about the difficulty of leaving her convalescing mother:

```
When your parent is getting older, they tend to want
their children close to them - my mum, just had a stroke,
like, 2007 - when you've had that experience you want
everyone close to you.
```

<div align="right">(Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)</div>

As Ella has six siblings living in Malaysia, her mother's practical care needs are accommodated. Nevertheless, prior to migration, Ella recognised that geographical distance, combined with her mother's frailty, would impact on her ability to display successfully to her mother, and the wider family. She attempted to discuss this with her mother and, further, Ella modified her transnational display to better suit her mother's needs:

```
I read a lot about when people got stroke […] they are
more sensitive and they need attention, so I call them
more often.
```

<div align="right">*(ibid)*</div>

Despite taking these measures, this has limited success, evidenced in the fact that Ella feels `bad about` not being able to display in the way she would if co-resident.

Ivana also reports that geographical separateness affected her ability to display family when her mother was seriously ill in hospital:

```
My sister rang - 'it's so hard, it's only me here.  If
you are here, we can talk and we can advise each other
what to do, and now it's the responsibility only on me'
- the doctor didn't want to talk with us on the phone.
He said somebody should come, and my sister is at work,
so for three days we didn't have any information about
her.
```

<div align="right">(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

In this situation, Ivana is unable to display successfully, both to her ill mother and the wider audience, indicated by the doctor's disapproval of her absence. Due to geographical separation, Ivana is also unable to display her *sisterly* relationship, confirmed by her reflections on the situation: "`my sister told me! That's`

```
even harder! She said, 'it's hard to have the responsibility
of what to do because I'm on my own'".
```

When serious illness occurs, both Ivana and Ella are unable to show that their transnational family *"works"*. Ella's efforts to minimise the impact of this indicates the "intensity" of the situation, although she is resigned to this, because she knows she is in the UK for a limited time as an international student. Ivana, by contrast, sees her inability to display in the way she would like as an indication that she must return home, now that her mother is older and `"getting ill"`. These families are, however, *able* to return home if the situation becomes worse. Both have access to finance in the case of an emergency, Ivana's family, as EU citizens, face no visa restrictions and Ella's are able to travel if she fulfils the bureaucratic requirements of her student visa.

By contrast, for two migrant families, since their arrival in the UK, family members in the COO have become seriously ill and have, sadly, died. Due to their migrant status in the UK, these participants were unable to travel and, thereby display the quality of their relationships. Saman, for example, had limited contact with his family during his early years in the UK as an asylum seeker, during which time his mother and, then, his father died. Due to circumstance, Saman did not learn of his mother's illness until after her death and, due to this lack of information and his migration status, was unable to visit her when she was dying. Two years later, when his father became ill, his family did inform him but, again, Saman was unable to travel to Kurdistan. Here, he explains the negative affect this had on his mental well-being:

```
It was very hard for me, because I lost my mum, my dad,
in two year and I not see them so I go more and more
crazy.
```
(Saman, father, Kurdish refugee)

Saman has limited agency to display his family relationships in the way that he would want; he did not have the opportunity to reassure his parents of the high quality of their relationship with him before they died. Further, his inability to travel home means that he also failed to display to the wider family and others living in Kurdistan that, despite

him living in another country, his parental relationships remained significant. As a consequence, the emotional impact is severe.

Justina has also experienced the death of a parent - her mother - since she came to the UK. Prior to her death, Justina's mother was ill and, during this time, contacts in Nigeria requested that "`she send £100 for an operation`" (Justina, mother, Nigerian asylum seeker). As an illegal immigrant and, subsequently, an asylum seeker, Justina's financial position did not allow this. As a consequence, she feels intense guilt about this because, "`I needed to give her, you know, proper treatment […] it's my mother`".   Further, Justina's lack of agency to display freely extends beyond financial capacity; her status as an asylum seeker inhibits travel and she lives in fear of her traffickers, both in the UK and her COO. For these reasons, Justina was unable to successfully display her *daughterliness* at the time of her mother's illness and this has had a long lasting impact on her well-being and mental health: "`It's not easy – the guiltiness that if I was at home my mum wouldn't have died`".

Illness and death are, then, periods of "intensity" (Finch, 2007) for migrant families. Further, the correct display, on this occasion, is to make physical contact with the family member that is experiencing poor health, particularly at the end of life. For those with the agency to travel, there is a chance that they can display their familial relationships successfully, despite geographical separateness. It seems, however, that this is an occasion where physical contact cannot be substituted and, when this is not permissible as a "family display", the impact on those based in the UK is profound.

Troubled Displays: When there is Conflict across National Borders

Discussion in this chapter has, so far, supported Finch's implication that "family display" reveals the positive nature of family relationships (Finch, 2007: 70). This section, will, however, consider Heaphy's argument that display can also reveal the negative aspects of family relationships, with a focus on the contention that some family constructs and, thus, displays are more valid or legitimate than others (Heaphy, 2011). Further, scholars also identify that familial norms and displays can be culturally located (Kim, 2011; Kristie

& Buckhan, 2011; Carver, 2014). Here, then, analysis considers the impact cultural familial norms have on participants negotiating transnational "family displays".

Nawa and Momo, for example, have been in the UK for two years and arrived shortly after they married. The circumstances of their marriage are complex, as they chose a 'love marriage'[42] rather than the arranged marriage associated with Bangladeshi tradition. After much coercion, Nawa's mother agreed to the marriage, but this was against her father's wishes. Post migration, Nawa attempts to restore her relationship with her father, via transnational "family displays". Although scholars identify this as a possible function of display (Hughes & Valentine, 2011; Valentine *et al.,* 2014), Nawa's attempts are unsuccessful and she reports how her father will not engage with her during phone calls and pretends that `he is reading the newspaper` or `he is out`. Further, her father goes `outside of the home` when she and Momo visit Bangladesh. In response to this, Nawa is driven to affirm that the choices she made were right and this shapes her transnational displays:

> `Sometimes, I am so angry with Momo, but I can't share`
> `with my family that I am having these kinds of things.`
> `I just tell them the good things about Momo […]sometimes`
> `we have fight and I feel very bad, but I go talk with`
> `them and I say, 'well, I'm fine. I'm good'.`
>
> (Nawa, Bangladeshi, international student)

Here, Nawa's father rejects her displays and, by refusing to communicate, omits his own. As such, he expresses his disapproval at her deviation from cultural norms and, in so doing, rejects the legitimacy of her marriage. As a consequence, Nawa presents an idealised version of her marriage in her transnational "family displays" in order to avoid the "cost" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 109) of further unsuccessful display (Gabb, 2011).

A further example is provided by Saman and Rachel. As stated previously, participants indicate that, in Kurdish culture, a man and woman should be married before children are born into a relationship. Nevertheless, Saman, who is Kurdish, cohabits with Rachel,

---

[42] Nawa and Momo met at university and had an established relationship before they chose to marry. This was independent of any involvement from their parents.

who is white British. They are unmarried, have two young children and Rachel has a son from a previous relationship. Consequently, transnational "family displays" are complex; Saman and his family have not yet visited Kurdistan, despite ongoing pressure from his brother for them to do so.   Saman, argues that this reluctance is because he wants to "`first go check`" how things are in Kurdistan and he doesn't "`want to leave Rachel here by herself`". Rachel, however, sees things differently and interjects, implying that Saman's resistance to visiting Kurdistan is grounded in the fact that they are not married: "`I think the one thing that you haven't told your family, though, is that we're not married`".

Although Saman initially minimises this issue, simply stating, "`No, err – I told them`", later in the group interview he provides more detail. Here, he acknowledges that his family "`don't like`" that he has had children outside of marriage, but there is nothing he can do about the situation: "`I can't take it back before kid!`"   Saman is aware that his UK based family cannot successfully display within Kurdish familial norms and, as such, he resists the invitation to visit in order to avoid this inevitability. As a result, at the time of the research, Saman's brother had withdrawn his displays of family as a protest: "`he thinks if he stop ringing me, I'll go back`".

These examples indicate occasions when transnational displays are influenced by the cultural expectations of the family of origin (Kim, 2011; Kristie & Buckhan, 2011; Carver, 2014). Furthermore, the "family displays" considered also reveal negative aspects of family relationships. Indeed, Nawa and Saman experience familial disapproval as a result of their UK based family not meeting the display requirements of the COO. Nawa attempts to ameliorate familial conflict by adapting transnational displays to present her 'love marriage' as unrealistically flawless. Nawa's father, however, still refuses to accept her marriage as legitimate. By contrast, Saman, "omits display" (Gabb, 2011) by refusing to visit home in order to avoid his UK based family being rejected in Kurdistan.   As Heaphy contends, then, some family constructs may be required to display more than others and, thereby struggle to display successfully and achieve familial legitimacy (Heaphy, 2011). Here, this applies to participants that do not reflect culturally located familial norms.

Intergenerational Transnational "Family Displays"

The arrival of children into a family does prompt an increase in "family display". Further, participants report that geographical separation from family children is often difficult for families where, culturally, the `grandparents look after the little one` (Chyou, father, Chinese economic migrant) or adults are `very connected to the young` (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee). Consequently, the development/maintenance of transnational, intergenerational relationships is prominent in participant accounts. The following section considers the role of "family display" in the maintenance of these relationships.

As discussed, access to technology and transnational visits are "enablers" of transnational "family display" for *all* family members, both adults and children. As such, restrictive factors such as migration status and finance available to the family also impact on "family displays" *between* generations. The data highlight, however, that intergenerational familial display is also affected by young family members being able to speak their mother tongue, the age of the child involved and parental influence. The following analysis considers the intersectionality of these influences.

Multiple "Enablers": Successful Displays

Siblings, Lech (seventeen) and Ruta (fourteen), for example, are Polish born economic migrant, came to the UK when they were in junior school and, whilst they are fluent in English, they see Polish as their first language. The age of these young people is also significant, as their migration status as EU residents as well as their language competency, means that they are able to visit the COO, without a visa or parent, during most of the school holidays. As a result, these young people display their relationships independently of parental influence; Lech, for example, reports that visits home *enable* him to maintain relationships with family members by `spending time with people and doing normal stuff`. Similarly, Ruta reports that she Skypes or calls relatives in Poland as a way of letting transnational family members `know that she cares`. Although successful displays are partly dependent on Sylwia, their mother, organising and financing transnational visits, it is a combination of this, Ruta and Lech's language ability and their age that result in them having the agency to act

with autonomy and, thereby, display family in order to develop quality, independent transnational relationships.

Parental Influence as an "Enabler" and Successful Displays

Although younger, Matus, (age eleven, Slovakian economic migrant) is also able to successfully display family transnationally as, Lenka, his mother, both facilitates and promotes his communications with transnational family members. Further, he is able to speak his mother tongue competently and, as he is eleven years old, he has free access to technological "enablers of display", such as Skype and email. This has resulted in him regularly displaying his familial link to his cousin in Slovakia: "on Skype, I always talk with him". The use of technology, combined with the family's migrant status as EU migrants allowing regular familial visits to the COO, has resulted in Matus forming independent, strong relationships with his transnational kin. The presence of these "enablers", for example, allows Matus' grandad and uncle to include him in typical Slovakian family traditions during a visit to the home land; a display of Slovakian family norms.

```
Last summer, we [Matus, his uncle and his grandad] went
to look for mushrooms.  I found lots of them. I don't
like mushrooms, but my uncle said to me, 'why do you go
looking for them if you don't like them?'  My uncle, he
loves going fishing and he takes me every summer, but he
doesn't like fish, so I said to him, 'why do you go
fishing if you don't like fish?'
```

(Matus, age eleven, Slovakian economic migrant)

The quality of the resulting relationships can be seen in the familiarity apparent in the interactions he describes in this example.

The importance of parental influence in successful transnational "family display" is brought into sharper focus when considering Dominik, Matus' brother, as he is only four years old and he cannot autonomously display family transnationally. In addition, the "enablers" of transnational display available to him are further restricted as he speaks little Slovakian, as he was born in the UK and has little opportunity to speak the home

145

area language. Despite this, as the family do visit Slovakia regularly and, as his mother persists in including him in transnational communications, Dominik does have a connection with his grandparents in Slovakia. Here, Lenka explains how she mediates and translates conversations via Skype, thereby displaying, to both Dominik and his grandparents, the significance she places on these relationships:

```
When they are on Skype with my parents, Matus' Slovakian
is quite strong, but Dominik not so much, so they are
asking me what he is saying, because half the sentence
might be in English.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Further, Lenka not only facilitates her children's familial displays, but she also ensures that her own transnational communications include displays of seemingly unimportant aspects of *everyday* family life. She recounts, for example, that her mother saw Dominik's chicken pox `"several times on Skype"` and she also explains how she encouraged both children to use Skype to show their grandma that they had a new pet: `"we got a new guinea pig, so we want to show my mum we got a new guinea pig"`. By sharing these *everyday* family moments with transnational kin, Lenka aims to recreate the intimacy experienced between co-located family members and, in doing so, she displays to both her children and their grandparents that these relationships are high quality and significant.

For this family, then, Lenka's facilitation of "family displays" is crucial to the long term development and maintenance of her family's intergenerational relationships. At the time of the research, Matus had many "enablers of display" available to him; his age, his language competency and the family's freedom to visit that county of origin. Despite this, as Matus was only two when he came to the UK, these foundations were nurtured via the familial displays of Lenka and family adults residing in Slovakia. Similarly, although Dominik's young age and limited language competency limit his involvement in familial displays, Lenka's drive to show that her transnational family "works", has the potential to override these restrictive factors.

Limited "Enablers": Successful Displays

The absence of multiple "enablers of display" does not, however, necessarily lead to unsuccessful transnational "family displays" or poor relationships. Indeed, "family display" can be successful when children are very young, possibly pre-verbal, and when transnational visits are absent or infrequent due to limited finance or restrictive visa conditions.

Gen (age three, Chinese economic migrant), is only three and his family are unable to visit China regularly, due to work commitments and high travel costs. Despite this, Gen's first language is that of his COO, as he and his UK based family speak Mandarin and very limited English. To add to this, he was born in China and lived there with his grandparents and his mother for the first two years of his life. As a result, Gen has a pre-migration relationship with his grandparents and, consequently, when display is *enabled* via weekly video chat, communication with his grandparents flows easily, with Chyou reporting that they talk about:

```
Normal stuff [and] sometimes grandparent will ask him,
'can you sing a song? Can you do a dance?' […] he just
does whatever he thinks he wants to do, to the point
that if he doesn't know what to say, he'll just play
around, but they still can see him.
```

(Chyou, mother, Chinese economic migrant)

Significantly, as Gen is so young, this planned weekly video chat, when family members are able to share "doing family things", must also be supported by his parents. The combination of his parents placing an emphasis on maintaining relationships and Gen being able to speak the same language as his grandparents means that, despite financial reasons restricting transnational visits, this family are able to successfully display this facet of their lives and, thereby, replicate some aspects of their previous relationships.

The data clearly indicates that parental facilitation of intergenerational displays is central to their success and the younger a child is, the bigger the parent's role; Aso, for example, has Kurdish parents, was born in the UK and at the time of the interview was under six months old. As such, he is the youngest family member in the study and he

has no pre-migration relationship with his grandparents in Kurdistan. Obviously, communication with his transnational family is nonverbal and, as visa restrictions inhibit travel to Kurdistan, any communication must also be fully facilitated via family adults. Hiwa, his father, however, reports how important it is for his Kurdish family to link with Aso and, as a result, he and Sana facilitate communication between grandparent and grandchild to reassure them that they have a familial relationship. Since his birth, grandparents have watched and "talked" with Aso, so much so, that Sana reflects: "actually he is growing with them [his grandparents], as well, because of Skype".

Although Aso obviously has little agency, here, by facilitating displays, Hiwa and Sana are able to show the grandparents that Aso is developing and that their UK based family "works" (Finch, 2007). Aso's grandparents, in turn, regularly display by investing their time in Aso becoming visually familiar with them; via the one available "enabler of display", Skype, family adults take responsibility for laying the foundations of future intergenerational relationships.

Limited "Enablers" and Unsuccessful display

In contrast to these examples, when children are relatively young and "family display" is not facilitated by a parent, transnational intergenerational relationships suffer. Daniella, for example, is seven years old and came to the UK as a pre-verbal infant. Although Magda, her mother, has encouraged her to speak Polish, because "basically, my mum, she can't speak English […] so it could be nice if she will remember" (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant), Daniella feels grounded in the English culture and resists learning her mother's first language, stating:

> I hate speaking in Polish because I don't like it. In English I love speaking because I'm much better because when I speak Polish, I sometimes get words wrong.
>
> (Daniella, age eight, Polish economic migrant)

As Magda's preferred form of transnational communication is the telephone and she does not like using Skype, this is also the only technological "enabler" made available to Daniella. As her ability to speak Polish is limited, Daniella cannot communicate with her

grandmother during Magda's weekly display of family, a telephone call. In addition to this, despite being a migrant from the EU, Magda and Daniella rarely visit Poland, due to limited household finances and because Magda prefers to spend holidays in the UK. Daniella's grandmother does visit Hull twice a year, yet the lack of a common language means that Daniella simply reports that, during these visits, `My grandma […] she says, 'I can't hear you' when I speak in English`. Although the visit is, in itself, Magda's mother displaying her relationship to her child and grandchild, the scarcity of other familial displays results in Daniella's relationship with her grandmother lacking in familial quality.

In contrast to the earlier quotations, where Ruta, Lech and Matus express a sense of intimacy with their transnational family members, Daniella does not. Instead, her knowledge of her broader family has a sense of distance and is framed by her experiences during a historical visit to Poland:

> I have a big cousin in Poland that I don't even know […]
> I have two cousins. I have one called Phillip. He's very
> smaller than me […] he's three years old, I think,
> because I don't know when he had a birthday. Last time I
> met him he was really small.

(Daniella, age eight, Polish economic migrant)

Indeed, in line with the conclusions Al-Ali draws from a study of young Bosnian migrants, for Daniella, limited language capability is a factor that estranges her from her parents' home area (Al-Ali, 2002: 92/93). In addition, this intersects with Daniella having limited autonomy when forming transnational relationships, resulting from both her age and Magda's ambivalence towards facilitation of displays. In this family, familial displays play a limited role in the creation of intergenerational transnational relationships and it is, in fact, the absence of such displays that is significant.

Unsuccessful Displays: When Display is not Enough

"Family display"*,* however, does not always allow migrant families to maintain transnational familial bonds that they deem as acceptable, irrespective of the "enablers of display" available to them. Indeed, for one family in the study, face-to-face contact,

living in a geographically co-resident place, is the only truly successful way to show "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73). This is apparent in Fillip's explanation as to why he and his wife want to return home with their children:

```
The relationship with the family, with grandparents […]
it's something which already, it suffer a lot. They have
no opportunity to build up the relationship with each
other because they have not time to spend, so if we
decide to stay here for the rest of the life, it mean
that my children and me are lost all the contact with
family.
```

(Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

As discussed, Ivana and Fillip, as a Slovakian family with finance available, visit home two or three times a year. Further, they have access to multiple technologies and they and their family members regularly engage in familial displays via this enabler; Ivana sends electronic photos of the children engaging in positive activities, her mother rings the UK regularly to check the family are OK and they Skype one another on significant occasions such as birthdays. Despite accessing these multiple "enablers" and engaging in such familial displays, Ivana and Fillip feel that their family is still unable to successfully display their relationships in the transnational context.

Although other participants feel able to adapt and modify family practices in order to show, "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73) for this family, their ideology of family involves physical closeness and the transnational *display* activities available to them are not enough. As Morgan (2011b) discusses, "family practices" and, therefore, displays*,* are a complex mix of both activities and ideologies and, as is the case here, family ideologies can sometimes be at odds with the realities of people's *everyday* lived experiences. This is aptly illustrated by the fact that Ivana and Fillip are in the process of planning their permanent return home.

Conclusion

Analysis presented indicates that transnational "family display" does have a significant function in the maintenance of transnational familial relationships, particularly

transnational intergenerational relationships. Findings further confirm a number of the features of "family display" identified in chapter three; "family display" is important, because, as Finch (2007) and others contest (Philip, 2013; Philip, 2014; Castren & Widmer, 2015), family extends beyond household. Furthermore, analysis adds to existing knowledge by revealing that "family display" *"matters"* in the context of migration, because family also extends beyond international borders. It is argued here, that "family display" is also, as Heath *et al.* (2011) posit, an activity of "relativising" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 14) that allows migrant families to reassure family members in the COO that, despite geographical separation, their relationships remain high quality.

The data also supports the assertion of Finch (2007), and others (Almack, 2011; Gabb, 2011), that migrant families display because of the "fluidity of family" over time; for these migrant participants, transnational inter-generational family relationships need to be redefined *after* family children are born, both in the COO or the migratory country. *All* familial relationships also need to be redefined for an unspecified period during early migration. Although it is argued here, that the *immediate* time around birth is a period of "intensity", these particular *extended* phases of "family display" are not. Instead, they persist for lengthy periods, until the unconventionality of transnationalism becomes normalised (Brahic, 2013) and, subsequently, the need to display reduces.

Analysis does, however, support Finch's assertion that families and, here, migrant families, do experience phases of "intensity" (Finch 2007) when family relationships need to be displayed more; birth, marriage, illness and death. Furthermore, the data reveals that "family display" is supported by "tools of display". Although artefacts do not have a privileged role in transnational displays, as argued by Finch and others (Finch, 2007; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Reynolds & Zontini, 2014), they *are* supported by the sending and receiving of photographs and/or gifts, which vary depending on the function of the display: my UK based family financially works and/or my transnational family relationships work.

Findings also highlight previously unidentified characteristics of display; transnational "family displays" are more successful when they are *enabled* by channels that allow

participant families to select and present specific elements of their family life to what Finch refers to as "relevant audiences" (Finch, 2007: 67). "Enablers of display" identified for *all* family members are visits to and from the COO and access to affordable communication technologies. When considering transnational intergenerational relationships, access to technology and visits continues to be significant, but displays are also enabled by transnational family members having a shared language, a child's age and parental facilitation of display.

Interrogation of the data also reveals more troubling aspects of family relationships. There are occasions where transnational "family displays" are not adequate in confirming that relationship are high quality, for example, the death of a family member in the COO. Analysis also reveals that cultural variations in perceptions of familial legitimacy both shape and impact on the success of displays. Furthermore, migrant families do not have equal agency in accessing *enablers;* those of EU origin are more able to engage in transnational visits, whilst the success of intergenerational displays is dependent on the intersectionality of *enablers* listed above. As suggested by Heaphy (2011), this chapter does indicate that, in the transnational context, some families *are* more likely to display successfully than others.

CHAPTER EIGHT: LOCAL "FAMILY DISPLAYS"

The data presented in this chapter affirms, but also expands scholarly understanding of "family display" by introducing new aspects of display that are specific to migrant family life within a new culture. Here, analysis identifies new reasons for display and additional "tools" of display, but also provides further evidence for the development of the original concept of "enablers of display", as introduced in chapter seven. Beyond this, interrogation of the data also confirms and expands "relativising" and "frontiering" as aspects of transnational family making (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002), by testing Heath *et al's*. (2011) hypothesis that "family display" *may* be a significant element of these transnational processes. Analysis does so, by using unique empirical data to detail the contribution "family display" can make towards the success of "frontiering" and "relativising". Data presented highlight the factors that also limit and shape these familial displays. Although analysis alludes to the audience of "family display", interviews with audience members and a detailed response to this aspect of the question will be presented in chapter nine.

Displays of Family or Something Else

Analysis presented assumes that social practices are inextricably linked and that what might be perceived as, say, a *cultural* or *gendered practice* merges with and influences what might also be seen as a *family practice* (Morgan, 1996; Morgan, 2011a). This is grounded in Morgan's argument that types of practices "overlap" and influence one another, because:

> Individuals do not start from scratch as they are going about family living. They come into (through marriage or parenthood, say) a set of practices that are already partially shaped by legal prescriptions, economic constraints and cultural definitions.

(Morgan, 2011b: 7)

James and Curtis argue that Finch's concept of "family display" is flawed, because she ignores these influences, thereby implying that "family display" occurs in a "social and cultural vacuum" (James & Curtis, 2010: 1165). The stance adopted in this thesis, however, is that Finch, by building on Morgan's family practices approach, *implicitly*

acknowledges that practices and, therefore, displays, *are* embedded in, and contribute to, broader social structures and context. It follows, then, that cultural, religious and gendered displays merge with ""family displays" and influence what individuals perceive to be correct familial behaviour. A cultural gendered display, for example, an Islamic women wearing a veil (Hoodfar, 1993), merges with "family displays" and, thus, wearing the veil on the school run might also be a culturally located display of "these are my family relationships, and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73).

Why Migrant Families Resident in Hull Display Family Locally

The empirical data reveal that participant families display family locally for two broad reasons; to build and maintain relationships with UK based members of the home culture (both kin and non-kin) and to actively engage with the indigenous community. These reasons resonate with two processes Bryceson and Vuorela (2002) identify as central to transnational family-making, that is, "relativising" and "frontiering". "Relativising" refers to the processes migrant families employ to, "maintain or curtail relational ties with specific family members," (kin and non- kin) (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 14) and to create, "an imagined community with shared feelings and mutual obligations" (*ibid*). Here, this is understood to include the creation of *family-like* relationships with non-kin from the COO that are co-resident in Hull. "Frontiering", by contrast, relates to the "agency [migrants have] at the interface between two (or more) contrasting ways of life" (*ibid*: 12), that is, "their own and the host society culture" (Heath *et al*., 2011: 4.3). Analysis of *local* migrant "family display" is, then, structured around these concepts, thereby highlighting how the study expands understanding of both "family display", as well as these elements of Transnational Family Studies. Although Heath *et al.* understand "relativising" to also include maintenance of relationships with "those left behind" in the COO (*ibid*), transnational displays are considered in the previous chapter. Consequently, the focus here is the maintenance of relationships in the UK.

"Relativising" and "Family Display"

The Fluidity of Family over Time: Redefining Relationships with Co-resident Kin

Finch argues that "family display" "matters", because the contemporary family is fluid and needs to "establish positively the contours and character of 'my family' […] as individuals move through the life course and change their mode of living" (2007: 69). Participant families *do* indicate that it is necessary to affirm the quality and character of their relationships with their Hull based co-resident kin, because they live geographically separate from the majority of their biological kin. Owing to the changes brought about by migration, participants display and, thereby, affirm the relationships which are, in Finch's words, "meaningful at any given point in time" (Finch, 2007: 70).

Chyou, for example, a mother and Chinese economic migrant, displays the quality of her familial relationships by focusing her attention on her co-resident family in a way she would not do if she were in her home land, because, `in China, I would work, but now […] to me, looking after him (her son) and my husband, that's my duty`.   Further, Bai, her husband, is aware that he is in the UK "`for working`" and, therefore, spends less time with his son than if he were in China. As a result, when he has time off, his focus is his child: "`I am occupied with him. He says I cannot go anywhere.  I have to play with him`". By responding to his son's request and committing his limited free time to their relationship, Bai displays, to both his son and wife, that his paternal bond is a priority.

Fillip and Ivana also have no kin living in Hull. Fillip works in the caring professions and has changed his working arrangements to ensure that his family are supported, because they are alone in a foreign land:

> `I can't cope any more with the permanent job and with`
> `the shifts what you have already allocated […] because`
> `my priority was the family, so I changed the job […] I`
> `try to spend the most of the time with them if I'm not`
> `at work [so] I do only night shift and I do the bank.`
>
> (Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

Here, Fillip shows that he is able to provide financially, whilst also prioritising his emotional relationships.

When children are not present in the family, participants also display and, thereby, define the high quality nature of their bonds with their co-resident kin. Momo, for example, does not spend more time with friends that are students, because:

> It's for my wife. If I ask her, 'let's go to a party,'
> and Nawa says 'no,' I won't go […] because she is not
> going and, here, it is only me and Nawa.

> (Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse to Bangladeshi international student)

Although Nawa does not explicitly request that Momo avoids "partying", by choosing to not engage in this activity, he affirms to Nawa that their marital relationship is the most "meaningful" (Finch, 2007: 70) to him, whilst also defining the contours of his *family* to his student friends. The outcome of the displays described here are two-fold; participants, like post-divorce fathers in Philip's study, display by putting "their children [or partners] first" (2013: 416) amidst this "new mode of living" (Finch, 2007: 67). Consequently, they signal to the immediate UK based family that their relationships with them are the most "meaningful" (Finch, 2007: 70), but they also fulfil their own need to be *anchored* within an intimate familial unit.

The Fluidity of Family over Time: Revision of Family Identity and the Maintenance of Cultural Traditions

Participant accounts also confirm that, in response to the changes brought about by migration, "family display" aids in the construction and continual revision of familial identity. For Chyou, Ella and Lenka, for this new identify to "work" (Finch, 2007: 73), their children must still know the cultural traditions of their home land; Chyou's family have, then, started to engage in Chinese cultural displays since the birth of Gen, their young son, because they are "trying [their] best to pick them [traditions] up for him". Similarly, Ivana has taken a lead role in weekly Slovak Community meetings, so that her children can learn Slovakian traditions, such as, "dance and Slovak songs [and] Slovak history". Furthermore, Ella maintains links

to the Malay community, so that, Anna, her daughter, learns how Malay children should behave in public:

```
Malaysian kids usually hug or whatever, but it's a must
for a kid to shake hands with the eldest, the other
parents. […] She already exposed to that and we are
trying to teach her when coming to our friend house, she
will shake and kiss.
```

(Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)

Each of these families intend to return home to their COO, either in the short or longer term and, therefore, for their familial identity to "work", their children must remain connected to home land norms. By inculcating children with these norms, these families display to co-located family members and those in the COO that their UK based families' international identity continues to be meaningful. Further, parents are also mindful that once they return home, for future displays to be successful, their children will need to understand the norms expected of, what Haynes and Dermott refer to as, "future audiences" (2011: 155) in the COO.

The Fluidity of Family over Time: The Creation of Family-Like Relationships

In the context of migration, intimate relationships change over time and, consequently, display "matters", because the relationships they are able to, or choose to support, also change (Finch, 2007: 70). This is the case in Sharma's study of university students forming *family-like* bonds in church communities (Sharma & Guest, 2013), owing to the geographical distance between biological family members and the limited availability of bonds with co-resident kin. As a result, participant families display family to establish what Weeks *et al.* refer to in their study of same sex families as, "families of choice" (Weeks *et al.*, 2001); "relationships based on friendships which become *family-like* in terms of levels of commitment and support" (Almack, 2011: 11).

Although Zontini and Reynolds (2014) also liken the way that migrants make new relationships in their host country to Weeks' "families of choice", this study uniquely evidences that "family display" contributes to the development of these kin-like relationships. Indeed, participants report interactions between themselves and co-

157

resident non-kin that establish and affirm relationships as *family-like*, specifically because they would normally expect these interactions to take place between kin. Sylwia, for example, is a single mother from Poland and, for her daughter (Ruta, age fourteen), local Polish friends are `like family`, because `when my mum has problems with my brother, she talk with friends and they advise her`. As these friends support Sylwia with family matters, they ease the pressure of being the sole adult in the family and, thereby, display that their relationship with the family is familial.

Similarly, Nawa describes the development of her *maternal-like* relationship with an older Bangladeshi woman, Rasheeda:

```
Sometimes she cooks something for me and then Mohammed
[the woman's son] will bring it to me - 'my Mum cook it
for you' - even sometimes they complain that, 'well, you
forget us!  Do you remember when you last visited our
house?' [laughs]
```

(Nawa, Bangladeshi international student)

Here, Nawa understands that the gift of food and the expectation of regular contact are *family-like* displays which invite her and her husband into Rasheeda's family.

Participants also report more explicit *family-like* displays. Zack, for example, reflects on the mutual support obligation that members of the Malay community feel for each other, because `there are not many of us here, so we need to look after each other [...] we just know that` (Zack, father, Malaysian, spouse to Malaysian international student). Ella provides an example of the type of "family display" that supports these relationships to move beyond friendship and to become *family-like*:

```
We can rely on them if anything happen [...] they lend me
some money [...] it's a big thing.  It's family-like, not
friend-like.
```

(Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)

Fillip also reports examples of "family display" experienced in non-kin relationships:

```
When we bought the house, […] I ask these friends for
help when I need the help and they came and did a lot of
things and they didn't ask me, 'you pay me ten pounds
per hour' […] they just came for one day without any
question for money[…] 'I help you with this, you help me
with this'. Sounds like, yeah, like a family.
```

(Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

For these families, their non-kin friendships start to be perceived as familial, based on the recognition that certain "actions do constitute 'doing family things' and thereby confirm that these relationships are 'family' relationships" (Finch, 2007: 67) or, in this case, have the "character of a 'family' relationships" (Finch, 2007: 69). Here, as in Sirriyah's study of unaccompanied asylum seekers, whereby kinship status is displayed by referring to foster family as "like-a-mum" or "like-a-sister" (2013: 8), these participants display kinship by referring to their *family-like* relationships. The examples cited highlight that, within the context of migration, non-kin *can* go some way to substituting the role of absent kin and "family display" plays a significant role in establishing these bonds.

The Fluidity of Family over Time: The Creation of Frontier Networks for Practical Support and in Order to "Belong" to the Home Area Network

The study also reveals that migrant families display family to support the development of "Frontier Networks"; interconnected co-resident people that "provide vital mutual support for the realisation of family and individual welfare" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002: 19). The boundary between "relativizing" and "frontiering" is blurred here, as when participants engage with the home area network (hereafter referred to as HAN) , "frontiering" becomes "relativising", because it leads to the creation of a "community with shared feelings and obligations" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 14). Participants report, then, that members of the HAN, both kin and non-kin, display family to migrant newcomers as one "way of belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2012: 2004; May, 2011) to a "set of relationships which one regards as family relationships" (Finch, 2007: 70). Fillip and Ivana, for example, came to Hull to find work, because Ivana's brother, Vlad,

lived in the city. In the initial phase of settling, Vlad showed his familial care by taking responsibility for any practical concerns they had:

> ```
> He picked us up from the train station and we started to
> live with him in the flat with another guy. […] We didn't
> need  to  look  for  accommodation,  the  furniture.
> Everything was already prepared for us and it was very
> helpful.  Then he help us with registration with GP
> practice.
> ```

<div align="right">(Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

In so doing, Vlad welcomes the couple into the HAN and displays to his sibling and the wider home and host audiences that, despite having been geographically separate from one another and now reunited, these "family relationships, thus configured, do really 'work'" (Finch, 2007: 70).

This type of "family display" is mirrored in participant accounts of non-kin, *family-like* relationships within their HANs; Chyou reports that she and Bai provided comparable support to friends arriving in the UK from China and Zack and Ella also received support from the Malay club when they first arrived in the UK:

> ```
> Before we came we contact Malaysian student here […] they
> ask us to join Malay club and when we arrive they provide
> information,  like,  TV  license,  accommodation,  the
> whereabouts of, err, jobs[…] buying a good car, prices
> of halal food.
> ```

<div align="right">(Zack, father, Malaysian, spouse to Malaysian international student)</div>

For both these couples, these initial *family-like* actions initiated long-term, strong relationships. Chyou, for example, describes her relationship with this couple to have become *family-like*, "because we support each other. If we have some problems […] they can give us advice and vice versa" (Chyou, mother, Chinese economic migrant), whilst Zack explains that the Malay club, for him, now provides "the nearest contact we have like our family".

These accounts are, however, provided by participants that chose to come to the UK and were able to, at the time of arrival, access appropriate support networks; Fillip, and Bai's families are economic migrants, welcomed into a pre-existing, albeit small and informal infrastructure of UK based members of their home communities with whom they were able to have prior contact. Nawa, as a student and Zack, as the spouse of a student, also had HAN contacts linked to the University.

In contrast, in 2001, when Kurdish participants were dispersed to Hull as asylum seekers, pre-existing networks were not present. As such, Hiwa recounts arriving as an eighteen year old asylum seeker to a city with an almost exclusively white, British-born population and a poor race relations record (Craig *et al.,* 2005). Consequently, for him, "`People wouldn't accept us as refugees – it was difficult to mix with the native people`" and, as a result, this "`pushed us to come closer to each other`" (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee). Although this group of men did not have a pre-established HAN to welcome them to Hull, accounts indicate that *family-like* display did occur, borne out of enforced isolation and absence of kin:

> `When we came we didn't know other people around, so we`
> `tended to congregate and socialise with each other […]`
> `we would go in each other's homes, staying until late at`
> `night and just talking, telling each other about our`
> `lives.`

(Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee)

Here, these men affirmed their relationships via *family-like* behaviours and, in so doing, displayed to one another that they were available to offer the *family-like* support required for their individual welfare; they began their own "Frontier Network" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 19).

These initial displays might be perceived as a period of "intensity" (Finch, 2011: 199) triggered by a migrant family's arrival in the UK. Participants report, however, that these displays reoccur and they are, instead, an ongoing element of frontier networking intended to show, or invite "belonging" to a particular community (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1006). Ella and Fillip, for example, now initiate the *family-like* displays that

welcomed them. Ella reports that her family engage in *family-like* gatherings, organised by the Malay club, to welcome new comers, whereby:

```
Every Malaysian family will come and bring some dishes
together, so we eat and, yeah, get together to welcome
the new arrival.
```

(Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)

As Fillip now has local knowledge and an ability to speak English, he provides new Slovakian arrivals with the type of support he and Ivana received as they arrived:

```
I help a lot of people with the things like insurance
for the car, or registration of the children's passports,
or a new GP practice […] because my English has improved
and I am able to do what would be hard for my friends
which are not able to speak very good English.
```

(Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

Once established as network members, participants further employ "family display" (Finch, 2007: 79) in order to maintain this sense of familial "belonging", examples of which are provided later in this chapter.

"Frontiering" and "Family Display"

Anlaysis reveals that participant families also display locally as a function of "frontiering", so as to engage "in an interface between their own and the host society culture" (Heath *et al.*, 2011: 4.3). The aim of these familial displays is, then, to achieve positive "integration" and "identity creation" in the host community (Bryceson & Vuorella: 2002: 11). Families do, however, experience different incentives for display and are influenced by a number of factors, as discussed in the following sections.

Displaying Parenthood in the Host Community

The research data indicates that "family displays" intended to promote bonding with immediate family members and those intended to create links with the host community are not always mutually exclusive; again, the distinction between "relativising" and "frontiering" is not as clear as Bryceson and Vuorela suggest (2002). Participants report,

for example, that when affirming the quality and character of their bonds with their co-resident kin (Finch, 2007: 70), they sometimes display family in a way that links them to the host community. This is particularly true when children are born into, or are present in the family, as a child's birth triggers a requirement to display parenthood to both the baby and broader host and home communities.

All participants that became parents whilst in the UK, report that their behaviours changed when they became a family with children. Fillip and Ivana (Slovakian economic migrants) have travelled less, spent more time in Hull and focused on building their relationship with their children, whilst Sana goes out more, because "I have to take him [her son, Aso] places, so I meet new people, of course" (Sana, mother, spouse to Kurdish refugee). For both these families, displaying parenthood, to both their children and the host population, involves spending quality time with their children, sometimes in public spaces and, in so doing, creates opportunities to engage with the local community.

For other participants, becoming a parent has had a more profound impact on their behaviours. For Saman, a participant with a history of violent anti-social behaviour, a 'good' father should be both a positive role model to his children and present favourably to the local authorities. Consequently, entry into parenthood and his desire to display successfully triggered a shift in his conduct:

> After my kids come in, I stop everything […] I don't want to make my kid copy me […] I don't want him to have any record with the Police. I have loads of record before.
>
> (Saman, father, Kurdish refugee)

For Bai, becoming a father prompts him to learn English. After five years of residence in the UK, he feels it is now necessary if he is to fulfil what he perceives to be his protective paternal role:

> If there's a sudden event that happens, due to my lack of English, I cannot solve the problem straight away […]

```
the thing is, my son is allergic to toothpaste […] so I
had to ask one of my colleagues that work with me to
ring the emergency GP […] because of my language, if I
couldn't find anyone to help me, that might delay things.
The consequences worry me.
```

<div align="right">(Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant)</div>

By fulfilling these parental roles, participants display their 'working' family relationships to both family members and local populations: Saman avoids conflict with others, including those from the UK; Bai, by learning English, can take care of his son's needs, but also start to interact with local residents; Sana and Fillip attend child-focused sessions with English parents. Although these displays occur because participants are parents, not necessarily because they are "migrant families", as a consequence, they *do* have the opportunity to show host populations that, "these are my family relationships and they work" (Finch, 2007: 73).

To Minimise the Position as "Other" and to Signify "Belonging"

Drawing on Mulvey (2010) and Greenslade's (2005) arguments that policy and media can influence public opinion towards an issue, it is necessary to consider specific events that occurred during the fieldwork period (2012-13), as well as political and media representation of immigration and BME communities (Mulvey, 2010; Greenslade, 2005; Chambers, 2001). In this time frame: the newly elected coalition government presented *all* immigration as problematic and promoted the imposition of further immigration "control" (Cameron, 2013); the Labour Party, in opposition, continued their pro-assimilationist stance (Sharma, 2008) in their rhetorical reference to "one nation" (Labour Party, 2014), without acknowledging British BME groups (Uberi & Modood, 2013); Theresa May, as the Home Secretary, promoted changes to the British Citizenship Test (BBC News, 2012) that supported Cameron's pledged to "put British history and culture at the heart of it" (*The Guardian*, 2011). Furthermore, on 22nd May, 2013, the soldier Lee Rigby was murdered by British-born Muslims. In response to this murder, the English Defence League (EDL)[43] held two marches in Hull, promoting an anti-

---

[43] The EDL are a far right protest group with extreme anti-Islamic views (englishdefenceleague, n.d).

Islamic, nationalistic agenda in an area highly populated by settled, Kurdish refugees (*Hull Daily Mail*, 2013).

Throughout the fieldwork period, then, the message to migrant families continued to be that, in order to "belong" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) - or to be "legitimate"' (Heaphy, 2011) - they must assimilate to dominant, white, Christian, familial typologies (Chamber, 2001). Some families, particularly those that plan to stay in Hull for the long term, display family in order to assert their "belonging" to their new, host country. The desire to "belong" to the new community is exemplified particularly well in Lenka's reflections on her eleven year old son, Matus:

```
He asked me if he will be able to change his nationality
from Slovakian to English.  I don't think he is feeling,
really Slovakian […] when he's talking about football
match, he will say, 'we won', for England [and] I can
remember when he had a period of time when he wasn't
liking his name, because it was making him feel different
from everybody else.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

For Matus and other young participants, signifiers of *other* are undesirable; Ruta wants her family to be viewed as `normal, like, not any different from any other family` (Ruta, age fourteen, Polish economic migrant) whilst her older brother, Lech, wants their family to be seen as `just the same […] I not feel like different person from Hull` (Lech, age seventeen, Polish economic migrant). Either consciously or consciously, for these young participants,

there are powerful incentives to claim recognition as family, because of the access it affords to full relational citizenship […] [because] those relationships that fail to display 'normal' family characteristics are likely to be constructed as second class families or as *other* to family.

(Heaphy, 2011: 33)

Owing to this desire to 'fit in', families that can and do stay, display family in line with what they perceive to be British familial norms. Lenka, for example, is affected by her

children's desire to "belong" and, as a family that has chosen to stay in the UK, they display a hybrid version of Christmas celebrations:[44]

> We had Slovakian Christmas on 24th and then we just continued with turkey on 25th, so I can quite accept both and I am also quite flexible with trying to understand my children's needs and I know how important for children it is to feel included. I don't want my children being really, feeling very different from their friends.
>
> (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Others, however, explicitly state that they have adopted British traditions as a familial display of "belonging", via assimilation. Magda's family, for example, adopt an entirely British version of Christmas festivities:

> I decided to start doing things more English because we're staying here for good […] so, this Christmas was the second Christmas where I was just celebrating in completely the English way.
>
> (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant)

Furthermore, it is not just Christian participants that adopt these behaviours; Hiwa and Sana, an Islamic family that intend to stay in the UK, celebrate Christmas with their Kurdish friends and Bai and Chyou, as practising Buddhists, note:

> We're thinking, if we're going to stay here, we'll have to merge into the environment […] we anticipate [celebrating] Christmas and Halloween for the kids […] two reasons, one is the nursery and one is the other kids. Mum would also like him to be involved as well […] because he is going to grow up here and live here.
>
> (Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant)

For these families, the decision to stay, combined with the influence of the dominant assimilationist discourse, results in familial displays that mirror those of indigenous,

---

[44] As the initial phase of the research was conducted in late autumn, examples provided by participants tend to relate to Christmas.

Christian families during festival times. These "family displays" are, as Levitt and Glick Schiller suggest, "ways of belonging", which, for both intimate family members and the broader audience, "signal or enact an identity which demonstrates a conscious connection to a particular group" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1010).

To Reflect Local, State Defined, Familial Norms

Analysis indicates that migrant "family display" also occurs, because, as Heaphy argues, families desire to be seen as "legitimate" (2011), on this occasion, by the UK authorities. Here, it is useful to consider Chambers' (2001) discussion relating to culturally specific familial norms; in *Representing the Family*, she draws on Foucault's (1978) theories of knowledge production and argues that contemporary institutions produce and maintain the dominant discourse related to family 'norms' in the West (Chambers, 2001: 26) (See chapter five).   In the context of migration, the institutions and, therefore, the influences contributing to the production of the discourse of family will differ in each country. As a result, what is seen to be a legitimate norm, or successful "family display", will also differ, dependent on both the family and observer's COO (Seymour & Walsh, 2013).

Dermott and Pomati contend that government policy *does* define what is perceived to be appropriate parenting in the UK (2015: 3). As with Dorrer *et al's* (2010b) study of children in care homes, participants can feel that their displays are surveilled by authorities. Participant accounts do, then, indicate that migrant families display family in order to show that their "family relationships work" (Finch, 2007) within the boundaries defined by UK authorities. This occurs because participants also understand that these authorities have the power to reprimand familial behaviours seen as culturally unacceptable. Slovakian research participants express this particularly well as a number of fellow Slovaks, although based in other parts of the UK at the time of the fieldwork, had had their children removed by UK social services officers:[45]

```
It panicked Slovak families and parents were ringing and
texting me, 'what's going on?' because they know my
```

---

[45] In 2010, a UK based Slovak family had two boys removed from their family home and placed in foster care after one of the children had presented at hospital with a minor injury. The case was high profile and the circumstances of the removal were controversial and the parents and Slovakian authorities became involved in a long legal battle attempting to return the children to the family home (Booker, 2012).

```
brother's lawyer […] two or three things happened in one
time and it made a big issue, so all really panicked and
closed their homes.  I don't let the children play
outside in case somebody will come and take my children.
```

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Lenka, also Slovakian, recognises that familial norms are culturally specific and she, too, feels 'watched' as a migrant parent:

```
Sometimes, when Dominik's screaming and shouting, I'm
worrying that my neighbours are thinking I'm doing
something to him and I wouldn't be worried about it in
Slovakia, but I'm worried here, because there was a big
case about children taken from families […] Here you are
more aware of your action might get reaction from
somebody else.
```

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Both participants explain that this sense of surveillance has resulted in Slovakian parents modifying their familial displays; Lenka does not leave her eleven year old son at home alone although she would do if she were in Slovakia, and Ivana does not `kiss` her pre-school children in public as she fears this will be interpreted as sexual abuse. Here, Ivana reports how others adapt their public displays of behaviour management to mirror what is acceptable within UK State defined norms:

```
In Slovakia, you can smash [smack] your child and you
can't here, so in public, you can smash [smack] […] It's
part how you punish children and you can't do it here,
so sometimes people say in Slovak, 'I will hit you at
home, when I come home I will smash you'[mum] knows that
because she's in public, she can't do it.
```

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Here, because participant families are unfamiliar with the local discourse, the high profile removal of a child from the family home has made this group fearful of the power of UK authorities. For Ivana, however, it is not only `Slovak families` that experience this sense of surveillance, `but maybe foreign, I would say`.

168

As such, the UK culture is clearly in a position of power and, as a consequence, the incentives and requirements to display in line with the dominant acceptable local norms appear to be "intensified" (Finch, 2007: 72) for migrant groups.

Owing to their position as migrant *other*, participant families also modify their familial displays over the long term in a similar way; Saman, a Kurdish father, and Magda, a Polish mother, both report that local children's centre staff recommended that they attend a parenting course,[46] in order to 'improve' their parenting. Both access the course willingly and adopt these State condoned, parenting practices. Magda, for example, reports:

```
The way I grew up in Poland, it was lots of shouting and
smacking […] I went to the Triple P […] and it was really,
really helpful, because I started doing things in a
different way.
```

(Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant)

Although these changes are less consciously linked to surveillance, it remains that both Saman and Magda change their culturally specific parenting practices to model those promoted and, thereby, legitimated, by this State sponsored programme. This public adoption of new modes of parenting is, then, a "family display" which shows the UK authorities a willingness to assimilate to the UK ideals of a "family that works". Indeed, these research participants recognise that, as Heaphy (2011) asserts, "alternative or critical displays of family are weak displays" (Heaphy, 2011: 37).

To Avoid Conflict and Promote Community Connection as "the Other"

The study also indicates that participants construct their familial behaviours in order to avoid conflict between themselves and the host community. As previously discussed, the dominant immigration discourse during the field work period was anti-immigration and pro-assimilation (chapter four). As such, six of the ten participant families had experienced negative attention from the host population: Sylwia's family (Polish

---

[46] Triple P (Positive Parenting Programme) is provided by agencies involved with children's welfare in the UK. The programme originates in Australia and, although delivered worldwide, has a western approach to behaviour management. In the UK, parents that are experiencing difficulties - defined by themselves or practitioners- are able to, or are required to, attend the programme (TripleP, n.d).

economic migrants) had plants in their garden set on fire; Magda (also Polish) and Hiwa (Kurdish refugee) had experienced verbal taunts and Saman (Kurdish refugee) and Bai (Chinese economic migrant) had both been physically assaulted. In general, the racism reported had no obvious links to a specific migrant status or COO. Participants respond, however, by displaying family as a strategy to deflect negative attention and show that, despite being 'migrant', their family can "work" (Finch, 2007) within the local community.

Saman and Nawa recognise that certain types of display are more valid than others (Heaphy, 2011) and consequently they display family by modifying their instinctive response to a situation, in the hope that their families are perceived positively and conflict is minimised. Here, Saman reports how he does not challenge racist incidents so as to avoid `trouble` with local people. He is, instead, passive and teaches his children to respond in the same way:

```
That kid is bullying Ethan […] I say, 'ignore him', don't
make any trouble for him.  There's no point in bothering
with that kind of stuff.
```

(Saman, father, Kurdish refugee)

Nawa also reports that her desire to be accepted has resulted in her being less assertive than is natural for her:

```
Culturally, our emotion is very much, like, if I'm crazy
and angry with someone I just blast out […] but here, I
want to avoid these things, because other people, they
will not feel good with my angry thing.
```

(Nawa, Bangladeshi international student)

Again, UK culture is dominant and in a position of power (Heaphy, 2011). As a result, migrant families wishing to avoid conflict report familial displays that not only compromise their integrity, but are also potentially harmful to their family's welfare.

Other participants also modify behaviours with the aim of avoiding conflict, but they do so by displaying their family's legitimacy within their broader community. Bai explains that his family display that they are "good" members of the community:

```
Because if you give a good impression, that impression
will be reflected in how they [local people] treat you,
[so] just try to show that we are polite to the
neighbours.
```

(Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant)

Similarly, Zack reports that his family's displays are constructed in order to promote harmony within his immediate environment:

```
If you are here for your career, you respect the other
community and what they are believing and, then, we try
to, like, not to interfere […] We like to be side-by-
side.  Sometimes, we try to help our neighbours.
```

(Zack, father, Malaysian, spouse to Malaysian international student)

Although these participants do not directly allude to political or media representation of immigration in the UK, their displays deflect the dominant discourse that migrants are "bogus" or undeserving of their status in the UK (Robinson, 2010; Cameron, 2011); in avoiding conflict by contributing to their neighbourhoods, they show that their families are, instead, "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011), *deserving* community members that do not warrant negative attention.

Migrant participants do not, on the whole, relate their avoidance of conflict to issues of race. The dominant anti-Islamic discourses (chapter four) do, however, affect Ella's approach to "family display". During both interviews, she makes direct reference to "`the look`" of suspicion she has experienced as an Islamic woman wearing a headscarf. Although she has not felt this in Hull, she is still mindful of the narrative of the suspect Islamic *other* (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009). Consequently, Ella feels a desire and pressure to display family positively, specifically because she is Muslim:

```
I need to engage them first, because I'm Muslim, rather
than I expect them to engage with me  […] We strike up
conversation with neighbours first […]I just do that to
show that it's not me that's unfriendly.  It's them.
```

<div align="right">(Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)</div>

Although the accounts of other Islamic participant families do not reflect this feeling, for Ella, "family display" is important, because Asian communities have been created as problematic (Amin, 2006; Kundnani, 2007; Finney & Simpson, 2009). The role of race, religion and "whiteness" of migrants is discussed in more detail in the following chapter when considering audience responses to display. Nevertheless, participant families suggest that "family display" is important, because the dominant, anti-immigration discourse is broad and fails to distinguish between migrant types (Burnett & Whyte, 2004; Robinson, 2010).

How Migrant Family Resident in Hull Display Family Locally

<u>Beyond "Tools" – "Enablers of Display"</u>

Chapter seven introduces the new concept of "enablers of display", that is, the channels that allow participant families to show selected elements of their family life to transnational family members. In the context of "family displays" local to Hull, the concept requires further development; here, "enablers" also encompass factors that allow participants to present specific elements of their family life to members of their original HANs and/or host populations.

"Relativising" Enabler: The Home Area Community Living in Hull.

In the context of "relativising", successful family and *family-like* displays are *enabled* by the presence of a large or well established home area community. This is supported by Bryceson and Vuorela in their statement, "Many families, especially those who have emigrated recently or form part of an ethnically based mass settlement, tend to espouse strong attachments to their home area" (2002: 19). Post A8 accession in 2004, Eastern European populations based in the UK (McGhee *et al.,* 2015) and, here, Hull, grew and established community networks rapidly. As such, participants from the largest migrant population in the city, that is Polish (chapter two), have many culture-specific facilities and are able to go to a Polish Church, buy food from Polish shops, attend a Polish school

and mix mainly with Polish people. Lech, for example, came to the UK when he was eleven, and reports that he only had Polish friends at his mainstream comprehensive school, because, `It is very thick with Polish people in there and now there is about two hundred Polish there` (Lech, age seventeen, Polish economic migrant). There are, then, numerous forums that enable Polish families to display family successfully, in line with their cultural norms. This is similar for the Slovakian participants; though smaller than the Polish community, Slovakians have freedom of movement within Europe, access to friendship networks from their home area and, via the Polish shops, they also have access to the food of their home country.

Forums for *family-like* displays, rooted in joint national heritage, are not necessarily dependent on the size of the home area population, but also the strength of the co-located community; Zack (Malay) and Bai's families (Chinese)[47] report that their HANs are small, but established due to international work and study connections. As a result, participants are able to engage in "family displays" as a way to signify cultural "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2005; May, 2011) to their particular home area community.

This is not always the case, however, and migrant populations living in the same geographical location may *not* be a "'cohesive" or homogenous group (McGhee *et al.*, 2015: 437). For Nawa and Momo, the Bangladeshi population in Hull is `British Bengali, not Bengali` (Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse to Bangladeshi international student). They are a settled, third and fourth generation population, with whom Nawa and Momo do not share values and, as such, they do not feel *enabled* to successfully display family in line with their cultural norms.   Similarly, Justina experiences numerous barriers to "family display", as discussed later in the chapter; she too reports a lack of a cohesive, or large, Nigerian community. As a result, neither of these participant families is *enabled* to "display family" as part of this particular "relativising" process.

---

[47] The 2001 census shows that, prior to A8 migration and Hull becoming a dispersement area for asylum seekers and refugees, the Chinese community were the largest minority ethnic group living in Hull (ONS, 2003).

"Frontiering" Enabler: The Ability to Speak the Language of the Audience

Heath e*t al.,* in their study of Polish populations conclude that intercultural connections are obstructed, "with poor English rather than a lack of willingness to engage often acting as a barrier to close friendship" (2011: 4.4). In support of this, participants indicate that English language competence has a significant impact on their ability and confidence to display family locally, particularly when "family display" occurs at the "frontiering" interface (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002). At the time of the interviews, participant ability to speak English varied considerably: Chyou and Bai, speak almost no English; Sana and Hiwa speak very little and lack confidence doing so publicly and Sylwia speaks some English but lacks confidence in her ability. The remaining participants have a good grasp of the language, so much so that interviews were conducted without interpreters.

McGhee *et al.* consider competence in the language of the host country as being central to migrant populations having "host country human capital'" and, therefore, an ability to "integrate" (2015: 433). Participant language competency is, however, impacted on by a variety of factors; those with student visas speak excellent English as, by virtue of studying at a post graduate level in the UK, they are required to pass an English language competency test before being granted a Tier 4 Student Visa (British Council, n.d). At the time of the fieldwork, however, economic migrants, both EU and non-EU, are not expected to speak English to enter the UK and report that they arrived with little ability to communicate verbally. Although participant EU migrants have become fluent in English over time, they report that other migrants from their HANs that have their local support needs met by this population, have less incentive to learn English. This is also the case for Chyou and Bai as, although their HAN is small, it adequately meets their familial needs.

Participants report, however, that access to free English classes is limited; despite the requirement to learn English being an aspect of the prevalent assimilationist discourse (Cameron, 2011a) and a requirement for those applying for British Citizenship or

'indefinite leave to remain',[48] Government funding for free ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages) courses, was dramatically reduced in 2011 (Hubble & Kennedy, 2011). Consequently, those wishing to learn more English - Sana and Hiwa, and Chyou and Bai - explain that availability of courses is limited.

Those that speak little or no English, report spending much of their time with migrants from their home communities and having little direct interaction with host populations, citing their inability to speak English as a contributory factor. Despite wanting to adopt local familial norms, to express their "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to UK culture, they feel unable to fully display these modifications to their familial behaviours, because they cannot speak English. Indeed, Chyou and Bai, state that, "first of all it would be the language that stops [us] merging" (Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant). Similarly, Sana, a confident, but newly arrived migrant, feels that her lack of English is, *the* barrier she experiences in her desire to display typical English familial behaviours:

```
The only thing that is a barrier for me is language.
Sometimes I'm not going somewhere, because my English is
not adequate and I cannot explain myself […]I want to
take Aso to the swimming pool, but I think that I need
English to explain things and to talk to people in there
[…] when I have English, I will go to more things.
```

                          (Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee)

By comparison, the remaining participants in the study speak English fairly confidently. As such, as long as other factors do not present a barrier, they have the linguistic confidence to display family within, and to, the host community. Lenka and Ivana, for example, as fluent speakers of English, report how they are able to fully engage in public, child-orientated displays, such as visits to the cinema, attendance at playgroups, conversations in the school playground and sessions organised by local children's centres, because:

---

[48] When applying for either of these statuses, the applicant must prove their English language competency by providing evidence that they have passed a Home Office recognised English test or qualifications (Gov.UK, 2015f).

```
It was easy decision to make, because I had the English
understanding.  I wasn't frightened of, not going to be
able to understand what is happening there.
```

<div align="right">(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Further, once in in these situations, these families are also able to directly interact with the host population and, consequently, Ivana understands that, "`because I can speak English, I can find friends`".

Competency and confidence in the English language is also an "enabler" of familial displays that are not child-focused; as an Islamic woman, fluent in English, Ella actively confronts prejudice by instigating casual conversations with members of the host population and can, for example say, "`'hey! It's a lovely day, right?' […] and we start to talk`" (Ella, Malaysian, mother, international student). Momo, by contrast, reports how his peers at the gym often invite him to visit the pub after a training session, before they return home to their families. Although he would like to engage in this local gendered familial display, Momo's lack of confidence when speaking English prevents him accepting the invite:

```
When I communicate with them, sometimes, words just
flying over my head.  What they're exactly saying, I
can't get it […] They go to the pub and they always ask
me to come, but I feel like, what's the point if I just
go and I can't mix?
```

<div align="right">(Momo, Bangladeshi, spouse to international student)</div>

Although, as data in previous chapters indicates, familial displays are not dependent on direct interaction between individuals (Finch, 2007; Almack, 2011; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Doucet, 2011; Slater *et al*., 2015), the ability to speak the English language does *enable* displays that do involve direct interaction. Furthermore, those confident in their language ability are also socially confident within the host country. As such, they report accessing public spaces, thereby enabling both direct and indirect interaction between communities.

"Frontiering" Enabler: The Presence of Family Young

Research data reveals that participant families with children are *enabled* to display aspects of their family, because they access inter-cultural, child-centred spaces including school playgrounds, public play parks, local authority funded children's centres or private businesses such as soft play centres.[49] Indeed, all participant families with pre-school children[50] access free sessions hosted in children's centre venues and, consequently, interact with the host population. Ivana, for example, feels that playgroups `helped me find more nice people […] you can just come for free, or pound, and you can start` (Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant). Furthermore, for Saman, attendance at children's centre sessions has allowed him to display the quality of his paternal role to his children whilst also developing relationships with members of the host population. Rachel recounts that this has made Saman `more involved with English people now, whereas before, [he] hardly ever talked to them` (Rachel, mother, British partner to Kurdish refugee). Similarly, Zack is not socially confident, but when he takes his daughter to the informal environment of the local park he does have conversations and interacts with the host population:

> `[In the park] we talk about, 'what's your daughter's age?` `What is her progress?' Just normal chat. […] in Pearson` `Park, it's very relaxing, not with focus on doing` `something really fast, so chance to do small chat whilst` `pushing the swing.`
>
> (Zack, father, Malaysian spouse to international student)

By sharing information about child development, then, Zack is able to show that his family is both *conventional* and "works" and, for all these participants, they are able to engage with the host population in a way they would not in more adult-focused spaces.

---

[49] In the UK, there are privately owned play spaces, whereby children and their parents pay a fee to spend time playing on large play equipment. Children's birthday parties are often held at such venues.

[50] At the time of the fieldwork, In the UK, children must legally be educated once they turn five and, most attended school from the September after their fourth birthday until there sixteenth birthday. A small number of parents chose to educate their children at home (citzensadvice, n.d; Gov.UK, 2015e).

Participants with school age children further report that their legal parental responsibilities, relating to compulsory education,[51] also "enable" inter-cultural familial displays, particularly during school drop-off and collection times. As a result of the recurrent nature of such activities, participants are able to develop long lasting connections. Magda, for example, became friends with an English mother, "just in the playground […]in front of the school, waiting for them" and Lenka explains how, for her, similar interactions developed into stronger relationships:

> Most of my friends, I met at Matus' school […] because children play together, it was easier to build my relationship or friendship with somebody […] I don't know if I will walk to park and talk to strange people just to know them, but it was easier through waiting at school playground.

(Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Family children do, then, provide an opportunity for migrant families to interact in inter-cultural spaces. These accounts are, however, provided by participants able to speak English and able to display family in ways that involve a dialogue. Families that do not speak the language are, by comparison, reliant on visual familial displays. Observations made whilst in the field support this, highlighting that, although children do enable "family display" in inter-cultural areas, this cannot be forced:

> It's a sunny afternoon in Pearson Park,[52] just after parents have collected children from school. Groups of women and a few men are sat happily chatting and laughing. From sight and overhearing different languages, I guess the groups are Polish, Lithuanian or Slovakian and, I would say, Iranian. Their chat is only interrupted by their children approaching, or them shouting over to their children. Although the groups don't mix and they speak their own

---

[51] See footnote 50.
[52] Pearson Park is a busy park with family facilities, located in the most culturally diverse area of West Hull and accessed by many communities of differing cultural and ethnic origins.

languages, families from all backgrounds seem to be functioning happily side-by-side, although I cannot be sure that this is how local populations feel.

(field diary, 12th February, 2012)

There is, then, a tendency for groups to socialise with members of their HAN when in child-centred spaces, an observation also made when attending sessions in local children's centres. Furthermore, as migrant populations are concentrated in the west of Hull, participants mostly report visiting child-centred sessions or spaces in this geographical area. Consequently, displays are *enabled* by the presence of children, although this is restricted to particular areas of the city.

"Frontiering" Enabler: Work and Study Providing an Inter-cultural Forum

Analysis also indicates that work and study commitments are significant in *enabling* local migrant familial displays. Some participants do not, however, have access to this "enabler". Chyou and Lenka do not work as they have caring responsibilities in the home, whilst Justina and Sana are unable to work, owing to their visa status.[53] Participants that are able to and do work are, however, provided an inter-cultural forum to display that they and, therefore, their families are "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011). Hiwa, for example, explains that once he was awarded "leave to remain" and, therefore, had the right to work, he "started to make friends with other people, mainly through work" (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee). Magda also has strong friendships with English people at work and Lenka explains that, owing to her employment, she and her family engage with the local populations and "I feel like I'm socialising quite a lot and I've got English friends" (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant). Further, Fillip proudly reports how, via work, he is able to build rapport with English clients:

So I always introduce myself, always explain [where I am from] […] later on, some of them, they are more interested about and ask, 'alright, which part of Slovakia you are from?'.

(Fillip, father, Slovakian economic migrant)

---

[53] Sana is awaiting 'indefinite leave to remain' as a newly married woman and Justina is an asylum seeker. As such, neither are legally able to work (Gov.UK, 2015d).

It should be acknowledged, however, that work commitments can also *obstruct* inter-community familial contact. For some participants, the reason they came to the UK takes precedent over socialising and, thereby, limits their opportunity to display family to the host population. Bai and Sylwia, for example, are economic migrants that brought their families to the UK to improve their financial position. Here, Bai, explains how this restricts his public "family displays", because:

```
Living abroad is mainly working, so I don't really have
the time to communicate with others […] working limits
everything, but if we do have time, then we will go to
the park.
```

(Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant)

Similarly, Sylwia is eager to "spend more time with [her] children" and display the quality of her intimate relationships, but as a single parent she works long hours in order to fulfil her financial commitments to her family.

Participants' families are not only restricted by paid work commitments; Nawa and Ella, both temporarily in the UK to gain post graduate qualifications, struggle to find time to socialise publicly with their immediate family members. Nawa, for example, explains:

```
I'm totally stuck with my research and my study […] I
can't think, even to go somewhere with Momo.  […] Even
my PhD peer group, they want me to go somewhere for
coffee or some other places, but I'm stuck with work.
```

(Nawa, Bangladeshi international student)

Similarly, although Ella is eager to link with the local population, she is restricted by both her study and the fact that her husband must work to financially support the family: "I tried to get involved with Hull families, but I'm studying most of the time and Zack is working" (Ella, mother, Malaysian international student).

Those participant adults that can work, or study, have the opportunity to present at a "frontiering" "interface between their own and the host society culture" (Heath *et al*.,

2011: 4.3). That said, access to this "enabler" may be restricted and work and study commitments can also limit "frontiering" opportunities; students are focused on their study, whilst others must prioritise displaying family by working long hours and providing financial support. Further, Bai works in a Chinese restaurant where all the staff are from China and Magda reports that many of her Polish friends work in factories with a predominantly Polish workforce. Consequently, work environments can be mostly populated by HAN members and, therefore, opportunities for display are restricted to this audience.

"Tools" of Local Migrant Family Display

As outlined in chapters three and seven, Finch argues that "family displays" are supported by "background features" that might be defined as "tools of display" (Finch, 2007: 77). Here, analysis considers the "tools" that participant families use in local "family displays" with co-resident kin, HANs and host populations. As in chapter seven, analysis considers the "tools" suggested by Finch, whilst also exploring the additional display strategies employed.

<u>Keepsakes, Heirlooms and Artefacts in the Home</u>

Finch argues that keepsakes, heirlooms and artefacts are "background features" of "family display" (2007: 77). Furthermore, Reynolds and Zontini (2014) contend that transnational families do employ these particular "tools" to maintain relationships across national borders, which is, to an extent, supported by analysis in chapter seven. Discussion here, however, is concerned with local "family display". Participant families, then, have few possessions, possibly because, for practical reasons, little was brought from the home land (Heath *et al.,* 2011: 3.15) and, also, they have relocated a number of times within a relatively short period of time. Field diary notes taken when visiting participant homes, confirm that Nawa and Momo, Hiwa and Sana, and Justina's homes, all contain very few items, other than those that are functional.

In the remaining homes, artefacts and possessions *were* used as "tools" of display and reflect the familial identity participants aim to create; Ivana and Fillip's home, although sparse, has a wooden cross displayed prominently above the fire place in their living

room. As such, the family displays their religious beliefs, which interviews show to be a significant element of their family identity. Furthermore, Lenka and Magda's families speak of adopting UK culture and their homes contain furniture, pottery and clothes that might be found in any British home. There are no items that display *otherness,* with the exception of two Polish recipe books in Magda's home, which are amidst a shelf of English recipe books and, therefore, inconspicuous. Ella and Zack's home, a family that wishes to be perceived as cosmopolitan and global, is similar, containing no obvious symbols of Malaysia, but many technological gadgets; a large screen TV, a laptop, an ipad and iphones. Sylwia, however, is settled in the UK, but is proud of her family's Polish heritage, attends the Polish church, only shops in Polish shops and engages mainly with her HAN in Hull. As such, she decorates her home to reflect this, as documented in field diary notes of the visit:

Initial impressions of the family home remind me of holidays in Eastern Europe: the pottery is china, with floral prints and gold edging. The coffee table is also covered in a table cloth, with colourful hand embroidery in the corners and lace edging which seem to me, very Eastern European. The rest of the house is, however, furnished with items that are common in both England and Poland - a glass topped table, a beige sofa, a flat screen TV.

<div align="right">

(field diary, December 10th, 2012)

</div>

It would seem that, for these participants, artefacts *are* a "tool" that allow them to display pertinent elements of their family's new identity to those that visit the family home, be they indigenous or migrant. For some, these are displays of assimilation to UK norms, whilst for Sylwia, displays also signify a link to the COO.

Naming Children Born after the Decision to Migrate

Writing in 2008, Finch builds on the arguments made in her original 2007 article and argues that "the naming of children […] represents one set of "tools" which is available to assist the process of displaying families" (Finch, 2008: 714). Writing earlier, in 2004, Zittoun also states that "when giving a child their first name, parents are defining to the world what they want the identity of that child to be, as well as saying to the world what type of child they want to be parents to" (Zittoun, 2004: 143); they are displaying their

preferred family identity. Analysis of interview data supports these assertions and reveals naming to be a "tool" of "family display" intended for the home, host and transnational communities.

Those children born before families made the decision to migrate have names rooted in the COO - Ruta, Lech, Matus - whilst others born after the decision to migrate, have transnational names. Sylwia, for example, reports proudly that her grandchildren have names that are recognised in both Polish and English cultures; Adrian and Maria. This is also the case for Lenka and Fillip; they consciously chose "Teresa" as a name that would be accepted by the homeland, by HANs and also local populations. This use of names, as a "tool" of display, is expressed particularly well in Zack's account of naming his daughter, Anna, who was born three months before he and Ella migrated to the UK. As they knew this relocation was about to happen and, they, as individuals, had lived transnationally for many years, they chose a name that would reflect their cosmopolitan family, which they hoped Anna would perpetuate:

```
There's a meaning of Anna in Islam, so we want name to
be Western and then also have some Islamic values […]
[because] we are hoping that we try to bring up Anna
until university and then she will establish a family
and then career internationally.
```

(Zack, father, Malaysian, spouse to Malaysian international student)

These transnational name choices allow families to display their "family links across separated families and transnational worlds" (Finch, 2008: 213) whilst also displaying "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to both home area and indigenous communities.

Lenka's account provides a different perspective on naming as she named her second child, Dominik, again a name that expresses familial legitimacy in host and Slovakian cultures. The reason for this, however, was her eldest son's rejection of his Slovakian name: "I can remember when Matus was little; he was upset about his name. He wanted to be called Josh! [laughs]" (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant). Matus, at a young age, recognises that his

international name reveals his family's identity as *other* and, instead, he wants a name that implies his family is English; in 2001, the year Matus was born, Josh was the third most common name given to boys born in the UK (Babycentre, 2015). For Matus, an eleven year old who speaks English, from a white, European family, his name is one of the few signifiers of difference and, as such, is problematic for him.

Using naming as a "tool" of family display is, then, difficult for some participants; for family adults and children born in the COO, naming occurred prior to families having an incentive to engage in cross-cultural display. As a result, their names are an unintended display of their international origin. Furthermore, Chyou and Bai (Chinese economic migrants), like Hiwa and Sana (Kurdish refugees/spouse of), speak little English and have limited contact with the host population. Rachel (white British) and Saman (Kurdish refugee), by contrast, mostly mix in British groups and all three of these families, unlike those from European countries, have few naming choices that are recognisable cross-culturally. For Chyou and Bai, and Hiwa and Sana's families, both the incentive and ability to display "belonging" to multiple audiences is minimal. For Saman and Rachel, as discussed in the previous chapter, this dual-heritage family's ability to be successful in transnational display is complicated by conflicting familial expectations present within the extended family. This is possibly compounded by the couple's decision to choose contemporary Western names that firmly locate the children as "belonging" in British culture. This choice of names does, however, possibly reflect the family's acceptance that their "blended family" (Glick, 1989) (here, an unmarried couple with children, including a child from a previous marriage) is, according to Saman, more likely to display successfully within indigenous norms, than transnationally (chapter seven).

<u>Selective Language Use as a "Tool of Display"</u>
"Relativising": Redefining Relationships and Revision of Family Identity
For migrant families in the study, the language of the COO and/or the English language is used as a "tool" of "family display". All migrant parents, for example, desire their children to speak the language of the COO. As Ruta and Lech (both Polish) were eight and eleven when they came to the UK, they were already fluent in Polish on arrival, but where children were born in the UK, or came as pre-verbal infants, parents work hard to maintain the COO language. As Gen (Chinese) and Aso (Kurdish) are both very young

and live in homes where their parents do not speak English, this is relatively easy, as the children's first language is also that of the COO and they have little exposure to the English language. For families where children are a little older and they attend nursery and school, more familial input is required; Fillip and Lenka only speak Slovakian in the home environment, Saman speaks to his children in "99% Kurdish" and Lenka encourages Matus to write to Slovakian transnational family members, so he is able to write as well as speak Slovakian.

For participant families, then, the language of the COO is not only a transnational "enabler" (chapter seven), but it is also a symbolic display of joint familial heritage. Justina and Magda, for example, are women fluent in English that, otherwise, avoid displays that signify attachment to their COO. Despite this, they still express a desire for their children to speak their home language. For Magda, "I'm just trying to involve her in Polish. It's where I am from" (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant) and, similarly, Justina explains her reasoning as, "because it's my language" (Justina, mother, Nigerian asylum seeker). Here, as in Brahic's study of bi-national couples living in Manchester, children's acquisition of the language of the COO is a "tool" of familial display as it reflects the quality of parent/child relations and allows parents to share their cultural experiences with another familial person (Brahic, 2013: 712).

"Frontiering": To Disguise Displays Perceived as Unsuccessful Within UK Norms
Gabb (2011) argues that families may "omit" displays so as to avoid negative attention. Analysis confirms this, showing that "migrant families may have good reason not to engage in overt displays of family, if it brings unwelcome attention in its wake" (Heath *et al*., 2011: 3.16). Indeed, using the language of the COO allows migrant families to disguise those displays that are potentially unsuccessful within English norms. Field diary notes taken at a local children's centre nursery support this:

I'm dropping Amos [my son], at nursery and I stop to say hello to another mother and her son. She's Bangladeshi, speaks English fluently and when I see her she nearly always speaks to her family in English. The boys are playing and they

have a three year old altercation. At this point, we both intervene, but she speaks to her son in Bengali, quietly and directly. From his demeanour, he has been reprimanded, but once the altercation ends, the woman returns to speaking English with her son.

(field diary, January 21st, 2012)

Here, the switch in language allows this mother to manage her child's behaviour and display her parenting, without fear of being seen to contravene English norms. This is further supported by participant accounts; Justina reports using her own language when her boys misbehave, because I can be `stronger, with them` (Justina, mother, Nigerian asylum seeker). Ivana supports this, explicitly stating that:

```
They [English] can't speak [Slovakian] and you can say
what they can't understand […] yes, we can say whatever,
because, you know, they don't understand.  I feel silly,
but of course, sometimes I do that.
```

She then goes on to report that:

```
Sometimes people say in Slovak, 'I will hit you at home',
[...] she knows that because she's in public, she can't
do it.
```

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

For these participants, language as a "tool" allows them to manage their children's behaviour within the norms of their own country, whilst ensuring this does not compromise their familial "legitimacy" within the context of the dominant model of family (Heaphy, 2011). The fact that these families all speak English fluently allows them to simultaneously display that their family also works within State and local population language competency expectations (Cameron, 2011a; BBC, 2013a).

"Frontiering": Displaying Assimilation and Minimising Being the "Other"

Participant accounts also indicate that those fluent in English switch between using English and the language of the COO to show that their family is "legitimate" (Finch,

2007) and, thereby, "belongs" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) within the context of UK assimilationist discourses (Karla & Koper, 2009; Cameron, 2011a; BBC, 2013a). For Ivana, this is a conscious decision and she proudly reports that her family speak English in inter-cultural, public spaces such as playgroups:

> Teresa, she will start to play with someone and some parent will approach speak in English, so I answer in English and, also, I deal with Teresa in English, because communication language in this place in English. There is no reason to speak to Teresa in Slovak, because situation now is the common English.

(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)

Here, then, Ivana assertively displays her families assimilation by speaking English to both her child and other families present in the setting. This is also supported by field diary notes taken during a visit to the local park:

> I am sat on a bench at the edge of the playground and a Polish mother comes and sits next to me with her two daughters. She speaks to her children in Polish and they answer her In Polish. I then shout to Amos in English. The woman gets items out of her children's book bags whilst they play in the park and she then shouts to her daughters in English: 'is this a thank you card from Emily? You have another party invite, too'. Her daughter answers briefly, but notably in English. It feels that this switch in language is important.

(field diary, 12th February, 2012)

For both these mothers, then, the ability to speak English does *enable* displays, allowing them to show that their family works, because they are friendly, or their children engage in English child–centred activities. Language is a "tool of display", however, as these families are also able to display their family's language competency, and their willingness to assimilate. In so doing, they also attempt to further align their family with English attendees in the park and the playgroup, thereby, differentiating themselves from the discourse of the "problem" migrant (Greenslade, 2005; Robinson, 2010).

Language is also a "tool of display" in other environments. For Lech and Matus, both of whom are bi-lingual, public use of their home area language is, again, a signifier of difference. Lech and his Polish school friends have recently started attending a sixth form college and have started to make English friends. Despite the possibility of speaking both languages in this environment, he reports that, `If we're going out with English and Polish, we just speak in English` (Lech, age seventeen, Polish economic migrant). Lech avoids using Polish as he wishes to `not feel different person from Hull` and, therefore, "belong" in the UK. Despite this, all participants, other that Matus and Daniella (both of Polish origin), speak English with an international accent and, as such, cannot entirely avoid language as a signifier of "otherness" (Chambers, 2001). Matus, however, came to the UK in his pre-verbal years and speaks English with a Hull accent. Consequently, he is not obviously of international origin and he desires to present as English; he only speaks Slovakian `in the house or when he's on holiday` and Lenka, his mother, reports that, `Matus, in public, he will tell me, 'don't speak to me in Slovakian'` (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant). Matus clearly has "an awareness of the kind of identity that action signifies" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004: 1006) and he recognises the use of the English or Slovakian language as a "tool" of "family display" that shows his family as either *other* (Chambers, 2001) or "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011).

"Frontiering": Being "Neighbourly" and Generous

A number of families interviewed report that they consciously engage in positive encounters with the host population and/or adopt familial behaviours that promote positive neighbourhood relations. Participants do so in order to avoid conflict and to present their family as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) and "worthy" migrants (Robinson, 2010) members of Hull's community. Magda, for example, does not consciously aim to win favour with local populations, but her family avoids conflict and promotes good relations by behaving in ways that they see as respectful, by being `a quiet neighbour and not making noises. I'm not making parties` (Magda, mother, Polish, economic migrant). Others, however, actively seek indigenous approval; Zack, for example, reports that he and Ella `accommodate our`

neighbour, like, he want us to call a taxi and we did" (Ella, mother, Malaysian international student) and Bai explains that Chyou:

```
To show that we are polite to the neighbours, if the
weather is bad or snowing, my wife will clean the whole
pathway, not just our own, the neighbours too, to be
nice.
```

<div align="right">(Bai, father, Chinese economic migrant)</div>

Both families engage in these acts of goodwill in the conscious hope that they will, "give a good impression" (Bai) to other members of the community.

Similarly, Sylwia displays her family's "legitimacy" (Heaphy, 2011) and "worthiness" (Robinson, 2010) via acts of generosity within the neighbourhood and she explains that "Whenever I make cake, I give my neighbour". Further, Sylwia also displays this generosity in order to connect with her work colleagues as members of the wider British community:

```
If people are asking for help, we do. Today, the English
person from my work asked me if Lech could help her to
fix her laptop, so I say, 'yeah, that's fine.  He can
help with that'.
```

<div align="right">(Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant)</div>

For these participants with limited competency in speaking English, these actions are, then, strategically employed; Sylwia is able to display her family's generosity and willingness to interact, despite her lacking confidence when speaking English, whilst Chyou and Bai, as non-English speakers, are able to display that their "family" is "worthy" without direct verbal interaction.

<u>Culture and Faith Based Festivals, Traditions and Events</u>
As a "Tool" of "Relativising"
By adopting culture or faith based familial norms during festival and ritual times in Hull, families are able to display that they "work" (Finch, 2007) within the norms defined by either the host country or COO. As such, participants can affirm *family-like* relationships

with co-resident non-kin and/or display familial "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to the host and home populations. As times of festival are often public, they may also be a period of "intensity" (Finch, 2007) when both participants and audience members feel that "the need for display becomes more intense, at least for the moment"" (Finch, 2007: 72) in order to show this "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011).

Chyou and Bai's family, for example, celebrate both Buddhist and Chinese traditions with their close, Chinese friends living in Hull. Chyou, reports how she and those "`we live in a house with and some others and their kids`" (Chyou, mother, economic migrant) maintain what would normally be family *practices*. She specifically refers to the Laba festival, when the new harvest is celebrated by preparing porridge with seven different seeds and, although her mother would normally make this, in her absence "`we [women friends] made the porridge`". Bai further explains that they spend festivals such as Chinese New Year with these friends and their broader HAN. As such, by sharing these normally familial festivals, these *family-like* displays affirm their *family- like* relationships with local non-kin, whilst also displaying cultural "belonging" to the HAN group.

Participants of European origin also report local "family displays" associated with their Catholic religious beliefs. During interviews, Fillip and Ivana, Sylwia, Lenka and Magda, all refer to culturally specific Easter celebrations, whereby on:

```
Easter Saturday, there's a small basket and put in the
basket bread, sausage, eggs, sweets […] and then we go
to church and then priest blesses it.  This is Saturday
and then we have it for breakfast on Sunday.
```
                                    (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant)

Although Easter is a display of Christian faith for Fillip and Ivana, Lenka's family and Sylwia (as an individual) rarely attend church and report that these rituals have cultural, rather than theological meaning for them. Further, Magda, although religious, has started to attend a Methodist church since moving to the UK. Despite this, at Easter, all three attend a Catholic church with a migrant presence in the congregation. This festival

is, then, a period of "intensity", as all three families feel required to engage in this activity as a public familial display of cultural "belonging" to their home land. Magda affirms this to be a cultural norm/requirement by explaining "`If you want to see anyone, you should go to church on Easter Sunday. Everyone's there`" (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant). As only Sylwia's family attend an entirely Polish church, other EU participants display this cultural and faith "belonging" to both the home and host audiences present in the church.

Islamic participants also engage in familial displays associated with their Muslim identity. For some, however, these are, again, intended as cultural, rather than faith based displays of family; Saman, for example, does not observe Islamic norms, such as attending mosque and avoiding alcohol or pork based products and Rachel is not Islamic. His dual heritage family do, however, attempt to display that they are "legitimate" within the Kurdish community by visiting Kurdish homes during Eid, as is traditional. Similarly, Sana and Hiwa are not strict Muslims, in that Sana rarely wears a headscarf, Hiwa attends mosque infrequently and they do not pray five times a day. They do, however, engage in Kurdish familial behaviours at Eid, such as, wearing "`traditional clothes`" (Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee) and, again, visiting Kurdish homes during the festival day. Furthermore, Sana, despite not covering her head in Kurdistan, does so when with members of the Kurdish community, because "`the women, they tell me, you must wear it`". For Hiwa and Sana, these celebrations and practices allow them to display their *family-like* connections with co-resident Kurdish friends and reinforce their cultural "belonging" to their HAN. For Saman and Rachel, by contrast, festival time is possibly an occasion when their "mixedness" is more salient and they experience what Haynes and Dermott refer to as a "moment" of display (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 154). As such, their mixed family feels required to display that their relationship "works", at least within these familial festival norms. These displays, however, seem to hold little significance as a display of "belonging" to Islam.

By contrast, Ella and Zack, and Nawa and Momo, are more traditionally Islamic in their behaviours and their displays are faith-based, rather than cultural. Both men attend mosque for the weekly Friday prayer, all family adults pray five times a day and all report

observing the rules of Islam concerning pork and alcohol. Nawa does not wear a scarf as, in Bangladesh, she is not expected to do so, but Ella proudly and consistently wears a scarf in public, because "`we are Muslim`" (Ella, mother, Malaysian economic migrant). Although these families celebrate Eid, it is not solely with first generation members of the HAN; during the festival, family men attend a local, Hull mosque that has a reportedly culturally diverse congregation (Momo/Bangladesh, Zack/Malaysian) and Eid is celebrated with a mixed community, including adults born in the UK. Nawa, for example, explains:

> `If there is an occasion, a celebration, like Eid`
> `festival, they [members of the British Bengali`
> `community] call us for dinner, so we go to there.`

(Nawa, Bangladeshi international student)

These familial displays of Islamic norms not only denote "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to the home land culture, but also British Islamic society. For all four Islamic families, Eid is, however, a period of "intensity", whereby they report a requirement to show that their family "works" within either cultural or faith-related familial norms. For those with strong Islamic beliefs, that do not intend to stay in the UK, the incentive to display "belonging" to Islam appears stronger than their desire to display "belonging" to their local HAN.

As a "Tool" of "Frontiering"

Many participants also adopt familial behaviours associated with UK festivals and celebrations to display familial "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) and "legitimacy" (Heaphy, 2011) within the host culture. As fieldwork spanned the Christmas holiday period, examples provided by participants tend to focus on this festival. These are, however, the familial norms of British Christian families, not those of other British faiths. Participant adoption of these ideals is, however, significant, as they reflect the ideals of "Britishness" promoted in the assimilationist discourse that dominated during the field work period (Cameron, 2011a; *The Guardian*, 2011; Uberi & Mommod, 2013).

For those participants that do not plan to stay in the UK there is, however, less incentive to do so. Nawa (Bangladeshi) and Zack's families (Malaysian), for example, are visiting

Hull under the terms of a three year student visa. As such, they intend to leave the UK once their studies are finished and have less incentive to be perceived as legitimate within UK familial norms. For them, then, their engagement with Christmas is a cultural experience, rather than a "family display"; Momo bought a Father Christmas toy to decorate the house fireplace, whilst Zack visited a friend's home for Christmas dinner, `"to taste the turkey"`. Ella reports that, other than this, for her family, `"Christmas was, about the sales"`.

By contrast, Magda (Polish) and Lenka's families (Slovakian) adopt UK Christmas traditions in order to display their "Englishness". In both Poland and Slovakia, all Christmas celebrations take place on the 24th December and, although Ivana's family still `"open our presents on 24th"`, they have adopted English traditions by changing `"our feast day to 25th, with Turkey"`. Magda's family, now `"like doing Christmas entirely the English way"` (Daniella, age eight, Polish economic migrant) and eat Turkey and feast on December 25th. As these families plan to stay in the UK, both women perceive these modifications as an element of their parental duty and a familial display that supports their children's new family identity in Hull. For these Christian, European families, these changes in tradition, although significant are, however, minimal. As such, they are able to display family in line with assimilationist requirements, with limited impact on their usual cultural practices.

Magda and Daniella's position is more extreme and their displays are located within a sense of estrangement from the Polish HAN; "reverse cultural alienation" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 21). Via "family display", Magda and, subsequently, Daniella, position themselves as English by rejecting the culture of their COO. Magda is proud that `"people say I look English"` (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant), that she doesn't shop in the Polish shop and that she will not drink Polish vodka. Furthermore, she no longer attends Catholic Church, as is a Polish norm, instead, she chooses to attend an Anglican Church and is happy that English people in the congregation question her heritage by asking, `"how is it possible that you are Polish? Polish are Catholic [and] you are in Anglican Church"`. As a single parent with only one significant relative living in Poland, Magda

has limited incentive to display successfully with local or transnational members of the COO. The incentive for her and Daniella to minimise their position as *other* and to be accepted as a "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) UK family is, however, high.

Those participants that plan to stay in the UK, but are from non-Christian traditions, also engage in Christmas celebrations as a "tool" of "family display"; as Bai and Chyou celebrate Christmas in China, they do so in the UK, but with their Chinese friends. This is not, however, an adoption of UK norms and is, in fact, a display of the quality of *family-like* relations within the HAN, rather than a display of "belonging" to the broader host population. Hiwa and Sana also celebrate Christmas with other Kurdish families in their family homes and, again, affirm the *family-like* nature of these home area relationships. Further, as these Kurdish families are Islamic and they have not celebrated Christmas historically, they are displaying to one another that their identity in now located within the traditions of the new community. Although these displays do mirror the English familial Christmas – privately celebrated in residential settings – the privacy of these displays does mean they have a limited function in terms of engagement with the host community.

Participants also display family by engaging in cultural traditions specific to Hull. Hull Fair, for example, has visited the city every October for over 100 years and is a major, week-long event, attended by many Hull families (Hull City Council, 2015b). Indeed, field dairy notes support the popularity of the fair with diverse populations:

> I went to Hull Fair with my family, between 6.30pm and 9pm. Most families were white and the noise of the fair meant that I couldn't hear other people, so I had no way of telling if Hull's A8 population were present. There were, however, a good number of families from BME groups, particularly Islamic families – husbands, children and women wearing headscarves - they all seemed to be taking part in the fair, and, apart from obvious symbols of difference, all families were behaving the same.
>
> (field diary, 9th October, 2013)

Attendance at the fair is, then, a community-wide experience and participant families report being told, by colleagues, that this is an event that Hull families should attend (Nawa/Momo, Ella/Zack, Sylwia, Lenka/Fillip, Ivana and Magda). As a result, all but Justina and Ella/Zack's family visit the fair in order to engage with Hull traditions, with Sylwia explaining, "I have to take Ruta. Her friend go, so I take her" (Sylwia, mother, Polish economic migrant).

The ability to display familial assimilation in this and other public environments is, however, affected by a number of factors; although white European participants report attending the fair, this is not noted in field diary notes, because there are no visible signifiers of their identity, such as colour or the wearing of a headscarf. Furthermore, these visible signifiers alone denote not white-Christian, but do not denote migrant. In the absence of direct interaction, then, indigenous populations may not be aware of these migrant "family displays". Issues of audience response are, however, discussed in more detail in the following chapter. Furthermore, attendance at such events is affected by access to publicity clearly welcoming diverse populations and/or promoting familial activities. Participants attended Hull Fair because they had been specifically advised to by trusted friends or acquaintances. By contrast, participants did not attend the Freedom Festival,[54] another significant, although less historical event in the city. The reason for this was simply that they did not know the festival existed.

Adoption of UK Child-Focused Activities

Once enabled to display family via the presence of family young in the family, participant families that wish to display familial assimilation, engage in what they perceive to be "good" English parenting. For some, this involves intensely self-conscious parenting (Lee *et al.,* 2014) via engagement with numerous, public child-centred familial activities. Magda and Lenka, for example, report that their children engage in "just like normal children things in England" (Magda, mother, Polish economic migrant). For Magda, this includes, "going to Brownies, places like

---

[54] The Freedom Festival is an annual, three day event that began in 2007 to celebrate Hull's history of and contribution to the abolition of slavery. It is a family arts festival that attracted approximately 115,000 attendees in September 2014 (Freedom Festival, 2014).

`museums, swimming lessons and going for Pizza"`. Similarly, Lenka reports that her children are `"doing football, swimming, Matus is doing cricket and Dominik starting gymnastics"` (Lenka, mother, Slovakian economic migrant). Engaging in these activities is a very public adoption of Anglo-norms and, thereby, a display of what they, as parents planning to stay in the UK, understand to be *good* parenting practices (Dermott & Pomati, 2015).

Furthermore, all participants with children report visiting the local park (with the exception of Justina) and, those with children under five, attend playgroups (Ivana, Lenka, Magda, Sana, Saman, Chyou); Sana, for example, reports that she does so, because `"Aso will grow up here, so we should do playgroup and I try to talk with the natives"` (Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee). Here, adult participants are displaying *good* parenting, and simultaneously minimising their position as "other" (Chambers, 2001) by adopting what they perceive to be English parenting behaviours.

Although *all* families with children report *displaying* in child-centred spaces, it is relevant that three of these families may also be displaying for reasons beyond that of being migrant; Lenka and Magda are both single parents and Saman, owing to his history of anti-social behaviour, is invested in displaying positive *fatherhood.* As such, these families have a double-incentive to show that their unconventional families "work" (Finch, 2007).

Barriers to Local Migrant "Family Display"

Previously in this chapter, a number of "enablers of display" are identified: the size and quality of the HAN; engaging in work or study; competency in speaking the English language and the presence of family young in the migrant family. The absence of these "enablers" can, then, restrict a migrant family's opportunity to display successfully. Analysis, here, reveals additional factors that obstruct participant "family displays"; fear of local responses and participant 'state of mind'.

Participant 'State of Mind'

As noted, Justina's experiences provide unique insight and here, her account reveals that "family display" can be affected by a family member's 'state of mind'. As a mother and an asylum seeker, awaiting a decision on her asylum application, Justina has experienced trauma, lives in fear of her traffickers and her family's future is uncertain. On one level, she has little incentive to display as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) to the generic indigenous population, because she may be deported in the near future. Further, owing to the fear she has of her Nigerian traffickers, she "omits" (Gabb, 2011) displaying "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to the Nigerian community, because she doesn't `"know who is who, [so] I don't go where people from Nigeria go"`. These issues are further compounded by the fact that Justina also lives with depression, as a result of the trauma she has experienced and her concerns for her family's future. This has a profound effect on her family's lived realty and, thereby, impacts on her "family displays" in inter-cultural spaces, because `"there is not energy for me to go to places like the park [laughs]. I stay at home a lot to care for them. My mind is overcrowded"`. Justina, despite having family young and English being her first language, reserves her energy for displays that focus on her *immediate* family.

Fear of Local Responses

As discussed, participant families report displaying to avoid conflict, particularly within the context of political and media discourses promoting assimilation (Cameron, 2011a; Cameron, 2011b; BBC, 2013a) and perpetuating the discourse of the "problem" of migration (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010). Analysis reveals, then, that participants "omit" display (Gabb, 2011), not only to avoid the psychological "pain" of unsuccessful display (Almack, 2011: 109), but also to avoid the possibility of verbal or physical attack.

Saman, for example, has experienced racist physical attacks and, consequently, he does not feel safe to `"go park with kids. I not trust people"`. Furthermore, this also impacts on displays between Saman/Rachel and their white British family as:

```
Even when we go out at night, for a drink with my family,
he always ends up with somebody staring at him and he
worries that they're going to start on him, so he goes
home.
```

(Rachel, mother, white British partner of Kurdish refugee)

The "omitting" (Gabb, 2011) of display is not, however, restricted to those participants that are physically identifiable as people of colour within this predominantly white British city (chapter two). During the fieldwork period, anti-A8 discourses gained momentum (Robinson, 2010) and both Polish participant families report "omitting" public familial displays in order to avoid "unwanted attention". Daniella (age seven, Polish economic migrant), for example, reports that her mum does "`not speak Polish in front of the boys on the street that make trouble`" and Sylwia recounts that, in a previous residence, her family "`didn't feel safe`" (Sylwia, mother, economic migrant), because they had experienced racist attacks on their home. As a consequence, at this time, she and her children avoided public interaction, resulting in Sylwia "`driving to bus stop to get Lech because he was too scared to walk`".

Here, participants report occasions where their "family displays" are affected by both real and perceived racism, resulting in them actively avoiding the interface with host communities. Although this indicates that audiences can, then, affect display, this is discussed in detail in the following chapter.

Conclusion

The data presented reveals "family display" to be an activity that assists migrant families in affirming their relationship with co-resident kin, but also in connecting with their HAN and/or local indigenous populations. This study, therefore, affirms that migrant families *do* engage in the transnational processes of "frontiering"" and "relativising" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002). Analysis further adds to these concepts, by proving Heath *et al.'s* (2011) speculation that "family display" can contribute to these transnational family making processes.

The study further confirms that "family display" *does* matter, because of the "fluidity of family over time" (Finch, 2007: 69), but also reveals that, as an aspect of "relativising", display is specifically important to migrant families so as to: affirm the quality of relationships with co-resident kin amidst migratory changes; inculcate family young with norms of the COO amidst migratory changes; to meet familial practical and emotional needs, by developing *family-like* links with members of the HAN (kin and non-kin).

The reasons display "matters" as an activity of "frontiering" are, however, different from those identified by Finch: family does not equate to household; the fluidity of family over time; the relationship between personal and family identities (Finch, 2007: 68-71). Migrant incentives to display *are*, however, specifically related to their family's position as "unconventional" or *other* and, as argued by Heaphy (2011), displays *are* shaped by dominant familial discourses. It is further revealed, here, that displays *are also* affected by popular UK representations of immigration and race and that migrant families do display in order to: avoid inter-cultural conflict; to promote community connectivity as the *other* and to reflect local, State defined familial norms.

Analysis presented in this chapter does support Finch's assertion that "family displays" *are* supported by "background features" or "tools of display" (Finch, 2007: 77). Artefacts (*ibid*) and the naming of children (Finch, 2008) are, for example, employed to denote familial belonging to the host, indigenous or faith-based community. A number of previously unidentified "tools" are also introduced here, including: cultural and religious celebrations and/or traditions; UK, child-focused activities; selective language use in public spaces to signify "belonging" to the host community, or to disguise potentially unsuccessful displays.

Participant accounts indicate that "enablers of display", as identified in this study, also impact on *local "*family displays*"*. With "relativising", the main "enabler" is the presence of a large or well established HAN, whilst for "frontiering", possible "enablers" are multiple and include: the ability to speak the language of the host country; the presence of family young; work and study providing an inter-cultural forum.

By drawing on theories of intersectionality (Collins, 1990; Taylor *et al*., 2010), analysis presented, here, reveals that the confluence of "enablers" and characteristics of the family as a whole can both *enable* or *disable* migrant "family display". Lenka and Fillip's "family displays" are, for example, supported by many "enablers"; on arrival in the UK they had access to an established HAN, they now have family children, they are both fluent in English and Ivana does not need to work so is able to access children's play spaces. Justina, by contrast, has fewer "enablers"; she speaks English and has children, but her asylum status means she cannot work, she rarely accesses child-centred spaces due to her 'state of mind' and she avoids her HAN due to the circumstances of her asylum case. Furthermore, Kurdish men, upon arrival in the UK, did not have access to "enablers"; as lone asylum seekers, they did not have any co-resident family, they could not speak English and they had no established HAN. Lenka and Fillip, consequently, have strong links with both host and home networks, whilst Justina has few and Saman and Hiwa have developed links over time.

In addition to this, although Heaphy argues that families experience "powerful incentives" to display, the study reveals that, whilst they do, not *all* families are driven to achieve "full relational citizenship" (Heaphy, 2011: 33) with indigenous audiences of display. Nawa and Momo, for example, have little incentive to display to either their HAN or indigenous populations, as they plan to return to Bangladesh in the near future. By contrast, Lenka and Magda, as single mums, are driven to settle in the UK because of the opportunity they feel this gives them. Consequently, there is a strong incentive for them to be recognised as "legitimate" by indigenous populations. Whether "enablers" are available or not, then, the incentive to display is also significant in which "family displays" migrant families prioritise.

Finally, the influence of the religion and/or "whiteness" of participants must also be acknowledged. Although these influences are not prevalent in migrant participant accounts, there is some evidence that culturally specific symbols of *other*, do influence how and when migrant families display. As such, it is possible that those more able to reflect dominant familial norms (Heaphy, 2011), in this case, white Christian norms, are most able to display successfully. To understand these influences fully and to draw

substantive conclusions, it is, however, necessary to consider audience responses. This will be discussed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER NINE: THE ROLE OF THE AUDIENCE IN "FAMILY DISPLAY"

The previous chapters have drawn on the accounts of migrant families living in Hull and why and how they display family both transnationally and in the local Hull community. This chapter now turns explicitly to the role of the *audience* in "family display". As Finch states, display is important, because "the meaning of one's actions have to be both conveyed to and understood by relevant others, if those actions are to be effective as family practices" (Finch, 2007: 73). This study asks, who are these "relevant others"? Although Finch, in 2011, adds to her initial discussion and argues that "family display" is primarily about conveying meaning to those *within* the family and it is not concerned with those audiences *external* to the family (Finch, 2011: 204), the empirical data presented, thus far, implies that this is not the case. In this chapter, then, further evidence will be presented to suggest that external audiences are, as Dermott and Seymour suggest, "participants in the construction of display" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 15).

Scholarly applications of the concept of "family display", since 2007, have recognised the need to explore the role of the audience in "family display" (Dorrer *et al.*, 2010a; Roth, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Carver, 2014; Carter *et al.*, 2015). This research is, then, distinct as an empirical study which engages specifically with the audience of "family display". Here, the data gathered is interrogated to consider if migrant "family displays", local to Hull (chapter eight), are successfully received by indigenous populations and what contextual factors influence this. In this chapter, specific attention is given to questions raised by scholars: what is the impact of audience requirements on "family display" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011) and what is the influence of the State as the audience (Roth, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011). By applying the concept of "family display" to the accounts of migrant families, as well as the audience of "family display", the study is unique in its consideration of what happens when migrant families negotiate the requirements of multiple audiences (Seymour, 2011), specifically in an international context.

As previous chapters have presented data that evidences the role of audience in "family display", the chapter is divided into three parts: part one summarises the influence of

the transnational, co-resident kin and HAN audience, as defined and discussed in chapter seven and eight; part two presents analysis of local audience accounts of migrant "family display", with a view to understanding contextual factors that influence their responses; part three also considers the accounts of local audiences, but with a focus on the negotiation of multiple audiences and subsequent impact on cohesive communities. Part one is grounded in the reports of migrant family participants, whilst in part two and three, local audiences also speak for themselves. Throughout these sections, analysis and discussion will also draw on field diary entries.

Who are the Audiences?

Throughout the study, participant migrant families, as well as indigenous participants, indicate that numerous groups both observe and require "family display"; there *are* multiple audiences. These include: co-located family members, also based in Hull; transnational family members and the broader transnational community, based in their home land; members of the HAN also based in Hull; members of the local indigenous population; representatives of UK government authorities, in the form of children's services, health services, education, the police force and other influential figures, such as faith leaders. As Dermott and Seymour assert, "the requirement to display family may involve a wide range of potential audiences that are not restricted to family members" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17).

Although the influences of transnational, co-located and HAN audiences are discussed, the prime focus here is on the accounts of thirty, Hull-based, UK born individuals from diverse backgrounds. Whilst the majority live at addresses within the areas most densely populated by migrant groups (see chapter two), nine live outside of these areas and have addresses in the east of the city, as well as in Northern Hull, Newington and Myton Wards (chapter two - fig 1). Indigenous participants also represent diverse ages, ranging from seventeen to seventy years old. Four participants are UK-born with international heritage; Ghanaian, Indian, Indian South-African and African-American and three have partners born outside of the UK, namely, in Malaysia, Romania and Jamaica. Twenty-one are either parents or grandparents, eleven are men and fourteen have a university level education. A wide range of professions are represented: manual workers,

students, public sector workers, private sector workers, and voluntary sector workers, as well as retired and unemployed people. For some, their prime purpose is to represent their profession. Three teachers, for example, were interviewed, as was a community cohesion police officer, a resettlement worker from The Refugee Council, a local authority community participation specialist, a representative of local media (*The Hull Daily Mail)* and the Imam from a local mosque. As such, they spoke in a professional capacity. Where relevant, this is highlighted in order to acknowledge that participants may give their professional, rather than personal response to migrant "family display". Others, however, spoke about their work experiences, but were interviewed as individuals, not primarily professionals. The identity of all participants is protected via the use of pseudonyms and identifying characteristics have been altered. Additional information relating to these participants is provided in appendix two.

Part 1: The Audience So Far

<u>The Influence of the Transnational Audience</u>

Chapter seven focuses on the role of "family display" in the maintenance of transnational relationships. Although this chapter was not anticipated at the outset of the study, when participants spoke about their experiences, they consistently referred to the importance of maintaining relationships with family members in the COO. As a result, a chapter emerged concerned with the interface between the UK based families and the transnational audience. For these migrant family participants, as Finch suggests, immediate biological family members do, indeed, constitute the significant audience, or "relevant others", that must acknowledge behaviours as familial (Finch, 2007: 73).

The influence of the biologically linked, transnational audience is exemplified particularly well when the Hull based family does not "work" (*ibid*) in line with the expectations of the home culture. Here, familial displays are shaped to suit the culturally specific familial norms of the COO (Kim, 2011; Kirstie & Buckhan, 2011; Carver, 2014); Saman knows that his family in Kurdistan will not approve of him having children whilst being unmarried, so he tells them he is. Similarly, Nawa does not let her family in Bangladesh know that her "love marriage", unsupported by her father, is anything less than perfect (chapter seven). In this context, families are driven to display successfully

to family members in the COO in order that they be acknowledged as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) by this geographically separate, long-distance audience (chapter seven). Meeting the needs of this, or any *one* distinct audience can, however, come at a high "cost" (Gabb, 2011). This will be discussed throughout this and subsequent chapters.

The Influence of the Local Audience: Co-resident Kin

In chapter eight, additional audiences, or "relevant others" (Finch, 2007: 73), are identified; for some participant families, their co-resident kin are the audience that take priority (chapter eight). Although other audiences are identified as significant, the displays associated with the *everyday* aspects of family life demand attention. Both Bai and Ella (Chinese economic migrant and Malaysian international student, respectively) report that their spare time away from work and study is spent at home playing with their young children. As such, even if a family wants to appear legitimate to a wider audience, this prioritising of immediate kin can restrict "family displays" intended for other audiences. Hiwa, for example, reports that, since he had his son, he and his wife Sana, `"mostly we stay at home"` (Hiwa, father, Kurdish refugee). These displays of parenthood do, however, extend to participants displaying in order to revise their familial identity and maintain cultural traditions, for the sake of their children. As a result, these familial displays, intended to express the quality of relationships with co-resident kin, can extend to the HAN audience (chapter eight), as discussed below. Further, these displays of parenthood, associated with "relativising", also have an impact on "frontiering"; by being present in child-centred spaces, migrant families engage in an "interface between their own and the host society culture" (Heath *et al*., 2011: 4.3).

The Influence of the Local Audience: The Home Area Network

Further analysis, in chapter eight, reinforces that audiences beyond the immediate biological family are also important to those engaging in "family displays" (Smart, 2008; Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Carver, 2014; Carter *et al.,* 2015). Migrant families, for example, highlight the importance of the HAN as a second audience of "family display"; as an aspect of "relativising" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002), participants display family in order to create *family-like* bonds, to continue home land

traditions and to 'belong' (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to frontier networks (chapter eight).

Examples provided, here, highlight the role of these wider audiences in influencing the behaviours of migrant families, now based in Hull; as Kristie and Buckham, (2011) Kim, (2011) and Carver (2014) suggest, for displays to be successful in permitting legitimacy, they must comply with culturally specific norms, which, on this occasion, are those defined by the HAN.   Ivana, for example, is influential in the Slovak community and assertively informs other members of what she perceives to be legitimate Slovakian familial behaviours:

> I'm telling, 'mum should be mum', and many Slovak women,
> my friends, they let children go to nursery before one
> year – I was angry because they know that's wrong. In
> Slovakia, we don't do that, and I was telling them,
> 'don't do that'.

<div align="right">(Ivana, mother, Slovakian economic migrant)</div>

Sana's experiences with the Kurdish HAN, based in Hull, mirror these culturally specific expectations; here she explains how she has adopted familial norms alien to her in her COO, but required by other Kurdish people in Hull:

> They told me directly – 'you're wearing tight clothes',
> or, 'you don't have a head scarf'[...] traditionally,
> [in] the region [I] live, the girls don't wear scarves
> […] I had more freedom in Kurdistan, in some cases [...]
> Here, I wear scarves, sometimes.

<div align="right">(Sana, mother, Kurdish, spouse to Kurdish refugee)</div>

In both these examples, the HAN audience, as suggested by Haynes and Dermott is, "not passive" (2011: 159). Instead, particularly in Sana's example, the audience imposes additional demands to those defined by the transnational audience. In so doing, HANs "require familial displays that would not otherwise take place" (*ibid*). For Sana, however, this is a condition of "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to this particular audience and she accepts that her "family cannot do things

because people in the Kurdish community can judge you".
Consequently, she adapts her dress in order that her family be accepted and viewed as
a "proper" Kurdish family.

As discussed previously, such familial requirements are culturally located (chapter
eight); although gendered, familial displays, such as wearing a headscarf (Hoodfar,
1993), may be accepted by both a transnational and HAN audience, in the context of
migration, families may also be subjected to the requirements of the multi-cultural, local
indigenous audience. The following sections explore local responses to migrant "family
display" and the complexities associated with negotiating multiple audience demands.

Part 2: The Influence of the Indigenous Audience

Chapter eight also provides examples of when migrant families, in Hull, display family to
those audiences beyond the immediate biological family and the HAN. Indeed, as an
element of "frontiering" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002), the local indigenous population
are also an intended audience for participant families. Analysis of data reveals that
these displays are intended to: display parenthood; to minimise being the "other" and
to signify "belonging"; to achieve legitimacy in line with local, UK State defined familial
norms; to avoid conflict and to promote community connections (chapter eight). In this
section, attention shifts away from the accounts of migrant participants and to data
provided by this local audience, both as the intended and unintended audience of
particular displays. Further, discussion considers if migrant families can display
successfully to multiple audiences, particularly from the perspective of the indigenous
audience and, in turn, what external factors impact on these indigenous responses. The
analysis, for example, refers to previously documented anti-immigration and anti-
Islamic discourses which dominated both politics and the media during fieldwork and
the preceding decades (chapter four).

A further factor taken into consideration during analysis, is that areas of Hull are
characterised by contrasting socio-economic factors, which may also impact on
indigenous audience responses. As participants indicate, Hull has experienced the
demise of the fishing industry "since the 1960s" (Daryl, parent, central west, 36)

and, consequently, has widespread social problems.[55] Drawing on multiple indices of deprivation scores for 2010, a small number of postcodes in the central west area of the city are traditionally more affluent and score between five-to-three in this measure (1 being the most disadvantaged on a scale of 1 -10). The majority of the city, however, experiences high levels of disadvantage; participants living in the Beverley Road area, Thornton Estate, North Hull Estate and east Hull, all live in areas scoring one and are, therefore, more likely to experience unemployment and crime, health inequalities and have fewer qualifications.

Local Populations do not have the same Opportunity to Observe Local "Family Displays"
It is necessary to acknowledge that some indigenous participants observe migrant "family displays" more frequently than others. Indigenous participants with children of primary school age (chapter eight), resident in the areas most densely populated by migrant families, report observing migrant families frequently in their day-to-day lives. This occurs in spaces such as schools, nurseries, playgrounds, local parks, swimming pools and tourist attractions (Beth, Mark, Sarah, Helen, Daryl – see appendix two for detail of participants). Others, from geographical locations across the city, also report observing migrant families, or members of these families, in their work environments (Bruce, Toni, Sue, Sarah, Andrew, Sharon, Beth, Mark, Daryl). For these participants, contact with migrant communities, either direct or indirect, is a regular, daily or weekly occurrence. For some, providing support to such families is a specific focus of their working responsibilities (Dave, Helen, Sarah, Brenda, Grace). Those that participated as representatives of their organisation (Phil, Scott, Jenny, Jackie, Paula, Donna, Robert, Lorraine, Anna and the Imam) also provided direct, specialised support to migrant communities.

The geography of Hull is also significant, as the majority of migrant populations live in the west and, in particular, central west areas of the city (chapter two - fig. 1). This, consequently, has an impact on the visibility of migrant populations in some locations. Indeed, data provided in chapter two is supported by participant accounts; Sharon drives buses throughout the city and reports that, "the east Hull estates,

---

[55] See chapter two.

they're all white British" (Sharon, west, 35). Similarly, Mark works in north Hull and reports that, "in certain sections of east and north Hull, you don't get the mix of cultures" (Mark, parent, central west, 50). As such, it is those participants that both live and work outside of west Hull that have less opportunity to observe migrant families. Although Kayleigh does have young children, she lives in the east of the city and has little contact with migrant populations and claims, "I don't know if I've seen a Polish family" (Kayleigh, parent, east, 20). It should be noted, however, that the "whiteness" (Garner, 2009) of Eastern European populations does affect the visibility of this community (see the following section). Nevertheless, Toni and Yvonne, both of whom live and work in east Hull estates, also have little opportunity to observe migrant families. Toni is in her twenties, and recently attended a sixth form college bordering the north and east of the city. Outside of her university experience, she has had little contact with migrant groups:

> In east Hull, at college, there was maybe a couple of black kids, but that was it.
>
> (Toni, east, 25)

Similarly, Yvonne has always lived in east Hull and, as second generation African-Indian, has no connection to her heritage and is fervently "British!" For her, the main time she sees migrant families is when she visits her sister's home in west Hull, "once in a blue moon" (Yvonne, parent, east, 46). By contrast, Annie and Arthur are retired and spend little time in child-centred spaces, yet their positioning as residents of west Hull means that they do have some awareness of, and contact with, migrant groups. Location and the presence of family young are not the only factors affecting participant observation of migrant families. Daryl and Helen, for example, do have young children and do live in the central west areas of the city. Despite this, both acknowledge that their contact with migrant communities is limited owing to their work commitments, as they are "too busy" (Helen, parent, central west, 35) and "working" (Daryl, parent, central west, 36).

All Communities are not Equally Visible

Further, without direct interaction, families from white European backgrounds may not be recognised as migrant. This is owing to the fact that the main indicator of their COO is their international accent when they speak English, or their public use of their home area language, both of which are only apparent as a result of close proximity. Garner contends, however, that there *are* signifiers of migrant identity that transcend skin colour, because the "boundary between white and 'other'" is affected by a variety of factors in "different places" (2009: 789). That said, Toni does affirm the significance of "whiteness" in her account of observing Eastern European families: `"It's impossible to tell unless you speak to them [Eastern Europeans]"` (Toni, east, 25).   As Hull is a predominantly white city, other migrant populations are more visible to the indigenous audience, because of aspects of their physical appearance, including their skin colour.

It is also significant that when interviewed, only the Imam and Grace - second and third generation migrants themselves - explicitly differentiate between British-born BME individuals and primary migrants. Other audience members, including those with international heritage (Yvonne, Bruce), assume conversations about migrants include British communities of colour. Bruce, for example, when asked when he sees migrant families outside of his working role, states:

> ```
> I can't really say about white […] I see black families.
> I notice them around, but I'm not really in a position
> in north Hull to see them.
> ```

(Bruce, north, 44)

Here, Bruce does acknowledge that European migrants are less visible, but he assumes that the black families in his community are migrants, despite his grandfather being African-American. Consequently, when audiences report migrant "family display", it is not clear if they are, in fact, referring to British BME families. This is, then, acknowledged in analysis.

<u>The Influence of the State as the Local Audience</u>

Migrant Families Display to Achieve Legitimacy with the State Audience

Migrant family accounts presented in chapter eight indicate that families with children *do* display family in order to achieve legitimacy in line with local, State defined, familial norms; the State audience is significant (Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Short, 2011). On one level, participants report examples of Anglo-centred familial norms being subtly promoted by the State; on the recommendation of support workers and children's centre practitioners, parents attend the State endorsed Triple P parenting programme (chapter eight). By contrast, Lenka, Ivana and Justina, modify their displays, because they feel surveilled by the local authorities (chapter eight). This is grounded in their awareness that UK authorities have the legal powers to remove children from the family home if they are concerned for the child's welfare. Migrant participant accounts imply, then, that the State is central in the production and maintenance of dominant discourses relating to familial norms (Chambers, 2001; Dermott & Pomati, 2015), that is, what is deemed as a "legitimate" "family display" (Heaphy, 2011).

Unlike other audiences, for those participants with family children, the gaze of the State audience is difficult to avoid as those under sixteen *must* legally receive an education and, on the whole, they attend school.[56] Further, if State authorities raise any concerns about a child's welfare, a family *must* engage with the relevant professional.[57] To add to this, the health needs of all migrant participants, whatever their age, will result in contact with health authorities, who in the UK are also imbued with a "duty of care"; they have a legal duty to prevent and reduce the risk of abuse and neglect to both vulnerable children and adults (NHS Commissioning Board, 2013). Consequently, in this context, the presence of family young in a migrant family is what might be referred to as a "forcer" of display, rather than an "enabler"; these displays are compulsory and, thereby, force interaction with, and the potential for surveillance from, the State audience.

---

[56] See footnote 50.

[57] In the UK, if a professional working with a child feels that there is a need for State intervention, although they may not yet be deemed as being "at risk", the authorities are able to apply for a "parenting order", which makes it compulsory that the family engages with social services (North Yorkshire Safeguarding Children Board, 2014).

A number of audience participants in the study observe "family display" in a professional capacity. Here, the main focus is on accounts provided by those working within the National Health Service (NHS),[58] the State funded education system[59] and Children and Young Peoples' Services (CYPS).[60] Each represents a State backed audience and, as in Dorrer *at al's,* study of children in care homes, these members of the State audience have a responsibility to ensure that "children are cared for" (2010a: 291); they have a role in judging whether migrant familial displays are "successful" (Almack, 2008a) and if families, therefore, "work" (Finch: 2007).

Here, participant accounts support the fact that those involved with such institutions are, therefore, central in defining what types of familial behaviours are acceptable within Western (Chambers, 2001; 2012) or, more specifically, UK norms. Indeed, they *do* have a clear cultural expectation of a "normal", "proper" family (Heaphy, 2011: 31) and what constitutes a successful way to display that a family "works" (Finch, 2007). Helen, Sarah, Dave, and Lorraine, for example, identify unreasonable physical punishment as a particular issue within migrant families and they explain the process of working with these families in order to change their behaviours. Helen, for example, acknowledges the cultural location of her profession:

```
Professionally, the way I work, a lot of the theories
that I use, for example, attachment theory, it's a very
white Western theory based on white Western culture.
```
                                            (Helen, social worker, parent, west Hull, 30)

and she does recognise that her response to physical chastisement is culturally specific:

```
In some cultures people think that we don't chastise our
children enough and children are allowed to get away with
all sorts.
```

---

[58] The NHS was launched in the UK in 1948 and is funded with public money. It is grounded in the ideal that good healthcare should be available to anyone who is a UK resident, regardless of wealth. Consequently, when any person, including migrant populations experience poor health, they will come into contact with representatives of the State (NHS Choices, 2015).

[59] Local government authorities are legally obliged to provide all children of compulsory school age with suitable full-time, public funded education (Citizensadvice, n.d).

[60] In this thesis, CYPS in Hull includes social services and children's centre support services.

(*ibid*)

Nevertheless, she expects families to adopt models of behaviour management that are not only white Western, but also Anglo-centric. If not, the consequences are severe:

```
We try and encourage and change their way of thinking
[…] to break the process down of how you parent a child
within our culture [if they don't] there is going to be
some reprimand, because the laws are very different over
here.
```

(*ibid*)

These examples provided are, however, complex, as these audience members enforce norms enshrined in legislation; it is unlawful in the UK to 'smack' a child if the force leaves a mark.[61] As a result, these examples are concerned with families that are experiencing safeguarding issues, that is, when the State identifies children as requiring protection "from abuse or neglect" and are not receiving "safe and effective" care within their family unit (North Yorkshire Safeguarding Children Board, 2014).

Participants working within State institutions do, however, report other migrant familial behaviours that they identify as unacceptable, although not necessarily a safeguarding issue; a community cohesion police officer, for example, explains that the force has had problems with Eastern European families "`thinking it's OK to leave children unattended whilst they go to work`" (Donna). Similarly, participants working in education report cases, whereby a Polish family left a nine year old child at home alone and a Nigerian family allowed a five year old child to cycle themselves to school (Jenny, Jackie, Paula, Anna). On each of these occasions, the professionals involved informed the migrant family concerned that, in order to avoid intervention from social services, they must change their behaviours. What is significant, here, is that whether there is a safeguarding issue, or not, the State, or those in positions of perceived authority - such as children's centre workers (Dave, Brenda)

---

[61] In the UK, "It is not illegal for a parent to hit their child as long as the 'smack' amounts to 'reasonable punishment' […] Unreasonable punishment is classed as a smack that leaves a mark on the child, or the use of an implement to hit the child, such as a belt or cane" (Law & Parents, 2015).

and the resettlement worker for The Refugee Council (Lorraine) - are clear about which "family practices" (Morgan, 1996; Morgan, 2011b) are acceptable within the UK.

Helen also acknowledges that her colleagues in social work respond cautiously to families that do not display in line with the cultural norms with which they are professionally familiar:

> ```
> Because somebody doesn't know a great deal about the
> culture, they become very fearful and they become very
> risk averse to keep those children safe, because of
> Victoria Climbie.[62]
> ```
>
> (Helen, social worker, parent, west Hull, 30)

As a result of this risk aversion, for both Dave (family support worker) and Helen, it is only when families have "`taken it [UK norms] all on board`" that their social services "`case will be closed`" (Dave). Similarly, for Jenny, a head teacher, the potential for social services involvement is only removed once families conform to what she perceives as acceptable UK norms. These audiences have a clear requirement that, for migrant families to show "this is my family and it works" (Finch, 2007), they must display Anglo-centric norms and, for Helen, they are under more pressure to do so than indigenous families. Here, as Haynes and Dermott assert, the audience "require displays that would not otherwise take place" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159). These scholars argue, however, that these requirements may be "inadvertent" (*ibid*). In this study's context, the State audience *explicitly* requires certain displays.

---

[62] Victoria Climbie was an eight year old migrant girl from the Ivory Coast, living in London with relatives. In 2000, she died as a result of their abuse, after which a public enquiry led to the development of a new national framework in the UK, named *Every Child Matters* (Department of Education, 2003). The enquiry concluded that Victoria's death resulted from the incompetence of government agencies, such as the NHS, social services and education. It was also acknowledged that services may have been reticent to question Climbie's family, because they did not understand the cultural location of their familial behaviours (House of Commons Health Committee, 2003). In March 2012, Daniel Pelka, the four year old son of Polish migrant parents living in the UK, also died as a result of their abuse and extreme neglect. Again, the subsequent enquiry concluded that services involved with Daniel missed opportunities for intervention and were also reticent to engage because of the family's migrant status (Wannacott & Watts, 2014).

Here, indigenous accounts support Seymour and Walsh's claim that, what is deemed as a successful "family display" will differ, dependent on the family and observer's COO (Seymour & Walsh, 2013). Migrant families, new to a country, do not, then, have the local awareness to know how families "*should* be organised" according to dominant discourse (Heaphy, 2011: 21). They do know, however - from anecdotal evidence and, for the Slovakian participants, high profile media stories (chapter eight) - that there is a high cost if "family displays" are unsuccessful (Almack, 2008a, 2011; Jones & Hackett, 2011; Carver, 2014); that is a child can be removed from the family home. For others, however, the fears are different. Justina, for example, is concerned that the State, in the form of the immigration courts, might judge her parenting and this will result in her asylum application being rejected. She reports, here, that she is upset by the Judge's comments during her application hearing:

```
The Judge tell me, 'Oh, you can't control your children
or conduct them'.  How am I meant to conduct them?  I
tell them, 'don't judge me!"
```

<div align="right">(Justina, mother, Nigerian asylum seeker)</div>

As a result, migrant families fear, to varying degrees, the possibility of State imposed sanctions. This is further compounded by workers, such as the resettlement worker from The Refugee Council, informing their clients that they should modify their behaviour management approaches as "`all adults, if they see something like that [physical chastisement], should report it`" (Lorraine). For migrant participants, then, the gaze of the State is both threatening and potentially ubiquitous.

As a consequence, when migrant families are forced to interact with the State audience, local participants report a tendency for families to either comply with clearly defined requirements or avoid unnecessary attention. Local participants in educational environments, for example, report that parents of migrant children, whatever the COO, respond well to invitations to attend formal activities at the school. Scott, a teacher at a primary school in the west of the city, recounts that "`a fair few parents came in`" when asked to participate in an International Day of Languages and they presented information about their family's COO:

> An Iranian parent came in, 'I'm going to bring some
> Arabic cakes'. A Hungarian, she came in and brought
> chocolate […] We had Russian parents that were absolutely
> thrilled that they could show off Russia.

(Scott, primary school teacher)

Further, other local participants speak positively about migrant parents, as they comply with the administrative activities of the school. Both head teachers, for example, report that these parents are keen to engage with the school during parents evening or consultation events:

> Actually, the predominant attendance is through EAL
> students' parents. They are engaged and keen to see
> their sons and daughters do well.

(Phil, head teacher, secondary school)

Here, by adhering to the school's expectations, these parents display successfully and, consequently, teachers report that these families "work" (Finch, 2007). Further, as migrant families represent the majority of attendees at these events, there is an implication that they feel more need to display than local parents. In line with Heaphy's claims, these families, unconventional in the local context, desire more validation and have more incentive to display than their local peers (Heaphy: 2011: 33).

Local participants further report that migrant families, when forced to engage with the State audience, adopt strategies to negotiate this interface successfully; although migrant parents respond to formal requirements to display, as detailed previously, they also avoid unnecessary communication. Scott, for example, reports that migrant families do not initiate conversation with teachers, even those that speak English well:

> They'll [UK born parents] come in the playground and
> have a chat with you, ask you things, but you don't often
> get that with EAL parents.

(Scott, primary school teacher)

Although Scott does not draw conclusions from this, Sarah, a nurse providing support to families around the time of birth, attributes this reticence to communicate to broader issues. For her,

> ```
> people are maybe fearful that I might be the eyes and
> ears of the establishment so are mindful to sometimes
> not share everything.
> ```
>   (Sarah, health professional, parent, central west Hull, 36)

For parents in the school playground and Sarah's clients, these strategies allow them to limit displays whilst under the gaze of the State audience. As in Gillies' study of working class parenting practices (2007) and Almack's study of same sex parenting, "omitting" display allows these migrant families to avoid the potential pain, and "cost", of displaying unsuccessfully (Almack, 2011: 109). From the perspective of the audience, however, these omissions are problematic. Indeed, Sarah goes on to provide a more in-depth example from her practice:

> ```
> There were some Indian cousins that were married, an
> arranged marriage, and they went on to have a child […]
> every professional that worked with them found that they
> didn't ask for help and, actually, they ended up with a
> very sick baby […] and when I tried to offer mum some
> support, she certainly wasn't telling me what had
> happened and she was trying to get rid of me.
> ```
>   (*ibid*)

For Sarah, this reluctance to engage with services is because, "`migrants are frightened of being judged`". Here, however, the fear is located in the culturally specific nature of this family structure (consanguineous) and that, in turn, this might be assumed to be the cause of their child's sickness. By comparing this account with Sarah's contrasting example of Eastern European migrant families below, it becomes clear that not all families have the same response to the State as the audience of their displays:

```
Polish people care less and are more able to seek help
and access health care […] I had a couple of Polish women
on my case load and tried to explain to them that the
level of alcohol they were consuming was at a very
dangerous amount – when they had young babies – but,
interestingly, both the women were, like, 'pah, you're
making a fuss over nothing'.
```

<div align="right">

(*ibid*)

</div>

As discussed previously, the political and media discourses surrounding migration during the fieldwork period, promote assimilation to white British norms (chapter four & eight). Further, those representing the State audience affirm that, for familial displays to be "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011), they must be grounded in "Anglo-ethnic culture" (Chambers, 2001: 124). Although *all* migrant families display by presenting "a specific face" (Smart, 2011: 541) to the State, as a "relevant audience" (Finch, 2007: 67), this is less so for European, white migrants, possibly because their familial norms, as European, are closer to "Anglo-ethnic culture" (Chambers, 2001: 124). By contrast, the Indian couple, fearful of being judged because they are married cousins, are aware that *they* cannot display successfully in line with the assimilationist State norms and that those that do not fit into the model are "others" (Chambers, 2001: 125). Unfortunately, by avoiding display, families are at risk of not receiving the support their families require. As A8 migrants present as being less fearful of this judgement, this is less of a risk for their families.

Beyond the State: Response of the Co – located Indigenous Audience

Migrant family accounts show that members of Hull's indigenous population, beyond those that represent the State, *can* be the intended audience of migrant "family display" and are, thereby, "relevant" (Finch, 2007: 67). These audience members are "relevant" when displays are associated with the process of "frontiering" (Bryceson & Vuorela, 2002) and are intended: to display parenting in line with the host populations expectations; to minimise the migrant position as the *other*; as a way of showing 'belonging' in the new community; to avoid conflict and to promote community connectivity (chapter eight).

Accounts presented, here, differ to those of State representatives, as indigenous audience participants do not have a professional relationship with the migrant families to whom they refer. Initially, attention is given to indigenous accounts when "enablers" of display are present; the presence of family young in the migrant family and the migrant family's ability to interact in work and study environments (chapter eight). Analysis also considers the contextual factors that influence audience responses and the subsequent success of these migrant "family displays".

When "Enablers" are limited

At the time of the fieldwork, migrant populations were concentrated in the central west areas of the city (chapter two). City schools outside of these areas, consequently, have a very low percentage of children with EAL[63] and participants report limited awareness of diversity in either child-centred or public spaces. Billie, for example, is nineteen and he reports that, "I've lived down Orchard Park all my life, until recently you never seen anyone other than white" (Billie, north Hull, 19).   Further, Dave, a resident of east Hull, is a support worker for families living on council estates in north Hull. Although he supports a small number of Somali families that are Gateway refugees (chapter two), he notes that migrant and indigenous families on the estate do not "mix". For him, the Somali families do not come to children's centre activities because they lack confidence and the sessions he runs are only attended by "white folk off the estate".

To add to this, the journey from central west areas to facilities in the east and north of the city takes ten/twenty minutes by car and much longer by bus. As there are similar facilities in the west of the city, only two migrant families in the study make this journey and they do so infrequently (Magda, Lenka). Field diary notes made in the main municipal park in the east of the city show, then, that the presence of migrant families in child-centred spaces, is minimal:

---

[63] Children with EAL are those that have a language, other than English, as their first language. They have usually been born in another country or have spent their pre-school years in a household where another language is the main spoken language. This, therefore, indicates that their family originates in another country.

It's the first week of the summer holidays and my boys want to go to East Park, which is a 15 minute drive from where we live - the central west area of the city. It's a lovely summer's day and the park is very busy. I sit and watch whilst the children play, just as other parents are doing - many are with friends. They're mainly women, as it's a week day and maybe family men are working. Unlike in the west, during the day, I see just two families that I would identify as black, but I have no idea if they are migrants. Although I am mindful of the voices I am overhearing, I don't hear any other languages or accents until just before we are leaving, at around 4pm – a family walk past us and they are speaking to each other in an Eastern European language, which I assume to be Polish.

(field diary, 24th July, 2013)

Here, then, indigenous participants that both work and live outside of the central west areas of Hull, have little reason to travel to areas where migrant populations live and, thereby, have less opportunity to interact with, or observe, migrant families. As such, migrant families are less *enabled* to display successfully to these "relevant audiences" (Finch, 2007: 67) and indigenous participants have less opportunity to develop "cosmopolitan capital"; experience of and exposure to other cultures (Brahic, 2013: 702).

When participants that live and work in the predominantly white communities *do* observe migrant families, responses are heavily influenced by dominant discourses. Sarah, for example, recounts that her brother-in-law, a resident of a North Hull Estate, collected her children from their school in central west Hull:

```
He came back cursing, because of all the 'foreigners'
that were in the school yard and he said that they were
speaking foreign in front of him.
```

(Sarah, parent, central west, 36)

For Sarah's brother-in-law, for migrant families to display successfully, they must comply with the political expectation to "learn English" (BBC News, 2013a; Gov.UK, n.d - b). Subsequently, this can be identified as one of *his* display "requirements" (Haynes &

Dermott, 2011). Furthermore, when Yvonne,[64] a resident of an east Hull council estate, sees "blacks and Muslims" in East Park, she draws on the dominant representations of *Britishness* as white and Christian (Solomos, 2003) and asks:

> What are you doing fucking coming here and fucking taking over our parks?
>
> (Yvonne, parent, east, 46)

Kayleigh, by contrast, draws on both anti-Islamic and anti-migrant narratives to interpret the familial behaviours she observes:

> This Asian woman got on [the bus] with all her babies – they have them so they can get a council house - wearing her fucking scarf? France has got it right. Banning them, I tell you.
>
> (Kayleigh, parent, east, 20)

For these participants, the lack of compliance with Anglo-familial norms, locates migrant families as *other* (Chambers, 2001; Chambers, 2012). Although the limited opportunity to develop "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013) does influence these responses to migrant "family display", there are other factors to consider. As indicated by the indices of multiple deprivation (chapter two), "there's a lot of poverty and deprivation in the north and east" (Helen) and, for Sharon, when talking about her relatives in north Hull, "they're poor and, because they're not really educated, they lash out". Here, then, (although this would warrant further research) responses to immigration in Hull are also influenced by the intersection of participant socio-economic characteristics: Billie is young and unemployed and Kayleigh is a single mum, surviving by claiming welfare benefits; whilst, Yvonne works, she too is a single mum caring for teenage children and she does not understand why she must be accepting of migrant groups when she was called a "coon and a nigger" at school. Nevertheless, for these indigenous participants, the migrant familial displays they observe are not successful in avoiding conflict and achieving connectivity (chapter eight). Instead, here, behaviours that do not conform

---

[64] It should be noted that Yvonne's responses are complex and influenced by her own desire, as a second generation African-Indian, to be perceived as *British*.

to Anglo familial norms can be perceived as provocative and, consequently, migrant families are "constructed as second class families or as 'other' to family" (Heaphy, 2011: 33).

When Indigenous Audiences Live Alongside Migrant Families

Participants living in the more densely populated areas of Hull do, however, have more opportunity to observe migrant "family displays". Further, the multiple indices of deprivation indicate that this area has higher levels of employment, income, and educational attainment (chapter two). A number of the indigenous participants that live in these areas also have high levels of "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013), that is, experience of and exposure to cultures other than their own. Daryl and Arthur suggest that this this is rooted in the history of the city:

```
This little part of Hull is a lot more cultural than
anywhere else, really. It's cos the Uni's here, or cos
the old trading ports were here.
```

(Daryl, parent, central west, 40)

In addition to this, participants also attribute this to the fact that they live amongst migrant populations (Sharon, Daryl, Andrew, Helen), whilst for others, this is because they have spent time living in cities with more cultural diversity, or they themselves have lived abroad: Daryl is forty and Hull born, but lived in London for five years in his twenties; Helen is in her late thirties, also Hull born, but has spent time living in Brighton and she is now in a long term relationship with a man of Jamaican heritage; Beth is fifty, has lived in Hull for ten years, but previously lived in an Islamic country, where she met her husband; Andrew is in his late twenties and Hull born, but his father lives in Spain and he has travelled extensively; Mark has lived in Hull for twenty years, but prior to this lived and worked abroad, where he met his Eastern European wife of fourteen years. As a result, Beth and Andrew and Mark feel that they are more welcoming to new comers that they would otherwise have been:

```
Having been in another country, I've really appreciated
a friendly smile and I try and be hospitable in that
way.
```

<div align="right">(Mark, parent, central west, 50)</div>

Here, then, although geographical location limits observation of migrant "family displays", these broader social, economic and cultural factors should be taken into consideration.

When Family Young are Present as an "Enabler of Display"

As discussed in previous chapters, the presence of family young *enables* migrant families to display to indigenous populations (chapter eight). One occasion when this occurs is in the school playground; as the family young of both indigenous and migrant families are legally required to receive an education in the UK, they mostly attend school, and migrant families are *enabled* to display family to their peers within this environment. This is particularly true when children are of primary age (up to eleven) as parents still take their children to and from school, whilst at secondary school, children either walk with their friends or parents drop them off and, thus, do not interact with other families.

In this environment, migrant "family displays" are most successful when they are grounded in "Anglo–ethnic" culture (Chambers, 2001: 124) and migrant families engage in what audience members define as the familial social norms of the playground. This is, however, dependent on migrant families being able to speak English; as defined by migrant participants, a third "enabler" (chapter eight). When, for example, families `"hang out and chat in the playground"`, it is interpreted as migrant families `"trying to fit in"` (Beth, parent, central west, 55) (Daryl, Sarah, Helen, Mark) and they successfully minimise their position as *other* (chapter eight). When migrant families do not display in accordance with these conventional "normal" family behaviours (Heaphy, 2011: 21), the displays are more troubling for the indigenous audience. Mark, for example, reports observing a Somalian family's first day in the playground:

```
The children were wearing the brand new [school name]
outfit, […] but one of the boys was wearing a skirt,
shoes that didn't fit.
```

(Mark, parent, central west, 50)

Here, this family are conspicuous because they do not yet know how families "*should* be organised" according to dominant discourse (Heaphy, 2011: 21) and also because they are black. Although Mark has empathy for this family and their lack of agency as newly arrived refugees (Heath *et al.,* 2011), it remains that their inappropriate display positions this family as *other* (Chambers, 2001) from the perspective of the indigenous audience.

Participants living in the more densely populated areas of Hull observe migrant "family display" in child-centred spaces beyond the school environment. As discussed, migrant families display to local indigenous populations by adopting Anglo-centred, child-focused family practices. This includes: going to the park, going to the swimming pool, holding or attending children's birthday parties, attending sessions at children's centres or going to junior football or rugby clubs (Lenka, Ivana/Fillip, Bai/Chyou, Saman/Rachel, Sana, Magda, Ella/Zack). Pearson Park, for example, located in the Avenues Ward, in contrast to East Park, is a public space that both indigenous and migrant participants visit with their family young (Beta, Ivana, Magda, Zack, Bai, Ella, Mark, Daryl, Sarah, Helen, Beth). Several indigenous participants resident in this area, report the diverse mix of families in this space as a positive experience (Mark, Daryl, Sarah, Helen, Beth) and Helen is proud that, "`on a sunny summer's day, there can be, like, 20 languages being spoken`" (Helen, parent, central west, 30). These migrant families display successfully, because indigenous participants perceive them to be, "`doing the things that everybody else does`" (Mark), which for Sarah is:

```
The kids play around, the parents watch, sometimes they
play with their children, have an ice-cream, have a
picnic, you know.
```

(Sarah, parent, central west, 36)

As in the school playground, when migrant families are seen to adopt these Anglo-norms, migrant families are perceived to display "'normal family characteristics"

(Heaphy, 2011: 33/203) and, therefore, "work" (Finch, 2007). On these occasions, migrant families display successfully and minimise their family's position as *other* (chapter eight).

Indigenous audience accounts also indicate that migrant "family displays" *can* be successful in promoting community connections as the *other* (chapter eight). When migrant families adopt Anglo-norms, they exist alongside indigenous audiences whilst engaging in activities that their "relevant audience" recognise as familial (Finch, 2007: 67). This results in migrant and indigenous populations engaging in casual, sometimes non-verbal interactions (Lenka, Ivana, Zack, Sarah, Mark, Beth, Helen, Daryl). Daryl recounts that:

```
Children play with each other, mum and dad might smile,
or talk to each other, whatever background they're from.
```
(Daryl, parent, central west, 40)

It is, however, when migrant families can speak English that the most successful displays are *enabled*. Hillary, for example, regularly takes her grandchildren to Pearson Park, but she is left frustrated and angry when families in this public space cannot speak with her:

```
I've tried in the park when there's been somebody my age
group […] but their English, that's difficult for them
and for me […] I just give up.
```
(Hillary, grandmother, west, 68)

For her, this experience has not resulted in connectivity between communities, but, in fact, more separation; migrant family engagement in Anglo-centric family activities does not fulfil her display requirements and, for her, like Sarah's brother-in-law in the school playground, the ability to speak English is not just an "enabler", but also a "requirement" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011) of successful migrant family display.

By contrast, when migrant families can speak English, displays successfully result in connectivity between communities; Helen, for example, regularly talks to a woman from Poland, because their children `played peekaboo together on the swings when they were toddlers` (Helen, parent, central west, 30). Mark also reports

having regular "chats" with an Iranian dad at the swimming pool when they are both there with their daughters, whilst Dave volunteers at a local amateur rugby club for boys, located in west Hull, where he:

```
Sees lots of cultures coming together […] Indian and
African […] we interact and chat.
```

(Dave, grandparent, east Hull, 57)

For the indigenous participants cited, displays in child-centred intercultural spaces are most successful in achieving connectivity when *enabled* by the migrant family's ability to speak English and this appears to be irrespective of the family's COO. Furthermore, the ability to speak English is revealed to be both an "enabler" and, for some members of the indigenous audience, a "tool" (Finch, 2007: 77) of migrant "family display" (this is given more attention later in the chapter). In addition to this, success is also dependent on migrant families "displaying in a way that reflects the cultural ideal of normal" (Heaphy, 2011: 21), thereby going some way to achieving what Garner describes as the real "test of belonging"; a metaphorical invisibility as *other* (Garner, 2009: 792).

Connectivity between Young Indigenous Audiences and Migrant Family Young

When family young are present in migrant and indigenous families *and* indigenous and migrant populations share geographical residence, "family display" *can* successfully promote long-term community connectivity, because relationships are formed between migrant and indigenous young. As established, one element of State "required" display is that all children resident in the UK are legally required to receive an education until the age of sixteen and this usually means attending a State school. In central west Hull, then, where schools have the highest intake of children with EAL (chapter two), family young are both forced and encouraged to interact in local educational environments and adult participants predominantly report positive connectivity between migrant and indigenous children.[65] On one level, "family display" can be educational (Almack, 2011) when migrant families share their cultural heritage (Scott, Anna) at organised school events, because "they'll all come in their own clothes from around the world, and proudly share with each other" (Jackie, lunch time

---

[65] As indigenous participants were all over the age of seventeen, indigenous adults have provided information relating to young indigenous audience members.

supervisor, primary school). Phil further reports that this "forcer" of display – the presence of family young - can also emphasise commonalities, rather than culturally located difference:

```
So I can have students form Lithuania wearing big
headphones and I've got kids from sub Saharan Africa,
doing the same and white British kids.
```
(Phil, head teacher, secondary school)

Further accounts support this and indicate that for these young indigenous audience members, migrant families are not necessarily "non-conventional" (Finch, 2007: 71). Sarah, for example, explains that her six year old daughter is nonchalant about migrant new comers in her class, because she,

```
knows they will soon be able to speak English and be her
friend […] lots of other migrant children in her class
have done.
```
(Sarah, mother, central west, 35)

Similarly, Brenda as a family support worker, reports that indigenous children at the play groups she facilitates, "just play, whatever culture they're from. They don't notice" (Brenda, parent, central west, 58), and Bruce recounts similar experiences when he is working as a lifeguard at a local swimming pool: "There are lots of kids enjoying the experience of kids from other countries. They don't care" (Bruce, north, 43). This sentiment is further mirrored in the accounts of other research participants living or working amongst migrant populations (Jenny, Paula, Scott, Lenka, Ivana, Magda).

As a consequence of these State imposed "family displays", in schools with a diverse intake, young audience members mostly respond well to migrant family young. Interactions between migrant and indigenous children can, therefore, begin to reshape what is perceived as "'normal' and 'proper' family" (Heaphy, 2011: 21; Chambers, 2001). This is not only relevant to those relationships between young people. Indeed, Anna reports that the international and indigenous parents she supports at school "see the children, how they perceive things and how they view each

other [and they] try to change - the parents" (Annie, grandparent, west, 64). Consequently, these State imposed displays, by bringing *children* together, have the potential, over the long-term, to "bring people together and engender strong, cohesive communities" (Offord, 2015).

When Differing Familial Norms Inhibit Connectivity between Communities
(Also see: *When the Majority Audience is White, British and Christian*)
In a city where the majority audience is white, British and Christian, migrant "family displays" may be unsuccessful, even when multiple "enablers" are present, because culturally different familial norms present insurmountable ontological challenges. For white indigenous participants, including those with "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013), connectivity can be inhibited when migrant "family displays" are located within British Islamic familial norms (Kirstie & Buchan, 2011). Sarah and Beth, for example, are keen to connect with migrant families at school, but both feel that the difference they observe in gendered parenting roles in "Islamic migrant families" (Beth, parent, central west, 55) interferes with their expected display of "chat in the playground" (Sarah, parent, central west, 35). Although their children attend different schools, both women report playground displays grounded in what they interpret as Islamic familial norms; it is men in "Asian" communities that take young children to school (confirmed by a local Imam and Lorraine, a refugee resettlement worker), but "here, [in the UK] it's mainly the women" (Sarah). Beth herself is married to an Islamic man, and attempts to talk with Islamic men in the playground. Although they do respond, for Beth, interactions are unsuccessful, because she senses that "he knows he shouldn't be talking to a Western woman" (Beth, parent, central west, 55). Sarah too feels that "Asian" men are uncomfortable with this "chat" and instead "talk with each other on the corner afterwards".

These accounts resonate with those of other indigenous participants. Despite relationships between family young being mostly positive, these ontological differences are also reported to present an obstacle; Phil, the head teacher at a local secondary school states that "the Asian girls keep themselves separate,

because that's what they're meant to do culturally". Further, Mollie, an eighteen year old woman, has formed relationships with Asian male peers, but has not done so with young Asian women, because:

> I don't really see a lot of them, the girls, [..] their families seem stricter with the girls [..] like they never go anywhere.

(Mollie, central west, 18)

Here, there is no sense of audience members responding to these "Asian" familial displays as "second class" (Heaphy, 2011: 33). They do, however, surmise that these migrant families are subjected to gendered display requirements that differ from those of their own. In these inter-cultural spaces, there exists a "criss-cross and clash of cultural values" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 13) and despite the intention of actors, successful "family displays" are inhibited.

When the Indigenous Audience Observes Displays in the Local Community

In areas of the city densely populated by migrant groups, migrant "family displays" can be successful in promoting community connections as the *other* (chapter eight) in areas *beyond* child-centred spaces and where audience members do not necessarily have family young. Indirect contact occurs between indigenous and migrant families during their *everyday* activities, whilst out `doing normal stuff` (Mark), `[waiting] at the bus stop` (Sarah), `shopping` (Sarah, Helen, Daryl, Andrew, Beth) and "on the way to work" (Daryl). Here, then, because populations live alongside one another, as argued by Finch and other scholars (Finch, 2008; Almack, 2007; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Walsh, 2015), display does not require direct contact and the indigenous audience is *enabled* to observe displays intended for both the indigenous and HAN audience.

For some, this results in the further development of their "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013). Mark, for example, responds positively to "family displays" located outside of his own Anglo-norms and is pleased that when he collects his paper on a Sunday morning, he sees:

```
African families going to the churches on Sunday, you
know, the, erm, bright coloured clothing […] you see
them dressed real smart […] I think it looks real good.
```

(Mark, parent, central west, 50)

Similarly, Hillary responds positively to some culturally located "family displays" (Kim, 2011; Kristie & Buckham, 2011; Carver, 2014) and "likes to see the women in all those African clothes" (Hillary, grandparent, west, 63) in the congregation where she attends church. Furthermore, Andrew, a local business owner (who does not have children), responds positively to migrant "family displays" and he recounts that indigenous customers welcome the vibrancy these displays have brought to his café in the central west of the city. He specifically identifies migrant customers that he feels visit the café as a weekly event:

```
We have the French woman that brings her son on a Friday,
the Eastern Europeans come on their way home from school
and there's the group of Arabs that bring their wives
and children on a Sunday and all sorts of people the
rest of the time.  I don't think about where they are
from, I just know who has espresso or mocha.
```

(Andrew, east Hull, 28)

Here, by observing migrant "family display" within their community, indigenous audience members acquire knowledge about the migrant populations with whom they share space and, as Daryl claims, "I think the more you meet people, the more you empathise. I think it's about contact, init?"(Daryl, parent, central west, 36). Indeed, within these communities, "family display" can serve a restorative function (Hughes & Valentine, 2011; Valentine e*t al*., 2014). This does, however, go beyond co-resident kin and, in this context, it is indigenous audiences external to migrant families that are able to gain knowledge about familial behaviours located within a variety of cultures.

Family as a Boundary Object

Indigenous participants, as a "relevant audience" (Finch, 2007), do not *always* "require" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159) migrant "family displays" to mirror Anglo–centred norms

in order for them to be successful. Instead, "family" can be a "boundary object", that is, an entity that holds "different meaning in different worlds, but [is] imbued with enough shared meaning to facilitate [...] translation across those worlds" (McSherry, 2001: 69). Consequently, some displays are located with the cultural norms of the COO, but some indigenous participants still "recognise" them as "familial" (Finch, 2007) and respond to them as "'normal' and 'proper'" familial behaviours (Heaphy, 2011: 21).

Indigenous participants in the central west areas, for example, engage in migrant family celebrations, because they `realise it's important to people even if it isn't important to you` (Mark, parent, north, 50); Sarah's family are friends with an Afghani neighbour and they attend an "`Eid celebration at his house each year`" (Sarah, parent, central west, 35), whilst Mark's family celebrates Eid with Kurdish families he has met via his interest in music. Brenda, by contrast, is a resident of a city centre council estate and she reports how this sense of "shared meaning" is reciprocated by a Kurdish neighbour that buys her a gift and `every Christmas, I get my big cake in a box` (Brenda, parent, central, 58).

Participants further report finding "shared meaning" with migrant families, grounded in them having a shared, culturally neutral "translation" (McSherry, 2001: 69) of the meaning of "family". Beth, Sarah and Brenda provide particularly pertinent examples of when this occurs. Sarah's children attend a primary school in the central west area of the city with a high percentage of pupils with EAL; indigenous and migrant family adults share a child-focused co-existence in the playground and have consequently shared intimate moments of family-life, such as:

> `When I had the baby, everyone cooed over him and you don't really need language to do that? […] There was an Indian woman who brought her new baby to the school, and everyone dashed round to have a look.`
>
> (Sarah, parent, central west, 35)

Similarly, Beth recounts how an acquaintance she made in Pearson Park, whilst their children played, has since become a `good friend`, because they have gradually revealed more private details about their family lives:

> She misses her family massively […] her mother died
> recently, after a long term illness and, of course, she
> couldn't go over that much and she felt really bad about
> it, as you would.

<div align="right">(Beth, parent, central west, 55)</div>

Further, Brenda reports that when an Iranian neighbour's family experienced bereavement:

> She came knocking for me. 'You come. My family are
> coming and I need them to see you.' So I went to the
> house to support them.

<div align="right">(Brenda, grandparent, central, 58)</div>

Here, the presence of family young and/or co-residence within the same geographical area, gives indigenous adults the opportunity to be included in migrant "family displays" that are recognisably "intense" (Finch, 2007: 72) across *all* cultures. These displays are, again, more successful and result in the development of meaningful relationships when, as in Beth and Brenda's examples, migrant families can speak the language of the indigenous audience. Nevertheless, as in Sarah's account of responses to new babies, this is not always the case and birth and death - as periods of "intensity" for migrant families (*ibid*) (chapter seven) - can transcend cultural difference and highlight similarities.

The Indigenous Requirements for Migrant Families to Speak English

(Also see "*Polish / Eastern European "Relativising": Prioritising the HAN Audience*")

As identified in chapter eight, the ability to speak the language of the indigenous audience, *enables* migrant family display. Consequently, those migrant families able to speak English display most successfully and are able to achieve connectivity as the *other* (chapter eight). Indeed, indigenous participants that provide support to migrant families (Anna, Lorraine, Brenda, Dave) confirm that the lack of a shared language is a significant obstacle to connectivity:

> Parents do want to socialise. It's just the language
> barrier that I think is the biggest problem. If they

```
could communicate better, connections would be really
good, even strong.
```

<div align="right">(Anna, primary school teaching assistant)</div>

This is affirmed in Sarah's account; as a mother that welcomes diversity in her community, she is keen to develop relationships with migrant families in the playground and `"naturally wanted to say hello"` to a new parent she realised to be a migrant. For her, however, connectivity is limited and Sarah is disappointed that, `"it's very difficult to take it beyond that and it feels that we are now stuck, cos she can't really speak English"`.

As indicated previously, this lack of a shared language not only inhibits migrant families being able to display family, but, for some indigenous participants, language acquisition is also a "display requirement" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159) (Mollie, Annie, Arthur, Yvonne, Toni, Hillary). Indeed, all participants, with the exception of Daryl and the Imam, feel that migrant families in the city should learn and speak English. For some, particularly professionals, this is for practical reasons and, because `"it makes it easier for them"` (Helen, Sarah, Dave and Lorraine). Others, however, make the "'when in Rome' argument" (Garner, 2009: 793) (Mark, Andrew, Annie, Arthur, Kayleigh, Beth, Sue, Toni, Bruce), that is, that `"when you are in another country, you should learn the language"` (Mark, parent, north, 50). A small number of participants, particularly those that do not live in areas populated by migrants (Yvonne, Danny, Kayleigh), are, however, fervent in their response to migrant families that do not fulfil this display "requirement" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159) (Yvonne, Danny, Kayleigh). Kayleigh, for example, expects migrant families to assimilate to what she defines as British norms, which includes them:

```
Being British! Speak in our language all of the time,
[…] If I see a family on the bus, I will get up and I
will tell them, 'either speak in my fucking language or
get off the bus'.
```

<div align="right">(Kayleigh, parent, east Hull, 20)</div>

For these participants, display requirements *are* located within Anglo based definitions of a "'proper' and 'good'" family (Chamber, 2001; Heaphy, 2011), but they also fuse with

the prevalent pro-assimilationist discourses surrounding migrant populations living in the UK (Barkham, 2008; Finney & Simpson, 2009).

When Work Enables Indigenous Audiences to Observe Migrant "Family Display"

Migrant family accounts also highlight work and study as an "enabler" of "family display" for migrant families living in Hull (chapter eight). Here, analysis focuses on those indigenous participants that come into contact with migrant families as work colleagues (Sharon, Sue, Daryl) or because, during the course of their working day, they encounter migrant families and populations, as, say, a bus driver (Sharon and Sue) or a swimming pool attendant (Bruce). Bruce, Sharon and Sue, for example, are all participants that live in areas of the city where migrant populations are sparse, and they do not have family young. Work does, however, allow them to observe migrant "family displays". Responses indicate, again, that when audience members recognise displays as familial and "normal" they are received as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011: 21). Bruce, as a swimming pool attendant, interacts with a diverse range of migrant populations and reports:

```
The Polish bring their families - they watch them more
than the British, err, there's Kurds that bring their
children […] yeah, they play with the kids,
```

(Bruce, north Hull, 43)

whilst, Sue, a driver on community transport, praises a Polish mother, because:

```
You couldn't do any more for her.  If she's running a
bit late on her way to work, she runs up to the bus and
says, 'I'm really sorry', and if she's not there the
father comes.  It's very family.
```

(Sue, west Hull, 42)

Here, although Sue and Bruce measure successful display by different qualities – levels of behaviour management and levels of gratitude - there is a sense that these migrant families display more and are perceived as legitimate, because they work harder than indigenous service users (Heaphy, 2011: 33).

In addition to this, when migrant family members engage in work activities, this can be a "family display", in and of itself; labour market activity is recognised as an important element of *being* a parent, particularly within the context of migration (Kilkey *et al.,* 2013a; Kilkey *et al.,* 2013b). Further, dominant political and media discourses at the time of the field work presented migrant populations as "*benefit tourists*" (Dominiczak, 2013; chapter four).   As a consequence, migrant family members with work visas, not in the UK for the purpose of study, are keen to display that they are in paid work and their families are `"not taking benefits and doing nothing"` (Magda) and `"we are not having any money from the government"` (Bai, Chyou, Fillip, Magda, Lenka, Hiwa, Ivana, Sylwia).

From this perspective, then, when indigenous audience members work alongside migrant populations, their displays can be successful in dispelling these discourses. Dave, for example, worked in the building industry for many years and reports that, `"from people I worked with, the majority of Poles are hard workers"` (Dave, grandparent, north, 57).   Similarly, Sharon, drives the bus that takes many Eastern European migrants to work and she observes that, `"they work really hard, twelve hour shifts.  You don't see the Brits doing that, do you?"` (Sharon, west, 30). Further, Daryl, also works on building sites and sees:

> `At hospital sites […] big groups of cleaners turn up to work and they're all Eastern Europeans.  They're probably earning about eighty quid a week, but they're doing it!`
>
> (Daryl, parent, central west, 36)

Again, these displays are successful, because as Eastern European migrant families, they present as "good" families (Heaphy, 2011: 21) by disproving the discourse that labels A8 migrants as "unworthy" *benefit tourists* (chapter four). As with Bruce and Sue's accounts, however, these families are required to display more than their British peers if they are to achieve familial legitimacy with indigenous audiences (Heaphy, 2011: 33).

For the indigenous participants interviewed, however, they are not representative of their workforce. When asked if Eastern Europeans are welcomed at work, Daryl laughs and says:

```
No!  God, Julie!  The Eastern Europeans, they just get
on with it. There's no trouble, but the lads that I work
with all have totally different attitudes to me. They've
lived in east Hull all their lives and they don't think
they're racist, but they are.  It's the only place I see
racism.  Here, in the west, in my social life, I don't
see any.
```

(Daryl, parent, central west, 36)

Although Sharon (west, 35) says her international colleagues are `"made welcome"`, her indigenous colleagues do express negative opinions towards migrant populations in the city, which reflect dominant national discourses; she reports that in a previous company, colleagues were heavily influenced by anti-Islamic narratives presenting Muslims as terrorists (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009), and although `"fine"` with an Islamic colleague, nick-named him, `"bomber"`. Furthermore, in her current role, she feels that colleagues talk about Eastern Europeans as simultaneously `"here for the benefits"` but `"taking our jobs"` and she concludes that `"some of their opinions are ridiculously racist"`.

As both Daryl and Sharon work in male dominated environments, their work colleagues are also mostly male. Although this indicates that work, as an "enabler of display" in these gendered environments may have limited success in dispelling dominant narratives, there is inadequate evidence to draw this conclusion.

Part 3: Community Connectivity and Cohesion

Responses of Co-Located Indigenous Audience – a summary

In the areas of Hull where migrant populations are concentrated, engagement in Anglo-centred child-focused activities - as a "tool" (Finch, 2007) and "enabler" of migrant "family display" - *does* facilitate the sharing of select familial moments and can result in connectivity between diverse communities. For these displays to be successful,

indigenous participants "require" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 156) migrant families to conform to the local, Anglo-ethnic familial norms (Heaphy, 2011; Chambers, 2001). That said, there are exceptions, particularly when family becomes a "boundary object" (McSherry, 2001: 69) and a number of participants describe positive cross-cultural interactions when Anglo-ethnic norms are not displayed (Mark, Dave, Sarah, Helen, Zack, Justina). Others, have also formed relationships that they refer to as `friendships` (Beth, Audrey, Sana, Beata, Ivana, Magda, Beth, Audrey) and it is argued here that "family display" can have a restorative function (Hughes & Valentine, 2011; Valentine *et al.*, 2014) within the broader community.

Furthermore, there is an indication that exposure to migrant "family display" in the work environment goes some way to achieving connectivity between indigenous and migrant communities. This is particularly the case when indigenous audience members observe migrant families displaying `more than the British` (Bruce, north, 43) or when their displays are in direct opposition to the dominant anti-immigration discourses (chapter four).

Migrant "family displays" are, however, also problematic for the indigenous audience and community connectivity; when familial displays reflect norms that are unfamiliar to the audience, they either present a barrier to connectivity, or are rejected as not being "legitimate" (Almack, 2011). For others, however, dominant familial discourses associated with "how families *should* be organised" (Heaphy, 2011: 21), fuse with those discourses that require migrant populations to assimilate to white, Christian, Anglo-norms (Kundnani, 2007), including adoption of the English language. For these indigenous participants, prevalent discourses can inhibit them from examining migrant "family displays", in either the workplace or wider community and positive community connectivity is not achieved.

Negotiating Multiple Audiences and the Impact on Community Connectivity
Successful displays, as defined by the indigenous audience are, then, mostly dependent on migrant families being seen to display in line with the dominant British familial discourse. As Dermott and Seymour assert, analysis presented thus far identifies that

"family display" does "involve a wide range of potential audiences that are not restricted to family members" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17). Here, discussion focuses on the outcome when migrant families do not display with the indigenous audience as the "most meaningful" observer (Finch, 2007: 70) with a view to exploring the impact this has on community connectivity and cohesion.

Indigenous Responses to "Relativising": When Local Audiences Are Not the intended Audience

In chapter eight, migrant family accounts indicate that participants display family to their HAN "as a way of belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011). Indeed, a local Imam affirms that migrant families at the mosque do so as they find support in these networks. He attributes this to the fact that, `family life is important to Muslims. They share this with other migrants and they will do anything to help each other`, norms which he feels are different from white European family norms.

Displays which signal "belonging" to HAN do, however, occur at "sites where it can be read as having multiple meanings depending upon the relevant others who make up the audience" (Seymour, 2011: 173). Consequently, indigenous accounts consistently report observing familial displays for which they were, or are not the intended audience, particularly when the Hull based HAN is sizeable. Participants identify that, during the early 2000s, the largest community observed was Kurdish, but, at the time of the fieldwork, this has shifted to the Polish populations in the city (chapter two).

A number of indigenous participants (Beth, Mark, Sharon, Dean, Sarah, John, Helen) observe and accept that migrant populations have formed HANs in central west areas of Hull, `because it's much nicer to live in a community where people are from a similar background to you` (Beth, parent, central west, 55). Others, however, respond differently and two issues dominate in participant accounts; locals do not respond positively to groups of Kurdish men gathering together in public spaces and the perceived, 'insular' nature of the Polish communities in the city is reported in a pejorative tone.

Kurdish "Relativising": Indigenous Audiences Associating Criminal Activity with 'Family-Like' Displays

To begin, the Kurdish men interviewed in the study, Saman and Hiwa, both refer to when they first arrived in the UK as unaccompanied, very young asylum seekers that were, `"still not shaving"` (Hiwa). For them, the Home Office dispersed them to Hull (chapter two), they had little local knowledge, didn't speak the English language and experienced negative responses from the local populations (chapter eight). As a result, they looked within their community in order to provide the support they lacked as a consequence of their biological family being absent from their lives, both geographically and emotionally. For them, strong, *family-like* links were developed by providing each other with *family-like* support. This was achieved via familial display, realised by gathering in each other's homes, but, also, local areas, namely an arterial road in the city, Spring Bank, and a local park, Pearson Park. For them, this provided an opportunity to get together and to `"share our stories"` and `"stay until late at night, talking"` (Hiwa). As the Kurdish communities arrived in Hull some thirteen years prior to the research, many individuals have returned to their home land, whilst a small community have settled; Spring Bank, located in the central area of the city, is approximately a mile long and includes Kurdish cafes, shops, restaurants and barbers. Kurdish men still gather in this area, and field diary notes report that:

Tonight, I cycled down Spring Bank. It was about 9 pm and, as it's a warm summer night, there were a number of people gathered on the street. There were a couple of groups of Arabic men, congregating outside the shops and cafes, laughing and chatting. African women and their children were busy choosing fruit from pavement displays and I notice a hairdressers, still open, with men, women and children stood about chatting. The energy is positive and social, almost more than it is commercial. The street is colourful and vibrant; there are massive crates of watermelons, pavement fruit displays, smells waft from the cafes and some of the shops are playing music.

(field dairy, 14th August, 2013)

This positive response to Hull's predominantly Kurdish area is not, however, mirrored in the accounts from the indigenous audience. Hillary and Annie, for example, do not like

the change in the area, particularly seeing groups of men on "street corners" (Annie, grandparent, west, 64). Hillary, for example, states:

```
Look at Spring Bank!  It wasn't like that.  You could
shop on it […] you see all the guys stood outside, don't
you.  Gangs of men stood outside of all their businesses
[…] I don't think that's good.
```

(Hillary, grandparent, west Hull, 63)

Similarly, Dave, Mollie and Toni all refer to the Spring Bank area and describe the groups of Kurdish men as "threatening" (Mollie, central, 18) and "intimidating" (Toni, east, 25). Although the local Imam, as a confidante for many of these men, recognises the supportive role of the Kurdish community, for the wider audience, displays intended for members of the HAN are not recognised as familial or supportive in character, but are, in contrast, interpreted as anti-social.

Indeed, local audience responses conflate several issues; indigenous participants report that peripheral to these "relativising" induced displays, when Kurdish asylum seekers were initially dispersed to Hull, many of these young men were involved in activities of which the indigenous population disapproved. Bruce, for example, reports that many of them, "carried knives and they didn't have car insurance" (Bruce, north, 43) and several others recount that the Kurdish men were attracting and engaging in relationships with local, young girls (Bruce, Brenda, Sharon, Dave, Toni, Helen, Mollie, Kayleigh). Indeed, Toni and Helen both report occasions when they received unwanted attention from Kurdish men and the community cohesion police officer for the city corroborates these claims relating to illegal activities.

Although a number of indigenous participants and professionals interviewed felt that the local authorities were not prepared for the dispersal of the Kurdish men to Hull, they also felt that agencies, such as Hull City Council and Humberside Police, did respond rapidly to the initial problems named above (Donna, Grace, Brenda, Mark, Helen). Despite this, local discourses developed around the Kurdish community and were fuelled by national representations of Islam as "dangerous" and "criminal" (Pantazis &

Pemberton, 2009) and asylum seekers as "unworthy" (Flynn, 2002) and a "problem" (Greenslade, 2004; Mulvey, 2010); their criminal behaviours were exaggerated (Daryl), and it was a common held belief that the Kurds `couldn't be arrested` (Bruce, Dave) and that they were also given `free mobile phones` or `fancy cars` (Bruce, Daryl, Yvonne, Kayleigh, Arthur, Sue, Billy). Although the local newspaper, *The Hull Daily Mail*, collaborated with agencies working with the Kurdish men to produce a series of articles dispelling such myths (Robert, Hull Daily Mail), many of these beliefs are still held today. Further, although there are `less groups of Kurds now` (Andrew, Donna) and participants refer to these issues as historical (Brenda, Sharon, Daryl, Mark and Sharon Donna), others continue to associate these myths and, particularly, illegal activities with groups of Arabic men socialising in public areas (Dave, Bruce, Kayleigh, Arthur, Mollie, Yvonne, Toni and Hillary). This is so much the case that both Toni and Mollie, who are twenty-four and eighteen respectively, choose to avoid Spring Bank, because `I just don't like the way they are. They stand outside the shops in groups and stuff` (Mollie, central west, 18).

Despite a shift away from the initial intensity of the Kurdish "relativising" behaviours, because the `Kurds have started to settle` (Daryl, parent, central, 36), the indigenous audiences still associate some anti-social intent with their continued *family-like* displays in public spaces. Regardless of Kurdish heritage families, such as Saman/Rachel's and Hiwa/Sana's engaging in "family displays" that mirror Anglo-norms, some of these decade-old, negative beliefs endure.

Polish / Eastern European "Relativising": Prioritising the HAN Audience
At the time of the field work, the Polish population constituted the single, biggest, non-UK born community in Hull, totalling approximately 5000 people (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a). Residentially, this migrant group are concentrated in the Beverley Road and Newland Wards (chapter two) and these areas are described by *all* indigenous participants as `Polish`.[66] According to census data, there was also a further 3,100

---

[66] Census data indicates that Polish populations also live outside of this area (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a), but according to participants, they are most visible in the Beverley Road and Newland Ave areas.

EU born people resident in Hull in 2011 (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a), residing in similar areas and accessing related facilities. Lenka and Ivana, for example, both of Slovakian origin, report that they buy foods from their COO at the `Polish shop`. Audience members do not, however, differentiate between EU nationalities when responding to what they perceive as `Polish` behaviours and, on the whole, identify all Eastern Europeans as `Polish` (Hillary, Daryl, Dave, Toni, Arthur). Although these populations are not obviously visible by their skin colour, the development of a culturally specific service industry is conspicuous to the indigenous audience as is the widespread, assertive use of Eastern European languages in public spaces. Indeed, field diary notes support this:

> This morning, I went to Newland Avenue to buy vegetables and I hear Eastern European languages everywhere I go, although I can't differentiate between languages! People are out doing their shopping, getting cash, going to the Post Office, Herons[67] and the Eastern European shops on the street. I mainly see couples with their children, confidently chatting in their own language as they go about their business. I bike down Beverley Road on my way home – Many of the shop fronts are boarded up, but, in between, there are shops with Polish signage: butchers, bakers, doctors, dentists, beauticians and restaurants, all of which are busy.
>
> (field diary 7, 24th July, 2013)

This "ethnically based mass settlement" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 19) *can*, then, fulfil the social and practical needs of the Polish (McGhee *et al.,* 2015), as reflected in Sylwia and her family's accounts (chapter eight). Further, when the A8 communities initially settled in Hull, the local authorities did not manage the process, because they weren't acknowledged as:

> `A group of people termed as vulnerable, [so] they were`
> `left to get on with it.`
>
> (Grace, community participation specialist)

---

[67] "Herons" is a local budget grocery store, popular with both indigenous and migrant populations and has no links with any particular migrant community.

Although studies highlight that these populations *were* vulnerable, particularly in terms of accommodation and working conditions (Craig *et al.,* 2005; Spencer *et al*., 2007; Wilkinson, 2008b; Antoniak, 2008), some Eastern European families do have less incentive to display (Heaphy, 2011: 33) to the indigenous comunity; they have freedom to travel, access to welfare benefits, are able to return home without fear for their safety and have the support of a large HAN.[68] As such, they require less validation from the indigenous community than migrant families that desire UK acceptance because their family's welfare depends on it, for example, asylum seekers, refugees or those with limited HAN support. Although McGhee *et al.* (2015) highlight that Polish communities in the UK are not necessarily homogenous, here, Polish families such as Sylwia's *do* focus their "family display" towards their HAN audience. Consequently, many Polish people `"haven't needed to learn English"` (Anna, Teaching Assistant) and, for Lech, this has resulted in him not `"care[ing] what the British think"` (Lech, seventeen, Polish economic migrant).

Nevertheless, as Polish familial norms are located within a Western typology (Chambers, 2001: 125), this population, therefore, have more agency to display successfully to the UK indigenous audience (Heath *et al.,* 2011: 2.1). Despite this, UK- born audience members often report Eastern European "family displays" negatively. Annie, for example, reiterates stories she has heard from friends whose children attend a local Catholic school, which, by virtue of many Polish families practising Catholicism, are reported to have a high intake of Polish pupils (Lenka, Matus, Lech, Ruta, Lenka, Sarah, Mollie). For these indigenous parents, the Polish parents in the playground:

> ```
> They stick together and don't try to get involved with
> the other parents.  The English parents tried, but they
> weren't interested.
> ```
>
> (Annie, grandparent, west Hull, 64)

---

[68] A8 migrants were permitted free movement with access to similar social rights as UK citizens. "For these reasons, post–accession Polish migrants have far greater agency than migrants in many other contexts, and have greater protections against the broader structural inequalities which govern migration practices in many non-EU contexts (Heath *et al*; 2011: 2.2).

Here, then, because the indigenous audience is not the intended "relevant audience" (Finch, 2007: 67) for these Polish parents, they do not engage in the required display of inter-cultural "`playground chat`" (Sarah, Beth). Consequently, the wider community are the unintended audience and perceive the Polish, as a group, as self-isolating (Beth, Hillary, Annie). Beth, for example, interprets this Polish lack of interest in the indigenous audience as "`arrogant and aloof`", whilst Daryl states that:

> `I don't think they're [Polish] really that bothered [what`
> `British people think] they seem to, like, stick together.`
>
> (Daryl, parent, central west, 36)

The role of audience is significant, here, as, according to Garner (2013), "white" migrants are less physically visible in the local community than families of colour. As such, this is a further reason that white European families have more agency to display family successfully and are less likely to be "othered" (Chambers, 2001). Despite this, Polish families *are* conspicuous to indigenous audiences, because their "family displays" prioritise the HAN audience which is, then, interpreted as an unwillingness to conform to white British expectations of "'normal', 'proper' and 'good families'" (Heaphy, 2011: 21). Daryl, for example, refers to Polish people on his street "`drinking cans [of`
`beer] pushing their prams in the morning. No-one can think`
`that's alright`" (parent, central, 36), whilst Beth describes her Polish neighbours as "`boisterous`" and explains that "`the families have fairly large`
`arguments in the street or fight`" (parent, central, 55). Ironically, then, these migrants that are less visible, owing to their appearance, do not support this with "family displays", precisely because they are not *other* in EU terms.

Indigenous audience participants do, however, "require displays" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 156) from this EU community. Grounded in the media representation that EU migrants are in the UK, "`taking benefits`" (Hillary, grandparents, west, 63) and, as Daryl's workmates think, "`coming over here, not working, getting`
`benefits`" (Daryl, parent, cenrral, 36), there is a sense that the 'Polish' *ought* to desire legitimacy from the host audiences. Their assertive unwillingness to do so, fuses with these anti-EU migrant discourses (chapter four) and the result is conflict and

"`community tensions`" (Donna, community cohesion officer; Grace, community participation specialist).

Consequently, participants from Eastern European communities are only successful in promoting connectivity via display within one-on-one cross-cultural relationships (Lenka, Ivana, Sylwia, Magda and Beth). By contrast, within the broader community, Daryl reports that:

> `It used to be the Kurds that were blamed for everything`
> `– broken windows and dog muck on the pavement – blame`
> `the Kurds, but people that I'm around seem to be blaming`
> `the Polish for everything at the minute.`

(Daryl, father, central west, 36)

Here, then, as has occurred historically with other migrant group, a number of participants (Donna, Grace, Daryl) feel that the Polish have become the new migrant scapegoats (Solomos, 2003; Greenslade, 2005; Robinson, 2010). This is so much so that migrant families have experienced racist attacks on their homes and Sylwia reports that when neighbours "`found out we are from Poland […] we had stones and eggs thrown at the window, but it's alright now`" (Sylwia, parent, Polish economic migrant).

When the Majority Audience is White, British and Christian

Indigenous audience accounts are also influenced by the Western political and media representation of Islam as "problem", "suspect" and "dangerous" (Allen, 2007; Pantazi & Pemberton, 2009). Audience perceptions of "proper" families (Heaphy, 2011: 21) are further affected by the political promotion of legitimate *Britishness* as being white, Anglo, English-speaking and Christian (Chambers, 2001; Kundnani, 2007, Cameron, 2011a; BBC News, 2013a). For the Muslim families interviewed, however, their Islamic faith significantly shapes *their* perception of "proper" family (Nawa, Momo, Naz, Ella, Hiwa and Sana, Saman) and the Imam interviewed reports that sixty children a day attend the mosque school to "`learn about Islam and how Muslims should behave`". As such, these families engage in public and, therefore, visible migrant "family displays" in order to achieve familial legitimacy with both the HAN and the

broader British Islamic community including: celebrating Eid privately with members of their HANs and at the local mosque; for the men of the families, weekly attendance at the local mosque for Friday prayers (Zack and Momo) and for two of the three women, wearing a hijab in public (Sana and Ella). Sana, however, does so as this display is *required* (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 156) by the Hull based Kurdish HAN, if her family is to "belong" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011). Similarly, Nawa only wears the hijab when attending celebrations with the Hull based Bengali community, who are, again, both migrant and British-born.   According to the Imam, then, attendance at Friday prayers and celebrating Eid with other Muslims does result in successful migrant "family display" for those that observe Islam.   Indeed, the Imam reports that his congregation has:

```
Doubled in the last ten years because of migrants coming
to Hull.  We were mainly Bengali, but there's Turkish,
Indian, Iranian, Malaysian, Iraqi.
```

(Imam, Local Hull Mosque)

As a result of engaging in these activities, these populations have been "`welcomed at the mosque`" (Imam).

The Islamic community in Hull is, then, both migrant and British-born. Despite this, it is only indigenous audience participants that have international heritage, via birth or marriage that explicitly recognise this (Imam, Grace, Helen, Beth). Bruce and Yvonne, also of dual heritage (African American and African Indian, respectively), do not acknowledge this and reject displays of Islam and, thus, "family displays" located within the faith. Bruce, for example states: "`I couldn't bring England to an Islamic country`" (Bruce, north, 43), whilst Yvonne angrily asks "`why do we need mosques?`". Furthermore, Dave, a resident of east Hull, feels that with Islam, "`a lot of people have been indoctrinated about religion, so that would stop them integrating`" (Dave, north, 57). Here, as Kundnani argues, these audience participants place Asian and, here, Islamic communities, both British-born and migrant, outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007).

Within this anti-Islamic, pro-assimilationist climate (Sharma, 2008; Finney & Simpson, 2009) it is, then, difficult for migrants whose familial behaviours are shaped by cultural and Islamic norms to display successfully to both Islamic and indigenous white British audiences. Despite this, participant families do *not* indicate that they intentionally "omit" "family displays" in order to avoid negative attention, that is, unsuccessful displays (Gabb, 2011: 43). Attendance at Friday prayers and celebrating Eid are, however, fairly private and take place in environments with only the intended indigenous audience present. As such, it is only audience participants with direct, professional contact with Muslim communities that refer to these Islamic "family displays" (Brenda, Imam, Grace, Sarah). Field diary notes, taken whilst observing men arriving at a local mosque in the central west of the city, support this:

It's Friday lunch and Amos and I are having a picnic in a corner of the park, close to the mosque. There is no call to prayer here,[69] and the mosque is in a secluded part of the park. As prayer time approaches, men come from all directions, some in traditional Shalwar Kameez, many in jeans or suits. They go inside, but after prayers, they congregate briefly at the front of the mosque, shake hands and bow a little. The ritual is peaceful, quite, passes quickly and is almost unnoticed in the community.

(field diary, June 14th, 2013)

Notes made at Eid Mubarak whilst walking along Park Grove, a street known by audience members as "Asian" (Mollie, Mark, Annie, Helen, Sharon, Sue), also show these displays to be low key in terms of the wider indigenous audience:

Whilst walking down Park Grove, I notice just two sets of visible Eid decorations – archways of colourful nets adoring front gates, decorated with fairy lights and silk flowers. There are also groups of people that I assume are Islamic, walking about in what seems to be particularly smart, traditional dress. Of course, I wonder if these things are only visible to me, because I am looking for

---

[69] Many mosques make a public announcement, five times a day, reminding the congregation that it is time to pray. This is often projected by a loud speaker into the community (beliefnet, n.d).

them and I suspect they're not so obvious to others that do not pass down this one,

but long, street.

<div align="right">

(field diary , 28th August, 2013)

</div>

In contrast to these low profile Islamic/migrant "family displays", the wearing of the hijab by Islamic women is, however, publicly visible and does receive attention in indigenous audience accounts, irrespective of their area of residence (Annie, Dave, Bruce, Arthur, Kayleigh, Danny, Mollie, Yvonne, Toni, Sharon, Sue, Beth). For Islamic migrant families in the research, wearing the veil is a familial display (Ella, Naz, Sana, Hiwa, Nawa and Momo). Indeed, for the scholar, Werbner, the wearing of the hijab within Islam is, "perceived as an external symbol of female modesty and familial honour" (Werbner, 2007). As such, for these families, the hijab is a "tool" of "family display" intended to achieve both "legitimacy" (Heaphy, 2011) and a sense of "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to wider Islamic networks.

Despite this, when indigenous participants recognise the wearing of the veil as familial (Ruby, 2006) they do not necessarily accept this as a "legitimate" display (Heaphy, 2011). For Beth, a woman that has lived in an Islamic country, the wearing of the hijab conflicts with her own ontological beliefs:

```
I'm not saying that they should be forced by the State
to remove them, but, personally, I don't think it's
individual choice I think it's cultural oppression.
```
<div align="right">

(Beth, parent, central west, 55)

</div>

This is similar for both Sharon and Sue and, for Kayleigh, this is unrecognisable as a positive aspect of family:

```
Why would you want to cover yourself up?  If you had a
partner, why would you want to cover a partner up? I'd
be like, 'well, you can fuck off'.
```
<div align="right">

(Kayleigh, parent, east Hull, 20)

</div>

For these indigenous, white British participants, their interpretation of the veil does not equate with their concept of a family that "works" (Finch, 2007: 70).

Although there is a broader discussion, here, relating to the role of gender in family within different cultures (Becher, 2008; Al-Jayyousi *et al.,* 2014), this is not the focus of this thesis. Instead, for the purposes of this study it is significant that the wearing of a headscarf, as a tool of Islamic/migrant "family display", is rejected as such and these families are de-legitimised by audience participants because, as Roth argues:

> Certain relationships can be considered by observers to be so far from their preconceived notions about family life that they might refuse to recognise certain acts as constituting displaying of the family, regardless of the intention of actors.
>
> (Roth, 2011: 30)

This is, however, located in broader discourses. Media and political representations in the UK (BBC News Europe, 2014) and other European countries (Aslam, 2012), present the wearing of the headscarf as negative and, for Werbner, this practice has become, "symbolically loaded with new connotations and to stand diacritically for wider religious and national symbols within the context of migration" (Werbner, 2007). Indeed, Arthur, for example, feels that the "`veil`" makes women "`strangers in a foreign land`" (Arthur, central west, 70), whilst Yvonne is more assertive in her opinions: "`You've got them with bloody veils on. They're under our roof, right, so they should go by our rules`" (Yvonne, east, 45). For these and other members of the indigenous audience, the wearing of the hijab is rejected as a familial display (Mollie, Billie, Kayleigh, Toni, Bruce, Yvonne, Beth, Annie, Arthur), because they do not perceive the wearers to be *British* (Kundnani, 2007).

For others, however, the veil is a symbol of the "dangerous" *other* (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009). Pervez, for example, argues that "people who fear Islam or who have certain misconceptions of Islam identify negatively with the hijab. They see it as an oppressive garment – one that represents hate and terror" (Pervez, 2013). As the soldier Lee Rigby was murdered by two British-born Muslims during the field work period, Islamophobia was heightened (Bruce, Arthur). Indeed, for the community cohesion police officer, this event did "`inflame things`" and Hull's Muslim community felt "`vulnerable`". Although the perpetrators of this crime, as men, did not wear the veil, for Islamic women this "required" display (by their faith and/or their HAN) symbolically

linked them to the narrative of Islam as "dangerous" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009) and, thereby, made them feel more vulnerable. Ella, for example, explains how she felt at this time:

```
They don't know with Zack [that he's Muslim], but because
I'm wearing scarf, when they see scarf they think of
Muslim and they think the bad stuff, so I think our
family's misunderstood.
```

                                        (Ella, mother, Malaysian international student)

Here, then, Islamic migrant families and, more specifically, Islamic migrant women, have curtailed agency in terms of displaying in line with the requirements of Hull's indigenous audience. Further, these gendered familial displays are not only misunderstood (Gabb, 2011), but, this misunderstanding can come at a high "cost" (Almack, 2011) to these migrant women and their families, as the veil can become the focus of negative, local attention. By drawing on a combination of prevalent discourses, a number of participants indicate that Hull's predominantly non-Islamic population (Migration Yorkshire, 2014a) observe this gendered "family display" and construct an alternative meaning. Consequently, the white, British indigenous response to these "family displays", for which they are not the intended audience, results in cultural division.

Conclusion

The purpose of this chapter is twofold. On one level, the data presented responds to those aspects of the research question concerned with the general role of the "audience" in family display. Furthermore, this chapter also presents analyses with a view to understanding how a specific context can influence audience responses to "family display". Overall, findings contribute to a broader discussion relating to the role of "family display" in promoting community connectivity and cohesion, which is discussed in detail in chapter ten.

Building on chapters seven and eight, the research data reveals that migrant families living in Hull do recognise a number of audiences of display as "relevant" (Finch, 2007: 67) and that these separate audiences do sometimes "require" conflicting displays (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159). Here, however, the main focus is the response of

indigenous audience participants. As stated in chapter eight, migrant families display family locally in order to: "belong" (Levitt & Glick, Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to the HAN; to minimise their position as *other* (Chambers, 2001) as a migrant family; to achieve connectivity with indigenous local populations and to present as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) to State endorsed audiences. Data presented show that indigenous participant responses are, however, affected by a number of factors which, thereby, impact on the success of migrant "family displays" in achieving their desired outcomes.

On the whole, accounts show that, within this predominantly white British city, Migrant "family displays" *are* most successful with, or "privileged" (Heaphy, 2011) by, the indigenous audience when they mirror "Anglo-ethnic" norms (Chambers, 2011: 124). This includes those accounts of indigenous participants of dual cultural heritage and those that are themselves in relationships with immigrants. It is argued, here, that pro-assimilationist discourses, in media and policy, *do* influence indigenous "requirements" of and responses to migrant "family display" (Chambers, 2001; Heaphy, 2011; Mulvey, 2010). Participants that represent audiences with authority, such as the State (Roth, 2011; Dermott and Seymour, 2011), *explicitly* and consistently "require" migrant "family displays" that mirror "Anglo-ethnic" norms (Chambers, 2001: 124) and migrant families display accordingly for fear of sanction.

Beyond this State audience, pro-assimilationist, anti-immigration and Islamophobic narratives (chapter four) *do* influence the "meaning" that audiences "construct" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011) and attach to migrant "family displays". The level of influence is, however, dependent on a number of intersecting indigenous participant characteristics. When indigenous participants work in, or reside in the areas most populated by migrant families, they have an opportunity to observe migrant "family display". This is especially true of indigenous participants that have young children that they accompany to school or child-centred environments. Further, participants in this geographical area also report having, or having the opportunity to develop "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013), as they experience more exposure to diversity. Although displays are still "required" to be "Anglo-ethnic" (Chambers, 2001: 124) in nature, it is the responses of these indigenous participants that are the least affected by

the negative discourses discussed and with whom migrant "family displays" are the most successful in achieving positive cross-cultural connections.

When these multiple "enablers" are available to families, accounts indicate that migrant "family display" can be successful and result in connections and positive outcomes for community cohesion. In this context, male indigenous participants *do* engage in positive interaction with migrant family men; it is, however, indigenous women that report participating in recognisably cross-cultural periods of "intensity" (Finch, 2007) for migrant families. Here, indigenous responses to migrant "family displays" transcend difference and family *can* act as a "boundary object" (McSherry, 2001: 69). Furthermore, analysis also shows that State enforced displays can also result in connectivity between indigenous and migrant family children when they live in communities together, thereby, potentially impacting on longer term-cohesion (Offord, 2015).

It is, however, more complex than this, as factors such as age, gender, location and socio-economic circumstance also intersect to influence indigenous responses to display. The older indigenous participants (over sixty) living in central west areas of the city are, for example, more affected by these narratives than younger participants resident in the same geographical area. Further, it is participants experiencing socio-economic difficulties, living in communities where they have less opportunity to observe migrant families and gain "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013) with whom migrant "family displays" are the least successful. In these circumstances, displays are, instead, eclipsed by narratives of migrants as "bogus" (Cameron, 2011a) and "dangerous" (Patazis & Pemberton, 2009).

When migrant "family displays" are observed by multiple-audiences, "family display" can have further *adverse* consequences for community connectivity; that is, when indigenous participants are the 'unintended', or 'accidental' audience of migrant "family displays". When, for example, Kurdish communities engage in *family-like* displays in order to form a HAN, indigenous audiences do not recognise this as such. Instead, indigenous participants draw on discourses that both problematise asylum seekers

(Greenslade, 2005) and criminalise young Asian men (Webster, 1997; Kundnani, 2002; 2007) and, thereby, interpret these displays incorrectly. Similarly, within a pro-assimilationist "Anglo-ethnic" (Chambers, 2001: 214) approach to Britishness and, therefore, "proper" family (Heaphy, 2011), Islamic families cannot simultaneously display successfully to their HAN, indigenous white British populations and Islamic British communities. British indigenous participants (as is reflective of Hull's majority population) *can "*misinterpret" (Gabb, 2011) these displays and, instead, interpret Islamic familial displays via discourses that position Asians "outside of Britishness" (Kundnani, 2007) and Islam as "dangerous" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009).

The case of Eastern European migrants, however, highlights the strength of the displays "required" of migrant families. This population, as white and Christian, are more able to display successfully in line with the white Western typology (Chambers, 2001: 125) required by indigenous participants. In response to narratives that present Eastern Europeans as "*welfare tourists*" (Patel, 2013), benefitting from the UK, there is, however, a sense that the Polish *ought* to desire legitimacy from indigenous audiences. It is their *resisting* of display that, therefore, impacts negatively on community connectivity and, instead, results in conflict.

CHAPTER TEN: THE SIGNIFICANCE OF "FAMILY DISPLAY" IN HULL

This chapter now draws on the evidence presented in previous chapters so as to answer the research question with a focus on the issues raised in this data set. As the study is distinct in its intention to work with migrant families to explore the relevance of "family display", initial discussion concentrates on evaluating Finch's (2007) concept within this particular context. Analysis does, however, go beyond this evaluative approach and considers aspects of "family display", illuminated in the study, that have not previously been recognised and, further, the contribution this makes to existing knowledge (part one). As discussion progresses, attention is given to questions raised relating to the role of the audience in "family display": who are the "relevant audiences" (Finch, 2007: 67; Dermott & Seymour, 2011); do audiences require certain displays (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159); how do migrant families negotiate the requirements of multiple audiences (Seymour, 2011: 173; Lowson & Arber, 2014) and what influences audience interpretations of the "family displays" they observe (part two). The chapter concludes by considering the impact of family and "family display" on connectivity between communities in the city of Hull (part three). Final discussions draw on the research findings to develop and present policy recommendations that support the role of family in promoting positive connectivity (part four).

Part 1: Evaluating "Family Display" as a Concept

As an Activity of Contemporary Family

Analysis of participant accounts presented in chapters seven and eight provides evidence to support Finch's (2007) initial argument that "family display" *is* a feature of contemporary families and, in this context, migrant families living in Hull.   Further, although the impetus to display family differs between the transnational and local context, participants *are* driven to display family because they desire to be perceived as a family that "works" (Finch, 2007: 73) and that is, therefore, "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011; Norquist, 2010; Almack, 2011). When the focus is on transnational family, the reasons identified as to why "family display" matters, do, again, resonate with Finch's reasoning (Finch, 2007): family expands beyond the household and, here, national borders. Family relationships, therefore, need to be affirmed; family is fluid and, therefore, relationships need to be reconfigured when family members are

geographically separated as a consequence of migration (chapter seven). When the focus shifts to "family display" local to Hull, participant accounts emphasise that they display family as a strategy to minimise their position as *other*, to promote connectivity and to "belong" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to specific communities (chapter eight). Although grounded in Finch's framework, the evidence presented affirms assertions made by scholars of transnational family studies; for migrant families, as "their own agents of change" (Vertovec, 2004: 973), "family display" has a broader function than affirming intra-familial bonds and, here, assists in the construction of a migrant family's new identity. It is, as argued by Heath *et al*. (2011), a feature of "frontiering" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002).

"Triggers" that Initiate a "Shift in the Pace of Display"

Finch argues that display is not only relevant to family relationships that take on a non-conventional form, but it is also useful to think about display in terms of "degrees of intensity"; for her, all families experience "certain circumstances where the need for display becomes more intense, at least for the moment" (Finch, 2007: 72). This study does, then, as do other applications of the concept (Almack, 2011; Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Haldar & Engebretson; 2013), support Finch's assertion that families *do* experience periods when they feel a more "intense" need to display. Examples provided include when a migrant family arrives in the UK, or when a family member in another country dies (chapters seven & eight). In the same way that "mixed families" display at times when their "mixedness" is more salient (Haynes & Dermott, 2011), these families display at times when their status as "migrant" is more salient.

This study adds to Finch's initial concept as migrant families in the study also experience what is termed here, *"triggers for display"*, that is*,* circumstances that initiate a shift in both the pace and nature of "family display" beyond "the moment" of "intensity" (Finch, 2007: 72). In terms of transnational display, for example, the birth of a child in the family *is* reported as a period of "intensity". Beyond this "moment", however, the event prompts *ongoing* displays intended to develop and reconfigure transnational, intergenerational relationships (chapter seven). Further, although migration and the processes of transnational family making are not a new phenomenon (Bryceson 2002;

Bartram *et al.*, 2014) and migrant families are not, in and of themselves, unconventional (Finch, 2007), this is not the case in Hull. In the context of the reported anti-migration discourses (chapters four, eight & nine), arrival in a city with a predominantly white British population *"triggers"* migrant "family displays" that, again, persist beyond "the moment" (Finch, 2007: 72). Here, families sustain displays in order to avoid conflict, promote connectivity and minimise their position as non-conventional or "other" (Chambers, 2001).

Displays Morph into Practices: Practices Morph into Displays

The study also reveals significant findings relating to the relationship between Morgan's *"family practices"* (1996) and Finch's newer concept of "family display" (Finch, 2007). As discussed in chapter seven, the distinction between *a family practice* and *a family display* is sometimes subtle. Further, the evidence presented, here, contributes to literature in the field, by showing that familial activities can also exist along a continuum, whereby a display can *morph* into a practice, and vice versa.   The location on the continuum shifts, depending on the "intensity" (Finch, 2007) of, "signals" to (Haynes & Dermott, 2011) or "triggers" of display experienced by the particular family. When a migrant family is new to Hull and experiencing a period of "intensity" (Finch, 2007), for example, a phone call to a parent, usually a *practice*, *morphs* into a transnational display to show that this transnational family "works" (chapter seven). Migrant *family displays*, can, however, also *morph* into *family practices*. Family young, for example, are so familiar with *family displays* via the use of Skype (chapter seven) that, for them, this is simply, "part of the taken for granted existence of the practitioner" (Morgan, 1996: 186). Over time, these children know this international communication as their 'norm' and accept this as an alternative, transnational mode of expressing the familial and *doing family* (Morgan, 1996).

Beyond "Tools": "Enablers of Display"

Participants in the study also confirm that families *do* support and reinforce their displays with "tools of display" (Finch, 2007; Rees *et al.*, 2010; Doucet, 2011; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Almack, 2011; Sirriyeh, 2013; Reynolds & Zontini, 2014).   Noted additions to this "potentially rich seam" (Finch, 2007: 77) include: the transnational

sending and receiving of gifts, photographs and videos (chapter seven); selective use of the home area and host language; engaging in cultural and faith based festivals and the adoption of Anglo child-based "family practices" (chapter eight).

Interrogation of migrant family accounts reveals that "family displays" are also supported and reinforced by previously unidentified features that are referred to here as "enablers of display"; the channels that allow migrant families to show selected elements of their family life to particular audiences, be this transnational, indigenous or the HAN. Examples of "enablers" include: technology, such as email, Skype, Facebook, telephones; transnational visits to spend time with family members (chapter seven); competency in the language of the local audience; the presence of family young and access to the local labour market (chapter eight).

Although less dominant in analysis, this study also reveals that families can, conversely, be subject to "forcers of display"; circumstances whereby display is demanded and failure to display successfully can come at a high cost. In this study, the presence of children, for example, *is* an "enabler", but also a "forcer of display" when in the presence of the, sometimes unavoidable, State audience.

Access to "Enablers of Display": The Impact on a Family's Agency to Display Successfully
The study is also unique in illuminating that the presence of "enablers", and access to them, impact on a family's ability to display successfully. This is not necessarily because families cannot display in line with dominant familial discourses, as suggested in applications of "family display" (Gabb, 2008; Nordquist, 2010; Kehily & Thomson, 2011; Carver, 2014). Instead, it is because their opportunity to display is either optimised by these "enablers" or restricted by the lack of them (chapters seven & eight). Access to "enablers" is, however, affected by number of external factors. For *all* migrant families in the study, being able to speak the English language is an important *enabler* of local displays. Since 2010, however, government funding for ESOL classes has been reduced

and has, therefore, limited their access to these courses [70] and, consequently, their access to this "enabler".

Furthermore, as argued by Heath *et al.*, migrants have different levels of agency dependent on their movement to and residence in the UK (Heath *et al.,* 2012: 2.2). The ability to travel transnationally in order to *enable* display, for example, is impacted on by the cost and time commitment associated with international travel. In addition to this, those in the UK as a consequence of seeking refuge and asylum may not be able to travel because of the danger this poses to their family (chapter seven). Further, visa restrictions also dictate a person's ability to access the UK labour market as an "enabler of display"; asylum seekers, for example, are "almost always unable to work" (The Refugee Council, 2015b). As discussed in chapters seven and eight, it is those migrant families with access to multiple "enablers" that are better positioned to "display" locally *and* transnationally. EU migrants, for example, are automatically able to access the labour market in the UK and can travel freely and relatively cheaply between the UK and their COO. This builds on scholarly arguments that family discourses and, therefore, displays privilege those family forms that are closer to the dominant societal ideal of family (Heaphy, 2011; Chambers, 2001; Chambers, 2012). Not only is this the case for EU families, because they are white and Christian, but their migration status also affords them more access to "enablers" and, thereby, increased opportunity to be "recognised and legitimated as family" (Heaphy, 2011: 30).

Rejecting the Norm: "Resistance to Display"

Critiques of "family display" argue that the original article focuses on the positive elements of family, when it is also important "to be mindful of what is happening at the edges and behind the scenes of the narrative of display" (Gabb, 2011: 39). This study does so and, as a result, findings highlight the role of what is referred to, here, as *"resistance"* in "family display".

---

[70] Although migrant families in the UK can access ESOL classes, accessing funding for these courses is complex. Migrants that are *able* to claim certain benefits and are, then, also *eligible* for certain benefits, can access courses free of charge. In the academic year 2014/2015, those who could not, were required to pay around £660 to attend a part time course and sit a final exam. For many, this is prohibitive (Skills Funding Agency, 2014).

Analysis shows, for example, that European migrant families are more able to display in line with Anglo–centred norms than migrant families that are not Christian, or those with visible signifiers of *other* (Chambers, 2001), such as skin colour and cultural dress. Despite this, white Eastern European families in Hull *are* visible in the communities they live in, precisely because they resist assimilation, instead assertively displaying characteristics that signify their position as migrant and *other* (chapter nine). This appears to be grounded in two factors. Firstly, A8 migrants "have greater protections against the broader structural inequalities that govern migration practices in many non-EU contexts" (Heath *et al*., 2011: 2.2). At the time of the fieldwork, for example, A8 migrants were permitted free movement, had similar social rights to UK citizens (*ibid*: 2.3), were in the UK of their own free will and were also supported by a relatively large HAN. Secondly, as EU citizens, the terms of their home land's accession, meant that they were entitled to reside in the UK (chapter two). For these families, the cost of not "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to indigenous communities is limited and there is less incentive to display successfully in order to be accepted by indigenous audiences. As such, they are more able to use "family display" as one site where they can publicly "resist" the discourses associated with assimilation to white British norms (Kundnani, 2007; Sharma, 2008; Finney & Simpson, 2009). This study highlights that "family display" has a much wider function than affirmation of positive relationships. Instead, when a migrant family's economic and social safety is less dependent on acceptance, "family display" can be employed as a "tool" to both reject and challenge audience display "requirements" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011).

Part 2: The Role of Audience in "Family Display"

<u>Relevant Audiences</u>

This section now turns to an area that has not previously been fully interrogated in relation to "family display". As highlighted previously, scholars identify the role of audience in "family display" as a gap in literature and, thereby, an area that requires exploration (Dorrer *et al.,* 2010a; Roth, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Finch, 2011). Here, data is discussed that contributes knowledge by making conclusions concerning the impact of audience on "family displays".

Discussion first focuses on a key contention: who constitutes the "relevant audiences" (Finch, 2007: 67) of "family display"? For Finch, the primary role of "family display" is to convey meaning to those within the family and any relationships beyond this should be analysed using different theoretical approaches (Finch, 2011: 204). Others, however, argue that audiences external to the family are also "relevant" (Dorrer *et al.,* 2010; Roth, 2011; Almack, 2008; Kehiley & Thomson, 2011; Haynes & Dermott, 2011; Seymour, 2011; Carver, 2014; Lowson & Arber, 2014). The prevalence of reported "family displays" intended for transnational family members, and the consequential chapter dedicated to the area, provides strong evidence that the immediate family *is* a "relevant audience" (chapter seven). The findings presented in both chapters eight and nine expand Finch's concept by providing myriad evidence to illuminate the significance of audiences *external* to the family. In the context of migration, the "relevant audiences" (Finch, 2007: 67) of migrant "family display" include: the HAN; indigenous members of the local faith community; indigenous audiences that are geographically co-located; work colleagues and "abstract participants such as the State" (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17). As suggested by Dermott and Seymour, these families *are* subjected to the gaze of multiple audiences that are not "restricted to family members" (*ibid*) (chapter nine).

In addition to this, the study indicates that these multiple audiences may be "relevant" in two distinct ways. As Seymour asserts, families might be displaying at "sites where it [display] can be read as having multiple meanings depending upon the relevant others who make up the audience" (Seymour, 2011: 173). As such, an audience may be "relevant" (Finch, 2007), because they are the intended audience and the migrant family desires their recognition as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011) (chapter seven & eight). An audience may, however, not be the intended audience of display, but they are also "relevant" in that they respond to these displays. They are *accidental* audiences (chapter nine). This study contributes new insights by highlighting the issues that can arise when this occurs, an area that is given more attention later in this chapter.

<u>Audiences Requiring Overt Displays</u>

Furthermore, the evidence affirms that audiences are influential as they can "inadvertently require" specific familial displays "that would not otherwise take place" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011: 159) and, as a result, they can shape "family display". What is significant, here, is that analysis also shows that in the context of migration, audiences can be *overt* in their "requirements". As a consequence, migrant families can feel compelled to display by these external pressures. Transnational family members, for example, expect geographically separate family members to provide emotional support to prove the continued "high quality" (Finch 2007) of their relationships (chapter seven). Further, members of HAN *expect* displays that families might not usually engage in; members of the Polish community *expect* other Poles to buy their food from Polish shops (chapter nine) if they are to display their "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004, May, 2011) and, thereby, receive the support of their frontier networks (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002). The expectations of these two particular audiences are, however, revealed via migrant family accounts (chapters seven & eight), not by members of the audience themselves and it is, therefore, difficult to know what influences impact on the formation of these requirements.

<u>Indigenous Audience Requirements</u>

By uniquely focusing specifically on the accounts of thirty indigenous audience members, the study is able to un-pick the factors that influence audience requirements of, and responses to, migrant "family display". Analysis shows, then, that in the context of Hull, the display requirements imposed by this audience *are* dependent on the combined effect of number of complex identity characteristics. In this sample, influences include: age; cultural heritage; professional frameworks; the presence of children in the family; levels of deprivation; social capital; "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013) and exposure to migrant communities via residence and work. Analysis, therefore, draws on paradigms of intersectionality and acknowledges that the impact of these identity characteristics can be difficult to separate (McCall, 2005). Some broad distinctions and influences can, however, be identified and, thereby, inform conclusions.

The majority of indigenous participants that have direct contact with migrant families via family young, have more "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013) and also live in the less deprived areas of the city (chapter two), *are* positive about cultural diversity and the culturally located "family displays" they observe (chapter nine). Nevertheless, the evidence presented in chapter eight, shows that these indigenous audiences do not escape the influence of dominant narratives and they still interpret "family display" through the lens of the Western familial discourses (Chambers, 2001). As such, they do inadvertently and perhaps, unconsciously, require migrant families to engage in displays that are, in essence, grounded in recognisably majority "Anglo-ethnic" behaviours (Chambers, 2001) (chapter nine); migrant "family displays" are most successful in achieving connectivity when they are, "more or less readily recognised and validated" (Heaphy, 2011: 21) as white British familial norms. These requirements are, however, subtle and migrant family failure to meet these expectations limits connectivity between communities, but does not result in conflict.

For those indigenous participants that have less contact with migrant groups, some of whom also live in the more deprived areas of the city, or are over the age of sixty (chapter two & nine), the study reveals their display *requirements* to be more explicit. For them, Western typologies of family (Chamber, 2001) have fused with narratives that present Britishness as white, Christian and English speaking (Sharma, 2008; Finney & Simpson, 2009).   As such, they *require* migrant families to overtly reflect their assimilation in their displays. Some focus on the requirement for *all* migrant families to speak English in public, whilst, for others, their requirements are grounded in anti-Islamic discourses (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009; Mohood, 2011) and the rejection of Asian Identities as British (Kundnani, 2007). For these indigenous populations, migrant family failure to comply with their display *requirements*, can result in culturally specific displays being rejected (Almack, 2011: 109) and, thus, migrant families can be perceived as ones that do not "work". For a small number of the indigenous audience, the result can be anger towards particular migrant groups and occasionally, the outcome is confrontation between communities.

It is the display *requirements* of the UK State that are particularly influential in shaping migrant family behaviours. As with other indigenous audiences, the State *requires* migrant "family displays" grounded within Anglo-centred policies (Dermott & Pomati, 2015), imbued with "societal expectation of what is normal and how to behave" (Chambers, 2001: 26). These *requirements* are unique, however, in that they are supported by legislation, can be enforced by the use of sanctions and they are promoted by a number of agencies. As a consequence, the gaze of the State audience is threatening and ubiquitous (chapter nine) and migrant families, like indigenous working class families (Cannan, 1992; Jagger & Wright, 1999), feel surveilled by the State. Here, then, the study reveals that the presence of family children both "enables", but also "forces" particular displays (chapter eight & nine).

Overall, the evidence reveals that migrant families are expected to meet the display requirements of a number of audiences. Further, the study also supports Heaphy's assertion that, when families are perceived as "unconventional" (Finch, 2007), as migrant families are by this predominantly white British population, they are required to "display" more than their *conventional* peers (Heaphy, 2011).

Building on this, critics also argue that the concept of family display privileges more conventional family structures and, thus, upholds family as a homonormative construct (Nordquist, 2010; Short, 2011; Heaphy, 2011). This study both supports and develops this critique; the requirements of indigenous audience members *do* define acceptable norms for migrant families, but, although these norms *are* imbued with heteronormativity, in this context, it is also *culturally* located familial norms that are being reified. Here, then, as asserted by Mulvey, the study shows that media and policy representations of migration, Britishness and Islam, do influence public opinion (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010). This, in turn, also impacts on the dominant expectations of ideal family. Although the extent to which these influences permeate opinion is dependent on the intersections discussed previously, in general, it is Anglo based norms that are privileged. Conclusions, here, resonate with arguments made by Chambers in that political and cultural narratives can *other* certain family forms (Chambers, 2001; Chambers, 2012). Here, it is those families that are unable to embrace

white Christian familial norms that are "othered" and, thereby, disadvantaged in their displays.

Negotiating the Display Requirements of Multiple Audiences

This study evidences, then, that migrant "family displays" *are* observed by multiple audiences (Seymour, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011; Lowson & Arber, 2014) and each audience does "require" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011) families to display in ways that they perceive to be "legitimate" (Finch, 2007). Further, migrant families consistently express a need to display successfully to multiple audiences, because, as Heaphy argues:

> There is a powerful incentive to claim recognition as family because of the access it affords to full relational citizenship [and] […] those relationships that fail to display 'normal' family characteristics are likely to be constructed as second class families or as 'other' to family.
>
> (Heaphy, 2011: 33)

Display *requirements* can, however, be culturally located (Kristie & Buckham, 2011; Kim, 2011; Carver, 2014), influenced by exposure to political narratives and affected by the intersectionality of audience characteristics. This study further illuminates the difficulties faced by families when negotiating the complexities of these diverse audience requirements and the strategies they adopt in order to do so. When audiences of display can be separated, for example, migrant families are able to adopt strategies to construct displays that meet the requirements of particular audiences. Participants report, for example, omitting information from transnational communication (chapter seven), or adopting Anglo behaviours in public spaces when indigenous participants are present (chapter eight). That said, this strategy is not always effective, because displays are sometimes required in public spaces where multiple audiences are present (Seymour, 2011: 173). The study reveals that when subjected to the gaze of multiple audiences, families evaluate their needs and make choices concerning the audience whose requirements they prioritise meeting (chapter nine).

<u>Creating a Hierarchy of Audiences</u>

It is argued here, then, that migrant families create an audience hierarchy and,

> consciously and unconsciously choose the extent to which they interact socially with people in the host society and the extent to which they engage in acts with fellow immigrants.
>
> (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 21)

Analysis shows that the immediate family is not the only audience of display (Finch, 2007) and the study further indicates that the co-resident and transnational family are at the top of this hierarchy. Looking outwards from the immediate family, however, migrant families then prioritise the display requirements of the audience that meets their family's survival needs, be this in terms of practical support, provision of familial security or avoidance of conflict and unwanted attention (chapter seven, eight & nine). A*ll* migrant families *are* mindful of the power of the State and recognise the high cost of not displaying successfully to this audience (chapter nine). As a result, the State is given high priority and families have been shown to adopt a number of strategies in order to avoid the gaze of, or to meet the requirements of, this audience. Here, the incentive to display successfully is not only about avoiding "the pain" of unsuccessful display (Almack, 2011: 109), but familial survival.

Beyond this, audiences are then prioritised based on familial need; during the initial stages of their stay in the UK, where possible, migrant families *do* prioritise displays to their HANs. This is because "belonging" to the HAN provides their family with practical and emotional support during this uncertain, but "intense" (Finch, 2007) stage of their migration story. This links with Bryceson and Vuorella's assertion that when migrant families have "migrated relatively recently", they develop their frontier networks based on the provision of "vital mutual support for the realization of family and individual welfare" (2002: 19).

For some participants, then, this audience is only prioritised when they initially arrive in the UK. For those that do not intend to stay in the UK - students and some economic migrants - there is little incentive to prioritise and be "legitimated" (Heaphy, 2011: 32)

by indigenous audiences, because the HAN can meet their short term needs. To add to this, the influence of culturally imposed norms and dominant narratives means it is also easier for *all* migrant families to meet the display requirements of their HANs, than those of indigenous audiences. For this group of migrants, then, it is logical that this audience continues to be their priority choice.

Migrant families that have chosen to, or have been given permission to stay in the UK, are more likely to give equal, or more priority, to the display requirements of indigenous audiences, particularly when a return home would be a threat to the welfare, or physical survival of their family: a dual heritage family in the study feel that their "mixed" Kurdish and white British family would be unable to meet the display requirements of the transnational family and, thus, fail to survive as a familial unit in Kurdistan; single parent families of EU origin report that they would have to return to unhappy or abusive relationships without the support of the "in work" welfare benefits they receive from the UK government [71] and the family that are seeking asylum fear that their lives would be at risk in Nigeria. Clearly, for these families, there is a strong incentive to stay in the UK and, thus, they prioritise and invest in displaying successfully to indigenous communities (chapter eight).   This is so much so, that some participant families avoid the gaze of their HANs, or assertively focus their displays in the direction of the white, indigenous or State audience.

The case of EU migrants is, however, more nuanced, because, as a general population, they are reported to both prioritise the HAN and *resist* displaying to the indigenous audience. This would seem to be a display choice influenced by a number of factors beyond their stay in the UK being temporary. EU migrants are also protected by their status as EU citizens and, thus, have more agency than other migrant populations (Heath *et al*., 2002) to be assertive in response to the anti-migration narratives. Although McGhee *et al.* (2014) assert that UK based Polish communities are not homogenous, the "mass" nature of their "settlement" (Bryceson & Vuroella, 2002: 19) *does* afford them

---

[71] At the time of the field work, EU migrants living in the UK had access to the same welfare benefits as UK citizens. Consequently, working single parents in the study, on low incomes, were able to apply for, and receive child tax credit. In addition to this, single parents were also able to apply for financial help with childcare costs in order to allow them to access the labour market (Gov.UK, 2015b).

the assurance that their familial needs will be met, within a community where their displays can be successful. As a consequence, many EU families continue to focus on meeting the requirements of their HAN beyond their initial stage of settlement and, indeed, *resist* displaying successfully (Almack, 2011) to indigenous audiences.

The display choices made by these EU families also resonate with those made by Islamic migrants in the study. Although Islamic families are not imbued with the agency and social protection experienced by EU migrants, they do have the security of a strong, Hull based audience with whom they share ontological norms.   Further, anti-Islamic narratives place both British Islamic and migrant Islamic populations outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007; Sharma, 2008; Finney & Simpson, 2009) and families from this heritage struggle to display successfully and connect with white indigenous communities. Consequently, these migrant families prioritise the HANs and indigenous Islamic audiences with whom they are most likely to achieve success and be rewarded with "validation" (Heaphy, 2011: 32).

"Layers of Othering" and the Ability of Migrant Groups to Display Successfully

Migrant families in the study do, then, adopt a number of strategies to negotiate multiple audience requirements. Despite this, it is argued, here, that families experience this differently, dependent on how compatible indigenous audience requirements are with those of their COO. Migrant groups that are white and Christian, for example, are closer to this Anglo ideal of "normal" family and are more likely to be "legitimised" in the UK (Heaphy, 2011). Despite *resisting* display as a community (chapter nine), Eastern European families in the study are still the most successful in achieving meaningful connections with indigenous families whilst still maintaining links with their HANs and transnational families (chapter seven & eight).

Despite this, *all* migrant families in the city *are* subjected to varying "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al*, 2015), because, as scholars argue, anti-immigration discourses can result in *all* migrants being perceived as problematic (Greenslade, 2005; Spencer, 2007; Robinson, 2010). As a result, despite Eastern European families being able to mirror Anglo-ethnic norms, indigenous audiences are

substantially influenced by political narratives focused at Eastern European migrants as "*benefit tourists*" (Perkins, 2013) and illegitimate competitors in an uncertain marketplace. For a number of indigenous participants living amongst Polish families, the EU populations remain the "other".

It is argued here, however, that it is migrant families that are not Christian or white and who are also the subject of negative political and media discourses, that experience the *most* "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al.,* 2015). Some Islamic audiences *require* women to wear a veil in public as a familial display. Although this display allows these families to show "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) to their HANs and British Islamic audiences, this clashes with the assimilationist tone of the displays required by British Christian audiences. For some indigenous audiences, then, these Islamic "family displays" are not accepted as characteristics of a family that "works" (Finch, 2007), because they are not located within the Anglo requirements of "normal" family (Heaphy, 2011: 33).

For other indigenous participants, however, even when Asian migrant families adhere to indigenous display *requirements,* these are eclipsed by narratives that place Asian families outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007) and frame Islamic "family displays" as "dangerous" (Pantazis & Pemberton, 2009). These multiple layers are particularly influential when indigenous participants have minimal exposure to diversity and they, themselves, are living in difficult economic and social situations. For these participants, displays are rarely examined as such, and migrant families are unlikely to achieve legitimacy with this section of the indigenous audience. Here, it is difficult for migrant families to meet the display requirements of multiple audiences, separated or not, and they report little success in achieving connectivity with local white British families.

Part 3: "Family Display" and its Role in Community Cohesion

Promotion of Community Connectivity and Community Cohesion

The third element of the research question is concerned with the influence of "family display" on community cohesion in the city of Hull. Here, discussion will give specific attention to this aspect of the study, initially focusing on areas where "family display"

can, and does contribute to positive cohesion, both in the short and long term. As argued previously, dominant discourses of *family* can shape "family display", influence audience responses to display and also reify Western familial norms in discourse (Heaphy, 2011). Discussion here, highlights areas of the study where "family display", as a consequence, does not assist connectivity, but, at times, affirms difference and impedes community cohesion. It is further argued, however, that discourses can be challenged (Foucault, 1978; Chambers, 2001) and that migrant "family display" can, albeit gradually, contribute to this (James & Curtis, 2010; Heath *et al., 2011*; Seymour, 2014), leading to a cross-cultural acceptance of differing familial norms and, ultimately, positive connectivity between communities.

It is important, then, to frame *cohesion* within the context of this thesis; the definition of *cohesion* used here is concerned with the development of "good community relations" (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 4). This rejects the previously discussed pro-assimilationist discourses of both the current and previous UK governments (Sharma, 2008; Shain, 2013; BBC News, 2014) and, instead, refers to the processes that would result in a concept,

> of citizenship that is based not on an uncritical annunciation of the dominant white culture, … [but] one based on the multicultural nature of UK society, that reflects the contribution to it of a diverse range of communities and ethnicities over the past 1000 years.
>
> (Wilkinson, 2011)

Drawing on the findings presented in chapters eight and nine and discussion presented in this chapter, the following section focuses on the contribution "family display" can make in achieving this culturally inclusive approach to "cohesion".

<u>When "Family Display" Assists Connectivity and Community Cohesion</u>

The evidence presented, then, reveals that migrant families *do* engage in local "family display" for reasons that can promote cohesion and "good community relations" (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 4): to avoid conflict; to promote connectivity; to minimise their position as *other* (chapter eight) and in order to "belong" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011)

to the indigenous community. When "enabler*s* of display" are multiple, that is, family young are present, migrant families can speak English and indigenous participants live in the area of the city most populated by migrant families, displays can be successful in achieving these outcomes (chapter eight).

Displays are most successful, however, when migrant families mirror "Anglo-ethnic culture" (Chambers 2001: 125) and, thereby, behave in ways that the indigenous audience both require and interpret as "normal' and "proper" (Heaphy, 2011: 33). When "family displays" fulfil these indigenous requirements, then, particularly in child-centred spaces, this does result in increased familiarity between communities and those in the central west areas of the city develop more "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013). It should be noted, however, that the success of this connectivity is dependent on migrant families displaying in line with the requirements of the white British population. This can, then, result in "Anglo-ethnic" (Chambers, 2001: 125) familial norms, or discourses, being reified, rather than other ethnic identities being acknowledged as British, as in Wilkinson's (2011) definition of cohesion, cited previously.

In these central west areas of the city, there is evidence that family, as James and Curtis surmise, is an embedded concept and the influence of the family has not seen demise in social spheres (James & Curtis, 2010). It is argued here, that in these communities where indigenous and migrant families live side-by-side, family *can* be "imbued with enough shared meaning to facilitate translation across worlds"; it can be a "boundary object" (McSherry, 2001: 69) that supports connectivity. "Family displays" surrounding events such as birth, death and cultural celebrations do result in local and indigenous families coming together and "family displays" can act as a two way "educational tool" (Short, 2011). By engaging in each other's intimate traditions, families, on a family-to-family basis, build empathy. This not only results in both indigenous and migrant families developing "cosmopolitan capital", but participants can also transcend cultural difference and develop meaningful relationships. The study shows that, in these family spaces and this geographical location, "family display" can promote community cohesion by exposing indigenous and migrant families to the multicultural

characteristics of their communities, thereby gradually changing what is acceptable within discourse.

"Family Display" and Long Term Community Cohesion: The Role of Family Young

"Family display" has a further positive role in challenging discourse and promoting community cohesion, as it *can* result in migrant families, particularly those with family young, adopting/accepting both home land and local traditions (chapter eight). In order to inculcate children with home land values, whilst desiring to "belong" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) in the host community, families adopt and switch between the display requirements of multiple audiences (Dermott & Seymour, 2011: 17). One Islamic migrant family, for example, celebrates both Eid and Christmas, whilst a Polish family celebrates Easter in-line with Polish traditions, but also has an Easter egg hunt as has become tradition in the UK. It is argued here, then, that "family display" contributes to long term community cohesion by supporting what Beck refers to as "cosmopolitanization", whereby localised "provincial and out of date" (Beck, 2013: 7) identities are undermined and replaced with more inclusive "plural" or "world building" identities (Beck, 2013: 12). Here, then, hybrid "family displays", consciously adopted by family adults in order to show that their "family works" (Finch, 2007), become the acceptable norm for family young and, over time, *morph* into a hybrid family *practice* (Morgan, 1996). As such, family young ultimately adopt hybrid identities that will potentially, over the long term, be incorporated into wider community norms. There is a sense with family young, that the search for community has led to "the formation of multiple and overlapping community formations" (Mulligan, 2015: 344) that are, over time, moving towards representing a "diverse range of communities" (Wilkinson, 2011). This serves as evidence that migrant family display does challenge what is perceived to be acceptable familial norms; the dominant discourse is, again, challenged..

Family young have a further role in affecting discourse and, subsequently, community cohesion as, migrant "family displays", such as the State imposed display requirement of attending school, or families engaging in Anglo-based child-centred activities (chapter eight), bring indigenous and migrant family young together. Indeed, both indigenous and migrant parents report that at this interface, children of all backgrounds play and build friendships based on commonalities and cultural differences do not prevail. Unlike

migrant family young, there is little evidence that these relationships result in indigenous family young (or adults) developing "hybrid identities" (Beck, 2013) or "hybrid" forms of culture (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002: 4). As a consequence of migrant "family display", however, indigenous children *are* reported to learn from migrant children and they too, develop "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013). Indeed, in April 2015, amidst a rising anti-immigration rhetoric, the leader of UKIP, one of the UK's growing political parties, claimed that:

Britons are so ill at ease with levels of immigration in their towns that their children do not play football with their neighbours in the streets.

(Hope & Bennett, 2015)

The findings of this study, however, contradict this assertion, indicating an altogether different reality. As Offord argues in his response to this comment,   "On the contrary, children playing outside bring people together and engender strong, cohesive communities" (Offord, 2015).   Indeed, the evidence supports Hörschelmann and Schafer's suggestion that young people, "can incorporate the global very literally into their personal identities" (2005: 239) and, by doing so, enhance their future prospects, life opportunities and "self-fulfilment" (2005: 237). As such, the future generation of adults in the city, the family young, living in areas populated by migrant families, have the potential to be key players in processes of long-term community cohesion.

When "Family Display" Can Not Assist Community Cohesion

"Family display" *is,* then, an activity of "frontiering" that *can* contribute to community cohesion and connectivity between diverse communities. That said, this study also supports Bryceson and Vuorella's argument that "frontiering" can be "conflict ridden" (2002: 11). Here, then, it is argued that "family display" can be counter-productive to community cohesion, because there are also influences that obstruct migrant "family displays" being perceived as successful.

As discussed previously, display requirements do differ, depending on the influences affecting audience members and the migrant family's culture of origin (Kristie & Buckham, 2011; Kim, 2011; Carver, 2014). Further, migrant families faced with multiple audiences can choose to prioritise one, depending on which audience will meet their

family's support needs and with whom they are more likely to achieve success. There are occasions, however, even when individual indigenous and migrant families desire connection that the requirements of one audience can obstruct links with another. Participants report that it is the familial norm, for example, for Islamic fathers to take their children to school, whilst, for white British participants, this is mostly a woman's role. In the school playground, despite Islamic fathers having family young, speaking English and living in the central west area of Hull, connection between communities remains difficult. Due to ontological familial differences in what is seen to be acceptable interaction between genders, unlike other parents in the playground, Islamic men and white British women do not interact. This example shows that, even when "enabler*s* of display" are present, connectivity and community cohesion can be obstructed by "family display".

It can also be argued that the competing display requirements of separate indigenous audiences and HANs can impede community cohesion and actually *promote* "nation building", rather than "world building" identities (Beck, 2013). On occasion, families can feel pressurised to meet specific audience requirements, if their family's support and survival needs are to be met. As discussed, indigenous white British audiences require displays located within what are perceived to be Anglo-norms, whilst HANs require displays located within the norms of their home culture (chapter eight). As unsuccessful display can come at a high cost, migrant families can feel torn between displaying family in a way that shows loyalty to their home land or faith, or in a way that shows assimilation to local white British familial norms. As migrant families manage this conflict by prioritising audiences they can chose to meet specific culturally located norms. As such, rather than promote community cohesion, "family display" can be divisive and strengthen cultural segregation within communities. Here, then, as argued by Delanty, the need to establish community can be strong, but it "has the power to fragment society as much as it can unite people" (Delanty, 2010, cited in Mulligan, 2015: 341).

When Discourse Drowns Out Successful Display and Inhibits Community Cohesion

At the time of the field work, anti-migration, anti-Islamic and pro-assimilation discourses were perpetuated in UK media and policy (chapter four & eight). It is argued, here, that these narratives affect public opinion (Mulvey, 2010) and, ultimately, community cohesion. It is further argued, that, in Hull, these media and policy influences are tempered or amplified by a number of intersecting indigenous audience characteristics. Indeed, the majority of indigenous participants that have direct contact with migrant families via family young, have more "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013), live in less deprived areas of the city (chapter two) and they are the least influenced by these narratives (chapter eight). By contrast, indigenous participants that have less contact with migrant groups, some of whom live in the more deprived areas of the city (chapter two & eight), appear to be the most influenced by them. Although contact with migrant communities - via residence or work - is one variable, here, it cannot be assumed that it is the ability to observe "family display" that diminishes the impact these discourses have on opinion. There are too many complex intersecting factors to draw this conclusion. What can be concluded, however, is that these discourses do limit the success of "family display" in achieving connectivity and cohesion between what Mulligan refers to as communities focused around "culture" rather than geography (Mulligan, 2015: 344).

Although migrant families do display family in order to achieve connectivity and minimise their position as *other* (chapter eight), the success of these displays *is* dependent on the "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al*., 2015;) through which they are interpreted. Eastern European families, for example, are white and Christian and have more agency to comply with the Anglo-ethnic familial norms (Chambers, 2001) that dominate indigenous display requirements. Despite this, counter discourses, such as those that present Eastern Europeans as "*benefit tourists*" (Perkins, 2013), can colour audience responses and prevent these families from successfully connecting as "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011). When migrant families are subjected to multiple negative discourses and, subsequently, a number of "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al*, 2015), "family display" is even less likely to achieve cohesion between communities.

It is argued here that some audience members do not examine migrant "family displays", as such, and, instead, they view them through the lens of anti-Islamic narratives and pro-assimilationist discourses (Allan, 2007; Kundnani, 2007; Sharma, 2008; Pantazi & Pemberton, 2012). Consequently, this results in some white indigenous audiences failing to recognise Islamic displays as familial (chapter nine) and, instead, they are interpreted as "suspect", "problem" and "dangerous" (Pantazi & Pemberton, 2012). Community is formed, instead, by either rejecting or "clustering around symbols of shared identity" (Mulligan, 2015: 344). Here, elements of Islamic migrant "family display", the wearing of the veil, for example, become the focus of division, rather than connectivity. Furthermore, this has broader ramifications for community cohesion and related policy, as these responses relate to both migrant *and* indigenous "family displays" located within Islam (Kristie & Buckham, 2011; chapter eight). Despite the display efforts of the Islamic migrant families interviewed, the audience is sufficiently influenced by the dominant narratives that place *all* Asians outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007; Finney & Simpson, 2009).

Overall, although this study does provide examples of where "family display" contributes to "good community relations" (Zetter *et al.,* 2006: 4), it is also clear that there is a "'dark side' to the emotional desire for community [where] narrow or competitive projections of community can cause division, conflict or severe social isolation" (Mulligan, 2015: 353). Consequently, where multiple audience requirements are incompatible, or when multiple "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al.*, 2015) are present, "family display" does not promote community cohesion. Nevertheless, the study reveals that "family display" can be one factor in the cohesion equation. It is argued here, then, that those with influence, namely the State, local agencies and national and local media, should develop approaches that move away from assimilation. Instead, as Mulligan asserts, policy should support "tolerance for the coexistence of diverse forms of communities [and] [...] the conscious construction of overarching communities that can aim to include rather than divide" (Mulligan, 2015: 353). The following section builds on this conclusion and presents relevant policy recommendations.

Part 4: Policy Recommendations

1. <u>Implement a new National Community Cohesion Policy</u>

- A paradigm shift is required in national policies, away from the anti-immigrant, assimilationist and anti-terrorism agendas that currently dominate;

- Policies should instead promote multicultural approaches, focus on connectivity and acknowledge the culturally and ethnically diverse nature of "Britishness";

- Given the role of children in future community connectivity, these multicultural approaches should be included in the national curriculum, which is taught in primary and secondary schools in the UK.

Rationale:

Broadly, many members of the white British population living in Hull, perceive Britishness as white, Christian and English speaking and, thereby, non-white communities, British-born or migrant, are placed outside of Britishness (Kundnani, 2007). More specifically, the study also shows that, in the city, community tensions exist between the indigenous white populations and specific communities, namely Kurdish, Eastern European and Islamic.

Although "family display", as one influential factor in the cohesion equation, goes some way to promoting connectivity between communities, displays are often interpreted through the lens of the dominant anti-Islamic, anti-migrant and pro-assimilationist discourses present in the UK at the time of writing. Although locally both voluntary and statutory sector agencies do deliver initiatives focused on cohesion, these are limited in number and white indigenous populations are rarely involved or attend. Further, community cohesion and development initiatives take place against the background "noise" of these discourses, which dominate over the emerging diversity of family discourse. Although there are many positive examples of diverse communities coming together, cohesion in the city is strained and the local election results in May, 2015, reinforce this; UKIP (UK Independence Party), as a party standing on a clear immigration control platform, came second in many of the city's twenty-three wards (Hull City Council, 2015a).

As discussed in chapter four, national policies relating to community cohesion are assimilationist. Further, "cohesion" is not prioritised in current government agendas and is, instead, conflated with anti-terrorism agendas. These agendas are criticised as being anti-Islamic and divisive (Khan, 2009; Taylor, 2014; Newsnight, 2015). The study shows that these discourses adversely influence white British responses to Islamic communities. The absence of an effective national cohesion strategy is, then, problematic. Current levels of division remain a concern as reflected in the study and as mirrored both in local election results, and national opinion polls. It is clear, therefore, that connectivity and understanding between Britain's diverse communities requires attention.

2. Provide resettlement programmes for new migrants arriving in Hull

These schemes should be three fold:

- Local authorities should be briefed of the needs of new populations;

- Essential information about life in the UK should be disseminated to migrant families;

- Voluntary sector programmes should be funded in locations throughout the city, whereby local families act as "buddies" to migrant families, thereby enhancing the possibility of successful cross-cultural "family displays".

Rationale:

Since 2000, two main groups of migrants have settled in Hull: Kurdish asylum seekers and Eastern European migrants. Although non-governmental organisations have endeavoured to support asylum seekers in the city and have done so with some success, this has been limited and not formally planned. Further, local authorities did not initially anticipate that Eastern Europeans, as economic migrants, would require resettlement support, as they were not perceived as vulnerable and, as such, there has been little resettlement provision. Although public services and organisations such as children's centres have responded to the needs of both these populations, the austerity measures implemented by the UK government between 2010–2015 (Public Sector Executive, 2015) have resulted in a much reduced public service provision for all those residing in the UK, migrant and indigenous alike.

This unmanaged resettlement process has caused cross-cultural conflict on a neighbourhood level, because groups were not, for example, familiar with UK law. Further, conflict also resulted, because, in the absence of local support, these communities have found "belonging" (Levitt & Glick Schiller, 2004; May, 2011) by developing their own frontier networks (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002). This has resulted in migrant groups having limited connectivity, via family display or otherwise, with indigenous populations. For the remaining Kurdish population, this absence of a resettlement programme and the resulting lack of local knowledge, has led to residual community tensions. For Eastern European groups, their self-sustainability is perceived, by some indigenous populations, as an unwillingness to integrate and, again, conflict has resulted. In terms of "family display", these conflicts have, for some, eclipsed the possibility of migrant "family displays" being received positively.

Given the strength of the anti-migration and pro-assimilation discourses discussed in the previous policy recommendation, planned resettlement programmes for new comers to the UK are essential if communities are to be cohesive.   Not only will this equip newcomers with the skills necessary for life in the UK, but local populations can be more prepared, thereby, minimising conflict and maximising the potential for migrant and indigenous family connectivity.

Any resettlement scheme requires tailored support, dependent on the needs of particular populations. Gateway refugees, for example, *are* supported for an initial twelve month period by The Refugee Council. Here, local authorities are educated about the needs of each cohort of Gateway arrivals, this information is passed on to local populations and the refugees are supported to gain the independent living skills they will require to settle in the UK. Gateway clients are also provided with information relating to the UK's welfare, education and health care system. Although this one-to-one professional support is financially costly, alternative, but less expensive resettlement programmes can be developed. Voluntary and statutory sector partnerships could achieve this.

3. Implement a cross-cultural engagement strategy for Hull City of Culture 2017

- Lead bodies for *Hull2017* to create a cultural diversity committee to oversee the implementation of the strategy;

- Hold engagement events, some specifically targeted at members of Hull's migrant populations;

- Promote cross-cultural connectivity by supporting the development of cross-culturally designed events;

- Engage with migrant communities to develop and disseminate *Hull2017* publicity;

- As part of the *Hull2017* legacy, ensure events promote connection between adults from all cultures, with a view to maintaining adult-centred cross-cultural meeting spaces.

Rationale:

In 2013, Hull was awarded the accolade of UK City of Culture for 2017 (BBC News, 2013b). The promotional video promoting the bid, "This City Belongs to Everyone" (Hull2017, 2013), shows Hull's population to be diverse and transient, but also culturally inclusive. Although this has some resonance in the central west areas of the city, it is mostly incongruent with the findings of this study and, as described previously, the election results of May 2015. This status, however, provides Hull with a unique opportunity to encourage populations in Hull to connect.

The study shows that "family display" *can* forge positive links between families, particularly when children are present. Families *without* children, both migrant and indigenous, have less opportunity to connect via "family display" as do families that live in areas outside of those most densely populated by migrant families, whether or not family children are present. City of Culture organisers must, then, create opportunities to promote the positive outcomes of "family display" for *all* families.

The City of Culture programme promises to deliver 1500 events in 365 days (Hull 2017, n.d). Although some Hull traditions are embraced by BME migrant populations in the study, they are not always aware of and, therefore, do not attend large events such as the Freedom Festival in visible numbers.[72] If *all* communities are to attend and *own* the

---

[72] See footnote 54.

events of 2017, organisers must engage with *all* of Hull's populations whilst planning *Hull2017.*

In addition to this, if opportunities for "family display" are to be successful, it is imperative that the publicity for these events is pitched at all communities in the city. Including communities in the design of publicity will ensure both ownership of events and also that the promotional materials appeal to target audiences. Publicity must be accessible to all, presented in easy-to-read formats and organisers should connect with community representatives to disseminate information in ways they know to be effective. As well as using traditional publicity methods, non-traditional forums should also be used to reach *all* of Hull's populations, for example, migrant community websites and faith establishments, including local mosques and the Polish church.

Furthermore, in order to promote links between adults in communities, events should be organised around areas of commonality, beyond children; throughout 2017, events surrounding common interests, for example, food, music, sport, art, theatre and fashion, will allow adult populations to learn from one another and connect.

The study shows that historically, specific events organised by migrant and BME populations in the city are attended by the organising communities and white British attendance is mostly limited to professionals working in the field. A number of initiatives should be delivered within migrant communities, with a view to encouraging attendance from culturally diverse populations, including white British. Venues might include work places, regular community meetings, parks and faith establishments.

4. <u>Invest in child-centred family spaces in Hull</u>
- Protect existing child-centred family spaces, including organised provision, for example, sessions at children's centres, but also free public provision, such as parks and local museums;
- Curtail future government cuts to these public sector areas;
- Reinstate provision that has been affected by government austerity measures.

Rationale:

The study supports Offord's summation that children in communities bring ethnically and culturally diverse people together and this can contribute towards the formation of stronger communities (Offord, 2015). Accounts also indicate that "family display" *can* achieve connectivity between communities, particularly when *enabled* by the presence of family young. This is because migrant families display by engaging in Anglo familial behaviours in public spaces and, because displays of parenting, in these spaces, bring family adults together. Consequently, migrant and indigenous participants report developing meaningful relationships as a result of encounters in child-focused spaces; school playgrounds and public facilities, such as, parks, libraries, the swimming baths and children's centres.

Since 2010, the UK central government has implemented austerity measures, in the form of sweeping cuts to local authority and voluntary sector budgets. This has impacted on children's services in the city, be this in terms of a reduction in children's centre sessions, a reduction in library sessions for young children, the number of childcare places available in the city or a reduction in youth work delivery. All of these activities provide environments for successful display and connectivity between both family adults and family young. In May, 2015, the Conservative Government was elected for a further five year term, and have signalled their intent to implement further cuts to these budgets (Public Sector Executive, 2015).

It is essential that policy makers recognise the role children can play in long term cohesion and connectivity. They must also recognise the significance of the spaces that children and their families use (Hackett *et al.*, 2015). Closure of child-focused facilities has significant ramifications and it is imperative that, conversely, they be viewed as playing a central part in long term cohesion and be funded appropriately.

5. <u>Implement a local training strategy to improve understanding of culturally diverse familial norms within State endorsed agencies</u>

- Professionals with expertise in working with diverse UK communities to be brought into the city to conduct a consultation with relevant professionals;

- Recommendations for change to be made and, advisors, by working with practitioners, to develop training required to action changes;
- Training to be rolled-out across relevant professions and incorporated into related vocational training, for example, at Hull York Medical School as well as social work, health practitioner and teacher training degrees.

Rationale

Recommendations are inextricably linked with those made in relation to community cohesion policy; recognition of *all* of Britain's diverse communities as British, must filter through to all statutory authorities. A paradigm shift is required in the approach that those in positions of authority take towards migrant and BME families living in the UK. Although child safety is paramount, Anglo-norms should not be privileged and perceived as the required form of display. Instead, other family norms should be recognised as acceptable and "legitimate" (Heaphy, 2011).

The majority of professionals in the study report that, for them, successful migrant "family display" is required to mirror "Anglo-ethnic" familial norms (Chambers, 2001). Professionals also report that high profile child abuse cases in families of BME origin, outside of Hull, have shaped UK approaches to working with families. [73] As a result, they, and their colleagues, are sometimes overcautious when working with families of either migrant or BME origin. This is because professionals are concerned about making mistakes that will put family children at risk of harm, because they lack the knowledge of diverse familial norms that would allow them to confidently make safeguarding decisions. Migrant families, however, omit culturally located displays, or develop strategies to avoid the attention of the State. As a consequence, there are occasions when families do not receive the support their family requires, for example, medical treatment.

Although these approaches are heavily influenced by top down changes in representations of Britishness, short term recommendations for practice, as suggested, can also be made.

---

[73] See footnote 62.

6. <u>To improve ESOL course provision in Hull</u>

- ESOL courses, as a contributing factor towards cohesion, should be provided free of charge, or offered at a significantly reduced fee;

- Funding should be made available to provide crèche places for students accessing ESOL classes;

- Sessions should be delivered at venues throughout the city in accessible community facilities.

Rationale:

The ability to speak English is important to cohesion. As an "enabler of display", migrant families able to speak the language have more opportunity to display successfully and achieve connectivity. By contrast, when migrant families do not speak English, a number of problems arise: participants feel less able to connect with local populations or engage with activities in their communities. Consequently, those that do not speak English desire to do so.

The majority of indigenous audience participants require migrant families to speak English as an aspect of displaying their assimilation to British norms, reflecting national discourses that require migrants to speak English (Cameron, 2011a; BBC News, 2013a). Migrants applying for "Indefinite leave to remain" in the UK are, for example, required to have an ESOL qualification (Gov.UK, n.d - b). As a consequence of these influences, when migrant populations are seen to not speak the language, there is, on occasion, conflict between communities.

UK authorities, then, have a responsibility to provide accessible English tuition. In the UK, prior to 2005, the European Social Fund funded free ESOL classes for migrant populations, delivered in familiar community settings throughout the city, supported by free childcare (Ward, 2008). Post 2005, ESOL provision changed and again in 2011 (Hubble & Kennedy, 2011); some migrant populations are now required to pay course fees and provision is centralised at a city centre, further education college. This college continues to strive to provide accessible accredited ESOL classes; there are fourteen per week, at various times, including weekday evenings. The college offers flexible

attendance at sessions, allowing people that work shifts to attend at different times each week (Hull College, n.d - b).

Migrant participants do, however, experience obstacles when attempting to learn English, some are unaware of this provision and accessing funding is a complex process. Although most people legally in the UK, under the age of eighteen, do have access to free ESOL classes, this is not the case for adults of nineteen and above. As access to funding is dependent on migrant families being in receipt of certain welfare benefits, only those that have recourse to public funds (EU citizens or people with indefinite leave to remain in the UK) can access funding. This is not the case for asylum seekers within the first six months of their claim, third country economic migrants, EU citizens not in receipt of the required benefits, or international students. For these migrants, for the academic year 2015–2016, the fee to study a part-time course at Hull College, including exam fees, is £660.[74] For asylum seekers in receipt of very limited NAS support and many economic migrants earning a low wage, this fee is prohibitive.

Insufficient access to childcare also limits migrant family access to ESOL courses. For instance, the college nursery provides only sixty-two places for 28,000 students (Ofsted, 2008), there is a lengthy waiting list and participants report that the cost can be problematic. Further, travelling to the city centre and leaving young children in an unfamiliar environment can be daunting. Childcare provision at ESOL courses should, then, be reviewed. The number of places available should be increased and, by providing sessions at venues in community settings such as children's centres and women's centres, costs can be minimised. As all three/four year olds in the UK currently have access to a number of free hours of childcare a week, the cost of some of these places could be accommodated with these funds (Gov.UK: n.d - a).

Furthermore, despite acquisition of the English language being both an implied and statutory requirement of those wishing to stay in the UK, the current fees charged are

---

[74] Potential learners are able to telephone ESOL providers to discuss fees. For speakers of other languages, the literacy levels required to locate this phone number and then make the phone call are, in themselves, an obstacle to learning. Information regarding the fees was provided by the Hull College (personal communication, 15 May, 2015).

comparable with those charged for other college courses. Funding for ESOL courses, therefore, requires review; those within the first six months of their asylum application, for example, should be able to access ESOL courses at no cost. A solution should be sought for those migrants that cannot afford tuition fees, but that are not in receipt of the benefits that would give them access to financial support.

Conclusion

In summary, this study does support the presence of a number of the characteristics of "family display" identified by Finch; families *do* display via the use of "tools", they *do* experience periods of "intensity" and display does matter due to the "fluidity of family over time" and the fact that family "extends beyond household" (Finch, 2007). The study also adds to and expands Finch's suppositions by identifying the use of additional "tools" of displays and "triggers" for longer term display. By showing that *migrant* families *also* engage in display in order to connect with co-resident non-kin and minimise their position as *other* with external audiences, the study also adds to understanding of TFS and the concepts of ""frontiering"" and "relitavising" (Bryceson & Vuorella, 2002).

More specifically, this research reveals previously unidentified features of "family display". There are, for example, extended periods when the family's identity, as migrant is heightened. It is argued here, then, that the migrant family should be recognised as an "unconventional" familial construct. In addition to this, this study also indicates that "enablers of display" are crucial to the success of displays. This adds to Heaphy's (2011) argument that some familial constructs are more likely to display as "legitimate" because they fit the dominant familial norm; it is also families with access to multiple "enablers" that are more likely to achieve "legitimacy", because they have enhanced opportunity to display.   Furthermore, findings highlight that *practices* (Morgan, 1996; 2011a; 2011b) and *displays* (Finch, 2007) exist on a continuum; what might be a *practice* can *morph* into a *display* dependent on context, the passage of time and the reasons family members engage in the practice/display.

The findings of this study also make a unique contribution to knowledge because of the intentional focus on the role of audience. Here, there is clear evidence that "relevant"

(Finch, 2007) audiences of display do extend beyond immediate kin and also include non-kin (Almack, 2011; Sirriyeh, 2013). Further, *all* audiences in the study do "require" (Haynes & Dermott, 2011) specific displays and families are sometimes faced with negotiating multiple and conflicting audience demands (Seymour, 2011; Dermott & Seymour, 2011). In the context of migration, these conflicting requirements are sometimes culturally located. Further, as "unconventional" families, the desire to be "legitimated" (Heaphy, 2011) can be heightened for migrant families. Consequently, participants create a "hierarchy of audiences". Priority is given to those audiences that ensure familial safety and security. For others, priority is given to the audience with whom their family is most likely to achieve success.

Analysis also shows that audiences are significant, because the success of migrant "family displays" in achieving connectivity and minimising their position as the *other* is dependent on how they are interpreted by the indigenous population. When migrant families are *enabled* to display, audience responses are, then, affected by the "layers of othering" (Dobson & Oelfse, 2000; Castles *et al*., 2015) experienced by specific migrant groups. It is argued here, that culturally located discourses associated with family do influence audience perceptions of "normal" and "proper" family (Heaphy, 2011), but so, too, do prevalent anti-immigration and anti-Islamic discourses (Greenslade, 2005; Mulvey, 2010). Theories of intersectionality are useful, as a combination of audience characteristics, such as, "cosmopolitan capital" (Brahic, 2013), geographical residence and age, influence the weight individuals give to such narratives.

"Family display" *is,* then, significant in cohesion: when contact occurs in the most culturally diverse areas, this can result in positive inter-cultural relations and family can be a "boundary object" (McSherry, 2001: 69), whereby areas of commonality transcend difference and dominant discourses can be challenged. Furthermore, the role of family children is significant, as migrant families inculcate family young with the norms of their COO, but also desire that their children "belong" in the host county in "hybrid" (Beck, 2012) familial identities. Legal requirements of display, for example, attending school, also force co-existence in child-centred spaces, which brings communities together. "Family display" can, however, be problematic for cohesion, particularly when

audiences are "accidental" rather than "intended", or when anti-immigration and anti-Islamic narratives eclipse potentially positive "family display" outcomes. Here, policy recommendations are intended to amplify the positive outcomes "family display" can have within an increasingly culturally diverse city.

CONCLUSION

This research set out to explore the significance of Janet Finch's concept of "Displaying Families" (2007), specifically in relation to the experiences of primary migrant families living in Kingston upon Hull and local indigenous responses to these families.   By speaking with individuals from within these groups, the study further interrogates "family display" as a factor in community cohesion and connectivity. In chapter ten, findings are consolidated and it is argued that this study offers unique and original insight in a number of ways. Building on these findings, policy recommendations are made that have the potential to affect practical change, both locally to Kingston upon Hull and nationally. In this final chapter, then, more general conclusions are presented relating to the significance of the study beyond this specific context. Areas considered include: the significance for family sociology; the significance for migration studies; the significance for social policy and areas for future research.

The Significance for Family Sociology

This study does, then, affirm that *family* remains an embedded, influential concept (Morgan, 1996; 2011) that holds significance within contemporary communities. "Family display" does, however, reify what is perceived to be "legitimate" family; scholars argue that familial norms are located within heteronormative, co-resident parenting structures (Almack, 2011, Doucet, 2011; Heaphy, 2011; Philip, 2013). The study reveals, however, that within white British-born communities, migrant and BME families are also perceived as "unconventional" (Finch, 2007).

That said, family is also revealed to be a potential "point of resistance" (Foucault, 1978) and can be transgressive (Seymour, 2014), particularly when family young are present or when different *types* of family live side-by-side. Consequently, it is indicated, here, that "family display" does have the potential to affect change and challenge what is "normal" within discourse (Heaphy, 2011; Chambers, 2001), beyond the context of migration.

The Audience and Family Display

The findings presented clearly show that multiple audiences of family display are significant in both shaping displays and assessing their success (Seymour, 2011). This particular study provides pertinent examples, because audience requirements imposed on migrant families are sometimes located within *cultural* familial norms which conflict with those of other audiences. Further, in the context of migration, the incentives to display are strong as, for some, familial security is dependent on audience responses. This does, however, have broader implications for *all* families that engage in "family display" and are also subject to multiple and conflicting display requirements (Haynes & Dermott, 2011). Consequently, the study reveals the need to explore the role of audiences further in order to understand how a diverse range of families negotiate this scenario.

"Enablers of Display"

 "Enablers of display", as identified in this study, are, again, relevant to families beyond those of migrants. Although less prominent, analysis also indicates that "forcers of display" can also influence familial behaviours. Whilst context specific "enablers" are identified, here, further exploration is required to understand what factors enable display for other families – beyond the context of migration - and, thereby, what impacts on their agency to display successfully.

The Significance for Migration Studies

This study indicates that migration *is* a salient issue for people living in UK communities (Zetter *et al*., 2006) and that "family display" *is* a feature of migrant resettlement strategies. Further, analysis also indicates that the process of settling in a new community is complex and that *all* migrant families – economic, refugee, asylum seeker, international student - negotiate multiple external pressures to display their "legitimacy" (Heaphy, 2011), specifically because they are *migrant*. These pressures originate from transnational, local and State sources. Although "family" is revealed to be one site where this legitimacy is displayed, further exploration is required to understand additional sites where this may occur.

It is also affirmed in this thesis that migrants are *not* a homogenous group. Furthermore, those from the same COO do not *necessarily* form a cohesive community or feel driven to remain linked to their HAN (McGhee *et al.*, 2015). The study shows, then, that the incentive to respond to multiple external pressures varies for individual migrant families and is dependent on a number of intersecting factors: the certainty of their legal status in the UK, their intention to stay in the UK and/or the survival needs of their families. It is useful, then, to those considering the processes of migration and resettlement, to recognise that "family display" is *one* useful concept in understanding migrant lived realities. This should, however, be considered alongside broader societal influences.

The Significance for Social Policy

In chapter nine, specific policy recommendations are made that reflect the significance of this study for social care, health care, education and both local and national community cohesion strategies.

These policy recommendations will be prepared in a user-friendly format and distributed to relevant agencies, including: specific departments within local statutory provision (Children and Young People's Services; The Community Participation Team; The Community Cohesion Police Team; The Hull City of Culture Team); appropriate agencies within the local voluntary and community sectors; relevant vocational training programmes; local ESOL providers. These findings will also be disseminated to agencies at the national level, to a range of academic fora and in academic journals.

Areas for Further Research

As discussed previously in this chapter, there are specific features of "family display" that require further exploration beyond the context of migration; the role of audiences, "enablers" and "forcers of display". In addition to this, there are also a number of areas within the study of migrant families where further empirical research should be considered, including:

- The relationship between single-parent migrant families, family display and informal sanctuary seeking;

- The significance of family-display for migrant/indigenous family-young, the strategies adopted to negotiate difference and the impact on long-term community connectivity;

- The impact that culturally located, gendered, familial norms have on community cohesion and connectivity.

- A deeper interrogation of the intersecting variables that affect audience responses to migrant family display.

Closing Comments

In May of this year (2015), during the UK's general election, all mainstream parties continued to promote immigration control (BBC News, 2015b) (chapter four). In line with the discourses discussed previously, debate focused on Eastern European migrants coming to the UK as "*benefit tourists*" and the strain this purportedly has on the UK economy, social housing stock and the National Health Service (Groves, 2015). The UK Independence Party, standing on a primarily anti-immigration platform (BBC News, 2015a), gained unprecedented support, indicating that considerable numbers of the UK population support this anti-migration sentiment. These issues continue to prevail in political discussion (BBC News, 2015b) and the media.

Today (3rd September 2015), the front pages of the mainstream UK press show a harrowing image of a drowned three year old Syrian boy, his face buried in the sand of a Turkish beach. His name was Aylan. Aylan's family, as part of their long journey to flee civil war in Syria, attempted to cross the Mediterranean Sea in an over-crowded rubber dinghy. He, his brother, his mother and at least another twelve passengers did not survive the journey (Elgot, 2015).

Thousands of families, like Aylan's, are currently fleeing war and/or persecution in their homelands, including Syria, Afghanistan, Iraq, Eritrea; there is a global humanitarian refugee crisis. Although the vast majority of refugees remain in countries neighbouring their home lands, it is estimated that 350,000 displaced people are currently in, and hoping to seek sanctuary in, mainland Europe (Dearden, 2015). At this time, the response of European governments is criticised as inefficient and inadequate. This is

supported by the fact that number of refugees that have died crossing the Mediterranean Sea has escalated from an estimated 700 in 2013, to 3072 in 2014 (Brian & Laczko, 2014: 11). Further there have been other high-profile deaths; seventy-one refugees were found suffocated in an abandoned van in Austria as a result of traffickers transporting these people in an airtight vehicle (Harding, 2015).   Meanwhile, displaced people are informally camped in Greece, Southern Italy, the French port of Calais and the Hungarian capital, Budapest (BBC News, 2015c).

Despite this situation, Prime Minister Cameron stated earlier today, that Britain should not take any more refugees from the Middle East (Wintour, 2015) and maintained that *all* immigration should be controlled. The emotive pictures of Aylan's body, however, accompanied by headlines such as "Somebody's Child" (*The Independent*, 3rd September, 2015), prompted sections of the UK population to call for a humanitarian response. By the end of today, Cameron conceded that the UK should take more Syrian refugees – although from Syrian refugee camps, rather than from within Europe - with *The Guardian's* online headline stating: "Cameron bows to pressure to allow more Syrian refugees in Britain" (Wintour & Watt, 2015). Although prior to this event, there was a grassroots response to the crises – pressure groups and local communities sending aid to those in camps throughout Europe – this harrowing image appears to have challenged the dominant narrative. In terms of family, this shared understanding of familial grief may have provided a "boundary object" of common meaning (McSherry, 2001: 69). One can only hope this image of Aylan has lasting resonance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Al-Ali, N. (2002) Loss of Status or New Opportunities? Gender Relations and Transnational Ties among Bosnian Refugees. In Bryceson, D. & Vuorela, U. (eds) *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks.* Oxford: Berg, 83-102.

Al-Jayyousi, G., Roy, R., & Al-Sali, F. (2014) Muslim Mothering and Migration. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 1(4), 41-49.

Allen, C. (2007) The death of multiculturalism: blaming and shaming British Muslims, *Durham Anthropology Journal,* 14. Available online: http://www.dur.ac.uk/anthropology.journal/vol14/iss1/PDF/allen.pdf [Accessed 25/01/2012].

Almack, K. (2008a) Display Work: Lesbian Parent Couples and their Families of Origin Negotiating New Kin Relationships. *Sociology*, 42(6), 1183-1199.

Almack, K. (2008b) Women Parenting Together: A reflexive account of the ways in which the researcher's identity and experiences may impact on the processes of doing research, *Sociological Research Online*, 13(1)4. Available online: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/13/1/4.html [Accessed 24/08/2015].

Almack, K. (2011) Display Work: Lesbian Parent Couples and Their Families of Origin Negotiating New Kin Relationships. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 102-118.

Amin, N. (2006) Muslims are trying to integrate, despite New Labour's best efforts. *The Milli Gazette,* 15 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.martinfrost.ws/htmlfiles/sept2006/muslim integration. Html [Accessed 28/02/2012].

Antón, J.I. (2010) The impact of remittances on nutritional status of children in Ecuador. *International Migration review,* 44(2) 269-99.

Antoniak, D. (2008) The Pastoral Care Needs of New Migrants in the North East of England: *Final report of a research survey into the needs of migrants in the North East's Catholic Community*. Roman Catholic Diocese of Hexham and Newcastle. Available online: http://www.crc-online.org.uk/downloads/THE%20PASTORAL%20CARE%20NEEDS%20OF%20NEW%20MIGRANTS.pdf [Accessed 05/01/2012].

Aronson, J. (1995) A Pragmatic View of Thematic Analysis. *The Qualitative Report*, *2*(1), 1-3.

Aslam, S. (2012) To Hijab or Not to Hijab – a Muslim business woman's view. *The Guardian*, 10 December [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk/the-northerner/2012/dec/10/hijab-muslims-women-islam-business-bradford-niqab-burka [Accessed 13/03/2015].

Babycentre (2015) *Top UK baby names 2001*. Available online: http://www.babycentre.co.uk/a547642/top-uk-baby-names-2001 [Accessed 18/07/2015].

Backett-Milburn, K., Harden, J., Hill, M. & MacLean, A. (2010a) Oh, what a tangled web we weave: experiences of doing 'multiple perspectives' research in families. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 13(5), 441 – 452.

Baker, P., Hussain, Z. & Saunders, J. (1991) *Interpreters in Public Services: Policy and Traning*. London: Venture Press.

Baldassar, L., Vellekoop-Baldock, C. & Wilding, R. (2007) *Families Caring Across Borders: Migration, Ageing and Transnational Caregiving*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Banerjee, B., & Linstead, S. (2001) Globalization, Multiculturalism and Other Fictions: Colonialism for the New Millennium. *Organization*, 8(4), 683-722.

Barkham, P. (2008) You Can't Come In. *The Guardian,* 18 November [Online]. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2008/nov/18/immigration-policy-phil-woolas-racism [Accessed 30/03/2012].

Bartram, D., Poros, M. & Monforte, P. (2014) *Key Concepts in Migration*. London : Sage.

Bauman, Z. (2003) *Liquid Love*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BBC News (2014) *Cameron: 'Stop Being Bashful About Britishness'*. Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-27853591 [Accessed 02/04/2015].

BBC News (2015a) *Election 2015: Results.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election/2015/results [Accessed 13/09/2015].

BBC News (2013a) *Eric Pickles: Immigrants Must Learn to Speak English.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-23271315 [Accessed 19/03/2015].

BBC News (2007) *Hodge attacked for 'BNP language'*. Available online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk_politics/6690007.stm [Accessed 27/03/2012].

BBC News (2013b) *Hull to be UK City of Culture 2017*. Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/entertainment-arts-25008856 [Accessed 14/05/2015].

BBC News (2015b) *Policy Guide: Where the parties stand.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/election/2015/manifesto-guide [Accessed 04/04/2015].

BBC News (2001) *Q & A: Asylum Seeker Dispersal*. Available online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/uk/1477491.stm [Accessed 27/05/2015].

BBC News (2011) *State Multiculturalism has failed, says David Cameron.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-12371994 [Accessed 06/07/2015].

BBC News (2012) *Theresa May, 'planning changes to the immigration test'.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk -18662531 [Accessed 01/07/2012].

BBC News (2015c) *Why is EU struggling with migrants and asylum.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-24583286 [Accessed 04/09/2015].

BBC News Europe (2014) *The Islamic Veil Across Europe.* Available online: http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-europe-13038095 [Accessed 13/03/2015].

BBC On This Day (2012) *1968: Race discrimination law tightened*. Available online: http://news.bbc.uk/onthisday/hi/dates/stories/november/26/newsid_3220000/32206 .... [Accessed 19/03/2012].

Becher, H. (2008) *Family Practices in South Asian Muslim Families*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Beck, U. (2012) Redefining the Sociological Project: The Cosmopolitan Challenge. *Sociology,* 46(1), 7 -12.

Beck, U. & Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995) *The Normal Chaos of Love.* Translated from German by M. Rutter & J. Wiebel. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beliefnet (n.d.) *Islam's Call to Prayer*. Available online: http://www.beliefnet.com/Faiths/Islam/2007/01/Islams-Call-to-Prayer.aspx [Accessed 04/08/2015].

Bleier, R. (ed) (1986) *Feminist Approaches to Science.* New York: Pergamon Press. Bloustein, G. & Baker, S. (2003) On not Talking to Strangers: Researching the Micro Worlds of Girls through Visual Auto-ethnographic Practices'. *Social Analysis,* 47(3): 64-79.

Booker, C. (2012) Foreign government may take UK to European Court over its 'illegal' child-snatching. *The Telegraph*, 15 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/comment/9545361/Foreign-government-may-take-UK-to-European-court-over-its-illegal-child-snatching.html [Accessed 20/07/2015].

Brahic, B. (2013) The Politics of Bi-Nationality in Couple Relationships: A Case Study of European Bi-National Couples in Manchester. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, XLIV(6), 699-715.

Brahic, B. (2015) European Bi-National Couples and their Pre-existing Families: 'Doing Family' Across Borders and Cultures. In Juozeliuniene, I. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Family Change in Times of the De-bordering of Europe and Global Mobility: Resources, Processes and Practices*. Vilnius: Vilnius University Press (page numbers TBC).

Brian, T. & Laczko, F. (2014) *Fatal Journeys: Tracking Lives Lost During Migration*. Switzerland: International Organization for Migration.

British Council (n.d) *Why British* Council (IELTS). Available online: http://takeielts.britishcouncil.org/choose-ielts/why-british-council [Accessed 05/01/2015].

Brown, R. (1995) Racism and Immigration in Britain, *International Socialism Journal, 68*. Available online: http//pubs.socialistreviewindex.org.uk/isj68/brown.htm [Accessed 04/01/2012].

Bryceson, D. (2002) Europe's Transnational Families and Migration: Past and Present. In Bryceson, D. & Vuorela, U. (eds) *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks.* Oxford: Berg, 31-62.

Bryceson, D. & Vuorela, U. (eds) (2002) *The Transnational Family: New European Frontiers and Global Networks*. Oxford: Berg.

BSA (2002) *Statement of Ethical Practice for the British Sociological Association, 2002.* Available online: http://www.britsoc.co.uk/about/equality/statement-of-ethical-practice.aspx [Accessed 15/06/2015].

Burnett, J. & Whyte, T. (2004) New Labour's New Racism, *Institute of Race Relations.* Available online: www.irr.org.uk/2004/October/ak0000008.html [Accessed 04/01/2012].

Butler, J. (1990) *Gender Trouble*. New York: Routledge.

Cameron, D. (2013) *David Cameron's Immigration Speech*. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/david-camerons-immigration-speech [Accessed 07/08/2014].

Cameron, D. (2011a) Good Immigration, not mass immigration speech on Thursday. *The Guardian,* 14 April [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/apr/14/david-cameron-immigration-speech-full-text [Accessed 06/01/2012].

Cameron, D. (2011b) *PMs Speech at Munich Security Conference*. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference [Accessed 24/08/2015].

Cannan, C. (1992) *Changing Families*. Oxon: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Cannon, L. W., Higginbotham, E. & Leung, M.L.A. (1991) Race and Class Bias in Qualitative Research on Women. In Lober, J. & Farrell, S. (eds) *The Social Construction off gender*. New York: Sage.

Carter, J., Duncan, S., Stoilova, M. & Phillips, M. (2015) Sex, love and security: accounts of distance and commitment in LAT relationships, *Sociology.* Available online: http://create.canterbury.ac.uk/13067/1/13067.pdf [Accessed 29/08/2015].

Carver, N. (2014) Displaying Genuineness: cultural translation in the drafting of marriage narratives for immigration application and appeals. *Families, Relationships and Societies,* 3(2), 271-286.

Castels, S., Ozkul, D. & Cubus, M. (eds) (2015) *Social Transformation and Migration: National and Local Experiences in South Korea, Turkey, Mexico and Australia.* UK: Palgrave MacMillan.

Castren, A. & Widmer, E. (2015) Insiders and outsiders in stepfamilies: Adults' and children's views of family boundaries. *Sociology*, 63(1), 35-56.

Chambers, D. (2012) *A Sociology of Family Life: Change and Diversity in Intimate Relationships.* UK: Polity Press.

Chambers, D. (2001) *Representing the Family*. London: Sage.

Channel 4 News (2008) *FactCheck: Enoch Powell's 1968 speech.* Available online: http://www.channel4.com/news/articles/politics/domestic_politics/factcheck%2Benoch%2Bpowells%2B1968%2Bspeech/1960847.html + [Accessed 14/03/2012].

Chorley, M. (2013) Migrants from poorer countries could be banned from Britain to curb benefits tourism. *The Daily Mail*, 13 December [Online]. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2523220/Migrants-poorer-countries-banned-Britain-curb-benefits-tourism.htm [Accessed 03/07/2015].

Christensen, P. & James, A. (eds) (2000) *Research With Children: Perspectives and Practice,* USA: Routledge Falmer.

Citizens Advice (n.d) *Access to Education.* Available online: https://www.citizensadvice.org.uk/education/school-education/access-to-education/ [Accessed 20/07/2015].

Clark, A. & Moss, P. (2001) *Listening to Young Children: The Mosaic Approach*. Trowbridge: The National Children's Bureau.

Cohen, S. (1972) *Folk devils and moral panics: the creation of the Mods and Rockers.* Oxford: Robertson.

Collins, P.H. (1990) *Black feminist thought: knowledge, consciousness and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.

Consterdine, E. (2014) *Immigration and Labour's Identity Crises*. Available online: http://www.newleftproject.org/index.php/site/article_comments/immigration_and_labours_identity_crisis [Accessed 19/06/2015].

Craig, G., Cordon, A. & Thornton, P. (2000) Safety in Social Research. *Social Research Update.* Available online: http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU29.html [Accessed 31/08/2015].

Craig, G., Wilkinson, M. & Ali, J. (2005) *A Turning Point? The State of Race Relations in Kingston upon Hull.* Hull: University of Hull.

Dallal, S. (2004) *Asylum Law and Policy: Historical and Contemporary Perspectives.* Great Britain: Sweet & Maxwell Ltd.

Davies, H. (2011a) Affinities, seeing and feeling like family: Exploring why children value face-to-face contact, *Childhood,* 1-16. Available online: http://chd.sagepub.com/content/early/2011/09/01/0907568211400453 [Accessed 31 August, 2015].

Davies, H. (2011b) Sharing Surnames: Children, Family and Kinship. *Sociology*, 45(4), 554–569.

Dearden, L. (2015) 6 Charts and a Map that show where Europe's refugees are coming from – and the perilous journeys they are taking, *The Independent*, 4 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/refugee-crisis-six-charts-that-show-where-refugees-are-coming-from-where-they-are-going-and-how-they-are-getting-to-europe-10482415.html [Accessed 04/09/2015].

De Hass, H. (2005) *International migration, remittance and development: myths and facts. Third World Quarterly,* 26(8), 1269-1284.

Department for Education (2003) *Every Child Matters*. London: The Stationery Office. Available online: https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/EveryChildMatters.pdf [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Dermot, E. & Pomati, M. (2015) 'Good' Parenting Practices: How Important are Poverty, Education and Time Pressure, *Sociology*, 1 -18. Available online: http://soc.sagepub.com/content/early/2015/01/27/0038038514560260.full.pdf+html?hwshib2=authn%3A1441188992%3A20150901%253A77a90b71-61f3-4f10-ace4-d243c1dda92f%3A0%3A0%3A0%3AP138g%2BhVdnw4MGQhZlx4JA%3D%3D [Accessed 12/05/2015].

Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) (2011) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Dey, I. (1993) *Qualitative Data Analysis: A User-Friendly Guide for Social Scientists.* London: Routledge.

Dobson, W. & Oelofse, C. (2000) Shades of Xenophobia: In-Migrant and Immigrants in Mizamoyethu, Cape Town. *Canadian Journal of African Studies,* 43(1), 124 – 148. Dominiczak, P. (2013) Britain and Germany Demand EU Cracks down on 'benefits tourism'. *The Telegraph,* 24 April [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/10014508/Britain-and-Germany-demand-EU-cracks-down-on-benefits-tourism.html [Accessed 11/03/2015].

Dorrer, N., Edmund, R., McIntosh, I. & Punch, S. (2010a) 'You don't have to be watched to make your toast': Surveillance and Food Practices within Residential Care for Young People. *Surveillance & Society*, 7(3/4), 291-303.

Dorrer, N., McIntosh, I., Punch, S. & Edmond, R. (2010b) Children and food practices in residential care: ambivalence in the 'institutional' home. *Children's Geographies*, 8(3), 247-259.

Doucet, A. (2011) 'It's Just Not Good for a Man to be Interested in Other People's Children': Fathers, Public Displays of Care and 'Relevant Others'. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, S. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life.* Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 81-101.

Edwards, R. (1998) A critical examination of the use of interpreters in the qualitative research process. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 24(1), 197 – 208.

Edwards, R. (1996) White Woman Researcher – Black Women Subjects. In Wilkinson, S. & Kitzinger, C. (eds) *Representing the Other.* London: Sage Publications, 83-88.

Edwards, R. & Ribbens, J. (1998) Living on the Edges: Public Knowledge, Private Lives, Personal Experiences. In Ribbens, J. & Edwards, R. (eds) *Feminist Dilemmas in Qualitative Research: Public Knowledge and Private Lives.* London: Sage, 1-23.

Eichler, M. (1991) *Non-Sexist Research Methods.* USA: Routledge.

Elgott, J. (2015) Family of Syrian boy washed up on beach was trying to reach Canada. *The Guardian*, 3 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/03/refugee-crisis-syrian-boy-washed-up-on-beach-turkey-trying-to-reach-canada [Accessed 04/09/1995].

Engage Online (2010) *Parliamentary Committee enquiry says Prevent Strategy 'alienates' Muslims.* Available online: http://www.iengage.org.uk/component/content/article/809-parliamentary-committee-inquiry-says-prevent-strategy-alienates-muslims [Accessed 01/01/2012].

Englishdefenceleague (n.d) *Mission Statement*. Available online: http://www.englishdefenceleague.org/?page_id=9 [Accessed 17/08/2015].

Euteneuer, M. & Uhlendorff, U. (2014) Family concepts – a social pegagogic approach to understanding family development and working with families. *European Journal of Social Work*, 17(5), 702-717.

Evans, D. (2011a) Sociological Approach to Household Food Waste Beyond the Throwaway Society: Ordinary Domestic Practice and a Sociological Approach to Household Food Management. *Sociology*, 10. Available online: http://soc.sagepub.com/login/shibboleth?uri=http%3A%2F%2Fsoc.sagepub.com%2Fcontent%2Fearly%2F2015%2F06%2F25%2F0038038515587651.full.pdf%2Bhtml&subcode=sagepub&env=prod [Accessed 01/09/2015].

Evans, N. (2011b) Work in progress: Indirect passage from Europe Transmigration via the UK, 1836–1914. *Journal for Maritime Research*, 3.1, 70 – 84.

Evans, J. & Jones, P. (2011) The Walking Interview: methodology, mobility and place. *Applied Geography*, 31(2), 849-858.

Finch, J. (2007) Displaying Families. *Sociology*, 41(1), 65 – 81.

Finch, J. (2011) Exploring the Concept of Display in Family Relationships. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 197-205.

Finch, J. (2008) Naming names: Kinship, Individuality and Personal Names. *Sociology,* 42(4) 709 – 725.

Finney, N., & Simpson, L. (2009) *Sleepwalking Into Segregation.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Flynn, D. (2002) British Immigration Policy, New Labour, and the rights of migrants: A critical assessment. *Sign of the Times Seminar.* London, 25 November 2002.

Foner, F. (2009) *Across Generations: Immigrant Families in America.* New York: New York University Press.

Foot, P. (1965) *Immigration and Race in British Politics.* London: Penguin.

Forsberg, L. (2009) *Involved Parenthood Everyday Lives of Swedish Middle-Class Families*. Linköping: Linköping University Electronic Press.

Foucault, M. (1978) *The History of Sexuality.* Translated from the French by R. Hurley. London: Penguin.

Freedom Festival (2014) *Freedom 2013*. Available online: http://www.freedomfestival.co.uk/page/freedom2014.php [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Gabb, J. (2008) *Researching Intimacy in Families*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Gabb, J. (2011) Troubling Displays: The Affect of Gender, Sexuality and Class. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life.* Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 38-60.

Garner, S. (2009) Empirical Research into White Racialized Identities in Britain. *Sociology Compass,* 3(5), 789 – 802.

Geddes, A. & Tonge, J. (eds) (1997) *Labour's Landslide: 1997 General Election.* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures: selected essays*. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, A. (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy. Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gillan, A. (2005) Ghettos in English cities 'almost equal to Chicago'. T*he Guardian,* 23 *September* [Online]. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2005/sep/23/race.world [Accessed 21/07/2012].

Gillham, B. (2005) *Research Interviewing: the range of techniques.* Glasgow: Open University Press.

Gillies, V. (2011) From Function To Competence: Engaging With the New Politics of Family, *Sociological Research On Line,* 16 (4) 11. Available online: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/11.html [Acessed 13/09/2015].

Gilroy, P. (1987) *There Ain't No Black in The Union Jack*. London: Routledge.

Glossop, C. & Shaheen, F. (2009) *Accession to Recession: A8 Migration in Bristol and Hull*. Centre for Cities. Available online: http://www.centreforcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/09/09-03-16-Accession-to-Recession-A8-migration-in-Bristol-and-Hull.pdf [Accessed 13/09/2015].

Goffman, E. (1969) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Allen Lane.

Google Scholar (2015) *Displaying Families citations*. Available online: http://scholar.google.co.uk/scholar?hl=en&q=janet+finch+family+display&btnG=&as_sdt=1%2C5&as_sdtp= [Accessed 14/09/2015].

Gov.UK (2015a) 2010 – 2015 government policy: community integration. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/2010-to-2015-government-policy-community-integration [Accessed 02/062015].

Gov.UK (2014a) *Apply to join family permanently living in the UK*. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/join-family-in-uk [Accessed 14/10/2014].

Gov.UK (2014b) *Asylum Support.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/asylum-support [Accessed 14/10/2014].

Gov.UK (2015b) *Child Tax Credit*. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/child-tax-credit [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Gov.UK (2015c) *Disclosure and Barring Service. Availabel online:* https://www.gov.uk/disclosure-barring-service-check/overview [Accessed 22/05/2015].

Gov. UK (n.d - a) *Help Paying for Childcare*. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/help-with-childcare-costs/free-childcare-and-education-for-2-to-4-year-olds [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Gov.UK (2015d) Immigration Rules part 5: Working in the UK. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/immigration-rules-part-5 [Accessed 27/08/2015].

Gov.UK (2012) *Leave to Remain.* Available online: http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/asylum/outcomes/successfulapplications/leaveto remain/ [Accessed 10/07/2012].

Gov. UK (n.d – b) *Prove Your Knowledge of English for Citizenship and Settling.* Available online: https://www.gov.uk/english-language [Accessed 05/03/2005].

Gov. UK (2015e) School Attendance and Absence. Available online: https://www.gov.uk/school-attendance-absence/overview [Accessed 05/03/2015].

Gov.UK (2015f) *Secure English Language Test - Transitional.* Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/405 631/selt_transitional.pdf [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Gov.UK (2014c) *Tier 2 Guidance.* Available online: https://www.gov.uk/governm,ent/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/342 862/Tier_2_v17.0_EXT.pdf [Accessed 14/10/2014].

Gov.UK (2014d) *Tier 4 Student Visa.* Available at: https://www.gv.uk/tier-4-general-visa/overview [Accessed 14/10/2014].

Gov. UK (2015g) *UK Border Agency.* Available at: https://www.gov.uk/government/organisations/uk-border-agency [Accessed 16/05/2015].

Greene,T., Porter,M., Iddenden, R., Kadhum, A. & Taylor, A. (2008) *Hull's 2007 Black and Minority Ethnic Survey Summary Report*. Hull: Hull Teaching Primary Care Trust.

Greenslade, R. (2005) *Seeking Scapegoats: The coverage of asylum in the UK press, Asylum and migration. Working paper 5 of the asylum and migration series.* London: Institute of Public Policy Research.

Groves, J. (2015) PM targets benefit tourists: he will demand EU allows Britain to ban payouts to migrants for first four years. *The Daily Mail,* 13 May [Online]. Available at: http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-3079042/PM-targets-benefit-tourists-demand-EU-allows-Britain-ban-payouts-migrants-four-years.html [Accessed 06/06/2015].

Hackett, A., Procter, L & Seymour, J. (eds) (2015) *Children's Spatialities.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Haldar, M. & Engebretsen, E. (2013) Governing the liberated child with self-manages family displays. *Childhood*, 21(4) 475-487.

Haldar, M. & Waerdahl**,** R. (2009) Teddy Diaries – A Method for Studying the Display of Family Life. *Sociology,* 43(6): 1141 – 1150.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clarke, J. & Roberts, B. (1978) *Policing The Crises: Mugging, the State and Law and Order.* London: Macmillan Education Ltd.

Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (1995) *Ethnography: Principles in Practice.* London: Routledge.

Harding, L. (2015) Police fear as many as 50 migrants dead inside lorry left by Austrian motorway. *The Guardian, 28 August* [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/aug/27/migrants-found-dead-inside-lorry-in-austria [Accessed 3/09/2015].

Haynes, J. & Dermott, E. (2011) Displaying Mixedness: Differences ad Family Relationships. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life.* Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 145-159.

Heaphy, B. (2011) Critical Relational Displays. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 19-37.

Heath, S., McGhee, D. & Trevena, P. (2011) Lost in Transnationalism: Unravelling the Conceptualisation of Families and Personal Life Through a Transnational Gaze. *Sociological Research Online*, 16(4), 1–7.

Herrera, F. (2011) The building of parental bonds: adoption and assisted reproduction in Chile. *Review of research and social intervention,* 32, 25-43.

Hill, M. & Issacharoff, R. (1971) *Community Action and Race Relations.* London: Oxford University Press.

Hodge, M. (2007) A Message For My Fellow Immigrants. *The Observer,* 20 May [Online]. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2007/may/20/comment.politics?INTCMP= ILCNETTXT3487 [Accessed 09/03/2012].

Home Office (2001b) *Building Cohesive Communities.* London: Home Office.
Home Office (2001a) *Community Cohesion: A Report of the Independent Review Team*. London: Home Office.

Home Office (1998) *Faster, Fairer, Firmer: a modern approach to Immigration and Asylum.* London: The Stationary Office Limited.

Home Office (2007a) *Preventing violent extremism – Winning hearts and minds.* London: The Stationery Office Limited.

Home Office (2007b) *Report on Community Cohesion: Our Shared Future*. London: The Stationery Office Limited.

Home Office (2010) *Sixth Report: Preventing Violent Extremism, Communities and Local Government Committee, Commission on Integration and Cohesion*. London: The Stationery Office Limited.

Home Office (2008) *The Economic Impact of Immigration: The government reply to the first report from the House of Lords Committee on Economic Affairs session 2007-2008*. London: The Stationary Office Limited.

Hoodfar, H. (1993) The Veil in their Minds and On our Heads: The Persistence of Colonial Images of Muslim Women. *Resources for Feminist Research/Documentation Sur La Recherche Féministe, 22*(3/4), 5-18.

Hope, C. & Bennett. A. (2015) Nigel Farage: Britons so ill at ease with immigrants their children cannot play in the streets. *The Telegraph,* 31 March [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/general-election-2015/11506884/Nigel-Farage-Britons-so-ill-at-ease-with-immigrants-their-children-cannot-play-in-the-streets.html [Accessed 13/04/2015].

Hörschelmann, K. & Schäfer, N. (2005) Performing the global through the local—globalisation and individualisation in the spatial practices of young East Germans. *Children's Geographies*, 3(2), 219-242.

House of Commons Health Committee (2003) *The Victoria Climbie Enquiry Report.* London: The Stationary Office Limited.

Hubble, S. & Kennedy, S. (2011) *Changes to funding for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) courses*, London: House of Commons Library. Available online: http://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN05946/SN05946.pdf [Accessed 13/09/2015].

Hughes, K. & Valentine, G. (2011) Practices of Display: The Framing and Changing on Internet Gambling Behaviours in Families. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 145-159.

Hull 2017 (n.d) *Hull UK City of Culture 2017*. Available online: http://hull2017.co.uk/ [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Hull 2017 (2013) *This City Belongs to Everyone – Supporting Hull's City of Culture Bid - #HullYes* [Video]. Available online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mXJkDgBUR9c [Accessed 10/02/2015].

Hull City Council (2012) *Ethnicity and Language Trends: January School Census.* Hull: Children and Young People's Services.

Hull City Council (2015a) *Local election results 2015.* Available online: http://www.hullcc.gov.uk/portal/page?_pageid=221%2C1365772&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Hull City Council (2015b) *The History of Hull Fair.* Available online: http://www.hullcc.gov.uk/portal/page?_pageid=221,388764&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL [Accessed 20/07/2015).

Hull City Council (2015c) *Ward and Neighbourhood Forums.* Available online: http://www.hullcc.gov.uk/portal/page?_pageid=221,146762&_dad=portal&_schema=PORTAL [Accessed 27/05/2015].

Hull College (n.d) *ESOL (English for Speakers of Other Languages).* Available online: http://www.hull-college.ac.uk/adults/esol [Accessed 31/07/2015].

Jagger. G. & Wright., C. (1999) *Changing Family Values: Difference, Diversity and the Decline of Male Order.* USA: Routledge.

James, A. & Curtis, P. (2010) Family Displays and Personal Lives. *Sociology,* 44(6): 1163–1180.

James, A. & James, A. (2008) *Key Concepts in Childhood Studies.* London: Sage.

Jamieson, L. (1998) *Intimacy: Personal Relationships in Modern Societies.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Jamieson, L., Simpson, R. & Lewis, R. (eds) (2011) *Researching Fmailies and Relationships: Reflections on Process.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Janmohamed, S. (2013) Woolwich attack: Muslims are free of guilt. We had to condemn this killing. *The Guardian, 26 May* [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2013/may/26/muslim-community-responds-woolwich-killing [Accessed 03/07/2015].

Jayaratne, E. & Stewart, A. (1991) Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in The Social Scineces. In Fonow, M. & Cook, J. (eds) *Beyond Methodology.* USA: Indiana University Press, 85-106.

Jones, O. (2014) *The Establishment*. London: Penguin.

Jones, C. & Hackett, S. (2011) The Role of 'Family Practices' and 'Displays of Family' in the Creation of Adoptive Kinship. *British Journal of Social Work*, 41(1), 40–56.

Jupp, V. (ed) (2006) *The Sage Dictionary of Social Research Methods.* UK: Sage.

Karla, V. & Kapoor, N. (2009) Interrogating Segregation, Integration and the Community Cohesion Agenda. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 35(9) 1397–415.

Kehily, M.J. & Thomson, R. (2011) Displaying Motherhood: Representations, Visual Methods and the Materiality of Maternal Practice. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 61-80.

Khan, K. (2009) *Preventing Violent Extremism (PVE): A Response from the Muslim Community*. Available online: http:// www.an-nisa.org/subpage.asp?id=284 [Accessed 20/01/2013].

Kilkey, M., Perrons, D. & Plomien, A. (2013a) *Gender, Migration and Domestic Work.* GB: Palgrave Macmillan.

Kilkey, M., Plomien, A. & Perrons, D. (2013b) Migrant men's fathering practices and projects in national and transnational spaces: recent Polish male migrants to London. *International Migration*, 52(1), 178-191.

Kim, J. (2011) Remitting 'filial co-habitation': 'actual' and 'virtual' co-residence between Korean professional migrant adult children couples in Singapore and their elderly parents. *Ageing & Society,* 32(8), 1337-1359.

King, N. & Horrocks, C. (2010) *Interviews in Qualitative Research*. London: Sage.

Klug, B. (2011) An almost unbearable insecurity: Cameron's Munich Speech. *CSAA Annual Conference.* Adelaide, 22-24 November 2011.

Kong, T.S.K., Mahoney, D. & Plummer, K. (2002) *Queering the Interview.* In Gubrium, J. & Holstein, J. (eds) *Handbook of Interview Research: Context and Method*. USA: Sage, 239-259.

Kristie, A. & Buckman, N. (2011) *Performing Allah's Work: Experiences of Muslim Family Carers In Britain.* PhD Thesis. The University of Nottingham.

Kundnani, A. (2001) *From Oldham to Bradford: the violence of the violated*. Available online: http://www.irr.org.uk/news/from-oldham-to-bradford-the-violence-of-the-violated/ [Accessed 19/01/2012].

Kundnani, A. (2002) *The Death of Multiculturalism*. *Available o*nline: http://www.irr.org.uk/news/the-death-of-multiculturalism/ [Accessed 2/06/2015].

Kundnani, A. (2007) *The End of Tolerance.* London: Pluto Books.
Labour Party (2014) *Rebuilding Britain With A One Nation Economy (speech by Ed Milliband).* Available online: http://www.labour.org.uk/rebuilding-britain-with-a-one-nation-economy-ed-miliband,2013-02-14 [Accessed 07/08/2014].

Laing, R.D. (1969) *The Politics of the Family and Other Essays*. London: Tavistock.

Law and Parents (2015) *Smacking Your Children*. Available online: http://www.lawandparents.co.uk/smacking-children.html [Accessed 05/03/2015].

Lee, E., Fairclough, C. & MacVarish, J. (2014) *Parenting Culture Studies.* London: Palgrave.

Levitt, P. & Glick Schiller, N. (2004) Conceptualising simultaneity: a transnational social field perspective on society. *International Migration review,* 38 (3), 1002–39.

Lewis, D. (2005) *Hull's Six Jewish Cemeteries.* Available online: http://www.jewishgen.org/jcr-uk/Community/hullSixJewishCemeterie.htm [Accessed 27/05/2015].

Lewis, H., Craig, G., Adamson, S., & Wilkinson, M. (2008) *Refugees, asylum seekers and migrants in Yorkshire and Humber, 1999-2008.* Leeds: Yorkshire Futures.

Lowson, E. & Arber, S. (2014) Preparing, Working, Recovering: Gendered Experiences of Night Work among Women and their Families. *Gender, Work & Organization,* 21 (3), 231-243.

Luzia, K. (2010) Travelling in your backyard: the unfamiliar places of parenting. *Social & Cultural Geography,* 11(4), 359 – 375.

Mason, J. (2004) Personal narratives, relational selves: Residential histories in the living and telling. *The Sociological Review,* 52(2), 162-179.

Mason, J. (1996) *Qualitative Researching.* London: Sage.

May, V. (2011) Self, Belonging and Social Change. *Sociology,* 45(3), 363–378.

Mayall, B. (2000) Conversations with Children: Working with Generational Issues. In Christensen, P. & James, A. (eds) *Research With Children: Perspectives and Practice.* USA: Routledge Falmer, 109-124.

McCall, L. (2005) The Complexities of Intersectionality. *Signs,* 30(3), 1771-1800.

McCollum, D. & Findlay, A. (2011a) *Employer and labour provider perspectives on Eastern European migration to the UK.* University of Dundee: ESRC Centre for Population Change.

McCollum, D. & Findlay, A. (2011b) *Trends in A8 migration to the UK during the recession.* University of Dundee: ESRC Centre for Population Change.

McDermott, E., Roen, K. & Scourfield, J. (2011) The non-display of authentic distress: public-private dualism in young people's discursive construction of self-harm. *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 33(5), 777–791.

McGhee, D., Travena, P., & Heath, S. (2015) Social Relationships and Relationships in Context: Post-Accession Poles in Southampton. *Population, Space and Place*, 21(5), 433-445.

McKie, L. & Callan, S. (2012) *Understanding Families: A Global Introduction*. London: Sage.

McLaughlin, J. & Clavering, E. (2011) Visualising difference, similarity and belonging in paediatric genetics Janice McLaughlin and Emma K. Clavering, *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 20, 1-16. Available online: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1467-9566.2011.01388.x/full [Accessed 11/01/2012].

McSherry, C. (2001) *Who Owns Academic Work? Battling for Control of Intellectual Property.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Migration Yorkshire (2014a) *Hull 2011 Census Profile*. Available online: http://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk/userfiles/attachments/pages/645/e-hull-2011-census-profile-iun-june-2014.pdf [Accessed 25/02/2015].

Migration Yorkshire (2014b) Hull Local Migration Profile Summary – November 2014. Available online: http://www.migrationyorkshire.org.uk/userfiles/attachments/pages/590/hulllmpsummary-november2014.pdf [Accessed 01/02/2015].

Miles, R. & Phizacklea, A. (eds) (1979) *Racism and political action in Britain*. London: Routledge and Kegan.

Mohood, T. (2011) Multiculturalism: not a minority problem. *The Guardian*, 7 February [Online]. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2011/feb/07/multiculturalism-not-minority-problem [Accessed 10/04/2012].

Morgan, D. (1996) *Family Connections.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Morgan, D. (2011a) Locating Family Practices, *Sociological Research Online,* 16(4), 1–9. Available online: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/16/4/14.html [Accessed 07/03/2014].

Morgan, D. (2011b) *Rethinking Family Practices.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Morris, N. (2007) Reid: Illegal Immigrants Are Scroungers. *The Independent on Sunday,* 7 March [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/leading-articles/leading-article-the-home-secretary-is-using-foul-language-439243.html [Accessed 23/03/2012].

Muir, S. & Mason, J. (2012) Capturing Christmas: The Sensory Potential of Data from Participant Produced Video, *Sociological Research Online.* Available online: http://www.socresonline.org.uk/17/1/5.html [Accessed 06/08/2012].

Mulligan, M. (2015) On Ambivalence and Hope in the Restless Search for Community: How to Work with the Idea of Community in the Global Age. *Sociology,* 49(2) 340-355.

Mulvey, G. (2010) When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematizing of Immigration and the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK, *Oxford Journals Online*. Available online*:* http://jrs.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2010/11/17/jrs.feq045 [Accessed 20/01/2012].

Nansen, B., Arnoldô, M., Davis, H. & Gibbs, M. (2011) Dwelling with media stuff: latencies and logics of materiality in four Australian homes. *Environment and Planning,* 29(4), 693-715.

Neill, S. J. (2010) Containing acute childhood illness within family life: a substantive grounded theory. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 14(4), 327 – 344.

Newsnight (2015) Editor Ian Katz [TV Programme]. BBC TWO. 13 May, 22.30.

NHS Choices (2015) *The NHS in England.* Available online: http://www.nhs.uk/NHSEngland/thenhs/about/Pages/overview.aspx [Accessed 05/03/2015].

NHS Commissioning Board (2013) *Arrangements to Secure Children and Adults Safeguarding in the Future NHS*. Available online: http://www.england.nhs.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/09/interim-safeguarding.pdf [Accessed 16/03/2015].

Nordqvist, P. (2010) Out of Sight, Out of Mind: Family Resemblances in Lesbian Donor Conception. *Sociology*, 44(6), 1128 -1144.

North Yorkshire Safeguarding Children's Board (2014) *Section 9: Safeguarding Children in Specific Circumstances.* Available Online: http://www.safeguardingchildren.co.uk/section-9c-procedures.html [Accessed 05/03/2015].

Oakley, A. (1976) *The Housewife, Past and Present.* New York: Vintage Books.

O'Connell, R. (2010) (How) is childminding family like? Family day care, food and the reproduction of identity at the public/private interface. *Sociological Review,* vol. 58(4), 563-586.

Offord. A. (2015) *Play Sector Slams UKIP Leader for "inaccurate and divisive" Comments*. Available online: http://www.cypnow.co.uk/cyp/news/1150760/play-sector-slams-ukip-leader-for-inaccurate-and-divisive-comments?utm_content&utm_campaign=090415+daily&utm_source=Children+%26+Young+People+Now&utm_medium=adestra_email&utm_term=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cypnow.co.uk%2Fcyp%2Fnews%2F1150760%2Fplay-sector-slams-ukip-leader-for-inaccurate-and-divisive-comments [Accessed 13/04/2015].

Ofsted (2008) *Hull College 2008 Ofsted Report.* Available online: http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/oxedu_reports/download/(id)/111489/(as)/130579_322276.pdf [Accessed 13/05/2015].

O'Kane, C. (2000) The Development of Participatory Techniques: Facilitating Children's Views about Decisions which Affect Them. In Christensen, P. & James, A. (eds) *Research With Children: Perspectives and Practice,* USA: Routledge Falmer, 125-155.

ONS (2003) *Census 2001 Summary Theme Figures and Rankings – ethnicity and religion*. Available online: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/search/index.html?newquery=hull+census+2001 [Accessed 19/07/2012].
Open Data Communities (2014) *Deprivation Mapper*. Available online: http://opendatacommunities.org/showcase/deprivation [Accessed 16/03/2015].

Ostow, R., Fijalkowski, J., Bodeman, M. & Merkens. (eds) (1991) *Ethnicity, Structured Inequality and the State in Canada and the Federal Republic of Germany*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.

Palmer, E. (2013) Mosque Attacked Every Three Days since Lee Rigby Murder. *International Business Times*, 26 June [Online]. Available at: http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/mosque-attack-lee-rigby-murder-full-list-483403 [Accessed 03/07/2015].

Panorama (2005) *Who Are The A8 Countries.* Available online: http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/programmes/panorama/4479759.stm [Accessed 10/04/2012].

Pantazis, C. & Pemberton, S. (2009) From the 'Old' to the 'New' Suspect Community: Examining the Impacts of Recent UK Counter-Terrorist Legislation. *British Journal of Criminology,* 49(5), 646-666.

Parsons, T. (1956) *Family Socialization and Interaction Processers.* Oxon: Routledge.

Patel, P. (2013) We can't afford benefit tourists. *The Sunday Express,* 17 February [Online]. Available at: http://www.express.co.uk/comment/expresscomment/378282/We-can-t-afford-benefit-tourists [Accessed 02/07/2015].

Peaker, G. (2007) *Local housing for local people.* Available online: http://nearlylegal.co.uk/blog/2007/05/local-housing-for-local-people/ [Accessed 29/03/2012].

Perkins, A. (2013) Cameron's Benefit Tourism is Fact Free Political Rhetoric. *The Guardian*, 27 November [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/nov/27/cameron-benefit-tourism-fact-free-migrants [Accessed 22/04/2015].

Pervez, S. (2013) Mishal Husain and the veil: what the Daily Mail was really trying to say. *The Guardian,* 08 October [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/the-northerner/2013/oct/08/mishal-husain-veil-daily-mail [Accessed 13/03/2015].

Philip, G. (2014) Fathering after separation or divorce: navigating domestic, public and moral spaces. *Families Relationships and Societies*, 3(2), 2119 – 2133.

Philip, G. (2013) Relationality and moral reasoning in accounts of fathering after separation or divorce: care, gender and working at 'fairness'. *Families, Relationships and Societies, 2(3),* 409-24.

Pilkington, A. (1984) *Race Relations in Britain*. Bath: The Pitman Press.

Pink, S. (2001) *Doing Visual Ethnography*. London: Sage Publications.

Pitt, B. (2013) *Online hate and the Grimsby mosque firebombing*. Available online: http://www.islamophobiawatch.co.uk/online-hate-and-the-grimsby-mosque-firebombing/ [Accessed 21/06/2015].

Public Sector Executive (2015) *Five Years of Severe Cuts for Children's Services.* Available online: http://www.publicsectorexecutive.com/Education/five-years-of-severe-cuts-for-childrens-centre-services [Accessed 14/05/2015].

Punch, S. (2002) Research With Children: The Same or Different from Research With Adults? *Childhood,* 9(3), 321-341.

Ramazanoglu, C. (1992) On feminist Methodology: Male Reason Versus Female Empowerment. *Sociology,* 26(2), 207-211.

Rees *et al.* (2010) Food in Foster Families: Care, Communication and Conflict, *Children and Society.* Available online: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2010.00332.x/abstract [Accessed 03/01/2012].

Reynolds, T. & Zontini, E. (2014) Bringing transnational families from the margins to the centre of family studies. *Britain, Families, Relationships and Societies,* 3(2), 251-68.

Ribbens, J. (1989) "Interviewing Women: An 'Unnatural Situation'?". *Women's Studies International Forum,* 12(6), 579-592.

Ribbens McCarthy, J. & Edwards, R. (2011) *Key Concepts in Family Studies.* UK: Sage.

Richards, L. (2005) *Handling Qualitative Data: A practical guide.* London: Sage.

Robinson, D. (2010) New immigrants and migrants in social housing in Britain: discursive themes and lived realities. *Policy and Politics*, 38(1), 57-77.

Roney, J. (2008) *Housing Report to the Migration Impacts Forum.* Available online: www.ukba.homeoffice.gov.uk/sitecontent/documents/managingourborders/mif/papersandagendas/thirdmeeting/housereport.pdf?view=Binary [Accessed 12/09/2013].

Rose, H. (1983) Hand, Brain and Heart: A feminist Epistemology for the Natural Sciences. *Signs,* 9(1), 73-91.

Roth, M. (2011) *Strategies of Transnational Motherhood: The Case of Romanian Women,* Romania. PhD thesis. Babes-Bolyai University.

Ruby, F. (2006) Listening to the Voices of Hijab. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 29(1), 54–66.

Ryan-Flood, R. (2011) Commentary on Almack's Chapter. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 122-125.

Saggar, S. (1997) The Dog that Didn't Bark? Immigration, Race and the Election. In Geddes, A. & Tonge, J. (eds) *Labour's Landslide: 1997 General Election.* Manchester: Manchester University Press, 147-164.

Seymour, J. (2011) 'Family Hold Back': Displaying Families in the Single-Location Home/Workplace. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 160-174.

Seymour, J. (2014) Servicing the Carnivalesque: Foregrounding Family Lives in Commercial Homes. *Families, Relationships and Societies,* 3(1), 135-138.

Seymour, J. & Walsh, J. (2013) Displaying Families, Migrant Families and Community Connectedness: The Application of an Emerging Concept in Family Life. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies,* XLIV(6), 689-698.

Shain, F. (2013) Race, Nation and Education: An overview of attempts to manage diversity since the 1950s. *Education Enquiry,* 4(1), 63-85.

Sharma, S. (2008) *Sleep-walking Into Segregation: The Backlash Against Multiculturalism and claims for a Differentialist Citizenship*. Available online: http://www.surrey.ac.uk/cronem/files/conf2009papers/Sharma.pdf [Accessed 19/01/2012].

Sharma, S. & Guest, M. (2013) Navigating religion between university and home: Christian students' experiences in English universities. *Social and Cultural Geography*, 14(1), 59-79.

Sheahan, J. (2011) *History of the Town and Port of Kingston-Upon-Hull*. UK: British Library.

Short, L. (2011) Commentary on Almack's Chapter. In Dermott, E. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Displaying Families: A New Concept for the Sociology of Family Life*. Great Britain: Palgrave Macmillan, 119-122.

Sirriyeh, A. (2013) Hosting Strangers: hospitality and family practices in fostering accompanied refugee young people. *Child and family Social Work,* 18(1), 5–14.

Sivanandan, A. (2006) *Britain's Shame: From multiculturalism To Nativism*. Available online: http://www.irr.org.uk/news/britains-shame-from-multiculturalism-to-nativism/ [Accessed 26/07/2012].

Skills Funding Agency (2014) *Funding Rules 2014 – 2015, Version 2.* Available online: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/401 649/funding_rules_2014_to_2015_version_2.pdf [Accessed 12/05/2015].

Slater, N., Adjonyoh, Z., Pang, J., Sodha, M., Allibhoy, O. & Khan, K. (2015) Let's Eat Together: How Immigration Made British Food Great. *The Guardian,* 24 May [Online]. Available at: Togetherhttp://www.theguardian.com/global/2015/may/24/lets-eat-together-cooking-immigration-britain-food [Accessed 27/05/2015].

Slocock, C. (2008) Phil Woolas Should Blame His Own Department, Not Asylum Seekers. *The Guardian,* 20 November [Online]. Available at: http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/nov/20/response-immigration-woolas-refugees [Accessed 08/04/2012].

Smart, C. (2008) 'Can I Be Bridesmaid?' Combining the Personal and Political in Same-Sex Weddings. *Sexualities,* 11(6), 761–776.

Smart, C. (2011) Families, Secrets and Memories. *Sociology*, 45(4), 539-553.

Smart, C. (2007) *Personal Life: New Directions in Sociological Thinking*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Smart, C. & Neale, B. (1999) *Family Fragments.* USA: Polity Press.

Solomos, J. (2003) *Race and Racism in Britain*, 3rd edition. Britain: Palgrave Macmillan.

Spencer, S. (2007) Immigration. In Seldon, A. (ed) *Blair's Britain 1997-2007*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 341-360.

Spencer, S., Ruhs, M., Anderson, B. & Rogaly, B. (2007) *Migrants' lives beyond the workplace -The experiences of Central and East Europeans in the UK.* UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Stanley, L. & Wise, S. (1993) *Breaking Out Again: Feminist Ontology and Epistemology.* London: Routledge.

Stevens, D. (2004) The Nationality, Immigration and Asylum Act 2002: Secure Borders, Safe Haven? *Modern Law Review*, 67(4), 616-631.

Taylor, J.E. (1999) The new economics of labour migration and the role of remittances in the migration process. *International Migration,* 37(1), 63-88.

Taylor, Y., Hines, S. & Casey, M. (2010) *Theorising Intersectionality and Sexuality.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

The Guardian (2009) Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act, 2001. *The Guardian,* 13 January [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/libertycentral/2009/jan/13/anti-terrorism-act [Accessed 05/07/2015].

The Guardian (2006) Kurds in Hull. *The Guardian,* 23 January [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2006/jan/23/britishidentity.features116 [Accessed 19/05/2015].

The Guardian (2011) The UK Citizenship Test: What Changes would you make? *The Guardian*, 12 October [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/news/blog/2011/oct/12/uk-citizenship-test-what-changes [Accessed 07/08/2014].

The Independent (2015) Somebody's Child. *The Independent,* 3rd September [Online]. Available at: 2015http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/if-these-extraordinarily-powerful-images-of-a-dead-syrian-child-washed-up-on-a-beach-dont-change-europes-attitude-to-refugees-what-will-10482757.html [Accessed 04/09/2015].

The Kindertransport Association (n.d) *Kindertransport and KTA History: Rising in the Moment.* Available online: http://www.kindertransport.org/history03_rising.htm [Accessed 04/07/2015].

The Refugee Council (2015a) *Resettlement Programme*. Available online: http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/what_we_do/refugee_services/resettlement_progr amme [Accessed 19/05/2015].

The Refugee Council (2015b) *The Facts About Asylum.* Available online: http://www.refugeecouncil.org.uk/policy_research/the_truth_about_asylum/facts_ab out_asylum_-_page_1 [Accessed 02/04/2015].

The Runnymede Trust. (1997) *Islamophobia: A Challenge For Us All.* UK: The Runnymede Trust.

The Telegraph (2010) Conservative manifesto: 2010 general election party policy. *The Telegraph,* n.d [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/election-2010/7165000/conservative-manifesto.html [Accessed 05/07/2015].

The Telegraph (2013) Woolwich murder a 'betrayal of Islam' says David Cameron. *The Telegraph,* 03 June [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/terrorism-in-the-uk/10096482/Cameron-Woolwich-murder-a-betrayal-of-Islam.html [Accessed 03/07/2015].

The Times (2013) Transcript of Woolwich killer speech. *The Times,* 23 May [Online]. Available at: http://www.thetimes.co.uk/tto/news/uk/crime/article3772760.ece [Accessed 03/07/2015].

Thomas, P. (2014) Divorced but still co-habitating? Britain's Prevent/community cohesion tension. *British Politics,* 9(4), 472 –493*.*

Triple P Positive Parenting Programme (n.d) *Triple P In a Nutshell.* Available online: http://www.triplep.net/glo-en/find-out-about-triple-p/triple-p-in-a-nutshell/ [Accessed 05/03/2015].

Uberoi, V & Modood, T. (2013) Inclusive Britishness: A Multiculturalist Advance. *Political Studies,* 61(1), 23–41.

UCL News (2015) *Positive economic impact of UK immigration from the European Union: new evidence.* Available online: https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/news-articles/1114/051114-economic-impact-EU-immigration [Accessed 17/06/2015].

UKBA (2012) *Leave to Remain.* Available online: http://www.ukba.homeoffice.gov/uk/asylum/outcomes/successfulapplications/leavet oremain/ [Accessed 10/07/2012].

Valentine, G., Piekut, A. & Harris, C. (2014) Intimate encounters: the negotiation of difference within the family and its implications of social relations in public spaces, *The Geographical Journal.* Available online: http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/geoj.12095/abstract [Accessed 01/08/2014].

Verkaik, R. (2010) Anti-extremist scheme 'spies on Muslims'. *The Independent*, 30 March [Online]. Available at: http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/antiextremist-scheme-spies-on-muslims-1930651.html?printService=print [Accessed 10/04/2012].

Vertovec, S. (2004) Migrant transnationalism and mode of transformation. *International Migration Review,* 38(3), 970–1001.

Walcott, H. (1995) *The Art of Fieldwork.* Walnut Creek: Alta Mira Press.

Walsh, J. (2015) Displaying Across Borders: The Role of Family Display in Maintaining Transnational Intergenerational Relations. In Juozeliuniene, I. & Seymour, J. (eds) *Family Change in Times of the De-Bordering of Europe and Global Mobility: resources, processes and practices.* Vilnius: Vilnius University Press, 340-358.

Ward, J. (2008) *ESOL The Context and Issues, Niace Independent Commission of Inquiry.* Available online: http://www.niace.org.uk/lifelonglearninginquiry/docs/Jane-Ward-migration-evidence.pdf [Accessed 22/05/2015].

Weber, L. & Bowling, B. (2008) Valiant beggers and global vagabonds: Select, eject, immobilize. *Theoretical Criminology,* 12(3), 355-375.

Webster, C. (1997) The Construction of British 'Asian' Criminality. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 25(1), 65-86.

Weeks, G., Heaphy, B. & Donovan, C. (2001) *Same Sex Intimacies: families of choice and other life experiments*. London: Routledge.

Werber, P. (2007) Veiled Interventions in Pure Space Honour, Shame and Embodied Struggles among Muslims in Britain and France. *Theory, Culture and Society,* 24(2), 1661-186.

Wilkinson, M. (2008a) *Migrant workers in the Humber Sub-Region, Humber Improvement Partnership.* Hull: University of Hull.

Wilkinson, M. (2008b) *New Labour, the Gangmasters Licensing Authority and the woefully inadequate protection of migrant workers in the UK.* Hull: University of Hull.

Wilkinson, M. (2011) Demonising 'the other': British Government complicity in the exploitation and vilification of migrant workers. *European Consortium for Political Research General Conference.* Reykjavik, Iceland, 25-27, August 2011.

Williams, A. (1993), Diversity and Agreement in Feminist Ethnography. *Sociology,* 27(4), 575-589.

Wintour, P. (2015a) Britain should not take more Middle East refugees says David Cameron. *The Guardian,* 3 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/02/david-cameron-migration-crisis-will-not-be-solved-by-uk-taking-in-more-refugees?CMP=share_btn_fb [Accessed 04/09/2015].

Wintour, P. (2015b) David Cameron to unveil new limits on extremists' activities in Queens' speech. *The Guardian*, 13 May [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk-news/2015/may/13/counter-terrorism-bill-extremism-disruption-orders-david-cameron [Accessed 14th May, 2015].

Wintour, P. (2012) Theresa May Considers Curbs on EU migration. *The Guardian,* 07 October [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/uk/2012/oct/07/theresa-may-curbs-eu-migration [Accessed 1/07/2015].

Wintour, P. & Percival, J. (2011) Cameron begins extremism crackdown as cash withheld from 'suspect groups'. *The Guardian,* 06 February [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/politics/2011/feb/06/david-cameron-islamic-extremism-radicalism [Accessed 06/07/2015].

Wintour, P. & Watt, N. (2015) Cameron bows to pressure to let in more Syrian refugees. *The Guardian*, 3 September [Online]. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2015/sep/03/cameron-bows-to-pressure-to-allow-more-syrian-refugees-into-britain [Accessed 04/09/2015].

Womack, S. (2001) Blunkett in Furore over 'British test'. *The Telegraph,* 10 December [Online]. Available at: http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/uknews/1364834/Blunkett-in-furore-over-British-test.html [Accessed 24/02/2012].

Wonnacott, J. & Watts, D. (2014) *Daniel Pelka Review – Retrospective Deeper Analysis and Progress Report on Implementation of Recommendations*. Coventry Safeguarding Children's Board.

Workpermit (2011) *UK Opposition Labour Party says their previous immigration policy was wrong.* Available online: http://www.workpermit.com/news/2011-09-28/uk-opposition-labour-party-says-their-previous-immigration-policy-was-wrong.htm [Accessed 10/04/2012].

Worley, C. (2005) "It's not about Race. It's about the Community'': New Labour and ''Community Cohesion". *Critical Social Policy*, 25(4), 483–496.

Young, M., & Willmott, P. (1973) *The symmetrical Family.* New York: Pantheon Books.

Zetter, R., Griffiths, D., Sigona, N., Flynn, D., Pasha, T & Beynon, R. (2006) *Immigration, social cohesion and social capital. What are the links?* UK: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Zittoun, T. (2004) Symbolic Competencies for Developmental Transitions: The Case of the Choice of First Names. *Culture and Psychology,* 10(2), 131–61.

APPENDIX ONE: MIGRANT FAMILY PARTICIPANTS

(refer to fig.1 in chapter two to see Local Authority wards)

Chinese Family
The members of this family are Chyou, an adult woman, Bai, an adult man, and their son, Gen (age three). Bai and Chyou are married, both are in there thirties and the family live in the Beverley Ward area (central west Hull). Six years ago, Bai was sponsored by a Hull based service industry employer to come and work in the UK. Initially, Chyou stayed in China, but after Gen's birth she and the child resided between China and the UK. In the last year, they have settled in the UK and the family now have "leave to remain". Chyou is a 'stay at home' mother and all three family members speak very little English.
Bengali Family
The members of this family are Nawa, an adult woman, and Momo, an adult man. Nawa and Momo are married, in their early thirties and they do not have children. They have lived in the UK for a year, because Nawa is a post graduate student at Hull University, although Momo is also employed in a professional role in a local business. They reside in the Orchard Park and Greenwood Ward area (north Hull) and both speak fluent English.
Nigerian Family
The members of this family are Justina, an adult woman, and her two sons, Edward (age two) and Gideon (age one). Justina is a single parent, unmarried and in her late twenties. The family live in the Myton Ward (central Hull) area and Justina has a professional qualification, but is unable to work as she an asylum seeker. Justina was in the UK some time before she was made aware that she could claim asylum and, during this time, her two sons were born.   Justina speaks a tribal language, but speaks English fluently as it is the official language of her birth country and her children are only learning English.
Slovakian family 1
The members of this family are Ivana, an adult woman, and Fillip, an adult man, and their two children, Vilam (age six) and Teresa (aged four). Ivana and Fillip are married and in their thirties and the family live in the Bricknell Ward area (central west Hull). At the time of A8 accession, the couple came to the UK to seek work. Since this time, Fillip has gained employment as a health professional, whilst Ivana is currently a 'stay at home' mother and, prior to this, she worked in the public sector in the UK. Both children were born post migration. Both family adults and the eldest child are fluent in English. Vilam speaks very limited Slovakian, whilst Teresa only speaks Slovakian.
Slovakian Family 2
The members of this family are Lenka, an adult woman, and her two sons, Matus (age eleven) and Dominik (age four). Lenka is in her early thirties and came to the UK with her husband to find work around the time of A8 accession into the EU. She is now a single parent and works in the public sector. She lives in the Beverley Ward area with her sons (central west Hull). The eldest boy was born in Slovakia and the youngest in the UK. All three speak fluent English. Matus speaks Slovakian to a good standard, whilst Dominik does not.

Malaysian Family
The members of this family are, Ella, an adult woman, Zack, an adult man, and their daughter, Anna (age two), who was born in Malaysia. Zack and Ella are married, in their thirties and have been in the UK for two years, because Ella is a post graduate student at Hull University. Both adults have well-established careers in Malaysia, which they intend to return to when Ella has finished her studies. Currently, Zack cares for Anna and works part time in the service industry. The family live in the University Ward area (central west Hull), both adults speak fluent English and they speak to Anna only in English.
Kurdish Family
The members of this family are, Sana, an adult woman in her twenties, Hiwa, an adult man in his thirties, and their son, Aso, who is a baby. Hiwa came to the UK in 2002 as an asylum seeker and has since been granted "leave to remain". The couple are recently married and, in the last year, Sana has moved to the UK as Hiwa's spouse. Since this time, Aso has been born. Hiwa works in the service industry and Sana has qualifications to work in the public sector, but does not work owing to visa restrictions and caring responsibilities for Aso. The family live in the Myton Ward area (central Hull), both family adults speak very little English and Aso is pre-verbal.
Polish Family 1
The members of this family are Magda, an adult woman, and her daughter, Daniella (age seven).   Magda came to the UK to find work with her husband at the time of A8 accession into the EU. At this time, Daniella was a new born and stayed in Poland with grandparents, but joined Magda after a few months. Shortly after migration, Magda and her husband separated. Magda is in her thirties and is now a single mother, working in the service industry. The family live in the Avenue Ward area (central west Hull) and both speak fluent English, although Daniella speaks very little Polish.
Polish Family 2
The members of this family are Sylwia, an adult woman in her forties, her son Lech (seventeen) and her daughter Ruta (age fourteen). Although Sylwia also has older children, they are not co-resident and are not research participants. At the time of A8 accession into the EU, Sylwia came to the UK to find work, leaving her children and husband in Poland. Shortly afterwards, Lech and Ruta came to join her in the UK but her husband did not. She is now a single mother and works in the service industry. The family live in the Marfleet Ward area (east Hull) and, although both children speak fluent English, Sylwia only speaks a little and lacks confidence in her ability. Both children speak fluent Polish.
Mixed Family
The members of this family are Rachel, an adult white British-born woman and, Saman, an adult Kurdish-born man. They are not married and have two children, Macey (age four) and Declan (age three). Saman is in his thirties and came to the Hull in 2002 as an asylum seeker and has since been granted "leave to remain". Rachel was born in Hull and is in her twenties. The family live in the Newington Ward (west Hull) area and Rachel is a 'stay at home' mother. Saman works in the mechanics trade and speaks fluent English. Rachel does not speak Kurdish, whilst both Macey and Declan speak both English and Kurdish. Rachel also has an older son, Jack, from a previous relationship.

APPENDIX TWO: AUDIENCE PARTICIPANTS

Indigenous Audience Participants Resident in Hull (not interviewed in professional capacity)	
Name	**Relevant Information**
Mollie	Is 18, lives in the Avenue Ward (central west Hull), attends a city centre sixth form college and is not a parent. She is white British.
Billie	Is 19 and lives in the Orchard Park and Greenwood Ward (north Hull). He left school at 16, is not a parent and does not work. He is white British.
Kayleigh	Is 20 and left school at 16. She lives in Southcoates West Ward (east Hull), is a single parent and does not work. She is white British.
Toni	Is 25, lives in Sutton Ward (east Hull), attended university and currently works in a shop in Ings Ward (east Hull). She is not a parent. She is white -British.
Andrew	Is 28, left school at 16, lives in Holderness Ward (east Hull) and works in Newland Ward (central west Hull). He is not a parent. He is white British.
Sharon	Is 30, left school at 16 and is a bus driver. She lives in Newington Ward (west Hull) and works throughout the city. She is not a parent. She is white British.
Helen	Is 30, attended university and is a social care professional working throughout the city. She is a parent and lives in the Newland Ward (central west Hull) and has a partner of Jamaican heritage. She is white British.
Sarah	Is 35, attended university and is a health professional working throughout the city. She is a parent and lives in the Newland Ward (central west Hull). She is white British.
Daryl	Is 36, left school at 16 and works in the construction industry. He is a parent and lives in the Beverley Ward (central west Hull). He is white British.
Sue	Is 42, left school at 16 and drives community transport throughout the city. She is not a parent and lives in Newington Ward (west Hull). She is white British.
Bruce	Is 43, left school at 16 and works in leisure services throughout the city. He is not a parent and lives in the Orchard Park and Greenwood Ward (north Hull). He is of white British/black American heritage.
Yvonne	Is 45, left school at 16 and lives in the Ings Ward (east Hull). She works in a shop in the same ward and is a single parent. She is of white British/ South-Indian heritage.
Mark	Is 50, left school at 16 and lives in the Avenue Ward (central west Hull), but works in Bransholme West Ward (north Hull). He is a parent. He is white British and his wife is of EU origin.
Beth	Is 55, a student and lives in the Avenue Ward (central west Hull). She is a single parent and white British. Her children are dual heritage white British/Malaysian.

Name	Relevant Information
Dave	Is 57, attended university and is a social care professional. He lives in the Southcoates East Ward (east Hull), works in the Orchard Park and Greenwood Ward (north Hull) and he is a grandparent. He is white British.
Brenda	Is 58, left school at 16 and works in family support. She lives in the Myton Ward (central Hull), works in the Newington and St. Andrews Wards (west Hull) and she is a parent. She is white British.
Hillary	Is 63, did work in the service industry and is now retired and cares for her grandchildren daily in central west Hull. She left school at 16 and lives in the Boothferry Ward (west Hull). She is white British.
Annie	Is 64 and is an adult education teacher. She lives in the Bricknell Ward (west Hull) and teaches throughout the city. She is a grandparent and white British.
Arthur	Is 70, left school at 16, had a career in engineering and is now retired. He lives in the Beverley Ward (central west Hull) and is a grandparent. He is white British.

Audience Participants Interviewed in their Professional Capacity	
Name	**Relevant Information**
Phil	Head teacher at a secondary school with a high EAL intake (approximately 40%) in central west Hull. He is not resident in the city and he is white British.
Scott	Teacher at a primary school with a low EAL intake (approximately 6%) in west Hull. Scott holds responsibility for diversity in the school. He is resident in west Hull and he is white British.
Jenny	Head teacher at a local primary school with a high EAL intake (approximately 50%) in central west Hull. She is not resident in Hull and is white British.
Jackie	Lunchtime supervisor at the same school. She lives in the school catchment area and is white British.
Paula	Family liaison worker at the same school. She lives in the school catchment area and is white British.
Anna	Teaching assistant at the same school, with responsibility for EAL children. She lives in the school catchment area and she is of Polish origin.
Donna	Community cohesion police officer working in west and central west Hull. She is also resident in west Hull and is white British.
Grace	Community participation specialist working throughout the city. She is British-born and of Ghanaian heritage. She is also resident in central west Hull.
Robert	New editor at the local newspaper, *The Hull Daily Mail*. He is also resident in central west Hull and is white British.
Imam	Imam at a local mosque situated in central west Hull. He is British-born and of Indian heritage.
Lorraine	Refugee resettlement worker, working in locations throughout the city. She is resident in west Hull and is white British.