Carfax Publishing
Taylor & Francis Group

There's No-Place Like Home: emotional geographies of researching 'race' and refuge provision in Britain

ERICA BURMAN and KHATIDJA CHANTLER

Department of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Manchester Metropolitan University

ABSTRACT   *In this article we draw on feminist and psychodynamic theory to discuss processes of researching service provision for minoritised women escaping domestic violence. Our aim is to take seriously the ways particular contexts, in this case as produced by the process of researching this topic, elicit specific responses. In particular we offer some conceptual tools for analysing the emotions generated in these geographies. Taking the 'space' of the research team as our focus, we analyse how culturally defined meanings of 'home', community and refuge that were the focus of our research topic also functioned as a lens through which tensions and dynamics within the project team could be understood. Just as secrecy, silence and shame figured in our participants' accounts, so they circulated between the team. Drawing on the motifs of the intersection of 'space' and 'place' (as they occur within discourses and practices around domestic violence and minoritisation) as well as the psychodynamic notions of 'mirroring' and 'parallel process', we consider the extent to which the combined racialised, gendered and institutional relationships structuring the research team constituted it as a 'non-place'. This is because it was a space produced by the research process which, other than this, had no acknowledged tradition of history or memory to anchor it. We discuss how this space functioned paradoxically to foster creativity and innovation in generating discourses and practices working across difference, as well as inevitably at times recapitulating prevailing power (including racialised) relationships. We end by evaluating the usefulness of such concepts for wider analyses of intercultural and antiracist feminist practice.*

Emotional Geography as Method and Topic

As non-geographers, but rather as practitioners of emotions (Erica is a group analyst and Khatidja a counsellor and counselling supervisor), as well as feminist researchers, we are interested in what attending to the placing and spacing of emotions brings to an understanding of their origins and meanings, and also in how such understandings might usefully inform practice. In this article, we discuss aspects of our research on domestic violence services for minoritised

Correspondence: Erica Burman or Khatidja Chantler, Department of Psychology and Speech Pathology, Manchester Metropolitan University, Hathersage Road, Manchester M13 0JA, UK. E-mail: e.burman@mmu.ac.uk *or* khatidja.chantler@lineone.net

women in one British city, but the primary focus is on our analysis of the emotions our research practices evoked. So this article is necessarily both a discussion of moments and processes within our research project, and some critical reflection on these. We do so in ways that can be relevant for both interpreting and informing the conduct of research and, beyond this, its substantive analysis and recommendations. We (Erica and Khatidja) formulate this analysis from our position as (joint) project managers, and other research team members will probably have different perspectives. However, while such accounts may seem risky and perhaps tenuous, we are convinced that some of the issues we faced arose not only from the specific features of individual and group relationships, but necessarily also engaged and recapitulated key structural–political dilemmas that are urgent matters for feminist attention.

The project of treating geographies as emotionally invested, social spaces brings under scrutiny the conceptualisation of emotions as well as their impacts and significance within feminist theories and practices. Feminists, of course, have been at the forefront of highlighting how acknowledging the subjective (situated, partial, etc.) experience and responses mobilised by research strengthens rather than undermines its rigour. But while reflexivity is a key hallmark of feminist research practice, the reflexive accounts accompanying research are not unproblematic. In this article we seek to contribute to theorisation of (reflexive) emotions by bringing alongside each other two analytical resources or technologies— psychodynamic understandings of emotion and antiracist feminist research practice. This is not to combine or equate these two approaches, but rather to explore how their juxtaposition can be both used *and* explored. Our account of our emotional experience presented here is necessarily impressionistic and anecdotal *and* conceptualised. We are particularly interested in how attending to the social– political conditions of our emotional experience offers useful clues as to why in our research project on domestic violence we experienced what we did.

More specifically we see the contribution of this article for the discussion of emotional geographies as developing Augé's (1995) notion of 'non-places', or spaces without acknowledged tradition, in three ways: as a methodological tool, as a psychodynamically invested location/position, with associated questions around forms of identifications and defences; and thirdly in relation to technologies of gender and 'race' (and their associated practices of oppression).

Mark Augé's (1995) deceptively simple book differentiates between 'places' as public spaces filled with historical and ceremonial memory and 'non-places' which are spaces of transition produced through (what he calls) 'super-modernity'. His paradigmatic examples of 'non-places' are airports and motor-way service stations, as arenas created through technologies of economic development, and especially globalisation, of which he takes high-speed travel as the prototype. Airports and service stations are places that do not (yet?) wield the cultural status of place, being regarded as empty, temporary sites of rest or transit produced through these new technologies. But we suggest phenomena of displacement produced through late capitalism are also more intimate, if just as devalued. Indeed, it is striking that Auge's analysis fails to engage with feminist discussions of space and place that would indicate the gendered character of his examples. Concepts of 'home' focus time and space, and emotion and location, so that belongingness has typically been connected with notions of past time and tradition (notably through conceptions of national identity), which thereby trap women further into the conservative fabric of 'community' and 'culture'

(Yuval-Davis, 1997). 'Home' of course, as well as being where the heart is, is the traditional site of women's oppression under heteropatriarchy. Moreover, we know that such relations not only rely upon, but also extend outside, this designated gender binary of space (e.g. Pringle, 1989).

Yet if we extend Augé's notion of non-places to those other sites of contemporary displacement—transit camps or hostels for the homeless—then non-places do indeed become places filled with meaning and the reproduction of available gendered and sexed relations (as amply indicated by Hyndman's 1998 analysis of how initiatives against sexual violence perpetrated against women in refugee camps reproduce particularly unhelpful notions of gender). This is no less true of women's refuges.

We might note the cultural resonance across different domains that is relevant for political coalitions that could be mobilised, but currently seem absent. Asylum was once considered a near-sacred place of sanctuary, then a retreat for the distressed from worldly pressures. In the shift from religious to medical hegemony documented so well by Foucault (1971), at an intra-state level, asylum has came to acquire psychiatric meanings (connoting a mental hospital). But—like the repressed—its religious and cross-national meanings have returned, albeit in reverse. Hence vilified religious identifications now attach to the minoritised asylum seeker in Britain; s/he who seeks, but is unlikely to be granted, the space of personal and political asylum.

Homes that are not nurturing or home-like could be regarded as 'non-places' within the cultural imaginary. This reflects the long history of denial of the abuse and violence perpetrated by men to women and children within the domestic sphere. Similarly, the asylum seeker is typically constituted according to a culturally masculine position, giving rise therefore to the double occlusion of the positions of minoritised women escaping domestic violence. This is not helped by the explicit negation or overlooking of such women within welfare policy, where uncertain 'leave to remain' (to live in the country) produces women subject to the 'one year rule' (whose marriages to British citizens have broken up within 1 year[1]) as ineligible to claim any welfare entitlements, i.e. as having 'no recourse to public funds.

Our contribution in this article, and Special Issue, then, resides less in our explication of geography than in our address to feminist geographers. Presenting this account of the tricky, sticky (cf. Ahmed, 2002) moments in our research processes is a matter for geographical as well as therapeutic attention. Three further caveats should be noted before we proceed. First, while we make some preliminary suggestions about promising routes for a conjoint geographical and antiracist feminist analysis, we see this as merely indicating the beginnings of a larger project. Nor, secondly would we, claim to be emotional 'experts'; rather we would see each of our professional/analytical positions as capable of being deployed to simultaneously enrich and also evaluate the other. This, if you like, is an emotional geography of both intersecting and separate (rather than merged) analytical frameworks.

Thirdly, we are aware that our reflexive focus could be interpreted as displacing attention from the women who were the topic and rationale for our work, i.e. minoritised women escaping domestic violence. As with discussions of reflexivity, the inclusion of autobiographical material within research practice could—alongside the current queasiness around representing others (cf. Wilkinson & Kitzinger, 1996)—so shrink the space of emotional geographical

analysis that all we are left with is our claims to experience (Rose, 1997; Kobayashi, 2003).

Without dismissing these political questions, fourthly, instead we take these up obliquely throughout this article by simultaneously positing and questioning the form and directionality presumed, but typically left unanalysed, by the concept of transparency underlying most current (including feminist) subscriptions to reflection and reflexivity (including our own) (Rose, 1997). For this is what a psychodynamic analysis calls for: whose identification underlies this 'reflection', and why? This question can never be entirely answered, especially in relation to apolitical and organisational analysis, rather than a therapeutic one. Nevertheless in part to offset the solipsism of feminist reflexive discussions and also to convey some flavour of our project material, we include later some interview extracts from survivors.

Introducing the Project

The initial process of producing this article prompted us to revisit and begin to rethink our work within a research project on domestic violence service provision and minoritisation[2]. The project, jointly funded by the European Social Fund (ESF) and Manchester Metropolitan University (MMU) (on a 'matched-funding' basis whose consequences we discuss below), aimed to identify, model and evaluate services for Irish, Jewish, African and African Caribbean and South Asian[3] women living in or escaping domestic violence within the Greater Manchester area. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with providers from 13 organisations and with 23 survivors drawn (approximately equally) from the four cultural–racialised groups under focus. The research was organised by a steering group (of 16) and a separate research team (of six women). As an action research project seeking to support good practice and inform service development, we also convened and ran three short-term[4] support groups whose cultural-racialised composition ('separate' vs. 'mixed') was organised according to survivor preferences[5]. The initial research report (Batsleer *et al.*, 2002) was launched at a conference at which both service managers and key national policymakers spoke and were—often critically—engaged in discussion, and included workshops facilitated by members of the steering group and the research team. In all, while this was an enormous achievement given the 11-month time-scale of the project, it did not happen without some major struggles.

In this article we will identify and explore some of the challenges and tensions that we encountered within this process. 'We' here refers primarily to Erica and Khatidja, although at times we also attempt to characterise aspects of the experience of research team meetings at various points in its history, including in relation to the steering group (composed of representatives from provider organisations)[6] that we convened as a consultative reference group for the project, and with the research participants. To say a little more about our positions, Khatidja describes herself as a practitioner researcher, who particularly enjoys the ways in which practice and research influence each other. She has worked in health and social care agencies, statutory and voluntary, black-specific and mainstream, for over 20 years. Her interest in research began through a desire to see more equitable services for groups especially at risk of exclusion, and by observing the very real difficulties organisations seem to experience in working with diversity. At a more personal level, as a South Asian woman, her research

interests lie in the intersections of 'race' and gender. Erica is an academic psychologist by background, as well as Jewish feminist and antiracist activist, working around the intersections of feminist research, women's studies and critical psychology and mental health practice. In terms of the analytical resources we brought to the project and to our account here, both of us also practice professionally as therapists in the mental health field. Having worked together successfully on a previous research project (Chantler *et al.*, 2001) that benefited by our recognising and valuing the different perspectives we each bring, the key challenge for us in this project was how to foster and maintain a climate of collaborative working within the research team in the face of all our differences, as well as attending to the complex dynamics of working around issues of abuse. As joint managers of the project, our working relationship—and reflections upon it— illustrates the difficulties as well as the pleasure and success of working across differences, including the racialised, professional and institutional differences embedded in (pathways to) research (see also Burman & Chantler, 2003). These differences, often based on unequal power relations and the ways in which these unfolded, were present not only in our working relationship but also within the research team (as we discuss further below).

In what follows, we begin by focusing on institutional positions and research processes to explain how we drew on ideas about mirroring and parallel processes that circulate among practitioners in therapeutic contexts. We also take up and extend Augé's (1995) notion of 'non-places' to address the racing and gendering of 'non-places'. From this we move on to consider some complexities of anti-racist feminist work in spatial terms, discussing notions of safe places and high-risk zones. As we illustrate, the use of these analytic frameworks offer a way of connecting and interrogating our research findings and research process, in relation to an analysis of emotion generated both by the findings and the process of the project. This includes making some connections between discursively produced spaces and practices of secrecy and shame that surround domestic violence, minoritisation and refuge provision.

Connecting 'Race', Class and Domestic Violence

A key rationale for the project was to build alliances across the 'black'/'white'[7] divide towards a broader focus on the position of (what we called) minoritised women, in this case African and African-Caribbean, South Asian, Jewish and Irish women. In so doing we were challenging the usual separation between 'black' and 'white', which excludes mixed heritage and also threatens to polarise difference, even as it also acknowledges the specific and different experiences produced through skin-colour-based racisms), and also rearticulating discussions of racism to include antisemitism and anti-Irish oppression. We were acutely aware of the controversial character of the study, since any work drawing attention to abuse within minoritised communities elicits charges of fuelling racism further (also see Pratt *et al.*, 2004), and this also contributed to hostile responses to our work from some (male-dominated) community organisations. A further area of contention was our argument that liberal multiculturalism in the United Kingdom has functioned to privilege 'race' over gender, in the sense that the focus on racialised position rather than gender has, paradoxically, has given rise to some acute cases of minoritised women's exclusion from services (Batsleer *et al.*, 2002; see also Gupta, 2003).

Moreover, our analysis also had to address the ever-present danger that a focus on cultural or racialised positionings can either work to obscure or instead spuriously racialise the overwhelmingly classed issue of access to services around domestic violence. This class dimension works in truly paradoxical ways, in terms of its dynamic of inclusion and exclusion from service access, alongside the stigmatising character of many interventions with, and much support for, working-class minoritised women. For, while domestic violence is widely acknowledged to cross all classes and cultures (see e.g. Hamner & Itzin, 2002, and especially Haaken & Yragui, 2003), violence in middle-class families is subject to a double invisibility: first, on the grounds that middle-class women typically have access to other resources that enable them to leave a violent relationship without having to draw on public (statutory) or voluntary sector services; and secondly because many services such as women's refuges are resourced by the welfare and housing benefit entitlements of their residents intensifying the invisibility of those without such entitlements (Larner, 2000; Chantler, in press). As we discuss, some minoritised women facing domestic violence are deemed ineligible for help by virtue of their immigration status. But those who are middle class, who are in employment or with financial resources, face paying hugely expensive rent to stay in refuge accommodation. Because of their absence from refuges they are largely invisible within our research material, reflecting a broader pattern of (non)representation within the domestic violence literature.

Crossing Spaces and Places: psychodynamics and action research

At this point we want to say something about the status of this account as a contribution to feminist politics. By offering these reflections upon our recent work we are aware that we could appear to be privileging reflection over action. Not only does this fall into a classic enlightenment dualism, but it also highlights how the 'space to think' that is so valued by counsellors and therapists (after theorists such as Bion, 1961) recapitulates that same privileging of thinking over doing that not only bolsters traditional structures of academic privilege but also pathologises political activism (especially in therapeutic contexts). Feminist researchers drawing on psychodynamic concepts and practices, i.e. unconscious processes, operating at individual, interpersonal and institutional levels (e.g. Obholzer, 1994), tread a precarious path since the threshold between 'acting' and 'acting out' is so blurred. 'Acting out' is considered to occur when one acts under the influence of insufficiently analysed dynamics (c.f. Sternberg, 1982), something that probably cannot be avoided within time-pressured research projects. But beyond this, our feminist commitment to engagement and change within the process of research was inevitably in tension with some of the analytical resources we were drawing upon to help us deal with this process.

There are important implications here for feminist activists drawn to psycho-analytic and psychodynamic work. Attending to psychodynamics has often been seen as antithetical to feminist politics. Rather than aiming for a blending or reconciling of these resources, perhaps the issue is to draw upon these tensions as resources to facilitate shifts in perspective and analysis; both to inform action, and also reflection upon action in alternating and successive stances. For, notwith-standing some of the depoliticising effects of the feminist convergence with therapy (through a misreading of the 'personal as political' as 'the political as

personal'), we suggest that the project of highlighting how geographies are emotional does not replace geography with (for example) therapy, but rather invigorates both.

   Nevertheless our professional positions as counsellor and group analyst were important in facilitating our work with the research team, as were those of the other five members of the team (who were qualified in social work, counselling and clinical psychology) despite the different models of our practitioner trainings. In particular our professional backgrounds (beyond our academic positions, in the 'caring professions') supported us in two key ways. First, we were well aware of the importance of process issues and so at least tried to encourage an open discussion of these in research team meetings, while also being aware of the tight time-scale of the project and our commitments to our funders. The tensions between these (time-scale, objectives and process) were frequently very difficult to manage and seemed to heighten and intensify our individual and collective anxieties, irritations and hostilities. These tensions were then layered with the multiple levels of difference that created a sometimes tangled, messy and frightening space. At its 'worst' period, one of the team members described research team meetings as a 'war zone'—a conception not that dissimilar from some of the experiences of survivors of domestic violence, or indeed of some of the literature on domestic violence (e.g. Marcus, 1994, argues for the term domestic terrorism over domestic violence). Rather than masking the difficulties and tensions of the project, our assumption was that engaging with them would allow for a fruitful exploration of some of the implications of anti-racist feminist work.

   Secondly, unusually for a research project (and probably more related to our professional trainings), we prioritised the resourcing of external supervision for research team members as a valuable space for reflection on the work being carried out, and structured this as separate and distinct from the supervisory functions conducted by managers (see Bingley, 2002). We were also acutely aware of our own support needs as managers of the project. Arrangements were made for the two researchers employed by the project to have individual sessions with a supervisor of their choice based in the University Counselling Service, while Khatidja as an independent practitioner and researcher (partly employed on the project) already had supervisory arrangements set up. The gap for the remaining three university-based members[8] (working on the project but not employed on it) made its presence felt at various points in the project. However, acknowledging our own needs for support not only sustained us, but it also challenges the prevailing view that 'proper' managers should be able to function effectively without support. Indeed support (or often lack of) featured as a key theme within the research process, in the survivor accounts and in discussions with the steering group. To take an example whose terms we explore further below, at a key point when the research team was feeling overwhelmed by the distress of the topic and the material, as well as the demands of the contracted time-scale of the research, we recognised some of the parallels between relationships among ourselves, and between workers and survivors, and discussed this with the steering group. What emerged was that in comparison to workers in the field, the support on offer to the research team was way beyond what organisations in the 'real world' could afford. Support for survivors and those working with them is clearly crucial and we discuss this later.

Mirroring and Parallel Processes

Having outlined the project and team, we can now discuss some key discourses that we drew upon, both during the course of the project and thereafter, that reflect the interplay between our disciplinary paradigms and analytical resources, namely mirroring and parallel process. 'Mirroring' and 'parallel process' circulate in counselling and therapeutic circles to connect communicative (including emotional) processes functioning at one level or arena with those at another, often, for example, between supervision and therapeutic practice, or between a therapist's own therapy and their clinical practice. When things got tough in research team meetings, members would suggest comparison between process and topic by speaking of how the team's struggles 'mirrored' those of either workers or survivors of domestic violence. Or, at another point, how our difficulties accessing women from the four minoritised backgrounds topicalised within our study 'mirrored' barriers and gaps in services that rendered available provision inadequate. It seemed that such concepts helped us to tolerate some of the pressures of our work, even if we did not fully explicate or analyse their meanings.

   Similarly, we interpreted the institutional dynamics of the research team as 'caught between' different departments of the university and between the university and services, as 'mirroring' the difficulties faced by partnerships working between services. Indeed, as good psychodynamic subjects who have absorbed the widespread therapeutic culture (Parker, 1997), our reflexive moments were prompted by moments of greatest resistance within the team. The most acute of these was when we were struggling to compose support groups of women organised around parameters of self-chosen racialised identities (or not). This was perhaps the most ambitious and demanding feature of the project that took us beyond merely researching the shortfall in provision, to try to contribute to and model something in the way of service provision. As an aside we might note that some team members' anxieties around working interculturally, i.e. crossing designated structures of 'matched' racialised identities, shifted during the project, in one of the research team member's words, 'from being a bone of contention to a bonus', and there were corresponding shifts in anxieties about working with sameness, which presumes a degree of comfort with one's own position of marginalisation that is not necessarily warranted.

   Interestingly the talk of 'mirroring' seemed to work to contain the anxiety mobilised within the team (and between team members), rather than generating much more analysis. It seemed meaningful to all members, but without these meanings necessarily being either explicit or even shared. Hence the issue for analysis is perhaps less the fact of repetition (of the term 'mirroring'), but on what aspects of the reflecting surface this disclosed; that is, what this indicated about the structure and process of our team. The myriad ways we identified with and differed from each other within the team not only engaged the structural, professional and racialised differences between us, but also shifted during the research according to the specific focus of the various tasks.

   Perhaps what the naming of this process achieved was that it enabled us to get on with our work. It functioned as a way of acknowledging, without opening up further either personal revelations *or* areas of interpersonal (including political) conflict. It enabled us to depersonalise and re-politicise our own difficulties by situating them within a broader institutional context. For feminist geographers,

we imagine that this emotional landscape of simultaneous but deferred reflecting surfaces prompts lots of possibilities, not least analysis of the implicit power relations that remain occluded within the undeconstructed discourse of presumed transparency of empty or direct reflection.

Would it have been helpful to have outright confrontation within the research team? Given the levels of anxiety that racism generates between 'black' and 'white' people (see our discussions elsewhere Chantler *et al.*, 2002; Burman 2004a), whether positioned as victims or perpetrators, our sense then—as now—is that opening up such discussions would have both paralysed and polarised the team, while instead such acknowledgement in terms of mirroring worked transitionally (in Winnicott, 1974), that is as an intermediate term or entity connecting the fantasy world of each team member with some shared framework that could sustain, in part precisely by obscuring the ambiguity, the ambivalence and difference of perspectives held by the team. Interestingly, Winnicott (1974) notes as central to the functioning of transitional objects that their reality status should not be challenged.

There were similar discussions about 'parallel process'. Drawing on systems theory, Berg (1985) defined parallel processes as:

> …the tendency of living systems to develop internal emotional dynamics that parallel each other. As a result research teams may experience whatever anxiety exists in the participating system, often mistaking this anxiety for their own. In this case the research team's anxiety can be used to develop hypotheses for understanding the dynamics of the research site. (Berg, 1985, p. 221)

Discussions of parallel process vie with reflexivity as fruitful crossover points between therapeutic and (feminist) research discourses. Here we should note that there were also many direct identifications, particularly with survivors, as evidenced by some of the disclosures made within research team meetings relating to personal experiences. And while we usefully identified such 'parallels' to inform our action, it seemed that there was a kind of speech act involved in naming a process as parallel—that thereby differentiated it from convergence or identification[9]. This may be so as much in a therapeutic as a research context (see also Forrester, 1990; Bondi, 2003). In this sense, speaking a process *as* 'parallel' perhaps works to ward off mistaking resonance or similarity from identification or, in spatial terms, it maintains the displacement and so constitutes that which is being related as apart. From this perspective, talk of parallel processes separates the speaker from the affect performatively, by drawing metaphorical, social and spatial boundaries or limit points between the speakers and the event spoken about[10]. In the sections that follow, we offer further examples of this.

Throughout the research different and shifting pairings and coalitions developed in the team, which can also be interpreted as 'mirroring' some of the more vexing issues facing service providers and policy makers in domestic violence, particularly in relation to minoritised women. Of central concern here is the role and place of culturally specific services versus mainstream services, including the dynamics between such providers and issues of marginalisation and tokenism. These were reflected in our research team in a variety of ways, as we now explore.

Organisational Dynamics: specialisation, cultural matching and support/ surveillance

In this section we summarise four aspects of organisational dynamics through which racialised differences between the research team figured in the project. First, in many ways the research team split in two in terms of its racialised and institutional constitution. The three 'black'[11] researchers (including Khatidja) were brought into the research project on short-term contracts funded by ESF. The three 'white'[12] researchers were already part of the university and reflected a range of institutional positions. Although the university had an official commitment to 'match fund', i.e. to provide staff time, this was often difficult to make tangible in practice. So some dynamics were set up by these institutional arrangements, which themselves reflected wider social and economic processes. Hence the racialisation involved in who was temporary and who was permanent cannot be overlooked.

Secondly, as university research members were having to fit in the research work around their teaching and other academic and administrative university commitments, there was always an element of 'good will' in their involvement in the project. In contrast, the position of the black researchers was very different: here there were very clear expectations of the tasks involved. Initially Khatidja's concern was how to ensure that black researchers were not exploited or expected to do the bulk of the work of the project, as they/we were being specifically funded for this. Later on it occurred to her (and was subsequently confirmed) that perhaps at times there was some resentment that these team members 'only' had the research project to work on, or had the luxury of a specific space carved out to work on the research. This brought to her mind the kind of dynamics that can exist between mainstream and specialist organisations when resources are allocated to specialist organisations. Hard-pressed and frequently under-resourced mainstream organisations may well resent resources being 'diverted' into (usually even less well-resourced) specialist organisations. Yet at the same time (as a response?) these mainstream organisations may have expectations that the specialist organisations will now deal with the 'specialist issue', thus letting mainstream organisations 'off the hook' in relation to these service demands.

Thirdly, expectations about 'cultural' matching were as likely to circulate within our research team as in issues of service provision. Just as there are frequently assumptions that all women spaces are safe and nurturing, so there are an equally powerful set of assumptions that black people, working together, will—because of their common experiences based on racism—be able to transcend any other differences between them. Furthermore, this set of assumptions—around bonding, empathy, commonality of experience and so on—intensifies with the closeness of the cultural match. While the need for culturally specific services, as in the provision of African-Caribbean, Jewish or South Asian refuges, is undoubtedly pressing, our project also illustrated the value of inter-cultural provision, which was the preferred option for many survivors', if only because of anxieties about being identified through close-knit community networks. In the project report we therefore argued that both sets of provision are absolutely necessary, and in terms of our research team it was interesting to monitor where and how the alliances within and across racialised positionings were initially forged and subject to shifts. In terms of group process, this is what would be expected, as collusive, defensive pairings give way to more flexible,

individualised differentiations. But the political (feminist and antiracist) challenge is to go beyond this descriptive and normative account to elaborate how this analysis might work formatively. For emotional geographies, this poses questions about the local/distal relations presumed by discourses of 'mirroring'/'reflection', and about a politics that addresses the intersecting character of 'race', class and institutional positions as spatio-temporally overlapping and shifting categories.

Fourthly, the double-sidedness of support and surveillance manifested itself within our research project in a range of ways that reflected wider social structures and processes. As the research moved into interviews and then group work with survivors, not unexpectedly, the support needs of researchers increased. Practical demands seemed to be pitted against emotional needs, and paralysis set in. Research team meetings came to be used increasingly as a space to offer and receive support. However, at a crucial stage of the research, the process and support issues became all encompassing and the tasks and goals of the project became increasingly blurred and lost. At this time the overwhelming need for emotional support was also being articulated very powerfully from the material documented by the survivor interviews. What was happening in the research team could be interpreted as indicative/revealing of the dynamics of abuse and service responses, in which physical rather than emotional needs are responded to more readily.

Having identified the need for support, interestingly the research team split further. Two of the white, university-based, researchers who were co-conducting one of the research groups, made a decision that they did not wish to use team meetings to discuss process issues arising from their group work. Although not intentionally, this meant that—since this was the only group being discussed within the team meetings—the attention and focus on the work of black researchers increased, and indeed they reported that they felt that their work was being monitored and they were being held accountable in ways the other researchers were not. This was a fair criticism which can in part be explained by the institutional arrangements described earlier, but it also raises two further points. One is the link between support and social control, and the other is to do with *which* groups tend to be subjected to social control and policing. Hence having asked for support and having determined that the research team was one of the key places for support, this provision was in part overshadowed by feelings of being monitored and 'policed'.

This also connects to some aspects of refuge life. So, for example, as Khatidja knows from her supervisory work, while refuges are designed to be supportive spaces, they are increasingly moving towards installing close circuit television (CCTV) to ensure women's safety, creating a very material link between support and surveillance. In relation to who it is that gets monitored, what happened within the research team reflected widespread aspects of the experiences of minority groups, whether in relation to child protection, or mental health, or the criminal justice system etc., as evidenced by the disproportionate numbers of black people in institutional systems of social control rather than in non-custodial 'supportive' systems such as counselling, therapy or family support.

However, despite these manifestations of difference based on racialised identities and institutional arrangements, there were many incidents of the research team working across such differences and supporting each other. Uncomfortably for Erica and Khatidja, as the project managers (but again entirely

predictable from a group process perspective, in which the unity of the group is sometimes maintained by ganging up against the 'leader(s)'), one such moment was when a class and institutional dynamic was called upon as a basis for this synergy. In this frame both of us, became positioned as 'bad' managers—as unsupportive, punitive, bureaucratic and even abusive and as too focused on the outcomes and goals of the project. Here, whatever fantasies there may have been of (the harmoniousness of) an all-woman team were quickly evaporating and a different coalition, based on workers uniting, came to the fore. For Erica and Khatidja, the key dilemma was how to meet our research obligations, which were also formulated to fulfil our political commitments; and how to try to balance this with researchers' support needs. Another way of exploring this is to think about how the fantasies of feminised space as safe and nurturing were challenged by perceptions of us as 'hard'/authoritarian (masculine?) managers (see Burman, 2001, 2002). This also serves as a starting point for further exploration of how power is used in relationships between women: between women workers and women managers, or women living with domestic violence and refuge workers. This complex emotional geography of denied or reactively constituted identifications demands urgent attention.

Domestic Violence and Minoritisation as 'Non-places'

Women who leave violent partners and go to refuges often do not find them home-like places. In this sense, characteristics of refuges that are unwelcoming can be linked to Augé's 'non-places' and here we outline three key inter-linked aspects of what might contribute to a sense of belonging and 'place' (or lack of belonging and 'non place') in a refuge: physical space, emotional space and structural positionings.

The days of a women's refuge being a converted house are long over, with markers of institutions (such as fire doors and smoke alarms) as requirements for funding, and as indicators of professional standards[13]. Notwithstanding this, typically physical space within refuges is limited with women and children having to share cooking and bathing facilities. As our survivor accounts indicate, such enforced communal living itself gives rise to difficulties between women as what might other be considered 'minor' differences in standards of hygiene, child-rearing, methods of cooking and diet, how to share 'public' spaces such as the lounge, how to negotiate what TV channels should be on, what space children are entitled to, intensify considerably, and are further exacerbated because these are not people with whom the residents have chosen to live.

The emotional space within refuges is also key to whether or not the refuge will be considered to be a 'non-place' by individual women. Many women reported feeling nurtured and safe through their contact and connection with other residents and with workers. However, there were also distressing accounts of difficulties between residents as well as in relationships with workers. In terms of relationships with workers, a number of women reported that while their physical needs (for shelter) were met, their emotional needs were not. A sense of disconnection, particularly from the workers, was reported as being felt so acutely that at times it precipitated a move back to abusive relationships. This raises all kinds of practice issues (which we take up later) about coping with dependency/independence and inter-dependency and how these impact on working with vulnerable women.

   Given the topic of our project, in terms of structural locations, we focus here on the dynamics generated by minoritisation, specifically the failure to tackle (multiple forms of) racisms within refuge settings. Failure to tackle racism in refuges can drive women back into the violent relationships they are trying to leave. This was how one survivor expressed it:

> …I've only got one abuser at home, here there's a group of eight women treating me like shit. Forget it. That was because they didn't understand, they didn't stop to ask the question. The workers did, and they said I needed to sort it out myself. I said I could've walked out and never come back. I said you could be so p.c., and that I was for walking and they said that I didn't… I could have been dead over a word, and those workers took part in that by not dealing with it. They should be assertive. I said they must have seen how upset I'd been about it. They must've known how close I was to going back and that if it hadn't been for [name of friend] I would've gone back. He'd have killed me.' (Irish woman)

There were many examples of this kind documented within the research, in relation to all of the minoritised groups. We also documented accounts where state practices, particularly immigration, intersected with refuge provision such that some women were turned away from refuges because they did not have proper immigration status. Although individual refuges can and do support women with no recourse to public funds, this group of women in particular need to be given a higher priority by women's groups as well as nationally. This brings us to other contrasts or paradoxes of emotional spaces.

Gender and Antiracist Working: safe spaces vs. high-risk zones

> Boundaries shift from within; boundaries are very tricky. What bound-aries provisionally contain remains generative, productive of meaning and bodies. Siting (sighting) boundaries is a risky practice. (Haraway, 1991, p. 201)

Our study was very much constituted as a feminist antiracist intervention, in a context of responses to antiracist work that we ourselves characterised as marked by 'race' anxiety (Chantler *et al.*, 2001). The personal and political temperature always rises when potential or actual accusations of racism are in the air (cf. e.g. Cooper, 1997; Treacher, 2001). Antiracist working—including among feminists— is perhaps the key example of the 'high risk zone' that Haraway (1991) among others has described, in her re-visioning of socialist feminist politics, as characterised by discomfort and insecurity—a place of fruitful unfamiliarity and necessary estrangement.

   As we have already described, the research team was constituted as diverse in terms of professional background (with a range of class ramifications), skill, designated role and, crucially, racialised background. Clear structures of racialised privilege were present and had to be worked with. Yet alongside all this, one area that we did not really address together was the significance of gender in our ways of working together, and in particular how this interacted with feminist and women-centred traditions or mobilisation around domestic violence[14]. It was striking (and noted at times by some members of the team) that although we were almost entirely researching with women[15], we only talked of

'women' when referring to the survivors within our study, and this pattern was noted also in service providers' accounts. It was as if women *as workers* within services were in some sense stripped of their gender, perhaps as were we all (notwithstanding our commitment and sympathies) when in role as a research team (see Burman, 2001, 2004b, for further analysis). This was especially so for us as the two managers of the research project. Moreover, this occurred notwithstanding the fact that we engaged very explicitly with, and indeed conducted the project in partnership with, women-only and culturally separatist organisations, as well as with a steering group composed largely of feminists with longstanding histories of working around domestic violence.

There are many explanations we might invoke to account for this silence on gender in relation to emerging discussions of the difficulties women workers encounter in dealing with abuse, in which professional roles and responsibilities can produce conflict with gender or feminist-based identifications (Dutton Conn, 1995; Featherstone, 1997), and in which personal responses and histories may intersect in complex ways. In retrospect we contend that one key feature at play in the largely unarticulated, but often compelling, emotional space of our team was that of competing ethics of working relations: those attending all-women and feminist groups, and those of anti-racist work. For if 'home' and 'safety' typically characterise the rhetoric (if not the reality) of women's organisations, then such categories undergo severe strain when their topic and process combines both antiracist work and support around domestic violence. It was as if we were attempting to work at the intersection of two orthogonally related spaces or dimensions of practice. Typically white feminist anti-violence work has operated according to calls to commonality and similarity between women (giving rise to now well acknowledged criticisms from black feminists, see Davis, 1982 and Haaken 2002, for reviews). While the limits to such identity-politics-based ways of organising are now widely accepted (Bondi, 1993; Warner, 2000), their ethos remains powerful in such counter-discursive places as academic Women's Studies, and indeed within (much needed) separate service development for women. By contrast antiracist feminist work has tended to undermine such securities by highlighting their exclusionary or covertly racist character (Carby, 1982).

In her account of political strategies within new social movements, Laura Chernaik (1996) quotes Bernice Reagon's call for a coalition politics, based on the forging of political alliances rather than on assumed qualities of similarity or liking. We are as much interested in Chernaik's citation and re-articulation as in Reagon's original sentiments:

> Coalition work is not work done in your own home. Coalition work has to be done in the streets… You don't get fed much in a coalition… It is very important not to confuse them – home and coalition… And it ain't no refuge place. (Reagon, 1983, quoted in Chernaik, 1996 p. 260)

Here coalition work is located outside the space of 'home', in the public place of contest and insecurity (where 'you don't get fed much…'). The nurture and security of 'home' is therefore counterposed to the risk and struggle of 'the streets'. This is of course interesting in terms of current discourses of new social movements as outside, on the streets and so on—as traditionally masculine spaces. Yet for women surviving and escaping domestic violence, home may be a site of key danger, or of great loss (or both); while for minoritised

women and their children the streets may also abuse and harass them, giving rise in some cases (as indicated earlier) to women returning to abusive relationships because of isolation from their community of origin and experiences of racism (see also Wilcox, 2000).

As well as there being literally 'no place' for many of our participants (in the sense of even refuges denying access to some women), it also seemed that symbolically we struggled to find a place for our work together. The 'non-place' of our team crossed departments, institutions and professional disciplines, and challenged assumptions of the commonality of gender through attending to the specificities of gendered experiences produced through structures of racialisation. Our work was also correspondingly invisible to our host institution, and we focus now on the ambivalent kinds of 'places' mobilised by domestic violence with minoritised women, and our positions as researchers of this.

Secrecy, Shame and Silence

It is widely acknowledged that the hallmarks of abuse include silence, secrecy and shame. From an analysis of our survivor transcripts, feelings of shame and silence escalated for minoritised women according to the wider political climate. Hence some Irish survivors, for example, talked of how, when there had been bombings, they felt silenced about everything, including their Irish identities, and within this context it was certainly impossible to talk about abuse. Thus, shame about being abused may be compounded by how minoritised women's cultural heritages are constructed. Furthermore, as discussed earlier, even where steps were taken to enter a refuge, the sometimes hostile responses to cultural identifications made it correspondingly more difficult for minoritised women to stay out of violent relationships: sometimes domestic violence was only being replaced by racial violence.

Another key issue concerned the secret locations of refuges, which is normal practice in the United Kingdom and in the majority of shelters in the United States. The rationale for secrecy is to ensure that women and children fleeing domestic violence are safe from further retaliation and attacks from perpetrators. While safety is of course absolutely essential, there have recently been some feminist challenges (in the United States) to the need for complete secrecy—particularly from black women. Although the United Kingdom context is different, and we are wary of drawing firm conclusions, some of the central arguments are relevant. Haaken and Yragui (2003) pointed out that the secrecy of refuges can communicate to women that to be abused is shameful, and thus reinforce the dominant message that it should be kept secret. They also argue that, since isolation is a tactic used by many perpetrators, refuges may be replicating that process by isolating women and children. This isolation takes the form of women not being able to share their address with supportive friends and family or invite them back to the refuge, making it very difficult to sustain or develop reciprocal friendships, and impeding transition to emotional and financial independence that refuges purportedly seek to generate. Here the emotional geography of the refuge unhelpfully replicates that of the abuse (see also Haaken, 1999).

Further, many of our survivor and worker accounts indicated the need for community and cultural identifications, especially for minoritised women and children who may be a very long way away from 'home'. Yet at the same time the smallness of community networks presents an enormous challenge, both in

maintaining safety for women and children and in providing opportunities to be part of community life. So although we acknowledge the need for secrecy and can understand how it has come about, it operates in tension with the importance of maintaining existing supportive networks and developing new ones.

However, perhaps even before accessing refuges, women living with domestic violence may need to tell some one outside their immediate family of the abuse in order to begin the help-seeking process. Project interviews documented the secrecy and shame surrounding not only the abuse, but of bringing an outsider in, including the fear of being seen as a failure as a woman, as a mother and wife, the fear of bringing your community into disrepute, fear of being judged, fear of having to act once the secret is out. This also had many resonances within our research team. At a point when we were really struggling with the group work, we (the managers) suggested bringing in additional staff to take the work forward and relieve the pressure. To our surprise, we were met with much resistance. The team talked of feeling that the 'outsiders' would not understand where the research process was up to. This perhaps indicated some fear of being seen as failures as researchers, or as failing to work inter-culturally or indeed with shared identities.

In keeping with the theme of outsiders and shame/secrecy, it is noteworthy that as a research team we were of course the outsiders in relation to the organisations that were participating in the research. We were enquiring about uncomfortable topics: domestic violence and minoritisation. So whereas shame is normally associated with survivors of abuse, we would also argue that organisations themselves might have often felt 'shamed' because of their lack of engagement and/or knowledge, or feelings of being overwhelmed both with issues of abuse and specifically in relation to minoritised women. Here a focus on emotional geographies usefully shifts the typical emphasis exhibited in policy and practice from service user characteristics to those of the service itself, thereby serving as a corrective to the psychologising that threatens to strip away contextual explanations and pathologise survivors.

'Too Much Too Soon'?: deprivation or excess?

Space and time structure each other, but sometimes collude either to overwhelm or neglect. In terms of the emotional geography of the project we sometimes asked ourselves: were we subjected to too much? From the above analysis we may be better equipped to answer some of the puzzling questions about our research experience. Was our refusal to analyse our relations between each other, including between ourselves and our participants, as 'women' an implicit resistance to this invitation to occupy the traditional female role? Brid Featherstone (1997) notes that there may be a powerful dynamic in relations between women workers and clients that is both fuelled by identification but that also thwarts this. Since we expect too much of ourselves (as 'copers'—and we certainly did on this project!) we can equally expect too much of needy clients.

Just as workers can find dealing with difficult clients challenges their conceptions of themselves as women, so too we found traces of this within our research material and our research process. Our interviews documented how often survivors felt they were being pushed too early to be independent, and did not feel emotionally supported[16].

> You are going through suffering. I know they [refuge workers] are trying
> to put us on the right path by giving us our independence, pushing us to
> do things…so when I came here it was like get out of the door and do it
> for yourself and even though I can read and write English, I was scared. I
> didn't know which school the kids were going to, which post office to go
> to, they just told you…they just give you a map and go. And it's not easy.
> (South Asian woman)

One explanation for this dynamic (beyond all the obvious but very pertinent ones about lack of resources) is the need to limit identification with the survivors' distress and vulnerability (hence the dual function of the discourse of 'parallel process' and 'mirroring'—as containing as well as acknowledging—as discussed earlier). Within the research team too there was a sense that as managers we were demanding too much from 'the workers', which tallies with the identifications that were frequently made by the team with the women survivors rather than women workers. In this sense the researchers and service providers were occupying positions that were structurally in tension with each other (and this was reiterated by the fact that of course we did indeed make extra demands on them—both to be research participants, and to find us other women to interview).

Naturally 'too much too soon' co-exists with 'too little too late', which forms the broader picture of provision for minoritised women generally, especially around domestic violence. In this sense also, there is no available adequate or comfortable place to stay, and (of course) none to occupy (in terms of both histories of colonisation and of women's disadvantaged positions in relation to property rights). Indeed refuges for minoritised women highlight the convergence of the two arenas of home and the state that liberalism struggles to separate. Like Bhattacharjee's (1997) US-based analysis of domestic violence in South Asian communities, both this and our previous project (Chantler *et al.*, 2001) demonstrate how state practices around immigration and deportation intersect with familial and domestic oppression; and, crucially, how the latter cannot work so potently without the former[17]. Such work also highlights the need to bridge the traditional divisions, not only between the individual and social, but also the ways these map onto models of the relations between public health and mental health provision (Chantler, 2002a, 2002b; Chantler *et al.*, 2002; Burman *et al.*, 2004).

Moving On

There are implications arising from this analysis for discussions of competing models of relationships between, and in particular therapeutic relationships between, women. Clearly as researchers our role was not to 're-mother' or offer corrective or reparative experiences, either to our participants or each other. Indeed Featherstone (1997) notes the kinds of criticisms put forward by Jane Flax (1993) that such analyses only give rise to further difficulties (see also Burman, 2001). For they invite the proposal that if only women therapists or workers were sufficiently aware they could be perfectly attuned partners successfully meeting their clients'[18] needs, thereby maintaining an idealised (and impossible and oppressive) conception of women as mothers. Instead of colluding with this, we need to work with an acknowledged analysis of the structural contradictions and constraints of women workers' roles and responsibilities in relation to their clients.

Featherstone (1997) ends her discussion by calling for the development and application of the notion of 'maternal ambivalence' as a fruitful resource for women working around abuse for warding off fantasies of some kind of essential harmony, and the corresponding derogation that is generated when such fantasies are frustrated. However, we could go beyond this to critique further the model of (modern, western) mothering as a prototypical model of relations between women. Perhaps if any such gendered image is relevant (and maybe we cannot avoid mobilising some such), that of 'othermothering' is perhaps the most useful (Hill Collins, 1991; Watt, 2002). Othermothering points to involvements that broaden networks of solidarity and responsibility beyond the intensity of dyadic and Eurocentric models of the bourgeois nuclear family, and connect with black and minoritised women's traditions of community activism. Indeed the aim of broadening responsibility emerged from the project as a key recommendation, and as the most viable way forward to promote and ensure women's safety and independence.

Perhaps we did not realise quite what we were taking on, or the demands we were making of ourselves, when we undertook this study. For there were no safe places: homes are sites of abuse and refuges turned out to be alienating, sometimes uncaring and even expelling. Although we did document much good practice, refuges were often found to be very unsafe places, in ways that resonated for the survivors with the abuse that had precipitated them to come there in the first place. Correspondingly, the research team was also on many occasions 'no-place' to be. The achievements of the project, perhaps as with any transformative work, have come at a cost, personal and political, and also reflecting and flexing our gendered and racialised positions. It has been a complex, challenging and sometimes traumatic project highlighting the tense and challenging nature of anti-racist feminist work which has to undermine the security of old 'places' in order to build the possibility for something different.

Questions of the configuration of women's relationships with each other have in multiple ways (as workers, as residents, as service providers, and as a research team) turned out to be central to both the process and outcomes of our project. With this in mind we return to some of our opening themes. In this article we have attempted to analyse differences between women in terms of the emotional geographies of conflict/connection, safety and challenge. Our focus on the shifting spaces of emotional dynamics of research processes within this challenging area of feminist practice has drawn upon and attempted to extend feminist geographical analyses methodologically and conceptually in relation to research processes. The gendering of public and private space is not only intensified, but also transgressed by, both institutional (publicly funded) refuge provision *and* by the ways the state intrudes upon, as well as produces, sites of oppression by aiding perpetrators through racist and sexist immigration legislation. Thus the private and public spheres intersect and interact in complex and mutually determining ways.

In terms of analytical and methodological developments, we have tried to work the concept of emotional geographies in a number of different directions. The attention to the spatiality of emotional responses has seemed to us useful in generating new perspectives on the processes and outcomes of domestic violence research and service provision in ways that counsellors, therapists and service providers could gain from. Moreover, informing this geographical analysis with an explicit set of intellectual resources for the analysis of emotions (from group-

analytical and counselling practices) seems to us vital to ensure that untheorised renderings of emotion do not come to dominate reflexive feminist accounts. Clearly, then, there would be other ways of representing and interpreting these emotional geographies, and we have only offered one such account. Moreover, our story here performs the difficulty we have. Rendering our analytical tools to understand emotions open to critical interrogation at the same time as using them to think about our research process is a paradoxical space (Desbiens, 1993; Rose, 1993) indeed. While we have formulated analyses in terms of variants of the psychoanalytic notion of repetition—itself spatialised through the notion of transference—particularly in the forms we have discussed here as 'reflection', 'mirroring', 'resonance' and 'parallel process', we have also attempted to problematise or explore how we used such terms, and how they functioned. Doubtless this produces a complex emotional geography for readers of this piece, as it does for us in writing it. In a sense, like our research team, this paradoxical space is also no-place to be. But maybe we cannot do without it.

In terms of their emotional geographies, therefore, 'non-places'—as indicated by this analysis of the dynamics of our research experience—may indeed be transient and shifting because—as with residence within a refuge—it is impossible to sustain or tolerate sufficiently ambiguous and unaligned orientations for very long without falling into old structural patterns. Nevertheless, striving towards, and at moments sustaining, such positioning, albeit temporarily, may be necessary to access or mobilise political alternatives and to highlight limits of their current forms.

Acknowledgements

Notes

1. Since the completion of the project, in the name of what is sometimes called rationalising as 'harmonising' EU legislation, this has now been extended to 2 years.
2. We used the term 'minoritisation' (rather than 'minority' or 'minority ethnic group') to highlight that groups and communities do not occupy the position of minority by virtue of some inherent property (of their culture or religion, for example) but acquire this position as the outcome of a socio-historical process.
3. These designations arose through survivors' self-identification. Clearly these four positionings span a great range of different experiences structured by class, age, sexuality, generation of migration, and so on. They are also indicative, rather than remotely exhaustive of the range of minoritised experience that could have been studied. We explain the rationale for this focus later. Here it needs to be emphasised that we did not presume either homogeneity of experience within each category, nor diversity between them. Rather such matters were part of our topic for research.
4. The aim here was to initiate a new form of provision that would continue in some form after the life of the project. This was the case with one of the support groups, the Asian women's group, with a partnership established via the process of the research between two organisations that had had no prior relationship.
5. Although some members of the Asian women's group also chose to attend the mixed group—indicating that the key issue was not necessarily type of group but volume of support.
6. Partly because participation within the steering group was also an intervention—in terms of helping organisations who had little previous contact with each other, or only conflictual contact

394   *E. Burman & K. Chantler*

through resource-led arenas—its membership remained relatively open throughout the life of the project. It started with approximately 12 and finished with 16 representatives from provider organisations plus the research team and other academic staff from Women's Studies in the university.

7. We introduce the polarity 'black'/'white' initially with scare quotes (as in '') to highlight their constructed character, as well as salience.

8. From a UK context we would normally talk of university 'staff', but we are advised that within a US context this would refer only to people employed within clerical or secretarial, rather than academic, positions.

9. Nitsun (1988, p. 259) highlights the differences between mirroring as an interpersonal response providing feedback from others, and as an automatic reflection involving immediate identification between aspects of (an)other inviting a mimetic engulfment.

10. Again, we might reflect on the political limits of the discourse of parallels: how this subordinates specific textualities of differences to common trajectories. In terms of group processes, while such 'subordination' (!) might be useful to maintain a workgroup in offsetting analysis of individual dynamics mobilised (or resonances in the group analytic discourse, Foulkes, 1975), once again a focus on parallels works to constitute an incomprehensible process into something meaningful by virtue of spatiotemporal comparison.

11. In the UK context, Black is used as a collective term to refer to visible minorities e.g. people of African, Asian and Chinese descent who experience racism on the basis of skin colour and culture. We use it here as 'black' to highlight the problematic associated with the term, but also its salience as an oppositional term.

12. White research team members also included those who were minoritised, so to differentiate between the minoritised positions of the researchers, and different access to structures of privilege, the term 'white' is used. See also endnote 7.

13. There are shades here of the procedures noted by Cooper (1998) as part of wider de-professionalisation processes affecting public sector professionals such as social workers, and as a futile institutional defence against the anxiety the work generates. In the case of refuge workers such de-(?)professionalisation coincides paradoxically with the imperative to professionalise this previously low status 'care' work—which thereby works to close down some key areas of autonomy and innovation that were, and are, central to campaigning and activism.

14. In some ways it is our impression that sexuality (in relation to which there were varied forms of identification within the team) seemed an easier arena for discussion than gender.

15. As further discussed shortly, all our organisational interviews, as well as secondary level contacts with service providers were with women, although some men are involved in the delivery of both culturally specific and mainstream services, excluding dedicated domestic violence and sexual assault services.

16. Indeed much of our final report is devoted to a critique of the notion of 'independence' as reflecting the culturally white, middle-class and masculine model that underlies current welfare policy.

17. That the converse is also true is highlighted by the ways rape is now used as a tool of political violence in contexts where there is a project of obliteration of cultural–national identity (thus underscoring women's ascribed roles and responsibilities within cultural as well as biological reproduction), the recent Balkan war being only one such example.

18. We use the term 'client' rather than survivor to indicate the wider grouping of women who may be using therapeutic services.

References

Ahmed, Sara (2002) Affective economies, Keynote presentation at Emotional Geographies Conference, Lancaster University, September.

Augé, Marc (1995) *Non-places: introduction to an anthropology of supermodernity.* (trans. J. Howe). (London, Verso).

Batsleer, Janet, Burman, Erica, Chantler, Khatidja, Pantling, Kamal, Smailes, Sophie, Mcintosh, Shirley & Warner, Sam (2002) *Domestic Violence and Minoritisation: supporting women towards independence* (Manchester, MMU).

Berg, David (1985) Anxiety in research relationships, in: David Berg & Kevin Smith (eds) *Exploring Critical Methods for Social Research*, pp. 218–30 (London, Sage).

Bhattacharjee, Anannya (1997) The public/private mirage: mapping homes and undomesticating violence work in the South Asian immigrant community, in: M. Jacqui Alexander & Chandra Talpade Mohanty (eds) *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial legacies, Democratic Futures*, pp. 308–29 (New York & London, Routledge).

Bingley, Amanda (2002) Research ethics in practice, in: Liz Bondi, Hannah Avis and Ruth Bankey. *Subjectivities, Knowledges and Feminist Geographies*, pp. 208–22. (Lanham, MD, Rowman and Littlefield).

Bion, Wilfred (1961) *Experiences in Groups* (New York, Basic Books).

Bondi, Liz (1993) Locating identity politics, in: M. Keith & Steve Pile (eds) *Place and the Politics of Identity*, pp. 84–101 (London/New York, Routledge).

Bondi, Liz (2003) Empathy and identification: conceptual resources for feminist fieldwork, *ACME: International Journal of Critical Geography,* 2, pp. 64–76.

Burman, Erica (2001) Engendering authority in the group, *Psychodynamic Counselling,* 7, pp. 347–69.

Burman, Erica (2002) Gender, sexuality and power in groups, *Group Analysis,* 35, pp. 540–59.

Burman, Erica (2004a) From difference to intersectionality: challenges and resources, *European Journal of Psychotherapy, Counselling and Health,* 6, pp. 1–16.

Burman, Erica (2004b) Organising for change? Group analytic perspectives on a feminist action research project, *Group Analysis,* 37, pp. 93–110.

Burman, Erica & Chantler, Khatidja (2003) Across and between: reflections on researching 'race', gender and mental health, *Feminism and Psychology,* 13, pp. 302–9.

Burman, Erica & Chantler, Khatidja (in press). Domestic violence and minoritisation: legal and policy barriers facing minoritised women leaving violent relationships, *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry.*

Burman, Erica, Smailes, Sophie & Chantler, Khatidja (2004) 'Culture' as a barrier to domestic violence services for minoritised women, *Critical Social Policy,* 24(3), pp. 332–357.

Carby, Hazel (1982) Schooling in Babylon and white women listen! Black feminism and the boundaries of sisterhood' in: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies , *The Empire Strikes Back: Race and Racism in '70's Britain*, pp. 211–224 (London, Hutchinson University Press).

Chantler, Khatidja (2002a) Self Harm and Culture, *Community Care*, 14–20 February, p. 40.

Chantler, Khatidja (2002b) The invisibility of black women in mental health services, *Mental Health Review,* 7, pp. 22–4.

Chantler, Khatidja (in press) Independence, dependency and interdependence: resistances of minoritised women in and on leaving violent relationships.

Chantler, Khatidja & Smailes, Sophie (in press) Acknowledging, negotiating and working with difference: domestic violence and minoritisation, *Journal of Critical Psychology, Counselling and Psychology.*

Chantler, Khatidja Burman, Erica & Batsleer, Janet (2003) South Asian women: systematic inequalities in services around attempted suicide and self harm, *European Journal of Social Work,* 6, pp. 34–48.

Chantler, Khatidja, Burman, Erica, Batsleer, Janet & Bashir, Col (2001) *Attempted Suicide and Self Harm—South Asian Women: report of a Health Action Zone funded project* (Manchester, Women's Studies Research Centre, Manchester Metropolitan University).

Chernaik, Laura (1996) Spatial displacements: transnationalism and the new social movements, *Gender, Place and Culture,* 3, pp. 251–76.

Cooper, Andrew (1997) Thinking the unthinkable: 'white liberal' defences against understanding in anti-racist training, *Journal of Social Work Practice,* 11, pp. 127–37.

Cooper, Andrew (1998) Psychoanalysis and the politics of organisational theory, *Group Analysis,* 31, pp. 283–95.

Davis, Angela (1982) *Women, Race & Class* (London, The Women's Press).

Desbiens, Caroline (1999) Feminism 'in' geography: elsewhere, beyond and the politics of paradoxical space, *Gender, Place and Culture,* 6, pp. 179–86.

Dutton Conn, Jane (1995) Autonomy and connection: gendered thinking in a statutory agency dealing with child sexual abuse, in: C. Burck & B. Speed (eds) *Gender, Power and Relationships*, pp. 100–19 (London, Routledge).

Featherstone, Brid (1997) 'I wouldn't do your job!' Women, social work and child abuse, in: Wendy Hollway & Brid Featherstone (eds) *Mothering and Ambivalence*, pp. 167–92 (London, Routledge).

Flax, Jane (1993) Mothers and daughters revisited, in: Janneke Van Mens-Verhulst, Karleen Schreurs & Liesbeth Woertman (eds) *Daughtering and Mothering: female subjectivity reanalysed*, pp. 145–158 (London, Routledge).

Forrester, John (1990) *The Seductions of Psychoanalysis* (Harmondsworth, Penguin).

Foucault, Michel (1961/1971) *Madness and Civilisation* (London, Tavistock).

Foulkes, Sigmund Heinrich (1975) *Group Analytic Psychotherapy* (London, Karnac).

Gupta, Rahila (Ed.) (2003) *From Homebreakers to Jailbreakers: Southall black sisters* (London, London: Zed Books).

Haaken, Jan (1999) Battered women's refuge as social symbolic space, *Journal for the Psychoanalysis of Culture and Society,* 4, pp. 315–18.

Haaken, Jan (2002) Stories of survival: class, race and domestic violence, in: Nancy Holmstrom (Ed.) *The Socialist–Feminist Project*, pp. 102–20 (New York, Monthly Review Press).

Haaken, Jan & Yragui, Nan (2003) Going underground: conflicting perspectives on domestic violence shelter practices, *Feminism and Psychology,* 13, pp. 49–72.

Hamner, Jalna & Itzin, Cathy (Eds) (2000) *Home Truths About Domestic Violence* (London, Routledge).

Haraway, Donna (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs and Women* (London, Verso).

Hill Collins, Patricia (1991) *Black Feminist Thought* (London, Collins).

Hyndman, Jennifer (1998) Managing difference: gender and culture in humanitarian emergencies, *Gender, Place and Culture,* 5, 241–60.

Kobayashi, Audrey (2003) GPC ten years on: is self-reflexivity enough? *Gender, Place and Culture,* 10, pp. 345–9.

Larner, Wendy (2000) Neo-liberalism: policy, ideology, governmentality, *Studies in Political Economy,* 63, pp. 5–26.

Marcus, Isabel (1994) Reframing 'domestic violence': terrorism in the home, in: Martha Fineman & Roxanne Mykitiuk (eds) *The Public Nature of Private Violence—The Discovery of Domestic Abuse*, pp. 11–25 (New York & London, Routledge).

Nitsun, Morris (1998) The organisational mirror, *Group Analysis,* 31, pp. 245–68.

Obholzer, Anton (1994) Authority, power and leadership: contributions from group relations training, in: Anton Obholzer & Vera Zagier Roberts (eds) *The Unconscious At Work*, pp. 39–50 (London, Routledge).

Parker, Ian (1997) *Psychoanalytic Culture* (London, Sage).

Pratt, Rebekah, Burman, Erica & Chantler, Khatidja (2004) Towards understanding domestic violence: reflections on research and the 'domestic violence and minoritisation' project', *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology,* 14, pp. 33–43.

Pringle, Rosemary (1989) Bureaucracy, rationality and sexuality: the case of secretaries, in: Jeff Hearn Deborah Sheppard Peta Tancred-Sherrif & Gibson Burrell (eds) *The Sexuality of Organisation*, pp. 158–77 (London, Sage).

Rose, Gillian (1993) *Feminism and Geography: the limits of geographical knowledge* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press).

Rose, Gillian (1997) Situating knowledges: positionality, reflexivities and other tactics, *Progress in Human Geography,* 21, pp. 305–20.

Sternberg, Tamar (1982) Defence mechanisms and the working through of resistances in group therapy, *Group Analysis*, XV, pp. 261–77.

Treacher, Amal (2001) Ethnicity: recognition and identification, *Psychoanalytic Studies,* 3, pp. 325–32.

Warner, Sam (2000) Feminist theory, the Women's Liberation Movement and therapy for women: changing our concerns, *Changes,* 18, pp. 232–54.

Watt, Diane (2002) Motherhood and mothering: the experience of three generations of Jamaican heritage women in Manchester, unpublished doctoral dissertation, the Manchester Metropolitan University.

Wilcox, Paula (2000) Lone motherhood: the impact on living standards of leaving a violent relationship, *Social Policy and Administration,* 34, pp. 176–90.

Wilkinson, Sue & Kitzinger, Celia (Eds) (1996) *Representing the Other: a feminism & psychology reader* (London, Sage).

Winnicott, Donald (1974) Transitional objects and other transitional phenomena, in: *Playing and Reality*, pp. 1–30 (Harmondsworth, Pelican).

Yuval-Davis, Nira (1997) *Gender and Nation* (London, Sage).