

DR. SIMON GOODMAN (Orcid ID : 0000-0001-5007-3740)

Article type : Research Article

Political and Media Discourses about Integrating Refugees in the UK

Simon Goodman, Coventry University & Steve Kirkwood, Edinburgh University

Running title: Discourses about Integrating Refugees

Correspondence details:

Dr Simon Goodman, Coventry University, Priory Street, Coventry, CV1 5FB, UK

Office phone: 0247659515 Email: Simon.Goodman@Coventry.ac.uk

Conflict of interest:

The authors have no conflict of interest.

Ethical statement: Ethical approval was granted by Coventry University and Edinburgh University ethics committees.

Transparency Statement: Instructions for accessing the data that is analysed are included in the manuscript.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2595

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Abstract

This paper addresses political and media discourses about integrating refugees in the UK in the context of the 'refugee crisis'. A discursive psychological approach is presented as the best way to understand what talk about the concept is used to accomplish in these debates. A large corpus of political discussions (13 hours of debate featuring 146 politicians) and 960 newspaper articles from the UK were discourse analysed. The analysis identified five dilemmas about integration: Integration is positive and necessary, but challenging; Host communities are presented as welcoming, but there are limits to their capacity; Refugees are responsible for integration, but host communities need to provide support; Good refugees integrate, bad ones don't; Refugees are vulnerable and are skilled. All are used to warrant the inclusion or exclusion of refugees. The responsibility of western nations to support refugees is therefore contingent on the refugees behaving in specific ways.

Key words

Refugee Crisis; Refugees; Integration; Discursive Psychology; Discourse Analysis

Introduction

This paper addresses political and media discourses about integrating refugees in the UK. The 'refugee crisis' has brought issues of integration into the public domain which has led to an increase in public debates about how refugees (and other migrants) can successfully integrate into society. The paper takes a discursive psychological approach (DP; Edwards & Potter, 1992) to the talk, which means that the data will be analysed to understand what the talk and texts about refugee integration are accomplishing in the wider debate about refugees, which in turn influences how refugee issues come to be responded to.

Context: The refugee crisis

The 'crisis' first became a news story in the UK in April 2015 after a number of boats that refugees were using to cross the Mediterranean Sea capsized (Goodman, Sirriyeh, & McMahon, 2017). Since then, but peaking in 2015 and 2016, the crisis has continued to be a major news story, although it is not as prominent as at its peak. The number of people attempting to reach the safety of Europe, and along with this the number of people dying attempting the journey has remained high. In 2015, according to official figures (UNHCR, 2015) that could potentially underestimate numbers, over one million refugees attempted the crossing, mostly by sea (but with over 34,000 crossing by land) and 3,771 of these drowned (IOM, 2016). In 2016 363,504 people attempted the Mediterranean crossing and 5,143 died in the attempt. In 2017 171,635 people crossed and 3,116 died (IOM, 2018) and in 2018 116,852 people crossed by sea with 2,297 dead or missing (IOM, 2019).

Europe's response to the crisis has been mixed, with Germany taking in over one million refugees (UNHCR, 2018) but other countries going to lengths to prevent refugees reaching them (Crawley, Duvell, Sigona, McMahon, & Jones, 2016). Media and political responses have varied throughout the crisis (Goodman et al., 2017), where general negativity and policies designed to prevent access have occasionally been marked by more humanitarian approaches, notably following the widely reported drowning of a three-year-old refugee (Parker, Naper, & Goodman, 2018). The 'crisis' itself, while not entirely new (Goodman et al., 2017) brought further attention to issues of refugees (people fleeing their country because of a fear for their safety) and asylum seekers (those awaiting official refugee status in the country they flee to) that had been topical in news settings for many years. How the European

Union (EU) should respond to the crisis has been controversial and has itself been considered a crisis for the union. The UK's decision to leave the EU has been shown to be influenced by the refugee crisis and general opposition to migration (Goodman & Narang, in press).

Integration

With the large number of people entering Europe, issues of integration can come to the fore. Mulvey (2010) shows how in the UK integration came to be linked with migration following the response of young Muslim residents to planned far-right marches which led to civil unrest. Rather than implicating the far-right, the government blamed the unrest on a lack of integration. This unrest occurred in the summer before the September 11th terrorist attacks in the USA. Following this, and the terrorist attacks in London in July 2005, issues of integration came to be linked more widely with Muslims. Mulvey shows how this focus on integration, especially directed towards Muslim migrants led a new concern with 'community cohesion'.

As part of this focus on integration, Ager and Strang (2004, 2008) developed a framework of integration for the government that could be used to assist with integrating refugees into the UK. They developed four 'domains' that are organised into the following four headings:

1. Means and markers: Employment; Housing; Education; Health.
2. Social connections: Social bonds; Social bridges; Social links.
3. Facilitators: Language and cultural knowledge; Safety and stability.
4. Foundation: Rights and citizenship (developed from Ager and Strang, 2004: 3)

Means and markers are described as being essential to achieve if integration is to occur. Kirkwood, McKinlay, and McVittie (2015) point out that most of the UK government's support for integration comes in this area, in the form of accommodation, education and access to the National Health Service, which offers healthcare free at the point of delivery. Asylum seekers, however, are not allowed to work, whereas refugees are. Social connections point to the importance of relationships with others, facilitators are necessary for integration to occur and foundations are the basis upon which new arrivals can be expected to integrate. This official framework for integration is not the only way in which integration can be understood. For instance, Berry's (1997) influential framework of 'acculturation' distinguished between integration (whereby an individual retains aspects of their own culture and engages socially with the host society) and assimilation (through which people engage with the host society while shedding or distancing themselves from their original culture). However, the way that people talk about integration does not necessarily fit with these theoretical definitions (Bowskill, Lyons, & Coyle, 2007). To properly address how integration is understood and used by actors in debates about refugees a discursive psychological approach is needed.

Discursive psychology and refugees

Discursive Psychology (DP; Edwards & Potter, 1992) is the approach to social psychology that topicalises social concepts such as integration to investigate in detail the ways in which they are made sense of, talked about and used within social interactions.

There is now a well-established body of work within discursive psychology addressing talk about refugees (Kirkwood & Goodman, 2018). This work has focussed on media representations (Goodman et al, 2017) parliamentary debates (Every & Augoustinos, 2008) and public discussion forums (Burke & Goodman, 2012) and has highlighted a range of argumentative strategies that are used to justify the harsh treatment and exclusion of refugees from the host nation, which are discussed below.

One of the most regularly seen anti-refugee arguments presents them as economic migrants who are posing as refugees (e.g. Lynn & Lea, 2003) and are therefore not legitimate. This leads to arguments over how refugees should be categorised, with opponents of refugees often explicitly claiming that these people should be referred to as either economic migrants or simply migrants, which works to undermine refugees' rationale for moving to a country that offers safety (Leudar et al, 2008). By distinguishing 'genuine' from 'bogus' or 'fake' asylum seekers, speakers are able to present themselves as caring about actual refugees and only opposed to non-refugees, however, this leaves open the possibility that any refugee arriving in a host country comes to be viewed as at least possibly illegitimate (Goodman & Speer, 2007). Partly as a result of the repositioning of refugees as economic or illegal migrants, they can come to be viewed as likely to be criminals (Leudar et al., 2008) or terrorists. Other anti-refugee arguments are about the costs that hosting them are assumed to incur (Lynn & Lea, 2003) so there are economic arguments about refugees too.

The 'refugee crisis' has led to an intensification of debates about refugee issues and there is already a range of DP work addressing the crisis. First, Goodman et al. (2017) demonstrated how the representation of the crisis fluctuates and that the different representations used infer different people affected by the crisis, particularly as it shifted from

focussing on ‘migrants’ to ‘refugees’ and then back to ‘migrants’ again, with a focus on ‘refugees’ corresponding with a more tolerant and supportive approach to those affected by the crisis. They also note that the crisis is usually presented as one for Europe, rather than for the people directly affected by the crisis. One of the reasons for the (temporary) shift to a focus on ‘refugees’ was the widespread viewing of photographs showing a three-year-old Syrian refugee who had drowned attempting the Mediterranean crossing, which was shown by Parker et al. (2018) to have changed the reporting of the crisis towards a more positive focus on refugees in the UK, Australia and Norway.

Another more positive focus on refugees came in the form of calls for shared humanity between the host nation and refugees. This was found by Nightingale, Quayle, & Muldoon (2017) and Kirkwood (2017) who both showed that humanitarian and sympathetic representations of refugees were made, but also that these were often not enough to fully support accepting refugees, on the grounds of other more practical considerations such as cost and space. While the most common anti-refugee strategy, as shown above, is to claim that refugees are not really refugees at all, in the context of the crisis this became more difficult due to the images coming out of Syria where many (but not all) the refugees originated. Nevertheless, anti-refugee arguments were still possible, as the findings demonstrate. For example, Goodman and Narang (in press) showed how support for child refugees was undermined by the ongoing suggestion that they were really adults posing as children. In addition to this, they showed that in the UK, the refugee crisis was used to justify voting to leave the European Union.

Discursive psychology and refugee integration

Many anti-refugee arguments identified through discursive analyses are implicitly about integration, including the regular use of ‘us and them’ distinctions in talk about refugees (e.g. Leudar, Marsland, & Nekvapil, 2004), which works to present refugees – ‘them’ – as different and apart from ‘us’, those in the host nation. There are further suggestions that hosting refugees can be harmful for the host nation by virtue of damaging the economy and the ability of the country to look after people born there (Lynn & Lea, 2003). It has been shown that preventing asylum seekers from entering the host country is justified on the grounds of protecting community relations and preventing the spread of far-right extremists (Goodman, 2008). Suggesting that community relations can be damaged by refugees settling into a country implies that refugees are unlikely to integrate properly and also that integration is a positive thing that should be protected.

Bowskill et al. (2007) discursively addressed talk about integration in regard to faith schools and showed how integration can be used to mean assimilation rather than the type of integration Ager and Strang described. This is a finding that is reproduced in the small number of discursive studies that have addressed the ways in which talk about integration are explicitly used in representations of and discussions about refugees. Kirkwood and colleagues focussed on ‘lay’ accounts, including asylum seekers and refugees as well as people who were already living in the area of Scotland that the refugees were being hosted (Kirkwood et al, 2015) and practitioners working with refugees (Kirkwood, McKinlay, & McVittie, 2014). They found that talk about integration regarding refugees is used flexibly to achieve different ends. Much talk about integration worked to position the refugees as being accountable for

integrating, and that 'good' integration was often presented as assimilation, that is accepting the British 'way of life'. Hanson-Easey and Augoustinos (2010) further show how a supposed lack of integration on the part of refugees, often attributed to their cultural differences, was used to justify their exclusion from Australia. However, to date no discursive analysis has been conducted on either parliamentary or media debates about refugees regarding integration and no research has done this during the high profile 'refugee crisis', which is why this research is innovative. Based on the above findings, it could be expected that talk about refugees and integration is likely to be used to warrant the exclusion of refugees from the host society while positioning the host nation as hospitable, rather than to inform actual policies about how best to integrate refugees. This is what the analysis will address. The research questions are therefore: (1) What is talk about refugee integration used to do, and (2) how is it used to legitimise the acceptance and rejection of refugees?

Method

To ensure that the analysis is suitably rigorous the data are drawn from two unique naturally occurring (Potter, 2004) sources, parliamentary archives and newspaper reports, both from within the UK. This diverse data means that both official debates that can determine political positions as well as media representations of refugee issues throughout the crisis are addressed. All the data are collected from a particularly interesting part of the 'refugee crisis' in that it is the period immediately following the widespread distribution of photographs of a drowned three-year-old refugee, Alan Kurdi. This period has been noted for its more lenient sentiment towards refugees (see ComRes, 2016). The parliamentary data are transcripts of five UK parliamentary debates that took place in September 2015 to January 2016 relating to the European refugee 'crisis'. These comprise approximately 13 hours of

debate in total and are generally representative of political positions on the ‘crisis’ (see appendix A for weblinks to sources). 146 politicians contributed to the debates, 118 of whom were from the three largest parties (Conservative Party [39], Labour Party [40] and Scottish National Party [39]). The Conservative Party is a centre right party that formed a majority government in the UK in 2015 and the Labour Party is a left wing party that formed the official opposition in 2015. The Scottish National Party campaigns for Scotland to be independent of the UK. Before the 2015 general election it had only six seats in parliament, but in the 2015 election it gained 56 of the 59 seats in Scotland, making it the third biggest party in parliament. Other parties featured in the data presented include the Social Democratic and Labour Party, from Northern Ireland which advocates for Irish reunification (and therefore leaving the UK) and the Alliance Party of Northern Ireland, a unionist party that favours Northern Ireland remaining in the UK.

Given the extremely large amount of media output regarding refugees at this time, we decided to focus on newspaper coverage that explicitly mentioned issues of integration. Therefore the newspaper data consist of all UK national newspaper pieces, including news reports, editorial and opinion pieces, referring to ‘refugee’ and ‘integration’ (n= 647) or ‘integrate’ (n= 386) during the same period as the parliamentary data (September 2015-January 2016) which produces a total of 960 unique matches on the LexisNexis library¹. As this data is secondary and in the public domain (and can be found following the descriptions above), it poses no ethical risks and ethical approval was gained from the lead author’s institution.

The data was subjected to a discursive analysis (Wiggins, 2017) to identify the arguments that are used by politicians and the newspaper article authors regarding refugee integration. A discursive approach pays particular attention to the ways in which the

arguments are made and, importantly, what these arguments are used to do, here with a specific focus on arguments for and against the inclusion and exclusion of refugees. Our analytic approach draws from both discursive psychology and rhetorical psychology (Billig, 1987) which demonstrates the need to address the ideological and dilemmatic nature of talk. The process of discourse analysis (see Riley & Wiggins, 2019; Wiggins, 2017) involves identifying all examples of a particular phenomenon in the data, which in this case means the varying references and uses of 'integration' in the two datasets. The analysis was undertaken by both authors, with author one initially focussing on the newspaper data and author two on the parliamentary data, to identify the ways in which talk of 'integration was used'. Next, the authors discussed the initial findings, searching for similarities and differences within the datasets. While a number of recognisable pro and anti-refugee arguments (including for example that refugees are not really refugees) were easily identifiable in the data by both authors, attention was given to the novel findings in which the concept of integration was shown to include dilemmatic aspects (Billig, 1987). These dilemmas were then further investigated collaboratively, before being organised into the findings presented below. The findings presented here are representative of the dilemmas identified in the analysis, and the examples that are presented are those that offer clear illustrations of the findings.

Parliamentary data are presented with the name of the debate, the speaker and their political affiliation. Newspaper data are presented with the newspaper source, date and the headline of the article. Extracts presented are those that best illustrate the analytic point being made, although as will be seen, more than one of the different dilemmas and strategies identified can often be seen in an individual extract.

Analysis

The analysis identified five dilemmas that are present in the talk and representations of refugee integration. Each of these dilemmas contain a varying number of different constructions of what integration means and related implications for how refugees should be treated. These five dilemmas, which will be addressed in turn, are:

1. Integration is positive and necessary, but challenging
2. Host communities are presented as welcoming, but there are limits to their capacity
3. Refugees are responsible for integration, but host communities need to provide support
4. Good refugees integrate, bad ones don't
5. Refugees are vulnerable and are skilled

Together, it is shown that integration can be the warrant for inclusion or exclusion.

1. Integration is good, but consists of challenges:

The first of these dilemmas is around the desirability of integration, which is presented as both something necessary to be strived for but also difficult to achieve.

In this first extract, from the parliamentary data, we see integration presented as an important aim to strive for.

Extract One: House of Commons Opposition Day Debate

Lucy Frazer (Conservative Party)

1. ...refugees have a moral and legal right to be treated properly, and that means
2. integrating them into our communities as soon as they arrive, giving them
3. homes, providing access to learning the language and access to study, to work
4. and to medical facilities. Many voluntary organisations already do a fantastic
5. job in holding the hands of the vulnerable in times of need. But when we take
6. 20,000 refugees, including many children and women who have suffered
7. violence and abuse, we must bring together local communities, charities, and
8. local and central Government so that we provide advice, homes, interpretation
9. facilities and the kind of care that we give to our own vulnerable families.

Many of the politicians talked about refugees in ways that highlighted their vulnerability and needs, and used this to justify the need for increased resources to support them and greater strategic co-ordination of services. In this extract, integration is treated as a 'right', which is facilitated through providing resources to refugees ('homes ... access to study ... work ... medical facilities'). Referencing the number of refugees to be accepted ('20,000') functions to highlight the scale of the need, thereby justifying better co-ordination ('we must bring together local communities, charities, and local and central Government').

The vulnerability of refugees is stressed through use of the categories 'children and women', which imply they need to be cared for, as well as referencing their potential experiences of 'violence and abuse'. Here, refugees are treated empathically by connecting them with 'us': 'the kind of care that we give to our own vulnerable families'. Overall, this construction emphasises refugees' needs, but also normalises the provision of support, thus working up the argument that the host society should provide well-organised support for integration.

Integration is treated as a common-sense good; support is necessitated due to an everyday ethic of helping the vulnerable; and this help is normalised through connecting refugees with 'our own'.

The common-sense good of integration is also taken for granted in this following example, an opinion piece by Angelina Jolie Pitt and Arminka Helic in The Times newspaper, where integration is presented as the way of preventing harm being done to (EU) host nations.

Extract Two: The Times, September 7, 2015

Don't blame refugees for seeking a better life; Families fleeing war must be prioritised over economic migrants to get a grip on this crisis

1. ... there is no question that the scale of the current refugee flow into
2. Europe poses political, social, economic and security challenges for EU
3. countries. When this is voiced, it should not be simply dismissed. It places a
4. particular responsibility on governments to find the resources to deal with the
5. domestic implications and to help refugees to integrate. Syria's neighbours
6. have been bearing much greater burdens for years, with exemplary generosity,
7. and need more assistance. Every country, and every government, needs to
8. have a clear plan to meet their international obligations and balance the needs
9. of their citizens.

The context of this article comes in the heading, where category work is used to distinguish refugees from migrants, so that the refugees are prioritised over migrants both morally and practically. The extract begins with a concession that internal flows of refugees are problematic for the EU, but this emphasis on the problems it can cause, which is illustrated with a long list of areas where problems can occur (2) is used to justify a drive towards supporting the integration of the refugees. While it is not explicitly stated, the

implication is that refugees who are not supported to integrate can cause a range of problems within the EU. Integration is presented as something requiring resources, and the suggestion that governments must ‘find’ them means that they are not currently available. The contrast with the ‘exemplary generosity’ of other countries implies that the resources are likely to be financial, which is why a balance with the needs of the host country’s citizens is said to be needed. However, this also suggests that the presence of refugees may be detrimental to the host’s situation. Integration is therefore presented as a necessary and positive factor, which may stave off a range of social problems, but which can also be a burden for hosts.

Integration is presented as a priority in the following parliamentary extract.

Extract Three: Northern Ireland Assembly

Claire Hanna (Social Democratic and Labour Party)

1. The key priority is, of course, a refugee integration strategy, as is in
2. place elsewhere. It seems shameful that, at precisely the time that
3. asylum seekers and refugees should be assisted with getting on with
4. their new life here, they are instead having to navigate complex
5. bureaucratic and legal systems to get what they are entitled to.

Some of the politicians talked about integration in a way that suggested systems in the host society acted as barriers to integration. In this extract, we can see that local systems make integration difficult. Specifically, the speaker refers to ‘complex bureaucratic and legal systems’ and the situation is referred to as ‘shameful’. In this way, the local situation is presented as poor and morally problematic, especially as integration is portrayed as a right: ‘what they are entitled to’. In this following example, a news article from the Daily

Telegraph, integration is presented as necessary, but there is more of a focus on addressing a potential threat rather than what 'they are entitled to'.

Extract Four: The Daily Telegraph, November 16, 2015

Refugees will be vetted as British families 'adopt' them;

Scheme to give Syrians safety checks address fears that extremists will infiltrate Britain when householders help asylum seekers settle

1. THE 20,000 Syrian refugees who are to be resettled in
2. Britain will be security-vetted, the Government said last night, as ministers
3. revealed plans for British householders to "adopt" refugee families to help
4. them integrate.
5. Theresa May, the Home Secretary, said that all those accepted would undergo
6. security checks before being granted visas. They would also have their
7. biometric details put on file.
8. ...
9. Families will be given private rented accommodation, to avoid complaints
10. from locals that they had jumped housing waiting lists.
11. All new arrivals will also be encouraged to take "intensive" English courses
12. to help them integrate.
13. Britons who volunteer to mentor a Syrian family will be offered a degree of
14. "cultural awareness" training on matters such as Muslim sensitivities about
15. eating pork or drinking alcohol.

The headline of this article frames it as security related, even in the context of British citizens supporting refugees. The article begins with a reference to security checks directly

preceding the mention of integration. Here the government's role is to address safety, while citizens (or 'householders') support the integration. Syrian refugees are presented as a threat, through the reference to 20,000, which is a large number, and more significantly through 'extremists' which implies that terrorists may be involved (see Leudar et al., 2008 for the linking of refugees with a threat of terrorism). While 'fears' of extremists are stated, it is not clear whose fears these are or whether or not they are grounded, but this has the effect of presenting refugees as a danger.

Later in the article integration is again topicalised. First, it is suggested that supporting refugees could cause tension within the host country, signalled through the reference to avoiding 'complaints' of preferential treatment of refugees (see Lynn & Lea, 2003 for more on this anti-refugee argument). Next, through the reference to language lessons, refugees are shown to be required to take action for their own integration, although the offer of these lessons is presented as helping them. The extract ends with a suggestion that integration may be a two-way process (albeit in a way that underplays the role of the host nation) through the reference to cultural awareness training about the incoming Syrian refugees. It is of note that 'cultural awareness' (14) is presented in quotation marks, or 'scare quotes' which potentially undermines the benefits of understanding the culture of incoming refugees. The choice of cultural matters referred to is also of interest, as this is used to highlight their religious difference (and a religion that is often presented as extremist, as seen in the article heading) and then refers to well-known cultural differences that work to present the refugees as hard to integrate (as they eat and drink differently) rather than referring to any similar or positive aspects of Syrian (rather than uniquely Muslim) culture.

Together, these extracts demonstrate that integration is presented as self-evidently necessary and as something that should be supported. However, it can also be seen as a potentially problematic and burdensome goal. The following section emphasises how integration can be presented as problematic throughout presenting it as difficult to achieve.

Extract Five: Scottish Parliament

Patricia Ferguson (Scottish Labour Party)

1. Help to support our health and social services and our schools will be needed.
2. For example, 134 languages are spoken in Glasgow's schools and we must
3. ensure that the support is in place to manage the practical difficulties that such
4. challenges present.

Some of the politicians spoke in ways that emphasised the challenges of integration. They tended not to describe refugees as such as being the problem, but, as shown in this extract, made reference to the 'difficulties' or 'challenges' of integration. Here the issue of language diversity is presented as a 'challenge' that needs to be overcome through appropriate support. This portrays integration as involving difficulties that must be addressed, in this case on the side of the refugees, although without constructing refugees as being the direct or intentional cause of the problem. In this way, integration is constructed as a faultless challenge that requires resources to be addressed.

Extract Six: House of Commons Opposition Day Debate

Jim Cunningham (Labour Party)

1. More importantly, does the hon. Gentleman agree that it is vital that refugees
2. are resettled in such a way that they fit into the community and that ghettos are

3. not created through lack of resources?

While some politicians highlighted the need for resources to support integration, and some described local systems as barriers to integration, it was possible for them to go further in portraying a lack of resources as creating problems for integration further down the road. In this extract, resettlement is described as needing to ensure refugees 'fit into the community' rather than creating 'ghettos'. Like the concept of integration more generally, metaphors of 'fit' suggest that refugees can, to greater or lesser extents, merge with host communities in ways that do not create problems, whereas situations where refugees combine with local communities in an 'unmixed' state will lead to trouble. The term 'ghetto' signals trouble of various kinds: poor, deprived, isolated, criminal and ethnically concentrated. The word has a self-sufficient quality, indicating not only a problematic housing situation, but one with particular moral connotations, and is therefore inherently negative. On the one hand, such a construction suggests refugees are a potential problem; on the other hand, it points to the authorities, and their use of resources, as liable if they do not support integration in the right way. The following extract, an opinion piece by Daniel Finkelstein in *The Times*, builds on the idea of integration being problematic.

Extract Seven: *The Times*, September 23, 2015

Here's what we really think about migrants; This country has a proud tradition of welcoming refugees. But in return, they have to live by Britain's liberal values

1. Is it really that unreasonable that we should take care about who we extend
2. this invitation to and how many invitations we issue at a time? I believe
3. passionately that people from other lands, and other faiths, enrich this country.
4. I suppose I would, wouldn't I? But I also believe that happens only if Britain

5. cautiously welcomes people at a pace that allows them to integrate into British
6. society.
7. I think most of us agree that people shouldn't have to believe the same things,
8. worship the same God or dress like each other. And isn't the great British
9. principle that if someone wants to keep themselves to themselves they are
10. welcome to do so? Yet I think we do want everyone to be willing to accept the
11. same basic laws, a common attachment to western democracy and a shared
12. responsibility for the nation's security. I think we also want every citizen to
13. acknowledge that every other citizen is a neighbour.
14. Which leads us to a topic that is hard to discuss. I need to touch on Islam.

As seen in the previous section, integration is again presented as necessary. This article differs in presenting refugees as potentially unwilling to integrate. The first thing of note is the conflating of refugees and migrants in the title (see Goodman & Speer, 2007) which works to remove the special status of refugees as people in need of protection from safety. The subheading also explicitly states that the UK 'has a proud tradition of welcoming refugees', a disclaimer which is a common preface to anti-refugee arguments (see Capdevilla & Callaghan 2008). The 'but' following this disclaimer, which works to present the UK as a fair and decent place not opposed to helping those in need, is that people entering the country must integrate their values. The beginning of the article works to bolster this claim (2-4, 7-8). However, as with the subheading, there is a 'but' which is that support for refugees is contingent on 'them' integrating and that this happens at a manageable pace. This paints a picture of two problems with integration, one that it cannot happen quickly and two that those who need to integrate may not.

The next part of the article addresses the dilemma of challenging refugees for not integrating while demanding integration as necessary for them. This is done by speaking on behalf of ‘most of us’ (Goffman, 1981; 7) in claiming that religious differences and cultural differences aren’t required. However, this time following a ‘yet’ (10) the author adds the caveat that integration is needed. The elements of integration that are described (11-13) are presented as essential components of integration, and by listing them in this way, it is suggested that current refugees may not do this. The presentation of the delicate balance needed for integration is the groundwork that allows the ‘hard to discuss’ topic (14) to be broached. By referring to Islam in this way, it is implied that Syrian refugees (who are majority Muslim) may not have the necessary will to integrate. Drawing attention to Islam in this way does three things; first it presents Muslims as unwilling to integrate into UK society, second it therefore presents Syrian refugees as unlikely to be able to integrate, or at least representing a problem and third it begins to build a case for not accepting Syrian refugees on the grounds of their unlikelihood to integrate properly.

2. Host communities are welcoming, but there are limits to their capacity

The previous extract begins to illustrate the dilemma of stating that host communities do welcome refugees, but also that there is a limit in their capacity to welcome them. In the previous example this is down to their supposed lack of willing to accept British values. In the following parliamentary example, there is a more explicit reference to a limit in capacity to be welcoming.

Extract Eight: House of Commons emergency debate

Nigel Evans (Conservative Party):

1. ...does the right hon. Gentleman not also accept that, in welcoming the
2. number that the Government have proposed, there has to be some limit?
3. Otherwise, what figure might he be talking about? Does he not believe that if
4. there is no limit the huge warmth that the British people will show to the
5. refugees may be jeopardised?

In this extract, the speaker uses a series of questions to imply that the ‘welcoming’ nature of the public is threatened by larger numbers of refugees. More specifically, he does this by asking whether ‘there has to be some limit?’ This draws on the repertoire that politicians must ‘be practical’ (Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Moreover, the public’s ‘welcome’ and ‘huge warmth’ is presented as having limits, which can be tested by larger numbers of refugees arriving. This constructs the positive outlook of the public as contingent on the demands placed on them and suggests refugees themselves may undermine and alter the public’s attitudes through their very presence. This functions to present the British public as moral (to an extent) but also reinforces the idea that there is a limited capacity for accepting refugees, and moreover that the actions of politicians are restricted by what the public will tolerate. The following extract, by David Goodhart from the Daily Mail, is critical of the government’s plans on integration, precisely on the grounds that they are attempting to integrate too many people.

Extract Nine: Daily Mail, September 19, 2015

THE FOLLY OF EUROPE'S HAND-WRINGING ELITE: In this courageously controversial article, a leading Left-wing voice says misguided compassion is only making the migrant catastrophe worse

1. Most people in Britain and the rest of Europe, faced with pictures of desperate

2. people, do feel compassion and many act on it as individuals by donating to
3. charities.
4. But most of us want to be generous without encouraging further flows, and
5. without damaging our own country's social infrastructure with unsustainably
6. large inflows of people. Britain is already struggling to properly integrate
7. incomers from more traditional, often Muslim, societies.
8. That is why I believe David Cameron's 'head and heart' approach is broadly
9. right. No doubt we can, and should, take a few more Syrians than the 20,000
10. over five years he has mooted. But our Government's approach of investing
11. more in the Syrian refugee camps to make them better places to live for a few
12. years is surely right.

As with the previous extract, there is the suggestion that there is a limit to the capacity of British people, both practically and in terms of their ability to welcome refugees. The extract is structured in a similar way to extract seven in the previous section, in that it begins with groundwork setting out the moral credentials of 'most' British people, who are presented here as being compassionate enough to do something to help refugees (here by giving to charity). Again, this preparation which presents Britain in a positive light is followed by a 'but'. This time generosity is linked with bringing more migrants to the UK, which is assumed to be damaging to the host nation (an argument seen used by others arguing against allowing in refugees, e.g. Capdevilla & Callaghan, 2008). Next, integration is shown to be a cultural issue, because integrating people from 'traditional' (7) societies is used to emphasise those who may not integrate well. Once more, Muslims are referred to, and again in a way that suggests that people of this faith are particularly problematic because they are unlikely to be able or willing to integrate. What is presented as problems with integration is then used to

warrant supporting refugees in camps rather than in the UK, although this is tempered with a very minimal suggestion that ‘a few more’ refugees could possibly be allowed into the UK.

These two examples demonstrate that integration can be presented as limited by the capacity of the host nation to remain welcoming, which is accompanied by claims that the nation is in fact particularly welcoming and supportive. More broadly, integration is shown to be presented as necessary, often with little explanation as to why, but it is also presented as something that is hard to achieve as well as being a strain on people’s ability to remain welcoming.

3. Refugees are responsible for integration, but host communities need to provide support

In this next section another dilemma can be seen; this time refugees are presented as being responsible for their own integration, but host communities are also needed to support them to do so, despite sometimes being hostile. Because of this, it is shown how ‘good refugees’ are shown to be those who integrate, whereas ‘bad’ ones do not. The Islamophobia seen in the previous section is expanded as Muslims come to be presented as ‘bad’ refugees because of their lack of willing to integrate. This first extract, from the Express, reports on language lessons for refugees and how this may help them to integrate.

Extract Ten: Express Online, December 9, 2015

Syrian refugees arriving in Wales will be given lessons in WELSH to help them settle in

1. SYRIAN refugees arriving in Wales after escaping their war-torn country will
2. be given lessons in WELSH to help them settle in.

4. The classes will be offered for free to 12 Syrians who are to settle in the
5. seaside town of Aberystwyth, West Wales where one in three speaks Welsh as
6. a first language.
7. Ceredigion Council came up with the idea for Welsh lessons to help the new
8. habitants speak to their new neighbours.
9. Taxpayers money will be used to fund the lessons but a spokesman for the
10. council said they would "not be willing to share how much money the lessons
11. would cost."
12. While the Welsh language is largely not used, Ferras Nadde of the Syrian
13. Association for Wales said the lessons would help refugees integrate into their
14. new communities.
15. Mr Nadde said: "It's great that these people will be able to learn the language
16. of Wales, and will only benefit them as they try to integrate into society.

As the heading and the first line of this article show, through the use of capitals, it is the teaching of Welsh to Syrian refugees that is the focus of this article. Despite the focus on the teaching of Welsh, and the suggestion that it may not be sensible, the article also refers to learning languages as being beneficial for integration. The (problematic) scheme to teach Welsh is justified on the grounds of aiding refugees to 'settle in' (2). Throughout the dataset, language is presented as a key facilitator for integration. Here the local language skills are presented as supporting being neighbourly, and also supporting 'communities' (14). It is of note that it is a Syrian representative, Ferras Nadde, who is quoted saying that refugees will 'try to integrate' (16). This demonstrates that the need for refugees to integrate isn't just referred to by others about them but is directly oriented to by a Syrian living in the UK. This suggests that the need for integration is a view that is shared by hosts and those arriving in the

country. This following extract, from the parliamentary data, points to the role for settled communities in integration.

Extract Eleven: Scottish Parliament

Humza Yousaf (Scottish National Party)

1. It is important that we do not kid ourselves. All members here have knocked
2. on enough doors in their lifetimes to know that there still exist plenty of
3. negative attitudes towards refugees and those seeking asylum. We will have to
4. work hand in glove with local communities, and we will have to do work on
5. getting integration, which is of course a two-way process, right from the very
6. start.

Beyond the resources needed to provide support for integration, in a few instances politicians made reference to the role of ‘local communities’ in integration. In this extract, the speaker makes reference to ‘negative attitudes towards refugees and those seeking asylum’ as a way of highlighting challenges for integration that exist in the host society. However, the reference is relatively abstract, presenting the issue as a matter of known fact: ‘All members here have knocked on enough doors in their lifetimes to know...’. In this way, the problem of negative attitudes towards refugees is presented as a reality of the context, without the account being particularly blaming or damning. The speaker makes explicit reference to integration as a ‘two-way process’, here working up responsibility for integration among politicians, ‘local communities’, and, presumably, refugees themselves. The figurative language (‘not kid ourselves’, ‘knocked on enough doors’, ‘work hand in glove’), combined with the reference to shared knowledge (‘to know’, ‘of course’), function to present the situation in ways that make it seem real, widely understood and commonsensical. The

following extract is a letter featured in the Express, which is presented as the 'Letter of the day' and is responding to a previous Express article² that also topicalised integration. Here it can be seen how a distinction is made between 'good' refugees who integrate, and those who do not, who are presented as bad refugees.

4. 'Good' refugees integrate and 'bad' ones don't

Extract Twelve: The Express, October 12, 2015

Being selective on immigration is not heartless; Letter of the day

1. I TOTALLY agree with Monica Porter's article ("Hungary was right on
2. migrant crisis", October 8).
3. I came to this blessed country in 1939 as a Jewish refugee at the age of 10.
4. Between 1933 and 1939 some 40,000 German and Austrian refugees were
5. allowed to come here (of which 9,900 were children) but only if they had a job
6. or a guarantor, so as to ensure that they were not a burden on the state.
7. They did not get housing or any other benefits. And in contrast to the present
8. wave of migrants they were anxious to integrate into the British way of life.
9. Many were highly educated with a good knowledge of English and made a
10. great contribution to the war effort, 14,000 joining the Army.
11. To limit the present immigration is not heartless as the number of people
12. wanting to come here is endless and the infrastructure cannot cope with this
13. huge influx.
14. By all means be selective but not open-ended.
15. Victor Garston, Golders Green, Greater London

This letter to the newspaper begins with explicit support for an earlier anti-immigration article in the Express and then moves on to a personal account where the writer distinguishes himself, as a good refugee, from the current refugees who, by contrast, are bad. The account begins with the author's story about being a refugee from the Nazis in the 1930s. While refugees from the Nazis are recognisable as deserving, their situation is presented as harsh (5-7) but reasonable, especially as it involved them not causing problems for the UK (6). As well as enduring these hardships, this group of refugees is explicitly presented as 'anxious to integrate' illustrated with the exemplar of fighting for the country. It is this concern to integrate that is favourably contrasted with current refugees, who are deemed not to have this desire. Therefore, current refugees (presented as migrants) are presented as bad refugees; the desire to integrate is what determines the quality of the refugee. It is the lack of desire to integrate in current refugees that is used as the justification for excluding them. As with previous extracts, the dilemmas of opposing refugees being viewed as lacking compassion and of the need to support refugees, but with limited capacity, are alluded to (11-13). The following extract, a column by Richard Littlejohn in the Daily Mail, develops the idea of the non-integrating 'bad' refugee, this time developing the idea that this bad refugee is likely to be Muslim.

Extract thirteen: Daily Mail, September 29, 2015 Tuesday

Is THIS what we fought the Battle of Britain for? RICHARD LITTLEJOHN asks what hero pilots would have thought of decision to ask RAF sergeant wearing his uniform to leave hospital in case he 'offended' other cultures

1. There are already a growing number of reports about aggressive Muslim
2. 'refugees' in Europe refusing to adapt to the countries which have given them
3. sanctuary, and rejecting food distributed by the Red Cross on the grounds that

4. the cross is offensive to their Islamic sensibilities.
5. Despite this, there are plenty of exhibitionist politicians and brain-dead
6. do-gooders in Britain who think we should take them all in, no questions
7. asked.
8. Then what? We are struggling to integrate the eight million foreign-born
9. folk already here, as a result of Labour's cynical decision to dismantle
10. our borders and scour the world for immigrants.
11. Anyone who raises these legitimate concerns is howled down moronically
12. as a RAY-CIST!
13. But it's not racist to be alarmed at the rapid pace of change in our society;
14. the great burden immigration has placed on our crumbling public services;
15. and the threat to social cohesion, civil liberties and freedom of expression
16. brought about by the pernicious cult of multiculturalism.

This extract from Richard Littlejohn's Daily Mail column begins with him attempting to redefine what a refugee is through the use of quotation marks around the word refugee, which works to challenge their status. The questioned term is preceded with 'aggressive Muslim' which is further used to challenge the legitimacy and the moral standing of the refugees, whose aggression may pose a danger. Beyond this category work, these people are presented as problematic for not integrating properly ('refusing to adapt' 2) in spite of the good nature of the countries that support them ('which have given them sanctuary' 2-3) and for their differing, and supposedly incompatible, religion. This point is followed by a criticism of supporters of refugees (5-7) who are insulted for being stupid. Next, support for refugees is further challenged through the suggestion that integration is already a serious problem in the UK. Exactly how the UK is struggling to integrate the 'eight million' people

isn't clear, but this is presented as self-evident. The contentious nature of these claims is alluded to through the criticism of accusing such comments as being racist (see Goodman, 2014 for more on accusations of racism in the refugee debate). This is immediately followed by a disclaimer, based on the practical consideration that immigration harms the host country, a more extreme version of the capacity argument seen in earlier extracts. Immigration (the term refugee is not used without scare quotes) is then presented as damaging to social cohesion, which is a further suggestion that a lack of integration is a problem. It seems likely that the earlier reference to Muslims is why immigration is presented as harming civil liberties and freedom of speech, although this isn't made explicit.

What these previous two extracts show is that willingness to integrate comes to be a proxy for the quality of the refugee, with current and particularly Muslim refugees assumed to be unable or unwilling to integrate properly, which is used to justify preventing them from reaching the safety of the UK.

5. Refugees are vulnerable and are skilled

The following examples show how many of the politicians emphasised the value that refugees bring to society.

Extract Fourteen: Northern Irish Assembly

Anna Lo (Alliance)

1. The Syrian refugees have much to offer our society. There are doctors,
2. engineers and other professionals in those refugee camps who are seeking a
3. better life. Let them seek it here.

Extract Fifteen: House of Commons Opposition Day Debate

Angus Brendan MacNeil (Scottish National Party)

1. There is often concern when we think of refugees and migrants arriving, but a
2. short while later they become indispensable within the community and we
3. could not imagine the place we live in without them.

Extract Sixteen: House of Commons Opposition Day Debate

Lucy Frazer (Conservative Party)

1. Our country has a proud history of accepting the vulnerable into our society.
2. That has not only saved lives, but enriched our culture.

This value could be presented as making contributions to the host society, particularly through skilled work (extract 14), broader contributions to the communities, which then become integral to a way of life (extract 15), and broader influences to the culture of the host society (extract 16). As shown in the first of these three extracts, through the use of particular professional categories ('doctors', 'engineers') refugees can be presented as having desirable and useful skills that can benefit the host society. Such categories convert them from individuals in need ('refugees') to those who bring benefits ('professionals'). However, within the wider discourse that makes distinctions between 'genuine refugees' and 'economic migrants', the argument can be tricky to pull off, and risk presenting some of those seeking refugee as not really in need. The third extract in this group is interesting because it emphasises the needs that refugees have ('the vulnerable') while still highlighting the contributions they make, through 'enrich[ing] our culture'. This touches on the complexity of categorising refugees; at times they are those in need and vulnerable, at other times they are those with skills who will contribute to the host society. Overall, these constructions work to

present refugees as desirable for the host community while managing the potential for them to be seen as not in need of refuge.

These dilemmas lay the groundwork that becomes the warrant for denying or justifying refugees' entry

As has been shown throughout this analysis, the talk about integration is rarely only about integration; instead this talk is used to argue either for or against offering refugees access to the UK. Much of the parliamentary debates focus on how best to offer integration. The newspaper data are more mixed, with some articles drawing on integration as necessary to argue for including refugees. On the other hand, a lack of willingness or ability to integrate on the part of refugees was often drawn upon to warrant their exclusion. This final extract, from the Guardian newspaper, makes a topic of this relationship between integration and support for refugees.

Extract Seventeen: The Guardian, October 30, 2015

Europeans feel a duty to help refugees - but not in their own countries;

Poll finds less than 50% of voters in UK, France and Netherlands are in favour of sharing out refugees, compared with 80% of Germans and Italians

1. The poll also finds a strong correlation between people's attitudes to
2. immigration and their perception of refugees' qualifications. Those who
3. believe refugees have poor qualifications and would struggle to integrate take
4. a more negative attitude.
5. There appears to be a weaker correlation between voters' attitudes and the
6. perception the public has of the motivations of refugees.

This article, reporting on a survey of attitudes to refugees (IFOP, 2015), reports a situation where those surveyed are more likely to support refugees that they believe will integrate well. The first thing of note about this extract is the shifting of categories between 'immigration' (2) and 'refugees' (2). Refugees believed to have bad qualifications (3) are equated with an inability to integrate. This presents qualifications (and by extension work) as a key pathway to integration, ignoring the many other possible ways of integrating. According to the article, and this interpretation of a survey, a suspected lack of integration is related to a lack of support for refugees. This ability to integrate is presented as a bigger factor in determining public support than belief in whether or not the refugees are legitimate.

Discussion

Integration is treated as an unquestioned good that must occur. However, in many cases, the term integration is arguably used to mean assimilation (e.g. Bowskill et al, 2007) rather than the type of integration outlined by Ager and Strang (2004, 2008). This demonstrates that the exact nature of integration is vague and that it can be used to support a range of responses to refugees, including accepting larger or smaller numbers of refugees to enter the country, and more inclusive or restrictive policies and practices. Although it is possible to distinguish between 'immigration policy' (regarding who is permitted into the country) and 'immigrant policy' (regarding what happens to refugees and other migrants while they are in the country; Hammar, 2006), here we can see how these two dimensions are intertwined. Integration is a weighted term, with a responsibility that falls more heavily on refugees; although 'we' must provide resources and support for 'them' to integrate, 'they' are the ones who must do the work. Politicians make reference to the 'two-way' nature of

integration at times, and there are many references to the contributions that refugees can make, but in general it is the refugees who must adapt to the host society, rather than the other way around. It is particularly evident in some of the newspaper materials that question the willingness or ability of refugees to adapt to the host society, which reinforces their ‘otherness’ and can bolster opposition to their presence. Some of the references to two-way integration, particularly in the newspaper materials, were relatively weak, such as ‘cultural awareness training’.

References to the contributions of refugees tended to be general or identify specific roles and people (such as named politicians or being ‘doctors’ or ‘engineers’) rather than citing the way refugees or other migrants may shape broader aspects of culture or society.

The term ‘refugee’ implies vulnerability and the need for protection, concepts which were used in the data to justify greater resources, better co-ordination of services and the provision of support. However, references to the potential contributions of refugees presents as somewhat of a dilemma. That is, refugees are portrayed as both vulnerable and skilled; they are both in need of help and able to make positive contributions. These representations are not strictly speaking incompatible, but they can create a policy paradox; in this case, although many politicians referred to the skills and potential contributions of refugees, the political response was the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme, a scheme implemented by the UK government to support 20,000 Syrian refugees (Home Office, 2017), the very name of which emphasises the focus on those who are ‘at most risk’. Indeed, those who had made their way from Syria to EU countries, and were not in refugee camps, were excluded from the scheme. Moreover, the Government often reiterates its distinction between refugees and ‘economic migrants’, being clear that those who do not play by the rules make themselves suspect and may be seeking entry to the UK in order to improve their lives rather than

because they are genuinely in need of protection. This means there can be a disconnect between the political rhetorical and policy development. Overall, then, integration is a taken-for-granted concept that speakers can 'fill' with more specific meaning, policies and practices, working to present refugees as desirable or suspect, which in turn supports or discredits the provision of asylum.

Of the dilemmas identified, not all are necessarily refugee specific. That 'integration is positive, but challenging' is generic to all migrants, as are the claims 'that good refugees integrate', and 'host communities being welcoming' which could equally be applied to all migrants. The dilemma of 'refugees being vulnerable and skilled' is likely to be refugee specific, due to the reference to vulnerability. The dilemma 'refugees are responsible for integration' is less clear, as it explicitly references refugees, but could arguably be applied to any migrants. It is difficult to make claims about the generalisability of these findings to non-refugee migrants, as the study was not comparative, although further studies could shed light on this point. What the analysis does show, however, is that refugee and migrant issues can come to be conflated in public debates (see Goodman & Speer, 2007).

There are a number of well recognisable standard anti-refugee arguments that intersect with talk about integration. Of particular note is the reference to the supposed economic impact of refugees (e.g. Lynn & Lea, 2003), which is strongly alluded to in the references to there being a limited capacity to integrate refugees. Associated with this, is the idea that many of the refugees are not really refugees at all but are in fact economic migrants (Lynn & Lea, 2003). This was clearly seen through the attempts to undermine the category of refugees, for example through putting the term in 'scare quotes' (e.g. extract 13). This is despite the civil war in Syria, a well reported conflict that was associated with the crisis,

where it would be assumed that the standard anti-refugee argument of denying refugees are fleeing conflict would seem to be made unavailable; nevertheless, despite the footage of this conflict, refugees' status can still be challenged. It is worth noting that although many refugees affected by the 'crisis' were from Syria, there were also equally legitimate refugees who were not, however it is mostly Syrian refugees that are referred to in this data, implying that only refugees from that one country (if at all) were deemed worthy of support. Another well recognised anti-refugee argument is emphasising the needs of the host community and placing these above refugees (what Lynn and Lea, 2003 called 'differentiating the self'), something that can be seen in the talk of integration, where there is assumed to be a balance between helping refugees and not damaging the settled communities.

The potential threat posed by refugees, including the implication of terrorism (Leudar et al., 2008) can also be seen clearly throughout the extracts. Indeed, it could be argued that the opposite of refugee integration is not presented as non-integration (although extract six does refer to ghettos) but an intention to cause harm to the host nation. This can be seen, for example, in references to 'security' (extracts two and seven) and 'extremism' (extract four). This association with terrorism leads on to another feature of the anti-refugee arguments that intersects with integration, that of Islamophobia. Throughout much of the newspaper data Islam is presented as a threat, and Muslims are presented as being (at least potentially) either unable or unwilling to integrate, often providing the rationale for their exclusion. The most obvious examples of Islamophobia can be seen in extracts seven and 13, both from right-leaning newspapers. In extract seven the reference to needing to 'talk about' Islam follows a section on the inability of some refugees to accept British values. The linking of the two therefore strongly implies that it is Muslims who will not integrate. The example in extract 13 is even stronger – here Muslims are referred to as aggressive, alongside extreme examples of

their supposed unwillingness to integrate (in this case not accepting help from the Red Cross because of the 'offensive' cross). Integration is therefore used as a way to exclude Muslims, to criticise Muslims and to draw a clear distinction between Muslim and British values. All of these represent clear cases of Islamophobia. Given that, at least in these extracts, refugees as a category are presented as overwhelmingly Muslim, it seems that there is a clear overlapping of anti-refugee and anti-Muslim sentiment.

It has been shown that talk about the integration of refugees is dilemmatic and used flexibly both to support and oppose supporting refugees. In many ways the data presented here are amongst some of the more positive representations of refugees; they can be presented as able to contribute to the UK and in need of support, with the parliamentary debates at least all presenting refugees as legitimate. However, alongside these more positive representations there also remained many anti-refugee arguments. Existing literature has demonstrated that the reporting of Alan Kurdi's death in August 2015 led to a more sympathetic approach to refugees (e.g. Goodman et al., 2017). However, many of the findings presented here, especially from the newspaper data, suggest that this is not entirely the case and that despite the outpouring of sympathy following this death, hostility towards refugees remained.

This analysis has therefore demonstrated that an approach to integration informed by discursive and rhetorical psychology advances our understanding of integration. It has shown that the taken for granted term 'integration' is itself dilemmatic, meaning a range of things, including assimilation. This means that rather than claiming to know what integration is, we need to understand how the concept is used flexibly in practice. What this analysis has shown is that, through drawing on integration, refugee status can come to be made contingent on

certain behaviour, behaviour often resembling assimilation. The approach used here therefore problematizes the mainstream approach to integration, which is that it is something that can simply be measured and reported as successfully achieved or not. Instead, it has been shown that integration itself is not a straightforward concept, but that it is dilemmatic and can contain an alternative to integration in the form of assimilation. It is only through this approach that the limits on being welcoming involved in integration can be fully understood, as it has been shown that integration can come with a built-in limit on being welcoming.

Conclusion

Talk about integrating refugees is noteworthy for containing a number of dilemmas; that integration is good, but hard to achieve; refugees are responsible for integration, but host communities need to provide support; and refugees are vulnerable and are skilled. All of these dilemmas demonstrate that integration can therefore be the warrant for inclusion or exclusion of refugees. Integration, while mainly being accepted as something to strive for, is generally presented as a one-way process, with the onus being on refugees to adapt to the British way of life. In some cases, because of their Syrian and therefore Muslim background, refugees are presented as being either unable or unwilling to do this, demonstrating a linking of talk about integration with Islamophobia. The responsibility of western nations to support people in need purely to protect them, is often presented as contingent on the refugees behaving in specific ways.

References

- Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2004). Indicators of integration: Final report. Retrieved August 8, 2018, from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20110218135832/http://rds.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/dpr28.pdf>
- Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21, 166–191. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fen016
- Berry, J. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46, 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x>
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and Thinking: A Rhetorical Approach to Social Psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowskill, M., Lyons, E., & Coyle, A. (2007). The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46(4), 793-813. doi: 10.1348/014466607X182771
- Burke, S & Goodman, S (2012). “Bring Back Hitler’s Gas Chambers”: Asylum Seeking, Nazis and Facebook: A Discursive Analysis. *Discourse and Society*, 23(1), 19-33, doi: 10.1177/0957926511431036
- Capdevila, R. & Callaghan, J. E. (2008). ‘It's not racist. It's common sense’. A critical analysis of political discourse around asylum and immigration in the UK. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 18, 1-16. doi: 10.1002/casp.904
- ComRes. (2016). BBC Local Radio—Refugees survey. Retrieved August 8, 2018, from http://www.comresglobal.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/BBC-Local-Radio_Refugees-Poll.pdf
- Crawley, H., Duvell, F., Sigona, N., McMahon, S., & Jones, K. (2016). Unpacking a rapidly

changing scenario: migration flows, routes and trajectories across the Mediterranean, (Research Brief No. 1). Retrieved August 8, 2018, from <http://www.medmig.info/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/MEDMIG-Briefing-01-March-2016-FINAL-1.pdf>

Edwards, D. & Potter, J. (1992). *Discursive psychology*. London: Sage

Every, D., & Augoustinos, M. (2008). “Taking advantage” or fleeing persecution? Opposing accounts of asylum seeking. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 12(5), 648–667.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9841.2008.00386.x>

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

Goodman, S (2008). Justifying the Harsh Treatment of Asylum Seekers on the Grounds of Social Cohesion. *Annual Review of Critical Psychology*, 6, 110-124.

<https://thediscourseunit.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/goodman.pdf>

Goodman, S (2014). Developing an understanding of race talk. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 8(4), 147–155. doi: 10.1111/spc3.12095

Goodman, S. & Narang, A. (in press). “Sad day for the UK”: The linking of debates about settling refugee children in the UK with Brexit. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2579

Goodman, S, Sirriyeh, A & McMahon, S. (2017). The evolving (re)categorisations of refugees throughout the ‘Refugee/Migrant crisis’. *Journal of Community and applied social psychology*, 27(2) 105-114. <https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2302>

Goodman, S & Speer, S.A. (2007). Category Use in the Construction of Asylum Seekers. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 4(2), 165-185. doi: 10.1080/17405900701464832

Hammar, T. (2006). ‘European Immigration Policy: A Comparative Study’. In Messina, A. M. and Lahav, G. (eds) *The Migration Reader; Exploring Politics and Policies*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.

Hanson-Easey, S. & Augoustinos, M. (2012). Narratives from the neighbourhood: The discursive construction of integration problems in talkback radio. *Journal of sociolinguistics*, 16(1), 28-55. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9841.2011.00519.x

Home Office (2017). Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (VPRS).

Guidance for local authorities and partners. Retrieved on January 14, 2019, from

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/631369/170711_Syrian_Resettlement_Updated_Fact_Sheet_final.pdf

IFOP (2015). Les Européens face à la crise des migrants (English: Europeans face the migrant crisis). Retrieved on January 14, 2019, from https://www.ifop.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/3181-1-study_file.pdf

International Organisation for Migration (2016). IOM Counts 3,771 Migrant Fatalities in Mediterranean in 2015. Retrieved on August 8, 2018, from

<https://www.iom.int/news/iom-counts-3771-migrant-fatalities-mediterranean-2015>

International Organisation for Migration (2018). Mediterranean Migrant Arrivals Reached 171,635 in 2017; Deaths Reach 3,116. Retrieved August 8, 2018, from

<https://www.iom.int/news/mediterranean-migrant-arrivals-reached-171635-2017-deaths-reach-3116>

International Organisation for Migration (2019). Flow Monitoring Europe. Retrieved January 14, 2019, from <http://migration.iom.int/europe?type=arrivals>

Kirkwood, S. (2017). The Humanisation of Refugees: A Discourse Analysis of UK Parliamentary Debates on the European Refugee 'Crisis'. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 115–125. doi: 10.1002/casp.2298

Kirkwood, S & Goodman, S. (2018). Discursive psychological research on refugees Gibson, S (ed.) *Discourse, peace and conflict: Discursive psychology perspectives*. Springer

Kirkwood S., McKinlay A. & McVittie C. (2014). 'Some People It's Very Difficult to Trust':

Attributions of Agency and Accountability in Practitioners' Talk About Integration,
Journal of Community Applied Social Psychology, 24, 376–389. doi:

10.1002/casp.2178

Kirkwood, S., McKinlay, A. & McVittie, C. (2015). 'He's a Cracking Wee Geezer from Pakistan': Lay Accounts of Refugee Integration Failure and Success in Scotland.
Journal of Refugee Studies, 28(1), 1–20. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feu003

Leudar, I., Hayes, J., Nekvapil, J., & Turner Baker, J. (2008). Hostility themes in media, community and refugee narratives. *Discourse & Society* 19, 187–221. doi: 10.1177/0957926507085952

Leudar, I., Marsland, V., & Nekvapil, J. (2004). On membership categorisation: 'us', 'them' and 'doing violence' in political discourse. *Discourse & Society* 15(2-3), 243-266. doi: 10.1177/0957926504041019

Lynn, N., & Lea, S. (2003). A phantom menace and the new apartheid: The social construction of asylum-seekers in the United Kingdom. *Discourse and Society* 14, 425–452. doi: 10.1177/0957926503014004002

Mulvey, G (2010). When Policy Creates Politics: the Problematizing of Immigration and the Consequences for Refugee Integration in the UK. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23(4), 437–462. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feq045>

Nightingale A, Quayle M, & Muldoon O. (2017). "It's just heart breaking": Doing inclusive political solidarity or ambivalent paternalism through sympathetic discourse within the "refugee crisis" debate. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 137–146. doi: 10.1002/casp.2303

Parker, S, Naper, A, & Goodman, S. (2018). How a photograph of a drowned refugee child turned a migrant crisis into a refugee crisis: A comparative discourse analysis. *For(E)Dialogue*, 2(1)12-28

<https://journals.le.ac.uk/ojs1/index.php/4edialog/article/view/601>

Potter, J. (2004). Discourse analysis as a way of analysing naturally occurring talk. In D. Silverman (Ed.), *Qualitative research: Theory, method and practice* (pp. 200–221). London: Sage.

Riley, S. & Wiggins, S. (2019). Discourse Analysis. In C. Sullivan & M. Forrester (eds.) *Doing Qualitative Research in Psychology* (2nd edition). London: Sage pp 233-256.

United Nations Refugee Agency. (2015). A million refugees and migrants flee to Europe in 2015. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/567918556.html>

Wetherell, M. & Potter, J. (1992). *Mapping the Language of Racism*. London and New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf and Columbia

Wiggins, S. (2017). *Discursive Psychology: Theory, Method and Applications*. Sage: London

Appendix A: Sources for parliamentary debates

House of Commons: Emergency debate: The refugee crisis in Europe (8 September 2015)

<http://www.parliament.uk/business/news/2015/september/emergency-debate-the-refugee-crisis-in-europe/>

House of Commons: Opposition debate on the humanitarian crisis in the Mediterranean and Europe (9 September 2015)

<https://www.parliament.uk/business/news/2015/september/mps-debate-humanitarian-crisis-in-the-mediterranean-and-europe/>

Scottish Parliament: Debate on responding to the global refugee crisis (15 September 2015)

<http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/parliamentarybusiness/report.aspx?r=10084&i=93110>

Northern Ireland Assembly: Debate on the ongoing international humanitarian crisis in Syria

(22 September 2015) <https://www.theyworkforyou.com/ni/?id=2015-09-22.3.4>

Welsh Assembly: Short debate: A nation of sanctuary? The role that Wales can play in the

refugee crisis (13 January 2016) <https://yoursenedd.wales/debates/2016-01-13-6-short-debate-a-nation-of-sanctuary-the-role-that-wales-can-play-in-the-refugee-crisis>

Endnote:

¹ Searches were conducted with the ‘moderate similarity’ filter used. The final total of articles is the sum of matches including ‘integration’ and ‘integrate’ minus the 73 articles that contained both terms.

² <https://www.express.co.uk/comment/expresscomment/610663/Hungary-migrant-crisis-Hungarian-refugee>