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Abstract

**Background:** Research concerning intergenerational trauma has often looked at a historic event(s) experienced in one generation and the effect of this on subsequent generations. This excludes ongoing, cumulative experiences that may be experienced repeatedly across generations, such as the case of racism. An abundance of research has looked at the effects of intergenerational trauma on clinical symptoms such as post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), depression and anxiety. There is a small pool of research focusing on intergenerational trauma in a non-clinical population or without looking at symptomology. The Windrush Generation (WG) and descendants of the WG have experienced ongoing adversity in the UK, including racism and the Windrush Scandal. However, there is an absence of academic literature looking at their experiences and stories across generations, including possible intergenerational trauma and racism. This research aimed to address these gaps.

**Method:** A type of qualitative methodology, Narrative Analysis (NA), was employed to look at the stories that are told across the WG and descendants, with a focus on possible stories of intergenerational trauma and racism. Four members of the WG and four descendants of the WG, all of whom identified as female, were recruited using snowball (word of mouth) sampling by emailing third-sector organisations, advertisements on social media and interviewees recruiting further participants. All participants underwent semi-structured interviews to address the research question and sub-questions.

**Analysis:** Interviews were analysed utilising Riessman’s (2008) framework, looking at content, structure and dialogical/performance aspects of participants’ stories. Links to context, interactional style and empirical literature were made. Two broad stories were presented for individuals of the WG: stories of opportunity and hard work and stories of challenge. Three broad stories were presented for descendants of the WG: stories of their ancestors’ experiences, stories of racism and stories of strength. The analysis highlighted that stories of Windrush are multi-faceted and include stories of collective trauma, adversity and challenge, yet also focus on individual, family and community strength, resistance and celebration. Whilst collective trauma and racism for the WG and descendants was recognised, it tended not to be spoken about by the WG across generations. Instead of stories of intergenerational trauma being told across generations, there seemed to be a focus on stories of strength and resistance.

**Conclusions:** The findings have important implications for considering stories of intergenerational strength and resistance versus stories of intergenerational trauma, including how trauma is conceptualised and worked with. This has implications for clinical practice in decolonising trauma-
informed care and stepping away from Eurocentric practices. Directions for future research are suggested.
Chapter One: Introduction

1.1 Chapter Overview

I begin by discussing my positionality and epistemology. This is to situate my outsider researcher status so that the reader has the autonomy to read further if they wish. My experiences are not comparable to those who have consulted on and participated in this research. My positionality provides a contextualisation of the interpretations of the stories told in this research.

Trauma will be defined before discussing the Windrush generation (WG) and racism. Psychodynamic theory of racism and intergenerational trauma will be drawn upon. The systematic literature review (SLR) is presented, alongside the research question and sub-questions, rationale and aims of the research.

1.2 Positionality

Connecting with Narrative Analysis (NA) employed in this research, I have reflected on my stories of identity and intergenerational trauma using the Tree of Life (ToL) (Ncube, 2006) (Figure 1). ToL is a strengths-based intervention grounded in concepts of Narrative Therapy, including deconstructing stories around a problem and strengthening alternative stories (Lock, 2016). To present my positionality using ToL embodies this approach. Table 1 clarifies what each section of the tree represents.

Table 1:

*The Tree of Life Sections, taken from Ncube (2006)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section of The Tree</th>
<th>What it Represents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roots</td>
<td>My origins and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ground</td>
<td>My current life – important activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk</td>
<td>My skills, strengths and interests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branches</td>
<td>My hopes, dreams and wishes for the future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaves</td>
<td>Important people in my life (past or present)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruits</td>
<td>Gifts that have been given to me by others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 1:

My Tree of Life, adapted from Ncube (2006)
1.2.1 Identity

A danger in research is the avoidance of racialised issues (Milner, 2007). I am white British and grew up in a white-dominated community where stories of ethnicity were scarce. My first engagement in anti-racism was through social media after the murder of Kendrec McDade in 2012 by police in America. My initial story was believing that these were isolated incidents and I attempted to distinguish how I was different from those who committed racist acts.

After my parents separated, my father moved to Hong Kong. There, I saw operations of power and privilege, evident in how white individuals can be positioned, perhaps linked to colonisation. Witnessing more police brutality against ethnically diverse* individuals, shifted my story to understanding that racism is ubiquitous, aligning with Critical Race Theory (CRT, Crenshaw et al., 1995; Hartlep, 2009) and that racism sits within white supremacy. CRT is a framework “used to theorise, examine and challenge the ways race and racism implicitly and explicitly impact on social structures, practices and discourses.” (Yosso, 2005, P. 70). Adhering to decolonising this research, CRT has been utilised to guide this research, with an explicit acknowledgement of the ways that research has historically been used to harm ethnically diverse individuals. This has prompted the co-production in this research with an expert by experience consultant panel. This has contributed to the honest reflection of the current context in the UK, and how policies, institutions, social practices and discourse could be detrimental to the wellbeing of ethnically diverse individuals and Windrush Generation and descendants. The frame of CRT led to the decision in the discussion and implications of the research to not relate participant findings back to theory, acknowledging that many psychological theories have roots in white, Eurocentric epistemology and that this research is not concerned with fitting participant’s stories into categories and models. It also prompted the recommendations for decolonizing the use of interventions to treat trauma and deconstructing the epistemology underpinning trauma-informed care.

I thickened my stories through the outputs of people such as Emma Dabiri, Guilaine Kinouani, Akala, Ibrahim Kendi, Reni Eddo-Lodge and Frantz Fanon, to name a few. Through engaging with their work and starting my career in psychology, I learned that one’s ideologies sit within one’s political and

---

*Please note that the term ethnically diverse was decided with the expert by experience consultant panel to describe people who are minoritised because of their ethnicity in a Eurocentric context (e.g. people of African and Caribbean heritage, people of South Asian heritage). Additionally, the expert by experience panel felt that the term ‘black’ may lack specificity for nuance in an individual’s heritage.
socio-cultural contexts. I began critically analysing the function that privilege and oppression serve. I shifted to an acknowledgement that whiteness is part of this. Aligning with CRT, I believe that racism has been socially constructed for the benefit of the dominant, white group. Relatedly, this has contributed to my decision to use the term ‘ethnicity’ as opposed to ‘race’ when describing ethnically diverse individuals, acknowledging that ‘race’ is a social construct. As I expanded my learning through figures such as Alexandra Oscasio-Cortez, Zarah Sultana and Vikki Reynolds, I understood my role to educate myself, “lean in” to discomfort and remain critical (Reynolds, 2013) regarding identity. My story has developed to believing that confronting racism is unattainable without confronting whiteness.

This thesis forms an integral part of my Doctorate in Clinical Psychology and the profession has a harmful history. Perry-Springer notes that decolonisation within psychology acknowledges that Eurocentric perspectives form one very dominant narrative, and places importance on hearing the voices of people who are ethnically diverse (The British Psychological Society, 2020). Aligning with a decolonising perspective, this research has been co-produced from conception to dissemination alongside ethnically diverse individuals, in an attempt to centre their voices. To caveat, this research is not ‘giving voice’ to participants. Rather, it aims to co-construct stories and facilitate a platform for these to be heard.

Throughout the project, I have kept a reflective log, guided by 50 questions that Patel and Keval (2018) wrote for white clinicians to reflect upon. My reflections are included further in the introduction, method, analysis and discussion and appendices.

1.2.2 Intergenerational Trauma

Four generations of women in my family have experienced mental health difficulties. Each of us would describe complex relationships with our caregivers, being raised with absent fathers, and – acknowledging that our needs were often unmet or invalidated and parental responses were inconsistent, with blurred boundaries, gossip and aggression. Stories of abandonment, loyalty, trust and control permeated my childhood and the generations above me. I was frequently told stories of trauma and its impact by my family. The search for ‘truth’ surrounding these stories often led to ruptures within family relationships. This unpredictability became a familiar environment to connect with others. Trauma has been carried inter-generationally in my family through patterns of relating, influencing our attachment styles (Ainsworth & Bell, 1970; Main et al., 1986).

Through psychodynamic therapy, I have begun to address these stories and how they link to my vulnerabilities. I have learned about my “inner child” (Jung, 1959) and defences. A defence has
been defined as an internal technique to prevent a person from experiencing what they perceive will be insufferable pain (McWilliams, 2011). A change occurred when reading the academic paper ‘Ghosts in the Nursery’ (Fraiberg et al., 1975), written from a psychodynamic perspective. It discusses that patterns will unconsciously be repeated if one can cognitively understand their experiences but cannot connect with the emotion. This helped me shift from intellectualising my experiences to feeling the emotions associated with my intergenerational trauma, something I am continuing to embrace.

1.3 Epistemology

Epistemology is concerned with knowledge: what is involved in the process of ‘knowing’ and how do we know what we know? (Crotty; 1998). Epistemology relates to a person’s ontological views, which is one’s perception of the nature of reality (Varpio & MacLeod, 2020).

There are a range of ontological and epistemological positions that one can adopt. This thesis is situated in a critical realist ontology and social constructionist epistemology. A critical realist ontology assumes that there is a reality on that we can base our experiences. Aligning with a social constructionist epistemology, our understandings of this reality are influenced by our historical, political and cultural context (Burr, 2015) and through conversations and interactions with others (Galbin, 2014). Under a critical realist ontology, racism exists as a concept that cannot be denied. Under a social constructionist epistemology, our understanding and meaning of racism change over time and context and the way it is spoken about. This fits with NA, which can be grounded in ontological relativism and epistemological constructivism (Smith, 2013). A social constructionist framework is considered appropriate as I am concerned with how stories are idiosyncratic and change over time: what is held onto, what is lost and how this links to discourses in wider society. Social constructionism is relevant to clinical psychology; where clinicians are looking at broader conceptualisations of distress, steering away from diagnoses and individualism, to acknowledge relationships and context. Aligning with the notion that our understanding of the world is generated through language (Burr & Dick, 2017), this has shaped my use of tentative language, acknowledging that what is written is one way of describing concepts, and is influenced by the access to language that I have, in the context that I am writing (e.g. doctoral-level thesis).

1.4 Terminology

Haberman (2000) stressed that:

“Language is not an innocent reflection of how we think. The terms we use control our perceptions, shape our understanding.” (P. 203).
Terminology (Table 2) was discussed with the expert by experience consultant panel. It was agreed that ‘minority’ and ‘BAME’ are unhelpful terms. The term ‘minority’ is globally incorrect and people have been placed into a minority position via oppression. ‘BAME’ lacks specificity for nuances in people’s heritage.

Aligning with social constructionism, the definitions described in Table 2 are one way of defining these terms, which could be defined differently in another context by another person.

Table 2:

Definitions of Key Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assimilation</td>
<td>Assimilation is a process where individuals from an oppressed group adopt the social, cultural and economic ideology of the dominant group (e.g. use of names, fashion and food preferences), at the expense of rejecting their own culture (Abramitzky et al., 2016), to survive. Living in a white supremacist context often forces people who are ethnically diverse to assimilate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>The opinions, encounters, behaviour, values and beliefs of a group and how these influence behaviour and interactions with individuals from different cultures (Jandt, 2017). Culture, therefore, supports how people can make meaning of the environment and the world and influences how we may relate to others (Jandt, 2017).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decolonisation</td>
<td>“A critical historical lens and a transformative approach to knowledge building in order to expose and dismantle the presence of colonial and imperial practices as they pertain to current divisions of race, gender, sexuality, and disability.” (Saini &amp; Begum, 2020, P. 218).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>It is important to distinguish race from ethnicity, as the two terms are often used interchangeably. Ethnicity is a wider term that connects to several facets of identity, such as a person’s language, place of birth, skin tone, cultural ways of living and beliefs concerning politics and religion (Loue, 2006, as cited in Beck, 2016).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eurocentric</strong></td>
<td>A way of viewing things from the perspective of European people or Europe and considering this viewpoint to be the most important, at the exclusion of viewpoints outside of Europe (Cambridge Dictionary, 2022).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gaslighting</strong></td>
<td>Gaslighting has been defined as “the act of manipulating others to doubt themselves or question their own sanity.” (Johnson et al., 2021, P. 1024).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intergenerational Trauma</strong></td>
<td>Trauma that is experienced by a person in one generation, which impacts the health and wellbeing of people in subsequent generations (Cerdeña et al., 2021). The trauma can occur at an interpersonal (e.g. domestic violence) and/or collective level (e.g. war) (Cerdeña et al., 2021). Intergenerational trauma has been extended to individuals who experience the impact of trauma without direct exposure to the original event (Mew et al., 2021). A well-documented example of intergenerational trauma would be an individual surviving the Holocaust and subsequent generations experiencing high levels of anxiety and fear around</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
their safety despite not living through the experience themselves (Dashorst et al., 2019).

Oppression

It appears difficult for a uniform definition of oppression to be described in academic literature. For this thesis, two definitions of oppression will be adhered to. The first, by Cambridge Dictionary, acknowledges that oppression relates to negative treatment, and the second, by Paradies, acknowledges that this is situated in a social/systemic structure.

“A situation in which people are governed in an unfair and cruel way and prevented from having opportunities and freedom” (Cambridge Dictionary, 2022).

“A societal system in which actors are divided along socially constructed dimensions with power unevenly distributed (or produced) based on these dimensions.” (Paradies, 2006, P. 144).

People of African and/or Caribbean Heritage

Many terms have been used interchangeably to describe a person’s ethnicity, such as black, person/people of colour (POC), person/people of the global majority (POGM) and black, indigenous person/people of colour (BIPOC) to name a few.

People of African and/or Caribbean heritage was chosen as the term ‘black’ can lack specificity and it felt important to acknowledge the specific heritages that are being referred to in this thesis. Please note, however, that black may be used as a term when quoting other authors, if this is the term that authors have used.
Additionally, the term **ethnically diverse** will be used to speak more generally of the experiences that people of colour may endure, as opposed to using racially minoritised, acknowledging that race has been socially constructed.

**Race**

The conception of race as a social construct has often been linked with the enslavement of Black Africans, as race was used to identify supposed biological differences between groups of people such as facial features and skin colour. Indeed, Nakkula and Toshalis (2006) note race has been used to “draw distinctions between people such that some might benefit at the expense of others.” (P. 123).

Race as a biological construct has long been contested as the idea that groups of people have inherent biological differences is flawed (Bryant et al., 2022). Rosenberg et al. (2002) found that 92% of alleles (which form genes) are shared across two or more continents and 46.7% of alleles are present across all seven continents, supporting that there is little biological variation between people.

**Racial Trauma**

Racial trauma refers to trauma caused by ethnic discrimination such as racism, humiliation, being shamed and physical injury or harm, which can occur directly to a person or witnessing this happening to another (Comas-Díaz et al., 2019).

**Racism**

The definition of racism that will be followed in this thesis is “a system of power entwined with practices and beliefs that produce and maintain an ethnic and racial hierarchy.” (Fish & Syed, 2020, P.
2). Under this definition, a person displays discrimination and prejudice to benefit themselves and oppress others and this is one-sided by the person in the position of power and privilege.

Racism takes multiple forms and operates at different levels and it is important to state these below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Racism</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Civilisational Racism</td>
<td>This is concerned with how we construct and understand the world and our epistemologies - being intertwined with racism (Scheurich &amp; Young, 1997). This type of racism is the broadest level, above societal racism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internalised racism</td>
<td>Internalised racism occurs when a person’s view of themselves, whether positive or negative, is based on how the dominant group perceives them (Seet, 2021). When it is negative, a person usually begins to have feelings of self-hatred and/or hateful feelings towards others of the same ethnicity as them. This can occur outside of conscious awareness. People may even reject parts of their identity and heritage through assimilation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional racism</td>
<td>Cobbinah and Lewis (2018) define institutional racism as “a structural and legalized system of policies, practices, and norms that results in a differential access to goods and services.” (P. 996).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Racism</td>
<td>This type of racism is relational and “occurs in interactions and relationships between members of different ethnic, racial, cultural, or immigrant backgrounds” (Kornienko et al., 2022 P. 1). This can include overt acts, such as explicit hate crimes, or covert and subtle acts of exclusion, such as being</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
treated with less respect or being spoken over in conversations.

| Societal Racism | Racism that goes beyond the individual and institutional levels to “societal or cultural assumptions, norms, concepts, habits, expectations etc., that favour one race over one or more races.” (Scheurich & Young, 1997, P. 6). |
| White Privilege | “Having greater access or availability to resources because of being white.” (Kendall, 2012, P. 5). It is important to note that white privilege does not mean that white people do not face hardship or deprivation and it does not assume that white people do not work hard or earn their success, but simply that their skin tone is not a barrier to their goals. White privilege is both a consequence and cause of racism (Collins, 2018). |
| Windrush Generation (WG) | Individuals who arrived in the UK between 1948 and 1971, predominantly from Caribbean countries (BBC, 2021). |

1.5 Overview of Empirical and Theoretical Literature

1.5.1 Definition of Trauma in this thesis: It is more than Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD)

Trauma is often used interchangeably with PTSD. However, PTSD has diagnostic criteria (Appendix A), of which a person who is experiencing the effects of a traumatic experience(s) may not have. Only a small number of people experience PTSD, despite a large number experiencing trauma (Kessler et al., 2017). For example, having our emotions dismissed, high expectations placed upon us, being bullied, being criticised, assuming a caregiving role as a child, frequently relocating and a lack of boundaries can result in trauma. It can include living in deprivation and experiencing discrimination regarding one’s ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation and religion (Straussner & Calnan, 2014). This distinction between traumatic events resulting in PTSD versus experiences accumulating over
time has been referred to as big ‘T’ and small ‘t’, respectively (Shapiro, 2001). Whilst labelled ‘small’ trauma, this does not feel small to someone experiencing it (Shapiro, 2001).

These ‘smaller’ traumas can go unrecognised yet can contribute to long-term psychological distress (Straussner & Calnan, 2014). They can lead to sleep problems, poor physical health and poor emotional wellbeing, without a clinical diagnosis (Beilharz et al., 2020). They can lead to suicidality and difficulties with emotion regulation (Elzy & Karver, 2018).

Systemic oppression is not considered trauma in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders V (DSM-V). The DSM-V mentions “actual or threatened death, serious injury or sexual violence” (American Psychiatric Association, 2013) insinuating that events must be extraordinary to qualify as trauma. This excludes ubiquitous experiences such as racism and the cumulative impact of colonialism, which permeates the past and present (Visser, 2015).

1.5.2 Racism and the Windrush Generation

It could be argued that experiences of racism constitute trauma. Some examples of experiences of racism for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage will be presented, highlighting that this may contribute to trauma for some people of African and/or Caribbean heritage.

Conversations around racism became more prominent following the murder of George Floyd on 25th May 2020. The UK, however, has an extensive history with racism spanning centuries before 2020. As Stevenson (2022) quotes:

“A more honest and reflective understanding of the history of racial injustice, together with the IT that has been generated from this profound racial trauma, is essential for us to engage with the current manifestations of racism” (Stevenson, 2020, P. 216).

The British Empire colonised 65 countries worldwide. The transatlantic slave trade, which took place from the 15th to 19th century, involved approximately 12-15 million people from countries throughout Africa who were forced to migrate to countries in the Caribbean and North, Central and South America for enslaved labour (Ochab, 2019). Even after the abolition of slavery in 1838, racism and violence have been enacted by the British, including the 1919 Jallianwala Bagh massacre led by the British Army (Kuortti, 2014) and in the Mau detention camps in Kenya in the 1950s-1960s (Elkins, 2015). There are substantial accounts of racism occurring in the UK. An example of this was the ‘Teddy boys’ – a group of white people in the 1950s who enacted violence towards people who are ethnically diverse (Kingsley, 2020).
An infamous event in British history occurred on 22nd June 1948, when the ship ‘MV Empire Windrush’ docked in Tilbury. The ship transported people from British colonies to fill post-World War II labour shortages, as Britain encouraged immigration to rebuild the country. People arriving in the UK on Empire Windrush, and other modes of transport, between 1948 and 1971 have been labelled the Windrush Generation (WG).

There are reports that the British Government had hoped to receive people from Canada, South Africa, Australia and New Zealand and people of European descent (Olusoga, 2018). The government worried about a threat to ‘white’ Britain and there were attempts to prevent the WG from entering, including attempts to divert the Empire Windrush Ship to Tanzania (Thorpe, 2019). When this was not possible, the Minister of Labour, George Isaacs, was quick to warn that the WG should expect to encounter difficulties rather than opportunities. Individuals from the WG were often denied housing and this was frequently attributed to racism (Jacobs, 1985). When given accommodation, people were charged more than white tenants and were “condemned to the worst housing” (P. 14). Ethnically diverse children were significantly more likely to be placed into children’s homes (House of Commons, 1984), which was conceptualised as racism (Association of Black Social Workers and Allied Professionals, 1983).

As depicted by Scheurich and Young (1997; Figure 2), racism operates at multiple levels.

**Figure 2:**
Levels of racism, taken from Scheurich and Young (1997)
There has been legislation that has adversely impacted people who are ethnically diverse and the WG (Figure 3). The British Nationality Act of 1948 permitted those who came to the UK as part of the WG to stay indefinitely and they did not need British citizenship as they arrived from British colonies. When the Immigration Act 1988 came into force these rights were revoked. In 2009, Windrush landing cards began to be destroyed by UK Border Force Agency. In 2010, Windrush registry cards began to be destroyed. In 2012, Theresa May introduced the ‘hostile environment’ (Taylor, 2022) where people had to prove their status as UK citizens to access healthcare, public services and employment. Many people from the WG faced being deported as many were unable to prove they had the right to live and work in the UK. Some people were taken to immigration detention centres and others lost their jobs and homes. In 2018, the Home Office admitted to detaining more than 850 people between 2012 and 2017 (Gentleman, 2018). In 2019, The Home Office’s Windrush Compensation Scheme was launched to offer financial compensation. By March 2021 5,413 applications had been made and only 1,363 people had received compensation (Home Office, 2023). One could infer that these experiences of racism, threats of deportation and loss of access to human rights could be traumatic for the WG.
Figure 3:

A Chronological Timeline of Significant Political Events in British History Regarding Ethnicity

1615-1815 - The Enlightenment Period across Europe, including England and Scotland. Classifying people based on 'race'. Eugenics.

1663 - Britain's role in the slave trade began. Britain transported approximately 50% of all enslaved Africans from Africa to the Americas between 1662 and 1807 (Oldfield, 2021)

1807 - The abolition of The Slave Trade Act in UK, which stopped the buying and selling of enslaved people. It didn't protect those already enslaved

1834 - Slavery Abolition Act - this act gave those who were enslaved their freedom - although many had to continue being enslaved under an 'apprenticeship' until 1838

1931 - Harold Moody founded 'The League of Coloured People' with an aim for ethnic equality

1948 - British Nationality Act - defined British Nationality as people from UK and all British colonies

1950 - Colour bar bill introduced by Labour MP Reginald Sorensen - "to make illegal any discrimination to the detriment of any person on the basis of colour or race"

1962 - Commonwealth Immigrants Act

1963 - Bristol Omnibus removed policies preventing black people from becoming bus drivers following the boycott by Paul Stephenson, Roy Hackett, Owen Henry, Audley Evans and Prince Brown

1963 - Race Relations Act banned racial discrimination in public places and made the promotion of hatred on the grounds of 'colour, race, or ethnic or national origins' an offence

1965 - Race Relations Act widened to include unlawful racial discrimination in employment, housing and advertising

1967 - National Front Party established - far right political party

1968 - Race Relations Act widened to include unlawful racial discrimination in employment, housing and advertising

1969 - Race Relations Act (came into force 1973) - preserved the right of Commonwealth citizens to have indefinite leave to remain. Recognised for wives and children to join those in the UK

1971 - Immigration Act (came into force 1973) - preserved the right of Commonwealth citizens to have indefinite leave to remain. Recognised for wives and children to join those in the UK

1973 - Immigration Act (came into force 1973) - preserved the right of Commonwealth citizens to have indefinite leave to remain. Recognised for wives and children to join those in the UK

1975 - Race Relations Act

1981 - repealing of 'SUS laws'

1988 - Immigration Act stopped Commonwealth citizens having right to remain indefinitely after two years absence. It removed the general right of wives and children to join them

1990 - Windrush compensation scheme was introduced

1992 - Government repeals 'SUS laws', allowing Commonwealth citizens to stay in UK indefinitely

1995 - Immigration Act - stopped Commonwealth citizens from getting British citizenship if not in the UK

1996 - Immigration Act - stopped Commonwealth citizens from getting British citizenship if not in the UK

1998 - Immigration Act - stopped Commonwealth citizens from getting British citizenship if not in the UK

2012 - Hostile Environment was introduced

2016 - Immigration Act

2016 - Immigration Act

2016 - Brexit vote

2019 - Windrush compensation scheme was introduced

2021 - reform to Human Rights Act by British Government

2022 - Rwanda scheme launched by British Government to send asylum seekers from UK to Rwanda

2023 - government extends Rwanda deportation policy to include anyone who enters the UK illegally, including victims of modern enslavement

2023 - changes to the Illegal Migration Bill to give the government power to bypass the European Court of Human Rights regarding deportations from the UK
1.5.3 2023: A post-racial world: Racism since the Windrush Generation

According to the Commission on Race and Ethnic Disparities report (2021), there is no institutional racism in the UK. I object to these findings and they have been rejected in healthcare (Younis, 2021), policing (Brooks, 2023) and education (Bhopal & Henderson, 2021).

Racism has changed over time and there is a distinction between ‘modern’ and ‘old-fashioned’ racism (Kandola, n.d.). ‘Old-fashioned’ racism describes overt discrimination, such as segregation, whereas modern racism captures covert forms of racism (e.g. speaking over and dismissing the ideas of people who are ethnically diverse). This modern view of racism may be linked to the dismissal seen in society, as there is a belief that equality has been achieved.

The Metropolitan Police have frequently been found to be racist, including strip-searching Child Q (Davies, 2022). People who are ethnically diverse are stopped approximately nine times more than people who are white by police (Zou’bi, 2022). Police are four times more likely to use force against people who are ethnically diverse in the UK (Francis et al., 2020). Data from the Department for Education (2019) shows that pupils of Caribbean heritage are four times more likely to be permanently excluded from school compared to other ethnic groups. HM Inspectorate of Prisons (2020) reported that male prisoners from ethnically diverse backgrounds described higher victimisation from staff, felt more unsafe and reported lower outcomes relating to rehabilitation than white male prisoners. Citizens Advice Bureau (2022) found that ethnically diverse individuals paid averagely £250 more for car insurance than white individuals. Additionally, families of African and/or Caribbean heritage are 5.2 times more likely to be homeless in London and 3.2 times more likely to be homeless elsewhere in England compared to white families (Bramley et al., 2022).

Institutional racism permeates the NHS. Diagnoses were embedded with racism from their conception (Fernando, 2017), including drapetomania (running away from being enslaved). As Kinouani (2021) quotes:

“Mental health services continue to struggle to work with racism; in fact it often reproduces it.” (Kinouani, 2021, P.3).

In 2021, black African individuals had higher rates of Mental Health Act sectioning than any other ethnicity (Mental Health Services Dataset, 2021). In February 2022, the BBC documented that 75% of ethnically diverse doctors have experienced racism in the workplace (Nagesh, 2022).

The above examples indicate that a post-racial world may not exist. Marshall et al. (2005) note that new stressors can compound trauma experienced in previous generations and impact outcomes.
This illustrates the complexity of facing ongoing adversity and its impact on wellbeing. It highlights how the current UK context could be perpetuating trauma in people who are ethnically diverse, the WG and descendants of the WG.

1.5.4 Psychodynamic Theory and Racism

Whilst it is acknowledged that psychodynamic theory may diverge from the social constructionist framework of this thesis, and there are tensions with its roots in Eurocentrism, the use of psychodynamic theory has been included to provide one way of considering theory that has been used to think about racism and intergenerational trauma. This theory was selected as it has deepened my understanding of my experiences of intergenerational trauma.

White (2002) expressed that the purpose of racism is for someone to become a container of bad things for the oppressor. An ethnically diverse ‘other’ becomes phobic (Oliver, 2017) for a white person, stimulating insecurity and fear (Fanon, 1952). Abjection (Kristeva, 1982) – which has been defined as entering a state of horror where there is a breakdown between oneself and others, social norms and reality – means to eject something from the body and make it an ‘other’ (Butler, 1990). Hook (2004) notes that as there is a “deep threat to the ego, to the body and culture...To the physical, psychological and symbolic integrity of the racist subject” (P. 216), hence one enters a state of abjection. In this state, the feelings of repulsion and disgust that they feel about themselves are projected onto another and these feelings are cast aside as the ‘other’ and not within them (Hook, 2004).

There are defence mechanisms involved in racism, including repression and projection (Clarke, 2003). Repression involves keeping disturbing thoughts out of consciousness and usually occurs in response to unmanageable experiences created by conflict (Boag, 2020). Projection is considered to take place when an individual attributes their thoughts, feelings and intentions onto another person (Sandler, 2018). Rasmussen and Salhani (2010) note that the qualities people project are often unacceptable to a social norm (e.g. laziness in a capitalist society, so one projects laziness outwards). Ergo, people project unwanted parts of themselves onto another, which can help to explain the function that racism servers for the oppressor. The power of these defences can mean that people who experience racism begin to experience themselves as being concretely the ‘other.’

1.5.5 Psychodynamic Theory of Intergenerational Trauma

It could be plausible to propose that repeated experiences of racism in people who are ethnically diverse and the WG could constitute trauma. This could be repeated inter-generationally, as each generation continues to have similar experiences. Experiencing racism can lead to mental
health difficulties (Vines et al., 2017), physical health problems (McDonald et al., 2014), sleep difficulties (Slopen & Williams, 2014) and substance use (Farahmand et al., 2020). Importantly, these difficulties are not attributable to an individual, yet occur due to inequalities in social structures, as Fanon writes: “if there is a flaw, it lies not in the “soul” of the individual, but in his environment.” (Fanon, 1952, P. 147).

Theories of intergenerational trauma transmission have often focused on events that subsequent generations have not experienced, such as refugee populations who migrated to flee war (Denov et al., 2019). However, people can experience ongoing trauma throughout generations, which could occur with racism. There are several theories about the transmission of intergenerational trauma (Table 3). This thesis will focus on the psychodynamic perspective as one way of understanding traumatic experiences, given these principles helped me understand my intergenerational trauma.

Table 3:

Theories of Intergenerational Trauma Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Principles of Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attachment Theory</td>
<td>Trauma impacts a person’s ability to regulate their emotions and can prevent mentalisation, which impacts a parent’s attachment to a child (Phipps, 2014). Mentalisation has been defined as “the ability to understand one’s own and others’ mental states, thereby comprehending one’s own and others’ intentions and affects.” (American Psychological Association, 2023).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biological Model</td>
<td>Trauma can change the function of a person’s DNA, which can be passed down to future generations (Yehuda &amp; Lehrner, 2018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychodynamic Theory</td>
<td>Trauma stems from a breakdown in the integration of the psyche, where a person is disconnected from themselves and thus experiences trauma ‘symptoms’.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a desire to avoid unwanted emotions and thus ‘un-symbolised’ trauma is unconsciously transferred into children through projective identification (Knight, 2017). Projective identification is an attempt to split away from the parts of ourselves that we do not like or do not want and place this into another (Klein, 1946).

Social Learning Theory

Trauma impacts a person’s behaviour (e.g. hypervigilance, anxiety). This can be observed and imitated by children and passed down through social learning and social norms (Pop-Jordanova, 2021).

Psychodynamic theory posits that trauma results in a breakdown in a person’s sense of self (Connolly, 2011). Trauma produces a disconnected state (Huopainen, 2012), where the symptoms experienced afterward are the replaying of unprocessed memories and we remain stuck in this cycle (Levine, 2014). Even without the re-living that occurs in PTSD, trauma manifests in the body (Baum, 2013) and causes a disconnection with it (Sieff, 2017). As the trauma remains unprocessed, this can be unconsciously transferred inter-generationally as a person projects the unwanted experiences onto another to avoid feeling their pain (Knight, 2017). As trauma can lead to a dissociative state, this can disrupt the relationship between a parent and child (Bradfield, 2011). Indeed, Fonagy (2001) reasons that caregivers with unprocessed trauma may present as scared or frozen when their child needs containment.

With collective trauma, psychodynamic theory suggests that trauma influences the way a group organises itself and carries out tasks (Berger, 2014). Trauma makes the current strategies that groups have ineffective and this can take generations to resolve. It causes a split between a person and the human community (Connolly, 2011) and can lead to a loss of collective identity (O’Loughlin, 2009). Initial responses can include fear and detachment from oneself, depression and guilt. Ritter (2014) reasoned that when intense feelings (e.g. anger, fear) cannot be released at the time of trauma, this results in a “mental deadness in motor/body expression” (P. 178), which manifests as silence. This can stop people from being able to put their experiences into a coherent story, which leaves a person with an inner conflict of wanting to be listened to, combined with a force not to speak (Frosh, 2013).
1.5.6 Psychodynamic Theory: Stories, Silence and Healing

Aligning with a social constructionist position, stories play a role in how people make meaning of their experiences (Scholander et al., 2021). Who we are, or who we think we are, is realised in the stories we tell about ourselves or are told by others (Bamberg, 2011). People who are ethnically diverse have had their experiences of racism denied and invalidated through gaslighting. Feeling misunderstood is common in trauma (Wilde, 2022), and given that gaslighting can be conceptualised as psychological abuse (Sweet, 2019), one could connect this to trauma for people who are ethnically diverse. Berger (2014) notes that “one can certainly see how prejudices such as homophobia and racism can have a cumulative traumatic impact” (P. 180).

From a psychodynamic viewpoint, there is an appreciation regarding the “conspiracy of silence” (Danieli, 1984, p. 24). Danieli noted that silence was enacted between Holocaust survivors and society because it was painful for others to hear about the experiences that survivors endured. It has been reasoned that parents may be silent with their children in an attempt to protect them from pain (Xiong, 2015). Silence, or caregivers only disclosing partial details about trauma, can mean that children can struggle to reach closure (Ancharoff et al., 1998).

Silence, emotional detachment and avoidance to racism can be coping strategies for people who are ethnically diverse (Wong et al., 2022). This is understandable, given that speaking of experiences of racism can lead to hostility and violence (Kinouani, 2020). Silence can serve a wider function relating to white supremacy (Saad, 2020). For example, the term ‘woke’ has been misused by white people to deny people’s experiences of racism, such as when Priti Patel labelled taking the knee in the Euro football tournament as ‘gesture politics’ (BBC, 2021).

Silence in families has been linked to greater vulnerability for intergenerational trauma transmission (Wiseman et al., 2002). Silence can hinder recovery following trauma, as it can perpetuate a person’s perception of seclusion and distrust in society (Danieli, 2007) and it can result in a fragile ‘ego’ (Ritter, 2014). The ‘ego’ is responsible for our perceptions, thoughts, judgements, reality testing and connection to our external world (Lemma, 2003). Lemma notes that it is “the closest thing to the self” (P. 22). Therefore if weakened, people can have a less stable self-concept (Kernberg, 1970).

Silence feels of particular prominence in considering how people who are ethnically diverse are given space to recover from trauma in the context of being silenced by others. One aspect of repairing and breaking the cycles of intergenerational trauma from a psychodynamic lens has focused on naming the unnamed. From an individual lens, psychoanalytic interventions for trauma focus on
the therapeutic relationship. With the therapist able to stay with the person during the re-telling of the trauma and providing containment, a person can shift from fragmented narratives to a coherent story (Bromberg, 2009). From a collective lens, psychoanalysis aims to connect communities to memories and stories to facilitate healing (O’Loughlin, 2009).

Over-sharing stories of trauma can occur and can be distressing (Ancharoff et al., 1998). Parental oversharing of problems has been linked to insecure attachment (Dalgaard et al., 2016) and poorer cognitive functioning in children (Ritchie et al., 2011). Shared trauma can trigger a need for intense closeness within families and groups, as a defence against feelings of separation and loss (Berger, 2014). Volkan (2001) reasons that a group has a shared symbol of the trauma and that intergenerational trauma is associated with previous generation’s inability to grieve and therefore needs to be mourned by the next generation to be ‘complete’, which connects to the need to speak within communities.

1.5.7 People who are Ethnically Diverse – A Single Story?

There has been a single-story of positioning ethnically diverse individuals as helpless, as depicted in Chimamanda Adichie’s “The danger of a single story” (TED, 2009). Anecdotally, there has been little recognition of the resistance shown by people who are ethnically diverse and the WG. Some examples are documented below.

In 1968, the British Black Panther Movement (BBPM) fought for the rights of people who are ethnically diverse. The movement helped to reveal racism in education, housing, government and in the police force (Angelo, 2018). After SUS (“suspected person”) laws were introduced in 1981, people who are ethnically diverse fought back in many ways. Mavis Best led a group campaign to end SUS laws. SUS laws are stop and search laws that permit police officers to stop, search and potentially arrest people on suspicion that they intend to commit a crime and breach section 4 of the Vagrancy Act 1824. After 3 years of petitioning the government, the law was scrapped attributable to their efforts. The Brixton Riots in 1981 led to the publication of the Scarman report that mentions concerns of ‘racial disadvantage’ (Cook, 2021). In 1984, under the name ‘Black in Care’, a group of 20 young people in care and care leavers led an event attended by social and community workers highlighting the inequalities facing people who are ethnically diverse, including the dismissal of identity and

---

2 The term resistance has been used and not resilience here, as resilience has often been associated with the absence of negative emotions in the face of adversity and is an individualised concept that does not account for the socio-political context (Sims-Schouten & Gilbert, 2022).
failures in the care system (Stein, 2021). The group worked on a national level to bring about changes for people in care and leaving the care system.

1.5.8 Windrush and Intergenerational Trauma

Many individuals, including the consultant panel, have spoken informally about the trauma and racism experienced by the WG and how this has impacted generations since. The impact of racism on the WG has been portrayed on television such as “Sitting in Limbo” (Harries & Rawlings, 2020) and in books, such as “Windrush: The Irresistible Rise of Multi-Racial Britain” (Phillips & Phillips, 1999). When looking at empirical literature, however, intergenerational trauma is absent from conversations around racism (Sewell, 2012) and there is a paucity of literature that has focused on people from the WG.

As discussed, silence and stories play a role in meaning-making. It is crucial to hear from the lived experiences of the WG and across generations, especially when racism is re-experienced and given the institutional failures the WG have experienced through the Windrush Scandal. Aligning with the principles of CRT, storytelling has been used to oppose racist ideology (Parker, 2019) and storytelling has been noted as a method of decolonising research (Samuel & Ortiz, 2021) and can facilitate healing for people who are ethnically diverse (Mbilishaka, 2018). When reflecting upon intergenerational trauma in ethnically diverse communities, much literature has focused on the impact of trauma and has done so in America (Auguste et al., 2021; Brooks et al., 2022). There is a paucity of research focusing on stories relating to experiences of trauma and racism and doing so in the UK.

The stories told by the WG and descendants hold relevance to the field of clinical psychology. There have been longstanding issues around unequal access to mental health services in the NHS for people who are ethnically diverse, alongside worse outcomes and experiences of care when using services (Hussain et al., 2022). Hearing stories of racism and trauma across generations could speak to experiences of psychological distress in people of African and/or Caribbean heritage. Understanding this further could have implications for how clinicians work with racism and trauma clinically, to provide meaningful interventions. It may provide rationale for changing our mental health services, to better work with people who have experienced trauma through racism. Part of the role of psychologists involves considering policies and context and advocating for social justice related to psychological distress. The Windrush Scandal is an example of how hostile policies around immigration impact wellbeing, something which is continuing to happen to the WG and other communities as this
thesis is written, such as Sudan (Crosby-Medlicott, 2023) and Afghanistan (Merrick, 2022). This may have implications for how psychologists can use their position of power within systems to make links between the WG and descendants and experiences of intergenerational trauma, concerning government policies, to push for justice and change.

1.6 Systematic Literature Review (SLR)

An SLR is a way of collating, evaluating and bringing together information around a topic, to consider what has been done and gaps in literature (Xiao & Watson, 2019). An SLR can answer queries that can only be identified when looking across studies, can reveal challenges, errors and priorities for future research, or produce or analyse novel phenomena (Page et al., 2021). I shall present an SLR that addresses the following guiding question: “What does empirical literature tell us about stories and experiences of IT in ethnically diverse groups?” This aims to synthesise what is already known, assess the quality of literature and identify gaps in literature.

1.6.1 Method

A search of the PROSPERO database conducted on 16th June 2022 and 24th October 2022 was completed using the search terms “intergenerational trauma.” This confirmed that an SLR had not been registered.

The SLR followed a thematic approach, intending to amalgamate findings from studies and identify themes to better understand intergenerational trauma. The SLR included studies with qualitative, and qualitative and quantitative methodology to reduce the risk of losing valuable information gained from mixed methods approaches. Quantitative methodology can uncover patterns across groups, although may not reveal motivations or why these occur (Goertzen, 2017). Qualitative research can deepen this, by providing in-depth data concerned with “understanding the social world of participants by learning about their experiences, perspectives and histories” (Moriarty, 2011, P. 2). Including qualitative methodology aligns with a social constructionist epistemology, noting that it is difficult to separate from our context (Gerring, 2017).

The SPIDER tool (Cooke et al., 2012) guided the planning of the SLR (Table 4). An abundance of literature has looked at the effects of intergenerational trauma, such as on mental health (Farina et al., 2020; Menzies, 2019), therefore the SLR concentrated on stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma. As this thesis adopts a broader view of trauma, away from diagnoses, the SLR focused on a non-clinical population. As there is evidence to suggest that people from ethnically
diverse groups may be less likely to access psychological services and therapy (Harwood et al., 2021), this solidified the decision to include non-clinical groups. A limit on the date of publication was not used as there have been many examples of oppressive practices that could result in trauma across generations in the last 100 years or so (e.g. Armenian genocide in the Ottoman Empire in 1915). Given that this thesis is focusing on an adult population, papers that only included people under 18 years were excluded. The inclusion and exclusion criteria are included in Table 5.

Table 4:

**SPIDER Planning Tool**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Phenomenon of interest</th>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Research type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-clinical population</td>
<td>Intergenerational trauma</td>
<td>Interviews, focus groups, observations</td>
<td>Stories, narratives, experiences, understanding, views and beliefs.</td>
<td>Qualitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnically diverse groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mixed methods – qualitative and quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults and children or adults only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5:

**Systematic Literature Search Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The study must be written or translated into English.</td>
<td>• The study was published in a language that is not English.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The study must focus on stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma in family relationships.</td>
<td>• The study does not consist of qualitative data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The study focuses on an ethnically diverse population of people.</td>
<td>• The study only looks at people under the age of 18 years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The study must consist of qualitative data.

The study must come from a peer-reviewed journal.

The study must not be a previous systematic review.

The study focuses on an intervention or evaluating an intervention around intergenerational trauma.

The study focuses only on the effects or impact of trauma (e.g. clinical diagnoses and presentation) without focusing on stories and/or experiences.

Systematic reviews.

The study focuses on physical health.

The study focuses on a clinical population.

### 1.6.2 Search Strategy

After several iterations of the search process (Appendix B), and discussions with my principal supervisor and the information manager at the School of Life and Medical Sciences, SCOPUS, Medline and PsycArticles databases were searched using three concepts: ‘stories/experiences’, ‘intergenerational’ and ‘trauma transmission’ (Table 6). To ensure the search terms were thorough, a thesaurus was used, in addition to looking at titles and key terms in literature. Truncation was used to incorporate differing word endings (e.g. Experience* = experiences, experienced). Boolean operators ‘OR’/‘AND’ were used within and across the search terms, respectively, to obtain papers. It was decided that ‘ethnically diverse groups’ would be manually screened as part of the inclusion criteria, given so few results were obtained during electronic searching. Alerts across databases were generated to allow for the identification of further papers throughout.
Table 6:

*Final Database Search Terms across SCOPUS, Medline and PsycArticles*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1: Story (key words/abstract/title)</th>
<th>Concept 2: Intergenerational (title)</th>
<th>Concept 3: Trauma Transmission (title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stories OR story OR narrative* OR experience* OR understand* OR feel* OR perce* OR belie* OR tell* OR expos*</td>
<td>Intergenerational* OR transgenerational OR family OR families OR cross-generational</td>
<td>Trauma OR “trauma transmission” OR “intergenerational trauma” OR “historical trauma” OR “complex trauma” OR “community trauma” OR “collective trauma”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Prisma 2020 flow diagram (Page et al., 2021; Figure 4) guided the review. The search identified 979 papers across SCOPUS (n = 630), Medline (n = 302) and PsycArticles (n = 47). Duplicate papers, papers that were not written in English and those not included in a peer-reviewed journal were removed. Papers were initially scanned based on title.
Figure 4

PRISMA 2020 Flow Diagram

Identification of studies via databases and registers

- Records identified from:
  - Databases: Scopus (n = 633), Medline (n = 302), PsycArticles (n = 47), Registers (n = 0), Total: 982

- Records removed before screening:
  - Duplicate records removed (n = 327)
  - Records marked as ineligible by automation tools (n = 0)
  - Records removed for not being written in English (n = 59)
  - Records removed for not being in a peer review journal (n = 53)

- Records screened (n = 552)

- Records excluded***
  - (n = 530)

- Reports sought for retrieval (n = 22)

- Reports not retrieved (n = 0)

- Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 22)

- Reports excluded:
  - Focusing only on impact in a descriptive manner and not stories (n = 2)
  - Not an empirical study (n = 1)
  - Focusing on occupational impact and healing (n = 1)

- Studies included in review (n = 10)

Identification of studies via other methods

- Records identified from:
  - Websites (n = 0)
  - Organisations (n = 0)
  - Citation searching (n = 37)

- Reports sought for retrieval (n = 37)

- Reports not retrieved (n = 0)

- Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 37)

- Reports excluded:
  - Not an empirical study (n = 18)
  - Focusing only on impact (n = 9)
  - Did not focus on IT transmission (n = 1)
  - Not peer reviewed journal (n = 1)
  - Study with healthcare staff (n = 1)
  - Clinical symptomology (n = 2)
  - Quantitative (n = 3)
  - Development of measure (n = 1)

- Reports of included studies (n = 0)
1.6.3 Results of the Systematic Literature Review

The SLR found 18 appropriate papers, however two papers (Hogman, 1998; Mozina et al., 2020) were excluded following quality assessment as these papers were deemed poor quality and their results could not be interpreted without caution (Appendix C). It is worth noting that excluding these papers as they did not align with the CASP (2018) criteria was a point of contention for me. In the context of declonising research, this raised questions around who decides what constitutes ‘quality’ and the nuances between research being valuable and meaningful, yet not subscribing to a particular framework. I wonder what research projects are devalued or dismissed under these guidelines of ‘quality’ and whether there needs to be a more holistic view of ‘quality’ outside of prescribed categories and boxes. Despite these reflections, 16 papers were featured. The papers were chosen as they focused on stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma across generations. Thirteen of the papers followed a qualitative methodology and three followed a mixed methodology. Most studies centred on the Holocaust and IT (n= 7). None of the papers were written in relation to a UK context.

All papers focused on ethnically diverse groups who have faced oppression. Five papers focused on Jewish populations and the Holocaust (Braga et al., 2012; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998, Schafer and Mayseless, 2011; Wiseman et al., 2006). Two further papers included a Jewish population and other populations: Lev-Wiesel (2007) included a Jewish family following the Holocaust, an Israeli Arab-Muslim population following forced dislocation and a Moroccan Jewish population living in a refugee camp. Zasiekina et al. (2021) focused on a Jewish population following the Holocaust and a Ukrainian population following the Holodomor. Two papers focused on Chinese Canadian populations and traumatic events in Chinese history (Chou et al., 2022, Chou et al., 2023). One paper focused on a Palestinian sample in the context of conflict and occupation (Dalgaard et al., 2019). One paper focused on a Bosnian American population following war in Yugoslavia (Dikyurt, 2023). One paper focused on a Turkish Alevi Kurdish population and genocide (Kizilhan et al., 2021). One paper focused on a Cambodian American population and genocide (Lin & Suyemeto, 2015). One paper focused on a Slovenian population and communist regime (Wirth, 2022). One paper focused on an African American population and ethnic inequalities (Petion et al., 2022). One paper focused on trauma in Burundian former child soldiers (Song et al., 2014).

Eight papers focused on intergenerational trauma in second-generation experiences (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Dikyurt, 2023; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Wirth, 2022; Wiseman et al., 2006), one on first-generation experiences (Chou et al., 2023), two on third-generation experiences (Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Petion et al., 2022),
two on second and third-generation experiences (Dalgaard et al., 2019; Zasiekina et al., 2021) and two across three generations (Kizilhan et al., 2022, Lev-Wiesel; 2007). One paper looked at parents and children, where the parents were the first-generation to experience trauma (Song et al., 2014).

A summary of the studies can be found in Table 7. Aligning with a social constructionist lens, I have included my reflections on each paper.
**Table 7:**

*Summary of Studies included in the SLR*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year and title of paper</th>
<th>Location of study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Population/sample</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis used</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strengths and critique (as discussed by authors)</th>
<th>Reflections (own lens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Braga et al. (2012). Transgenerational transmission of trauma and resilience: A qualitative study with Brazilian offspring of Holocaust survivors.</td>
<td>Brazil.</td>
<td>Looking at Brazilian Jewish children’s perception of intergenerational transmission of their parents’ experiences after surviving the Holocaust.</td>
<td>15 adults (7 males, 8 females) aged 44 to 60 years. Non-clinical population.</td>
<td>Brazilian Jews – children of parents who survived the Holocaust. Snowball sampling.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td>Three conceptual categories were identified related to intergenerational trauma transmission: communication style, experience of trauma and mechanisms of parents working through their trauma and resilience.</td>
<td>+ GT allowed participants’ experiences and meanings to be considered. + Facilitated the development of a theoretical model that can be used to understand mechanisms of intergenerational transmission of trauma and resilience. - Findings cannot be generalised and may be influenced by current findings of intergenerational trauma transmission in previous literature, reliance on case study methodology), however I was left wondering about the context of the project (e.g. based on inconsistent findings of intergenerational trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context, feelings and intentions.</td>
<td>Jewish population in Brazil and wondered why the authors did not situate the paper to this context in the introduction and discussion.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Did not look at gender differences.</td>
<td>I was curious about facilitating the interviews in Portuguese and how the words/language/findings were impacted by translation into English and would have liked to have</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chou et al. (2022). The steps of data analysis are thoroughly explained; however, I was left wondering about the lens of the researchers and how this impacted the results described.

<p>| Narrative themes of Chinese Canadian intergenerational trauma: Offspring perspectives of | To look at the narratives of intergenerational trauma in Chinese Canadian offspring in how they perceive | 5 adults (2 female, 2 male and 1 gender fluid) aged 22 to 26 years. | Semi-structured interviews. Collaborative narrative method (Arvay, 2003) and reflective thematic | Five themes emerged regarding transmission of trauma and the perceived impact: silence and disconnection, saving face and + Used cultural understanding and trauma-informed approach. + The first study to look at the Chinese diaspora in relation to | The reflective note at the start of the paper nicely situated the first author’s personal lens to the topic. Reflexivity was further commented |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>trauma transmission.</th>
<th>how their parents’ trauma has impacted their lives.</th>
<th>parents’ experienced migration-related trauma.</th>
<th>Convenience and purposeful snowball sampling.</th>
<th>analysis (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006).</th>
<th>conflicting values, discipline and the internalisation of insecurities, education as a necessity and preservation and reclamation of heritage.</th>
<th>intergenerational trauma across two generations.</th>
<th>The use of trauma-informed narrative methodology provides contextual understanding to Chinese diaspora.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+ The use of trauma-informed narrative methodology provides contextual understanding to Chinese diaspora.</td>
<td>- All participants were University students in a particular location of Canada and therefore represent a small proportion of Chinese Canadians.</td>
<td>- All participants were young adults at a particular developmental stage and themes may be intertwined with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- All participants were young adults at a particular developmental stage and themes may be intertwined with this.</td>
<td>- All participants were young adults at a particular developmental stage and themes may be intertwined with this.</td>
<td>- All participants were young adults at a particular developmental stage and themes may be intertwined with this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was curious about the results from the parent interviews, which were not discussed in the paper, and how this impacted the lens in which the offspring narratives were analysed, particularly when</td>
<td>I was curious about the results from the parent interviews, which were not discussed in the paper, and how this impacted the lens in which the offspring narratives were analysed, particularly when</td>
<td>I was curious about the results from the parent interviews, which were not discussed in the paper, and how this impacted the lens in which the offspring narratives were analysed, particularly when</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The use of narrative smoothing by the authors may mean there is a different representation of original narratives. I wondered about the quotes undergoing minor modifications (e.g. grammatical corrections) and how adapting the structure might change the performance and interpretation of participants’ stories.

| Chou et al. (2023). Narrative Themes of Chinese Canadian | To look at parental perspectives of how trauma | 3 adults (1 male, 2 females), aged | Semi-structured interviews. | Five general themes related to experiences of trauma emerged | + The first study to look at the Chinese diaspora in relation to the number of participants recruited for the study was guided | education and parental expectations arose as a finding. |
Intergenerational Trauma: Parental Experiences. Canadian parents who have experienced socio-political traumatic events in China between 1950's and 1980's. Purposive sampling. Collaborative narrative method (Arvay, 2003) and reflective thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Including: decimation of social structures; oppression, chaos, and abuse; desperation for survival; personal losses and the denial of education and opportunities; preservation of values. Three specific themes associated with parental perception of how their traumatic experience transmitted to their offspring emerged, intergenerational trauma across two generations. + Parental perspective is unique. + Multi-lingual approach and multi-layered consent process. - Small sample size may not represent all Chinese parents. - Only two-family pairs across the two papers (Chou et al. 2022 and 2023). - Limitations in translation and Anglo-based perspectives of analysis. by the concept of information power – that the greater the information provided by participants, the fewer participants that were recruited for the study. The authors note that this is impacted by aims, sample specificity, theory, quality of dialogue and analysis, however I wonder how their own perceptions of what constitutes “greater information” and “quality dialogue”
including: desire for stability and opportunities; pressure and concern for the future of their offspring; hope for the future.

impact this.

Whilst the researchers reflect on their positionality, they do not directly link this to information power.

I wondered about the current socio-political context with Hong Kong and whether this could have been referred to in the introduction.

I wondered about the decision to present the two papers separately and how this
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cohn &amp; Morrison. (2018). Echoes of transgenerational trauma in the lived experiences of Jewish Australian grandchildren of Holocaust survivors. Australia.</td>
<td>To understand the experiences of grandchildren of Holocaust survivors.</td>
<td>6 adults (3 men, 3 women) aged 25 to 34 years.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews. Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2013; Shaw, 2010).</td>
<td>Four themes were identified that were underpinned by a broader theme of ‘Holocaust identity’ where being a grandchild of a Holocaust survivor informed their sense of self. Participants discussed anxiety and fear of persecution related to their Jewish identity, the importance of the origins of their Jewish identity and. + Adds to limited literature on third-generation Holocaust survivors and is the first of its kind to do so in Australia. + Adds to findings in Israel and other Holocaust communities by focusing on Australia. - All participants were born and raised in Sydney and attended Jewish schools, therefore it may not be a representative sample.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a clear rationale situated in an Australian context. I wonder about the impact of participants being able to see the interview schedule in advance of interviews and how participants’ understanding of the questions/language changed with time and how this impacted results.

The study had 3 aims. To look at the content of intergenerational communication between parents and children around two Palestinian traumas (War Of 1948, Nabka, 170 Palestinian families (170 mothers aged 25 to 56 years, 170 fathers aged 28 and 65 years and 170 children aged 11-13 years). Sub-sample of larger

Mixed methods. Aim 1 and 2: semi-structured interview. Aim 1: Phenomenological content analysis (content) and t-tests (difference

Aim 1: The most common categories of the content of intergenerational communication with children were parents giving facts and reasons for the war, loss and deportation (23%), silence (22%) and + The first study that compares the content of communication between survivor generations.

Results may be culturally bound and unique to the Palestinian context.

- Using narrow qualitative content analysis may have prevented the timings and

I wonder if or how the results observed were impacted or compounded by ongoing conflict and tension in the Gaza strip. This current political context was not discussed in the
Palestine – Gaza Strip. and 1967 Arab Israeli war. To look at how parental trauma influences intergenerational communication. To see if there is an association between intergenerational communication and children’s mental health.

**Aim 1:** randomized study. between parents and generations).

**Aim 2:** exploratory principal components analysis (EPCA) with one-tailed Spearman correlation or MANOVA.

**Aim 3:** Questionnaires – Child Revised Impact of Events Scale (CRIES), depression self-rating scale, Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ), 14-item stories of violence and aggression (20%). No significant differences were found between parents.

**Aim 2:** severe parental war trauma did not significantly impact the use of negative intergenerational communication about trauma.

**Aim 3:** parents with more positive communication significantly correlated with less PTSD and styles of parental communication to be explored.

- Children’s self-report may not have been the most valid method.
- The mental health of parents was not explored.

The sample consisted of a subset of participants who engaged in a previous research study and I wonder how their experience in the initial project could have impacted their engagement in this research. This was not reflected on by the authors. I wonder how the results observed were influenced by
Aim 3: hierarchical binomial logistic regression.

measure of traumatic events.

psychological distress in children.

the absence of prompts or follow-up questions.

I wonder how the results are impacted by the notion that the second-generation were reporting what their perspectives were on the communication/behaviour of the first-generation and what they tell to the third-generation, with the third-generation not
| Dikyurt. (2023). | To understand identity formation and transmission of trauma and emotions in second-generation Bosnian-Americans whose parents have experienced war and genocide. | 10 adults (7 women, 3 men) aged 18-24 years. | Semi-structured interviews. | Transmission of trauma and emotions is evident from first-generation to second-generation Bosnian Americans. This can occur through mechanisms of silence and transmission of emotions (e.g. trust, anger and emotional unavailability) both of which impact identity and | + First of its kind to look at second-generation Bosnian Americans' experiences of intergenerational trauma. | The Bosnian-American context is spoken to. | The researcher did not comment on how the archival data was used to produce interview questions and I wonder how this influenced the direction of the research. | The data analysis procedure and steps are absent from the paper and thus it is difficult to |
Kizilhan et al. (2022). Transgenerational Transmission of Trauma across Three Generations of Alevi Kurds in Germany and Turkey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researchers</th>
<th>Study Methods</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Findings and Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kizilhan et al.</td>
<td>Mixed methods: Semi-structured interview, The Structured Clinical Interview for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Health</td>
<td>8 older adults (4 men, 4 women) in first-generation (mean age = 89), 10 adults (6 men, 4 women)</td>
<td>The study found the presence of clinical diagnoses and an impact on emotions across all three generations. + Adds to literature that how trauma is transmitted depends on the type of trauma experienced in the first-generation. + Mixed methods enabled a deeper understanding of how experiences of trauma and coping transmit across generations. The researchers acknowledged the context of ongoing persecution, yet do not discuss this in the interpretation of the results. I was curious about the differences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and communication patterns in families relating to previous traumatic events and intergenerational transmission of memories. Communication patterns in families relating to previous traumatic events and intergenerational transmission of memories.

Disorders (DSM; SCID). The Posttraumatic Diagnostic Scale (PDS).

Content analysis and multiple linear regression. and what was spoken about (e.g. repressive practices they experienced, persecution) differed across generations.

Kurdish Alevite generations, which have rarely been used in literature around genocide.

- The selection of participants and small sample size may hinder generalizability.

In Turkey, 12 adults (6 men, 6 women) in second-generation (mean age = 63). In Germany, 12 adults (6 men, 6 women) in third-generation (mean age = 41). Born and lived in Germany. Purposive sampling.

Lev-Wiesel. (2007). To investigate intergenerational trauma transmission of

Three Israeli families where the first-generation had semi-structured interviews. Family 1: there was a narrative across the three generations around + Examines the intergenerational transmission of trauma from a viewpoint of the in the paper, the traumas were defined as something "publicly seen in communication concerning cultural practices/context in Turkey and Germany and, perhaps, educational differences in participants. This was not reflected on by the researchers.
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trauma across three generations: A preliminary study. to see whether the type of trauma impacts the effects experienced by subsequent generations. There was an emphasis on not forgetting the Holocaust across generations. There was a strong connection and belonging to Ikrit across the three generations, a sense of community cohesion and determination to return to Ikrit and the importance of community, family, and belonging to Ikrit.

Family 1: Holocaust survivor (Israeli Jewish): Grandmother (70), mother (49) and granddaughter (27). Family 2: forced dislocation from Ikrit (Israeli Arab-Muslim): grandfather (74), father (51) and granddaughter (27).

Content analysis

- Enmeshment and reification of the war experience across different generations.
- Acknowledgment of “I was curious about this use of language and what it means for the participant.”
- Initially, five families were included in the study. Three families progressed to the final stage as the first-generation survivor met the criteria for PTSD. I wonder about the exclusion of the two families where the first-generation survivor did not meet the criteria for PTSD.

- Limited generalisability as there is only one representative in each generation. The study could be trusted.

- The importance of subsequent generations fulfilling this. The concept of trauma in this way: (70) mother and (49) father.
Snowball sampling.

Family 3: living in a transit camp (Moroccan Jewish): grandmother (69), daughter (50) and granddaughter (25).

There was a shared sense of sadness and pain spoken about across generations.

Family 3: there was a shared feeling of inferiority and devaluation across the three generations, which translated into the third-generation emphasising education and occupational success. The pain and suffering of memories of the transit camps were shared across generations.

The first-generation member did not experience PTSD, and what would be lost with the focus on diagnostic criteria.

When drawing inferences on the comparisons between traumas, I felt it would have been important to acknowledge social, political and cultural contexts when considering these conclusions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lin and Suyemeto. 2015</td>
<td>To understand how Cambodian American children understand their parents’ experience of trauma when they did not experience this themselves.</td>
<td>Semi-structured interviews. Phenomenological analysis.</td>
<td>The study found that intergenerational communication of trauma is an interactional process between generations and is explained by parental communication and younger generations co-construct this and learn outside of the family. Intergenerational communication of trauma is mediated by opportunities to speak, younger + Can help therapists when working with parents and clients to think about the impact of silence and communicating past trauma in a way that fosters adaptive functioning. - Only gathered the perspective of one generation. - May not be a representative sample as all participants had engaged in higher/college education, participants were self-selected and not all Cambodian American young adults are aware of The initial critique of diagnostic labels and a medicalised model situates the lens of the researchers in which they give their conception of intergenerational trauma. It is credible that the reflexivity and positionality of the researchers were shared with participants, however, I wonder about the difference between when this was shared (e.g. in</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sample and snowballing.

generations' motivation to learn, older generations' willingness to talk and the emotional distress tolerance of both generations.

direct response to a participant’s question versus when the researchers voluntarily reflected this during interviews) and how this influenced subsequent conversations and/or findings in interviews.

Petion et al. (2022). “Battling something bigger than me”: A phenomenological investigation of generational

Aimed to look at how African American, female college students understood and experienced 8 African American adult women aged 20 to 28 years. Non-clinical sample: Semi-structured interviews. Interpretive phenomenological analysis (Miller et al., 2018).

Six themes emerged: collectivistic yet disconnected; avoidance; functioning in dysfunction;

+ Clinicians can better understand how to assess and discuss trauma in the context of family systems.

+ Has important implications for moving beyond trauma-informed

Researcher reflexivity on their lived experience and biases is a valuable contribution to the paper.
trauma in African American women. United States of America.

generational trauma in their family contexts and how this impacted their lives, to help healthcare and educational systems identify and better understand and work with generational trauma.

University students.

Convenience sampling.

gendered differences; motivation to change the family’s homeostasis; and talking about GT and constructing a genogram as helpful for self-reflection and repairing damaged relationships.

care to generational trauma-informed care in counselling spaces to help counsellors treat generational trauma.

- Focus on individual and family experiences meant community, collective or historical trauma could not be explored.

- Convenience sample and homogeneity may have prevented diversity in experiences and negative case analysis and exploration of resilience and overcoming IT.

- Some interview questions may have been misleading (e.g. “what kind of mental health care to generational trauma-informed care in counselling spaces to help counsellors treat generational trauma.

The use of a family genogram for each participant feels meaningful in this paper and I wonder how it influenced the information elicited from interviews, as opposed to relying on verbal information alone.

I wonder about the impact of necessitating that all three coders needed to agree on a theme before progressing and whether acknowledging
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rowland-Klein &amp; Dunlop. (1998).</td>
<td>The transmission of trauma across generations: Identification with parental trauma in children of Holocaust survivors. Australia.</td>
<td>Aiming to better understand the transmission of intergenerational trauma from survivors of the Holocaust to their offspring within an object relations framework.</td>
<td>6 adult women, aged between 32 and 49 years. Australian Jews. Snowballing sampling. Semi-structured interviews.</td>
<td>Four themes were identified: heightened awareness of parents’ Holocaust survivor status, parenting style, over-identification with parents’ experiences and transmission of fear and mistrust.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ultimately the findings.

One participant elicited differing findings from the other five and, interestingly, the researchers labelled this as “the odd one out” as opposed to simply an alternative perspective. The authors gave their perspective on why this may have emerged; however, it would have been interesting to consider their lens and biases within...

To understand the dynamics and mechanisms involved in the transmission of intergenerational trauma in a non-clinical population of second and third-generation Holocaust survivors by looking at themes of disorganizing experiences, 196 parents (54 of which both of their parents were Holocaust survivors, 88 of which had one parent who was a Holocaust survivor) and their 18-year-old children (47 men, 95 women). The sample was selected from 2 larger Semi-structured interviews using the Adult Attachment Interview (George et al., 1985) and Parenting Representations Interview-Adolescence (Scharf & Mayseless, 1997/2000). Phenomenological-thematic analysis. Three themes were identified that could contribute to intergenerational trauma (disorganising experiences) in the second generation: survival issues, lack of emotional resources and coercion of the child to please parents and satisfy their needs. + Extend knowledge regarding disorganising experiences.

- The authors only gathered verbal information.
- No direct assessment of symptoms that might indicate disorganisation or PTSD.
- The sample of Israeli participants may not reflect the experiences of other Holocaust survivors.

The sample consisted of a subset of participants who engaged in a previous project around parent-child relationships. I wonder how their experience in the initial project could have impacted their engagement in the current study. The authors did not reflect on this.

I wonder about the decision to discard the research, which was not reflected on in the paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song et al. (2014).</th>
<th>To examine intergenerational trauma in Burundian former child soldier families and understand how the effects of trauma are passed onto the next generation.</th>
<th>25 Burundian former child soldiers (17 male, 8 female), aged 22 to 32 years and their children, aged 6 months to 14 years old.</th>
<th>Semi-structured interviews. Focus groups. Observations with event sampling. Grounded theory (Glaser &amp; Strauss, 1967).</th>
<th>Trauma may be transmitted from former child soldiers to their offspring via the effect on Indero (how to raise a child); severe parental emotional distress; and community effects. + First study of its kind to look at intergenerational trauma in former child soldiers and with a comparison group. - Families were not interviewed systematically (e.g. only those available were interviewed – rare for both parents to be home and children were guarded and so not included).</th>
<th>I wonder about the impact of having a translator present in interviews and how this influenced the results described. This was not reflected on by the authors.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indero: Intergenerational trauma and resilience between Burundian former child soldiers and their children. United States of America and the Netherlands.</td>
<td>Their nature and sequelae. Studies in Israel.</td>
<td>Themes there were less prominent or less clear and how the inclusion of these could have built upon or added to the findings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22 to 27 years
and their
children, aged
5 months to 11
years.

Purposive
sampling.

- An outsider interviewer
  (e.g. American and
Burundian from a different
province) may have
impacted results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To expand knowledge of trauma transmission in Carinthian Slovenes by focusing on the second-generation.</td>
<td>9 adults (3 women, 6 men) aged between 47 to 82 years.</td>
<td>Problem-centred interviews with photo elicitation method.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer (purposive) sampling.</td>
<td>Carinthian Slovenes.</td>
<td>Psychoanalytic text interpretation (Mayring, 1999; Wieser; 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whilst the researcher acknowledged their positionality in the paper, I would have liked to have seen reflections on how they made their psychoanalytic interpretations of the data and how their context...
and grief) and child identification with a traumatised parent. All participants were motivated to protect their Slovene identity. I wonder about the impact of having one interview with a married couple, whilst the other interviews were individual, and how this influenced dynamics/ the results. There were no inclusion or exclusion criteria specified and I wonder how this impacted participant recruitment. Additionally, one
participant did not identify as one generation, but across the first and second-generation and whilst the researchers noted that distinct categories may not always apply, it would have been interesting to unpack the construct of what it means to identify as first or second-generation.

Wiseman et al. (2006). Anger, guilt, and intergenerational anecdotes

To look at experiences and expressions of anger and guilt in 52 adults: 26 men and 26 women, aged

Interviews using the Relationship Anecdotes Paradigm (RAP) There were significant correlations between parental + The Relational Anecdotes Paradigm (RAP) interview is a promising way to study emotions.

Whilst the authors discuss definitions and descriptions of anger and guilt, I
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communication of trauma in the interpersonal narratives of second-generation Holocaust survivors, by looking at the narratives of meaningful interactions with their parents. This aims to better understand what is involved in experiencing guilt and anger in offspring of Holocaust survivors, but also think about family communication of trauma and the offspring of Holocaust survivors, by looking at the narratives of meaningful interactions with their parents. Random sampling. (Luborsky, 1998) and Core Conflictual Relationship Theme (CCRT) standard categories (Barber et al., 2002).

Correlations and Narrative analysis (Hill et al., 1997) behaviours and the emotions experienced in children (e.g. controlling parent and feeling angry). Parental behaviours of over-protectiveness related to emotions of anger. Guilt in children was related to an internal conflict between balancing parental needs and sensitivities with their own and related to parental experiences of the Holocaust.

+ Narrative approach has advantages over self-report measures. Combination of narrative and quantitative methods.
- Causal relations between anger and guilt and wishes and responses of others cannot be drawn.
- A differing picture may have emerged if participants were directly asked about feelings of anger and guilt.
- Findings may be limited to the sociocultural context of Israeli-born children of parents who immigrated to Israel.

I am left wondering why other possible emotional experiences were not included alongside anger and guilt and what this would have brought to the conception of these emotions and how their conceptualisation impacted the results described. The authors did not reflect on this in the paper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>Limitations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zasiekina et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Forgotten stories of women: Intergenerational transmission of trauma of Holodomor and Holocaust survivors' offspring in Ukraine and Israel.</td>
<td>20 women aged 37 to 77 (split into “mothers” and “daughters”).</td>
<td>Focus groups (mothers and daughters separately) – two in each country.</td>
<td>Five common themes emerged across both groups in relation to mother and daughter narratives of intergenerational trauma: emotions and feelings, attitudes toward food and starvation, sense of loss and death, transgenerational transmission of trauma in family narratives and ethnic identity.</td>
<td>No strengths and limitations are described by the author.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 women aged 22 to 70 years (split into “mothers” and “daughters”).</td>
<td>Thematic analysis (Braun &amp; Clarke, 2006).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I wonder how the use of focus groups impacted the nature/content of conversations and the results that emerged. The authors did not reflect on this.
“mothers” and “daughters”).

Snowball sampling.

Differing themes included: coping with trauma for the Ukrainian sample, which meant sharing information about the Holodomor at a societal level (e.g. in schools) and commemorating the Holodomor and asceticism in the Israeli sample, which related to gratitude and appreciation for what they have.
1.7 Quality Assessment

Critical appraisal involves evaluating whether research studies “address questions under meaning, process and context in relation to the intervention and outcomes under review” (Hannes, 2011, P. 1). Critical appraisal is susceptible to researcher bias, which necessitates the need for frameworks (Shea et al., 2017). As the papers identified followed qualitative and mixed methodology, two quality frameworks were chosen. The Critical Appraisal Programme (CASP) Tool (CASP, 2018) for qualitative papers and The Crowe Critical Appraisal Checklist (CCAT) (Crowe, 2013) for mixed methodology papers. The CASP consists of 10 questions that fall under three aims around validity, the findings and contribution (CASP, 2018). It is the most commonly used framework for qualitative papers (Long et al., 2020). This framework was chosen as it had an explicit question about the relationship between the researcher(s) and participants, which was absent in other frameworks. The CCAT consists of 22 items across eight categories*: preliminaries, introduction, design, sampling, data collection, ethical matters, results and discussion (Crowe, 2013). It is useful for papers with differing methodologies (Naseralallah et al., 2020). This framework was chosen as it referenced confounds, which were missing in other frameworks. The summary of the quality of the qualitative papers (Table 8) and mixed methodology (Table 9) are documented below.

*Please note that an overall score for each paper across these 8 categories of the CCAT was not generated. This is attributable to the notion that this is a qualitative research project that looks beyond numbers and quantifying categories, therefore formulating a total score was considered less relevant here.
Table 8:

Quality Assessment Appraisal of Qualitative Papers using CASP (2018) Qualitative Checklist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Yes =criteria met</th>
<th>No = criteria not met</th>
<th>Cannot tell</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Was the research design appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Was the recruitment strategy appropriate?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Has the relationship between the researcher and participants been adequately considered?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Is there a clear statement of research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) How valuable is the research?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Braga et al. (2012)

| Braga et al. (2012) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | The authors demonstrated a comprehensive theoretical model of transgenerational trauma and the link with transmission and overcoming trauma across generations. |
They highlighted the need for more research on a larger scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chou et al. (2022)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Cannot tell</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The findings connect with previous literature. Future research could look at how intergenerational trauma relates to family conflict. The study gives contextual understanding of how narratives of intergenerational trauma are formed in Chinese populations and suggests implications for counsellors around the use of silence and culture. Future research could look at families as a whole and use quantitative methodology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chou et al. (2023)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The first paper of its kind to examine intergenerational trauma in the Chinese diaspora that involves both parent and
offspring generations. The findings are consistent with previous literature on intergenerational trauma yet add a unique sociocultural perspective for Chinese Canadians. The study identified conceptual difficulties with the use of the word “trauma” of which there is no direct translation in Chinese. Future research should involve participants from multiple generations in the same family and should look at how intergenerational trauma is conceptualised within a Chinese cultural world view. Future research could focus more on intergeneration resilience. The paper gave implications for
Cohn and Morrison (2018)  
Yes   Yes   Yes   Yes   Cannot tell   Yes   Yes   Yes  

The study expands prior research to think about second-generation and third-generation profiles and found that the mechanism of transmission may differ. Gave suggestions for future research around looking at a Jewish population in Australia who do not actively attend Jewish schools or engage in the community as much.

Dikyurt (2023)  
Yes   Yes   Yes   Yes   No   Yes   No   Yes  

One of the first papers to look at second-generation Bosnian Americans and intergenerational trauma and the transmission of emotions.
Future research should facilitate interviews in person and use participant observation, using a wider geographical range across USA to generalise findings across gender, age, generation and geographic region. Future research should interview both the second and the first-generation to gain a deeper understanding of intergenerational trauma and identity formation in Bosnian Americans.

Lev-Wiesel. (2007)

The study raised questions about the mechanisms through which “family missions” (e.g. keeping Holocaust alive) and what happens if a “family mission” is completed and emphasised further research to
look into this. Discussed that trauma in an older generation impacts the wellbeing of subsequent generations and so clinicians need to be aware of people’s trauma-related backgrounds, even when this may not be the predominant presentation. The author proposed that clinicians should understand a client’s understanding of parental trauma and the role of trauma in family relationships.

Lin and Suyemoto (2015)                                                                                       The study has implications for therapists caring for traumatised parents to help think about communicating past experiences to younger generations in an adaptive manner. The authors note that
Petion et al. (2022)

| Petion et al. (2022) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |

The study has implications for therapists differentiating between silence and not communicating the trauma and the impact of verbal and non-verbal messages. They note that future research should further explore silence as a construct. Future research should have participants from more than one generation and do so using qualitative and quantitative methodology. Future research could look at links between mental health and motivation/willingness to talk about trauma.

The authors discuss the implications for clinicians and educational settings to understand and discuss trauma.
and generational trauma-informed care and apply this to African American women in a person-centred way. Options for future research are given including exploring individuals’ experiences in counselling around generational trauma and conducting focus groups to facilitate healing.

Rowland-Klein & Dunlop (1998)

Rowland-Klein & Dunlop (1998)
| Scharf & Mayseless (2011) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Cannot tell | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | Yes | The study provides a theoretical framework for understanding the transmission of trauma and disorganising experiences and extends knowledge regarding disorganising experiences to failures in meeting autonomy and competence needs. The findings have implications for the mental health of second and third-generation survivors of traumas. An awareness of the disorganising experiences that disrupt competence, relatedness, and/or autonomy could help therapists in choosing appropriate targets for intervention. Future studies should examine processes of... |
intergenerational transmission and the characteristics of stability, potency, incomprehensibility, and helplessness in more detail.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Song et al. (2014)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Cannot tell</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The study is the first of its kind to look at intergenerational trauma in former child soldiers. The study has implications for interventions for former child soldiers and for people with PTSD to look beyond the individual and incorporate family and community to give a more comprehensive approach to healing and understanding how difficulties and solutions are transmitted across generations. Family-driven initiatives may have implications for preventing and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wirth. (2022).</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study showed evidence of intergenerational trauma in former child soldier families. The study showed evidence of intergenerational trauma transmission of the psychological burden attributable to family history. The mechanisms that guided this were posited to be the transfer of unconscious emotions and grief through identification. Future research could include questions about siblings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zasiekina et al. (2021)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The study highlighted the presence of intergenerational transmission of trauma in mother-daughter relationships and illustrated that this involves many complex emotions. The</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
paper showed the similarities and differences between second and third-generations and demonstrated some of the consequences of trauma. The authors proposed implications for therapy with women who have experienced transgenerational trauma, in co-creating family narratives.

Table 9:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminaries</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (N/A)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STORIES TOLD IN THE WINDRUSH GENERATION AND DESCENDANTS

- Includes study aims and design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abstract:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contains key information</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Is balanced and informative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sufficient detail others could reproduce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear, concise writing/table(s)/ diagram(s)/ figure(s)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Introduction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summary of current knowledge</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific problem(s) addressed and reason(s) for addressing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Objective:

- Primary objective, hypothesis(es) and aim(s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design</th>
<th>Research design:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research design chosen and why</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suitability of research design</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intervention, treatment, exposure:</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention(s), treatment(s), exposure(s) chosen and why</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precise details of intervention(s)/ treatment(s)/exposure(s) for each group</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intervention(s)/treatment(s)/ exposure(s) valid and reliable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome, output, predictor, measure:</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Outcome(s)/ output(s)/ predictor(s)/ measure(s) chosen and why</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Design Elements</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clearly define outcome(s)/ output(s)/ predictor(s)/ measure(s)</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome(s)/ output(s)/ predictor(s)/ measure(s) valid and reliable</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias:</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential sources of bias, confounding variables, effect modifiers, interactions</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence generation, group allocation, group balance, and by whom</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equivalent treatment of participants/ cases/ groups</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling</td>
<td>Sampling method:</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling method chosen and why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sampling size:</td>
<td>Sampling protocol</td>
<td>Data Collection</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sample size, how chosen and why</td>
<td>• Description and suitability of target/actual/sample population(s)</td>
<td>Collection method:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Suitability of sample size</td>
<td>• Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants/cases/groups</td>
<td>• Collection method(s) chosen and why</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical matters</td>
<td>Participant ethics:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informed consent, equity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical matters</th>
<th>Participant ethics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Privacy, confidentiality/ anonymity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical matters</th>
<th>Participant ethics:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical approval, funding, conflict(s) of interest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection protocol:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include date(s), location(s), setting(s), personnel, materials, processes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method(s) to ensure/ enhance quality of measurement/ instrumentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage non-participation, withdrawal, incomplete/ lost data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability of collection method</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection protocol:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method(s) to ensure/ enhance quality of measurement/ instrumentation</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage non-participation, withdrawal, incomplete/ lost data</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ethics:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy, confidentiality/ anonymity</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical approval, funding, conflict(s) of interest</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suitability of collection method</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collection protocol:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method(s) to ensure/ enhance quality of measurement/ instrumentation</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manage non-participation, withdrawal, incomplete/ lost data</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant ethics:</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Privacy, confidentiality/ anonymity</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical approval, funding, conflict(s) of interest</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>Analysis, integration and interpretation methods</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Partially) Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- A.I.I. (Analysis/ Integration/ Interpretation) method(s) for primary outcome(s)/ output(s)/ predictor(s) chosen and why
  - Not applicable
  - Not applicable
  - Not applicable

- Additional A.I.I. methods (e.g. subgroup analysis) chosen and why
- Suitability of analysis/ integration/ interpretation method(s)
- Essential analysis:
  - Flow of participants/ cases/ groups through each stage of research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Partially Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic and other characteristics of participants/ cases/ groups</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyse raw data, response rate, non-participation, withdrawal,</td>
<td>(Partially) Present</td>
<td>(Partially) Present</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incomplete/ lost data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome, Output, Predictor analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary of results and precision for each outcome/ output/ predictor/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>measure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of benefits/ harms, unexpected results, problems/ failures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of outlying data (e.g. diverse cases, adverse effects,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minor themes)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion/ Interpretation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Interpretation of results in the context of current evidence and objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Draw inferences consistent with the strength of the data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Account for bias, confounding, interactions, effect modifiers, imprecision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Generalisation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Consideration of overall practical usefulness of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Description of generalisability (external validity) of the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Concluding remarks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Highlight study’s particular strengths
- Suggest steps that may improve future results (e.g. limitations)

- Suggest further studies
1.7.1 Methodological Quality of Literature

All papers had a clear statement of findings, clear aims and objectives. A form of IPA was the most commonly implemented methodology, used in four papers (Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Petion et al., 2022; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011). In one paper (Dikyurt, 2023) it was unclear what type of qualitative methodology and analysis was used.

Eleven papers used non-probability sampling. Non-probability sampling has been credited for reaching participants that otherwise may not be included in research (Vehovar et al., 2016). Snowball sampling was the most popular method, used in seven papers (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Dikyurt, 2023; Lev-Wiesel, 2007; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Zasiekina et al., 2021). Two papers did not include inclusion or exclusion criteria (Dikyurt, 2023; Wirth, 2022). Not including this information results in challenges in concluding potential bias in selecting participants and the impact of this on the findings.

For all papers, the methodology was justified and suitable for research questions. All but one paper (Zasiekina et al., 2021) credited that qualitative and mixed methods approaches allowed for a deeper understanding of intergenerational trauma. Nonetheless, 13 papers spoke about lack of generalisability of results (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Chou et al., 2023; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Dalgaard et al., 2019; Kizilhan et al., 2022; Lev-Wiesel, 2007; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Petion et al., 2022; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf and Mayseless, 2011; Wirth, 2022; Wiseman et al., 2006), meaning that broader conclusions about intergenerational trauma could not be made. Although sample size and generalisability are used to critique methodology from a realist perspective, under a social constructionist lens, there is value attributed to the nuances and lived experiences of individuals, despite if this cannot be generalised.

Seven papers acknowledged methodological choices that could have confounded data (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Dalgaard et al., 2019; Petion et al., 2022; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Song et al., 2014; Wiseman et al., 2006). This feels crucial, under a social constructionist lens, to consider how different researchers may have drawn different interpretations on results and how researchers managed this (e.g. through reflexivity). None of the papers mentioned further exposure to trauma since the original event(s) as potential confounds. This seems important given that, under a social constructionist lens, our understandings will change across time and contexts.

Speaking to the quantitative methods in three papers (Dalgaard et al., 2019; Kizilhan et al., 2022; Wiseman et al., 2006), it is important to reflect on the measures and tests employed. In Dalgaard et al. (2019) the t-tests, MANOVA and logistic regression were performed appropriately. The measures
of PTSD (CRIES; Smith et al., 2003) and psychological distress (SDQ; Goodman, 2001) had been used and validated with samples of Palestinian children, indicating high validity. The authors acknowledged possible confounds, such as gender, income and exposure to war trauma. The use of multiple linear regression in Kizilhan et al. (2022) was performed appropriately. A valid and standardised questionnaire for PTSD was implemented via a structured interview with trained psychologists, however, this relied on self-report and may be biased to subjective interpretation. The authors acknowledged that the gender of the psychologist did not confound results. However, they did not consider other potential confounds. Wiseman et al. (2006) appropriately used correlations to examine associations between guilt and anger in narratives. The interviews were scored by more than one trained professional to increase reliability.

For 11 papers (Braga et al., 2012; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Dalgaard et al., 2019; Dikyurt, 2023; Kizilhan et al., 2022, Lev-Wiesel, 2007; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Song et al., 2014; Wiseman et al., 2006; Zasiekina et al., 2021) the researcher(s) did not reflect upon their relationship to the research or what was evoked for them by participants and interviews, or it was unclear if they did.

Four papers (Braga et al., 2012, Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Wirth, 2022; Wiseman et al., 2006) did not attend to ethics. Three further papers (Dalgaard et al., 2019; Dikyurt, 2023; Kizilhan et al., 2022) attended to informed consent but did not mention other ethical considerations. This feels particularly important for how to keep participants safe and ensure that discussing intergenerational trauma is not re-traumatising.

Overall, it can be concluded that the papers included are of reasonable quality. The review of methodological approaches provides helpful implications for this thesis. This has included but not been limited to the consideration of alternative methods to IPA, ensuring that inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly defined, acknowledging confounds and the context that may impact stories and ensuring that attention is paid to the relationship between myself and the research topic and participant interviews.

1.8 Summary of Findings from Systematic Literature Review

Thematic analysis was used to amalgamate the findings using principles from Braun and Clarke (2013). This was an inductive, bottom-up approach, where I was not attempting to fit the data into pre-existing categories. The full text of each paper was read to obtain a deeper understanding of the data. Then, specific data relating to stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma were identified. This involved looking across the dataset at all papers, particularly the results section of each
paper, to identify similar themes in the content of the data at a semantic, explicit level. This included looking for divergences within the content of similar themes. Regarding papers that included quantitative components, the quantitative aspects were included when they complimented the qualitative themes. The data were grouped into three main themes: communication; parental behaviours; and offspring reclamation and growth. Under a social constructionist epistemology, the themes and seven sub-themes (Table 10), are worded as I have interpreted that data and are impacted by my access to language. These themes may have been defined differently by another researcher in another context and time. Once gathered, the themes and sub-themes were checked against the results of each paper and their relevance to the SLR question.

Reflecting on my experiences of intergenerational trauma, I was interested in verbal communication as my childhood included many stories around trauma. I was conscious not to look for data that aligned with this and instead wanted to ascertain the nuances in what is told and how this may impact generations. To aid this process, I employed bracketing. This involved reflecting and acknowledging my thoughts and beliefs, whilst aiming to attend to the papers with openness (Starks & Trinidad, 2007). Bracketing can be an important process to begin early in research (Rolls & Reif, 2006), henceforth this guided my approach to the SLR and continued as a self-reflective process.

Table 10:

Themes from the SLR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub-theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Communication</td>
<td>1. Silence versus open communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Parental narratives of survival and fear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Community and culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Parental behaviours</td>
<td>1. Over-protectiveness and discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Emotional closeness versus distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Offspring reclamation and growth</td>
<td>1. Connecting with heritage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Learning outside of the family</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8.1 Theme 1: Communication.

All papers except two (Cohn & Morrison, 2018, Wiseman et al., 2006) mentioned verbal communication between generations as part of intergenerational trauma transmission. Three papers
discussed the impact of communication on offspring’s ability to integrate parental trauma (Braga et al., 2012; Kizilhan et al., 2022) and to understand relationships (Lin and Suyemeto; 2015).

Overall, there seemed to be a distinction between whether verbal communication was present or absent and, if present, what was communicated across generations. One paper (Wirth, 2022) noted that if parents had healed from their trauma before communicating with their children, this protected subsequent generations.

1.8.1.1 Sub-theme 1: Silence versus Open Communication. Six papers noted the presence of silence as part of intergenerational trauma transmission (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Dalgaard et al., 2019; Dikyurt, 2023; Petion et al., 2022; Wirth, 2022). Silence was found to leave individuals with an inability to process the traumatic experiences of other generations (Braga et al., 2012; Kizilhan et al., 2022), a sense of vagueness about their parents’ experiences (Wirth, 2022), disconnection with family (Chou et al., 2022) and society (Kizilhan et al., 2022), a lack of belonging (Braga et al., 2012), feeling frightened (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) and a desire to know more (Chou et al., 2022; Dikyurt, 2023). Silence could be interpreted by subsequent generations as the topic was dangerous (Lin & Suyemeto, 2015) or that they needed to be protected (Wirth, 2022). There was a sense, however, that even with silence, individuals knew about traumatic experiences in previous generations:

“She always knew that there was something behind the silence.” (Wirth, 2022, P. 170)

One paper (Dikyurt, 2023) noted a contrasting observation that several participants were content with their ancestors not speaking about their trauma. One paper (Dalgaard et al., 2019) did not find an association between parental silence and the presence of mental health difficulties in children, however, the paper noted that open and positive communication (e.g. providing meaning around past trauma) significantly correlated with less PTSD symptoms and distress in offspring. Open communication and growth in subsequent generations was corroborated in other papers (Braga et al., 2012; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015). There was, however, a balance with disclosure, in that hearing their ancestors’ suffering was perceived as painful and overwhelming (Wirth, 2022; Zasiekina et al., 2021) and humour mixed with disclosure was found to minimise trauma (Braga et al., 2012).

A generational pattern was described in one paper (Kizilhan et al., 2022), whereby silence was more evident in the first-generation and decreased across the second and third-generations. Silence was seen to manifest from emotions of guilt, shame and fear and worries that this would harm subsequent generations. This fear also prompted the opposite pattern in that it spurred some individuals to talk more to help children process trauma and not forget the trauma (Lev-Wiesel, 2007).
1.8.1.2 Sub-theme 2: Parental Narratives of Survival and Fear. When communication was present, narratives that permeated papers were of survival, fear and that the world is hostile (Braga et al., 2012; Dikyurt, 2023; Lev-Wiesel, 2007; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011), which linked to anxiety and fear of persecution in subsequent generations (Cohn & Morrison, 2018). In some papers, assimilation was described for protection and survival in subsequent generations (Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998), including not wearing religious items to identify one’s faith (Braga et al., 2012). The narrative of “being prepared” contributed to hypervigilance in subsequent generations, due to beliefs about the world being unsafe (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011).

Related to the need for survival was a sense of carrying on living for what was lost in previous generations (Lev-Wiesel, 2007). This was linked to more positive outcomes in subsequent generations. Considering what previous generations had lost due to trauma, this related to the importance given to education (Chou et al., 2022; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) for subsequent generations. This was corroborated by first-generation experiences, who wanted their offspring to have opportunities and stability that they felt they were denied (Chou et al., 2023):

“I always emphasized the importance of education to [my son]. I placed a lot of value in his education because, to me, education was our family tradition.” (Chou et al., 2023, P. 23)

However, emphasising education and success was linked to increased pressure on subsequent generations to succeed on behalf of previous generations (Chou et al., 2022; 2023).

1.8.1.3 Sub-theme 3: Community and Culture. Five papers (Chou et al., 2022; Dikyurt, 2023; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Petion et al., 2022; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998) made links between communication and cultural practices. Chou et al. (2022) linked silence with respect, “saving face” and “role hierarchies” in the Chinese diaspora and it connected to language barriers in older generations. Lin and Suyemeto (2015) noted that older generations were more likely to talk about trauma when it was related to school assignments. Two papers (Dikyurt, 2023; Petion et al., 2022) noted cultural practices of coping with things by oneself in Bosnian-American and African American communities, respectively.

Community stigma was found to compound trauma in one paper. Song et al. (2014) found that former child soldiers can be feared in the Burundian community and others can think badly of them. As a result, they are not helped when they need support, and the same treatment is given to children by association. It is not clear, however, how this contributed to intergenerational trauma transmission.
Gender identity and culture were linked to communication (Dalgaard et al., 2019; Petion et al., 2022). For example, expectations of third-generation African American women to take care of the family were linked to repressing experiences and pushing through trauma:

“As women, we’re supposed to take care of everything and be strong and just keep it pushing, so I really feel like that’s how we operate in our family.” (Petion et al., 2022, P. 8).

Dalgaard et al. (2019) found second-generation mothers were less likely to be silent than second-generation fathers. It would have been interesting to see, from a social constructionist lens, what contributed to this difference between genders (e.g. societal expectations of women, toxic masculinity).

Three papers (Lin & Suyemoto, 2015; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Wirth, 2022) linked communication to cultural ideas around age, in that details around trauma should be shielded until adulthood to protect children from pain.

One paper (Lin & Suyemoto, 2015) noted the importance of communication coming from multiple sources, such as directly from family and other sources, as each on its own was not enough for individuals to understand what had happened.

1.8.2 Theme 2: Parental Behaviours.

1.8.2.1 Sub-theme 1: Over-protectiveness and Discipline. Related to narratives of survival, five papers (Chou et al., 2022; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Song et al., 2014; Zasiekina et al., 2021) discussed parental behaviours of over-protectiveness and discipline as connecting to intergenerational trauma transmission. This may connect to the oppression experienced by the first-generation and may be an attempt to give their offspring a better life (Chou et al., 2023). Not being able to be autonomous out of parental fear of injury or death (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) or engage in sports (Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998) led to offspring feeling controlled and that the world is dangerous (Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998). When parents were perceived as controlling, this led to offspring feeling angry and avoiding confrontation with parents yet wishing for their needs to be understood (Wiseman et al., 2006). One paper (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) documented that parental over-protectiveness manifested through saving money to be prepared for danger, however, this led to children feeling deprived and contributed to helplessness and perceptions of the world being unsafe (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011). Harsh discipline (Chou et al., 2022; Song et al., 2014) and anger (Dikyurt, 2023) were understood by children to relate to parental experiences of trauma, particularly when they found parental behaviour confusing (Wiseman et al., 2006), however, it led to ruptures in parent-child relationships and led to children internalising insecurities (e.g. self-criticism).
(Chou et al., 2022). One paper (Petion et al., 2022), noted that offspring did not perceive their home conditions to be harsh until they were exposed to other family norms and this led to anger. This is important to note as, under a social constructionist lens, our understanding and meaning-making of events evolve over time and contexts.

Two papers (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Zasiekina et al., 2021) documented eating behaviours related to survival and parental over-protectiveness. In both, over-eating and not throwing away food was linked to being prepared for danger or starvation, however, it left children with a lack of self-efficacy and control (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011).

In two papers (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Wiseman et al., 2006), parental behaviours impacted communication from children back to parents. For instance, if children perceived that their parents would become intensely upset or abusive when a child needed emotional support (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) or if parents were often angry (Wiseman et al., 2006), this led to children feeling unable to communicate their needs.

1.8.2.2 Sub-theme 2: Emotional Closeness versus Distance. I interpreted that emotional closeness between parents and children was described in eight papers (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Lev-Wiesel, 2007; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Wirth, 2022). This included crying when their parents did so and identifying with their ancestors’ pain (Lev-Wiesel, 2007, Wirth, 2022), which led to fear, anxiety and hypervigilance in offspring (Braga et al., 2012, Cohn & Morrison, 2018). Emotional closeness was linked to subservience in children, at the expense of their own needs (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011). Lin and Suyemeto (2015) noted that when offspring could not cope with seeing their ancestors in pain, or believed that ancestors were emotionally overwhelmed, this inhibited intergenerational communication regarding trauma. In one paper (Dikyurt, 2023), witnessing parental emotions of trauma (e.g. anger) led to offspring trying to empathise with their parents and feeling their pain.

Three papers discussed emotional closeness that manifested as successive generations experiencing nightmares related to their ancestors’ trauma, as if they had experienced the trauma themselves (Braga et al., 2012; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Rowland-Klein & Dunlop, 1998). It was unclear, however, how stories from ancestors contributed to this.

“\textit{I was having a lot of nightmares about being chased. Then I told my mother: “I’m going to therapy, I must have a problem.” [In the nightmares] I ran and I ran and I saw [Nazi] uniforms, narrow hallways and doors and people threatening me with guns.}” (Braga et al., 2012. P. 6).
In four papers, emotional closeness with parents resulted in an inner conflict for offspring around separation from parents whilst wanting to heal their ancestors’ pain (Chou et al., 2022; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Wiseman et al., 2006). In one paper (Wirth, 2022), two participants displayed avoidance from parents to protect themselves from pain. One paper (Cohn & Morrison, 2018) noted that emotional closeness could strengthen one’s identity and connection to their heritage.

In four papers (Dikyurt, 2023; Scharf & Mayseless, 2011; Wirth, 2022; Zasiekina et al., 2021), an opposite pattern of emotional closeness was described, around parents being emotionally distant and unavailable. Parental avoidance (Wirth, 2022), unresponsiveness (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) and not meeting children’s needs (Zasiekina et al., 2021) and had disorganising effects on children (Scharf & Mayseless, 2011) and contributed to poor relationships (Zasiekina et al., 2021).

1.8.3 Theme 3: Offspring Reclamation and Growth

1.8.3.1 Sub-theme 1: Connecting with Heritage. Related to silence and fragmented communication, five papers documented that this propelled individuals to find out about their ancestors’ trauma (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022; Cohn & Morrison, 2018; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Kizilhan et al., 2022). Understanding ancestors’ heritage was linked to appreciation and pride (Chou et al., 2022) and remaining connected to their mother tongue helped with self-confidence (Wirth, 2022). The building and reframing of subsequent generations’ own narratives (e.g. perceiving their ancestors as heroes – Braga et al., 2012) acted as a form of growth, allowed offspring to process and cope with their ancestors’ experiences (Kizilhan et al., 2022) and led to a sense of cultural grounding (Chou et al., 2022). It improved parent-child relationships and led to a deeper understanding of family and themselves (Lin & Suyemeto, 2015; Petion et al., 2022).

In one paper (Dikyurt, 2023), offspring described that connecting with their parents’ trauma gave them important life lessons, such as careful risk-taking, which contributed to growth. There was an acknowledgement by participants that their current lives would not be possible (e.g. career opportunities, education) if it was not for their parents’ experiences. It also led to a stronger identification with their ethnic identity and facilitated self-confidence in subsequent generations (Wirth, 2022).

1.8.3.2 Sub-theme 2: Learning Outside of the Family. Several papers discussed learning outside of the family through websites and books (Lin & Suyemeto, 2015), looking at document records and taking part in interviews (Braga et al., 2012), connecting with other survivors and offspring (Cohn & Morrison, 2018) and visiting sites of trauma (Kizilhan et al., 2022).
The notion of their ancestors having fewer opportunities due to their trauma prompted third-generations to carry out tasks, such as returning to a home country (Lev-Wiesel, 2007). Values and culture were linked to growth and connecting with others outside of the family (Braga et al., 2012; Chou et al., 2022, Cohn & Morrison, 2018, Zasiekina et al., 2021). This may be encouraged by the first-generation, who were unable to act in line with their values due to trauma (Chou et al., 2023).

There was a sense of descendants using their position to commit to conversations about trauma as a form of social justice and to make ethical decisions in political and cultural events (Cohn & Morrison, 2018). A commitment to widening conversations about ancestor trauma was deemed protective as it led to a stronger sense of ethnic identity (Zasiekina et al., 2021).

1.9 Conclusions

This is the first SLR looking at stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma in ethnically diverse groups. It revealed several dichotomies. The first was silence versus communication not being overbearing. For some, silence left individuals with unanswered questions about their ancestors’ trauma and a desire to know more. For others, too much communication left individuals feeling overwhelmed. This is related to another dichotomy between parental over-protectiveness/discipline versus emotional unavailability. When older generations spoke with subsequent generations about trauma, there were often messages of safety and protection, which was associated with subsequent generations internalising these narratives, feeling anxious and struggling to trust those outside of their community. For families with silence, this linked to subsequent generations feeling that their ancestors were less available, witnessed in behaviours of detachment. This left individuals with an inability to process their ancestors’ experiences.

Another dichotomy was the juxtaposition between fear enabling and disabling people from talking. Whilst some found that messages of protection and survival prompted subsequent generations to inform others of trauma, for some this felt disabling. This connects to another dichotomy, between emotional closeness and separation from ancestors. For some, hearing about their ancestors’ pain through their communication or behaviours of over-protectiveness prompted closeness, including experiencing the same emotions as their ancestors. For others, it presented an internal conflict of wanting to empathise with their ancestors’ pain, whilst also trying to form their own identity.

Each side of these dichotomies were related to intergenerational trauma across generations and it could be concluded from the SLR that IT is idiosyncratic. In most papers, these poles appeared
to link to relationships across generations. From a social constructionist perspective, it would have been interesting to think about how the social, political and cultural context contributed to narratives of openness versus silence.

There was more consensus on the protective factors that contributed to growth in subsequent generations. Connecting and learning about heritage, taking control of personal stories and connecting outside of the family to communities, aligning with values and culture, were deemed important for adaptive outcomes. This identified a need to look at intergenerational trauma from an individual and a wider, cultural lens.

Whilst this thesis is not concerned with clinical populations, there could be clinical implications from the papers. There was a consensus that clinicians should be adopting a person-centred and generational approach to trauma and should be addressed from an individual and collective lens. Focusing on how individuals understand and make meaning of intergenerational trauma, the role of trauma in family relationships and how they understand communication and silence, related to culture, seems imperative. An important part of therapeutic work could be helping individuals to co-create personal, family and collective narratives of intergenerational trauma, including the impact of verbal and non-verbal communication. Therefore, understanding more about intergenerational trauma transmission in people who are ethnically diverse may help guide meaningful therapeutic interventions.

1.10 Gaps in the Literature and Rationale for Current Research

The SLR identified a gap in literature as most papers have focused on intergenerational trauma in the Holocaust and other populations and only one paper looked at people of African and/or Caribbean heritage. No papers looked at stories and experiences of intergenerational trauma across generations in the UK, nor did a paper focus on the WG. Most papers focused on experiences of intergenerational trauma in the second-generation alone. This highlighted a gap and rationale for the current research to consider stories of intergenerational trauma in people of African and/or Caribbean heritage in the UK, with experiences related to the WG and descendants of the WG being unique to the UK context.

Narrative Analysis (NA) is a valuable method for the detailed exploration of people’s lives via stories (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000), and it can be used to go beyond an individual to look at stories across communities and generations (Squire et al., 2014), which has not yet been done with the WG and descendants. As only one paper in the SLR used NA methodology, this highlighted a gap and rationale to focus on better understanding the stories of intergenerational trauma using NA.
1.11 Research Aims and Research Questions

The aims of this research are:

1. To address a gap in the literature by looking at possible intergenerational trauma in the WG and descendants.
2. To address a gap in the literature by looking at what stories are told by the WG and descendants about Windrush, racism and possible intergenerational trauma.

These research aims will be explored through the following research question: “What stories do people tell of Windrush in the Windrush Generation and descendants of the Windrush Generation?”

Two sub-questions will be addressed:

1. Do people tell stories of trauma and/or racism across generations?
2. How do stories told by the WG influence the second-generation?
Chapter Two: Method

2.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter details the method followed to explore the research question: “What stories do people tell of Windrush in the WG and descendants of the WG?” This includes the research design and methodology, and justification for these. The use of expert by experience consultation and the procedure of the study is outlined, including participant recruitment and sample, data collection, data analysis and ethical considerations. The use of a quality framework will be presented. My reflexivity as a researcher is discussed.

2.2 Design

2.2.1 Qualitative Methodology and Rationale

The SLR and empirical literature identified a gap in looking at stories of intergenerational trauma for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage, with a focus on racism and possible trauma. Individuals’ experiences, such as racism and possible trauma, of being part of the WG and descendants of the WG have not been explored. This research utilised qualitative methodology to explore this.

Qualitative research encompasses varying empirical methods, such as interviews, case studies and observations, which describe events in people’s lives and the meanings they assign to these (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011). Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they allow idiosyncratic participant responses to evolve, allow interviewers to flexibly respond to participant responses and allow reciprocity between interviewers and interviewees (Kallio et al., 2016). Cromby (2012) claimed that qualitative methods are more likely to foster in-depth richness of one’s lived experience compared to quantitative methods. Qualitative methodology was adopted as it can foster self-expression, agency, self-understanding, self-acceptance and new knowledge (Opsal et al., 2016).

2.2.2 Narrative Analysis and Rationale

NA considers how individuals can make sense of their experiences (Josselen & Hammack, 2021). It is underpinned by a belief that individuals actively place meanings onto objects in our social environments and this is subjective (Bamberg, 2012). Storytelling is a key part of NA (Riessman, 2008). The stories that people tell of themselves – and are told by others - can inform us of important events in someone’s life and can speak to a person’s identity within a social and cultural context (Silver, 2013).
Wong & Breheny (2018) make the distinction between a story and a narrative. They posit that “a story is the account of events the speaker tells, whilst a narrative refers to the wider accounts of social life that are drawn upon to tell a story” (P. 246) and impact how and why stories are told. There are ‘small’ and ‘big’ stories. Small stories can be the telling of everyday events that occur naturally in conversations (Andrews et al., 2013). Big stories have been defined as longer stories that involve reflecting on a situation, a part of someone’s life, or the whole of their life (Smith & Monforte, 2020). There is an appreciation that small stories are woven into big stories and only when these are integrated can we tell a complete picture (Freeman, 2011). This thesis is concerned with both small and big stories and the wider context these are presented in.

Although alternative methodologies could be considered, NA was chosen as storytelling is useful for community phenomena, particularly within marginalised groups (Earthy & Cronin, 2008). Storytelling was centred in this research because of its potential role in facilitating growth for groups who have faced oppression (Mbilishaka, 2018). NA was chosen as it has been described as a decolonial praxis (Samuel & Ortiz, 2021). This is significant when considering the harm that research has led to for ethnically diverse groups. NA was chosen as it connects to CRT, including the importance of sharing the lived experiences of people who are ethnically diverse through storytelling and counter-storytelling (George, 2021). NA allows for divergent and conflicting stories to be presented (Fløttum & Gjerstad, 2017) to honour idiosyncrasies within groups.

This research adopted a constructionist approach to NA (Squire et al., 2014), which posits that stories are created within a cultural, social and interpersonal framework. Whilst social constructionist approaches are not looking for ‘truth’ within stories, aligning with the critical realist ontology, there is an acknowledgement that concepts such as racism are real and valid.

I acknowledge that any interpretations of stories made will be located in the current socio-political and cultural context at the time of conducting the interviews, which may change over time. There is an appreciation that the context of the interview and my identity will impact the stories presented (Wells, 2011). As NA is concerned with the reciprocal relationship between participants and the research in co-constructing participants’ experiences (Haydon et al., 2018), this further supported the appropriateness of NA.

2.3 Expert by Experience Consultation

Given the harm that has been caused to people of African and/or Caribbean heritage, it felt crucial that this was not replicated. Accounting for my outsider researcher status as a white British female who will never experience racism, it felt vital that the project was co-produced from the outset.
Four experts by experience (EbE), who all identified as people of African and/or Caribbean heritage, were either part of the WG or descendants of the WG and had personal connections to Windrush organisations consulted on the project. This included co-producing the research questions, participant population, recruitment, interview schedule, the format of interviews and dissemination. One EbE reviewed the introduction and gave feedback, which was incorporated into a revision of the write-up. Seven meetings took place from March 2022 to June 2023. EbEs were remunerated with vouchers following each meeting. An example of incorporating their feedback for the interview schedule is included in Appendix D and signposting organisations and resources to participants post-interview is in Appendix E.

2.4 Procedure

2.4.1 Participant Recruitment

Due to my outsider researcher status, it was anticipated that there may be difficulties with recruitment. It was decided with EbEs that participants would be recruited through the organisations that EbEs were linked to, social media, and the principal researcher emailing third sector organisations related to Windrush or people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and through word of mouth from recruited participants. Thus, participants were recruited using snowball (word of mouth) sampling (Figure 5). Recruitment took place between December 2022 and February 2023. As half of the participants were recruited from other interviewees, this facilitated quick recruitment. The inclusion and exclusion criteria of participants are listed in Table 11.
Figure 5

Flowchart of Participant Recruitment

Recruitment 1: Consultants shared participant information sheet and poster with their organisations

Recruitment 2: Participant poster was shared on Instagram:
- Theoxfordpsych - 16.3k followers
- Thetriculturaltrainee - 1k followers

Recruitment 3: Principal researcher emailed 33 third-sector organisations relating to Windrush and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage

Interested people emailed the principal researcher. A phone call was facilitated to explain the project and interviews were organised

No. of individuals who contacted researcher: 4
Recruited: 4 participants

Consent form and the participant information sheet were emailed to participants

Interviews took place via Zoom. Consent form and participant information sheet were reviewed prior to interview commencing

Recruitment 4: Participants spoke about the project with people they knew who met the inclusion criteria.

Those individuals emailed the principal researcher. A phone call was facilitated to explain the project and interviews were organised

No. of individuals who contacted researcher: 4
Recruited: 4 participants

Consent form and the participant information sheet were emailed to participants

Further interviews took place via Zoom. Consent form and participant information sheet were reviewed prior to interview commencing
Table 11:

Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Someone who identifies as part of the Windrush Generation (not necessarily</td>
<td>• Individuals who were born in the Caribbean and travelled to the United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>travelling on the Windrush ship) travelling from a country in the Caribbean between</td>
<td>outside of 1948 to 1971.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948 and 1971 or someone who identifies as a descendant of someone in the</td>
<td>• Individuals who identify as a descendant of Windrush Generation yet were not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windrush Generation and was born in the United Kingdom.</td>
<td>born in the United Kingdom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Can speak fluent English (for Narrative Analysis of interviews).</td>
<td>• Individuals who cannot speak English fluently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Participants aged 18 and above.</td>
<td>• Individuals under the age of 18 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Those who self-identity as able and willing to speak about their experiences</td>
<td>• Those who do not feel able to speak about their experiences related to Windrush.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(including, but not limited to, racism and intergenerational trauma).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4.2 Participants

Eight individuals were recruited for the study – four from the WG and four who identified as second-generation descendants of people from the WG. The sample size fits with NA and demonstrates rigour in obtaining an appropriate level of data to answer the research question and sub-questions. As NA is concerned with the production of in-depth stories, a large sample size is not needed (Esin, 2011) and a minimum of five participants is deemed sufficient (Wells, 2011). All participants identified as female. Aligning with a social constructionist approach, participants defined their gender identity and ethnicity. For confidentiality, participants chose a pseudonym to be referred to. Demographic details are described below.
Table 12:

Participant Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pseudonym (as described by individual)</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Geographical Location</th>
<th>Ethnicity (as described by individual)</th>
<th>Generation (Windrush)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thérèse</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>First-generation (Windrush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Southampton</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>First-generation (Windrush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lydia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>British Citizen</td>
<td>First-generation (Windrush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miriam</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>Black Caribbean</td>
<td>First-generation (Windrush)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>Second-generation (parents and grandparents part of the WG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>African Caribbean</td>
<td>Second-generation (parents part of the WG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Shropshire</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>Second-generation (parents part of the WG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant1</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Bedfordshire</td>
<td>Black British</td>
<td>Second-generation (parents and grandparents part of the WG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5 Data Collection

Semi-structured interviews were employed. Creswell (2009) defined an interview as a controlled conversation compromising of questions that are asked verbally to gather data. Interviews are the most common form of qualitative data collection (Taylor, 2005) and are used to gather idiosyncratic data (Gray, 2021). Interviews can provide opportunities for reflection and learning for participants (Husband, 2020). Semi-structured interviews were chosen as they enable the freedom to explore anything meaningful that arises (Adeoye-Olatunde & Olenik, 2021).

A time limit of 2 hours for the interviews was decided with EbEs. Interviews ranged between 60 minutes and 112 minutes (average 75 minutes). At the start of each interview, the participant information sheet (Appendix F) and consent form (Appendix G) were reviewed and participants were reminded that the interview would be recorded. It was agreed that interview recordings would not be shared with participants. At the end of each interview, participants were given space to debrief and offered signposting to relevant organisations and sources of support if requested.

2.5.1 Devising the Interview Schedule

Patton (2002) asserts that qualitative interview questions should cover six areas: experiences, opinions/values, feelings/emotions, knowledge, sensory and background information and that interviews should commence with background questions. I worked with the EbEs to devise the interview questions (Table 13). This was an iterative process and a pilot interview was conducted with EbEs, which led to a revision of the schedule. Interviews commenced with background questions about participants’ relationship to Windrush before asking exploratory questions to allow rapport to build.

Taylor (2005) described some drawbacks in interview schedules including asking leading questions, having a fixed script that one does not modify or uses too loosely and not including follow-up probes. Once the questions were devised with EbEs, these were taken to the supervisory team and we added the use of interview probes, adapted from Bogdan and Biklen (2007).

Table 13:

*Interview Schedule Devised with the Consultant Panel*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions:</th>
<th>Windrush Generation</th>
<th>Descendants of the Windrush Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Follow-up Probes:

What do you mean? How were you feeling? What emotions came up for you? I’m not sure that I am following you. Would you explain that? What did you say then? What were you thinking at
the time? Give me an example. Tell me about it. Take me through the experience.

2.6 Ethical Issues

An initial proposal was approved by the research team for the Doctorate in Clinical Psychology at the University of Hertfordshire (UH). A risk assessment was approved by UH School of Life and Medical Sciences (LMS). An application was approved by UH ethics panel (Appendix H).

2.6.1 Informed Consent

Participant information sheets and consent forms were used with participants to ensure informed consent. Acknowledging that consent is ongoing, verbal consent was checked continually with participants.

EbEs were given an information sheet about what the role would entail and remuneration. They signed a consent form for meetings to be recorded and ground rules were co-produced to ensure that the space felt comfortable.

Copies of consent forms were sent to participants and EbEs for their records.

2.6.2 Confidentiality

Pseudonyms were used to protect confidentiality. EbEs were given the option to be named on the project. All chose to be identified.

I had access to participant contact details (e.g. telephone number and email address) to facilitate screenings of eligibility, gain consent and schedule interviews. These details were not shared with anyone. Virtual interviews took place on a UH secure Zoom account.

In line with UH ethics, data was confidentially stored on the UH OneDrive on a password-protected computer. Participants were made aware that data could be stored for up to 5 years.

2.6.3 Protection from Harm

It was important that participants felt protected from harm and re-traumatisation. There was an acknowledgement - as addressed in the participant information sheet - that interviews could involve reflecting upon painful experiences involving themes of racism and trauma, which may be uncomfortable for participants. This, however, felt necessary to capture participants’ stories about these constructs. Regular pauses, giving participants permission to skip questions or stop interviews
and supporting participants to manage any distress using grounding techniques were offered. Participants were signposted to helplines and support services following the interview if requested.

Protection from harm was considered during recruitment. The strategy of participants contacting the researcher was designed so that participants felt they had autonomy, time and choice in partaking in the study and, with the use of the participant information sheet and initial telephone call, could consider their participation.

The use of ground rules in meetings with EbEs aimed to minimise the likelihood of harm, however, it was acknowledged that contextual factors may impact attendance and meetings were voluntary.

2.6.4 Right to Withdraw

Participation was voluntary and participants knew that they could withdraw at any stage of the process. Participants were told that if they withdrew within 2 weeks of interviews, their data would be permanently deleted. If withdrawing after this point, participants were informed that their data would be used, but direct quotes would not be included in the write-up. This was detailed in the information sheet and consent form.

2.6.5 Professional Responsibility

I acted within professional competencies during the project. For instance, my role was not to provide therapy during interviews.

2.6.6 Researcher Reflexivity

I was conscious of the harm caused by white people infiltrating spaces created for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and asking for their support and involvement in research. I wanted to ensure that I did not recreate this harm and I continually reflected on my privilege, biases and areas of learning, complimented by a reflective log and questions by Patel and Keval (2018). Example questions and extracts from my reflective log are included in Appendix I. An extract of my reflections during interviews is included in Appendix J.

2.7 Data Analysis

2.7.1 Interview Transcription

The eight interviews were listened to and transcribed verbatim, including repetitions of words, pauses and vocal disfluencies (e.g. “um”), laughter, changes in pitch and pace and changes in emotion. Each interview recording was listened to three times whilst reading transcripts to supplement
familiarity with the data and ensure rigour in the analysis. To demonstrate transparency and rigour during analysis, two excerpts of interview transcripts are included in Appendix K.

Transcript data was reviewed by Dr. Aishath Nasheeda and Dr. David Herndandez-Saca, to ensure rigour during analysis. Both researchers have published numerous papers utilising narrative methodology and David’s research also focuses on intersectionality, oppression and decolonisation.

2.7.2 Analytic Process

Once fully transcribed, transcripts were initially read without making notes. They were re-read multiple times to aid familiarity and rigour within the data, before being analysed for stories.

There is no uniform approach to NA (Sharp et al., 2019). Riessman (2008) described three categories to analysing interviews: thematic/content, structural and dialogic/performance analysis.

Table 14:

Categories for the Analytic Process, taken from Riessman (2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description of Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thematic</td>
<td>This category is interested in content and what is being said in stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>This category is interested in how things are said and how narratives are organised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogic/Performance</td>
<td>This category is interested in how a narrator engages with the listener to tell a story and how the story is performed and why the story may be being performed in this way, for what purpose. This category acknowledges that stories are told in context and accounts for how context may influence storytelling.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each transcript was analysed under these categories. This involved giving equal attention to the content, structure and performance of the stories and situating this within the interview context and interactions with myself as the principal interviewer, as well as making links with the wider political, cultural and social context that these stories may be located in. Microsoft Word was used to organise coding and reflections. Questions related
to the research question and sub-questions guided the analysis (Table 15). These were reviewed with my supervisory team to ensure rigour.

**Table 15:**

*Questions to Support the Analytic Process*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thematic</strong></td>
<td>1. What stories are being told?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Is the speaker talking about stories of racism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is the speaker talking about stories of trauma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Is the speaker talking about stories of trauma across generations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structural</strong></td>
<td>1. How are the stories organised (e.g. is there a beginning, middle and end)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Does the story flow?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Is the story coherent?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dialogic/Performance</strong></td>
<td>1. What emotions are present for the speaker when they are presenting their stories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How is the speaker constructing their identity when presenting their stories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How does the speaker want me to view them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. How am I interacting with the speaker during the storytelling?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. How does my identity impact the stories that are told – those that are privileged and those that are not shared?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. How do the speaker’s culture and heritage come into and impact their stories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. How is the story located in and impacted by the socio-political context of the UK?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this, individual stories were summarised. There is a recognition that I would be drawn to certain stories and may overlook other stories, impacted by my context. Following this, stories were looked at collectively across participants, for similarities and differences across accounts.
2.8 Ensuring Quality in the Research

Aligning with a social constructionist stance, member checking was not used. I took steps to ensure quality by following the CASP (2018) qualitative studies quality framework, which is summarised below:

**Table 16:**

*Quality Assessment during the Current Research*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Steps taken to follow criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Validity</td>
<td>Aims of research</td>
<td>The aims of the research were explicitly discussed with the participants, which were to explore the stories that are told by the WG and descendants of the WG, with a focus on possible stories of racism and intergenerational trauma. Discussions were had with participants around the importance and relevance of this, particularly given the ongoing experience of racism in people of African and Caribbean heritage in the UK and the political context of the Windrush scandal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td>Qualitative methodology has been justified in this research, to consider the subjective and idiosyncratic experiences of participants, with an in-depth focus on life experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research design

The Narrative Analysis (NA) research design and use of semi-structured interviews were both justified in light of the research aims.

Recruitment strategy

There were several methods of recruitment of participants, which were collaboratively decided with EbEs, to consider several different ways to reach participants and to reach participants in an informal way. This aimed to foster participant choice and autonomy in participation of the research. There was an appreciation of using organisations related to Windrush and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and also using social media, acknowledging that we live in a digitally-expanding context, and to reach participants who may not otherwise hear about the project. Explicit inclusion and exclusion criteria were used to standardise the recruitment process.

Data collection

Participants were given a choice around the facilitation of interviews and whether they wanted an advocate present for support. The use of semi-
Structured interviews was justified and explicit conversation was given to the development of the interview schedule, which was co-produced with EbEs and refined using a pilot interview process.

| Exploration of the relationship between researcher and participants | Participants were made aware of my interest in intergenerational trauma and were briefly told about my experiences in childhood in relation to this. I gave my reasons for looking at the Windrush generation and descendants in that this had not been looked at before and with the context of wanting to go further than my personal experiences. This was also elaborated on in the introduction section of the thesis. During interviews, I took notes on the reflections that were coming up for me, noticing what I was drawn to, and what arose emotionally for me during interviews. I also considered my context and how this may have impacted my role and participation in the interviews in my reflective log. An extract of this reflective log has been |
What are the results? Ethical issues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical issues</th>
<th>Ethical issues of consent, confidentiality and the right to withdraw were discussed with participants. Protection of harm was given particular consideration with EbEs and addressed in thinking about building rapport, the timings of interviews, the use of breaks, including the option for an advocate in interviews and signposting to organisations and resources for support. Ethics was also sought and accepted by the University of Hertfordshire.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Data analysis

| Data analysis | The use of NA was justified and the process of what this involved has been explicitly discussed in the thesis. I attended six NA workshops throughout the project to help aid my understanding of NA and the data was reviewed with my secondary supervisor to ensure rigour within the analysis. The use of NA has allowed for idiosyncratic and contradictory stories to be presented, as opposed to looking for harmonious themes across |
I have reflected on the social constructionist approach to data analysis and how I have impacted the stories presented and the interpretations of participant stories.

| Statement of findings | The findings of the data have been explicitly discussed in the results and discussion section of the thesis in relation to the aims and research questions and sub-questions. Given that this thesis has adopted a social constructionist approach, triangulation and member checking were not employed in this research. |

| Will the results help locally | Value | As identified in the systematic literature review, empirical studies looking at the experiences of the WG and descendants of the WG have not been published in academic literature. Therefore, this research has an important contribution to think about the stories and experiences of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage within the UK context. |
2.9 Reflexivity

The lens of a researcher and the dynamics between the researcher and participants shape what is told and how (Silver, 2013). Throughout this thesis, I have named my positionality and I have wondered how this connects to the stories told, how they are told and what may not be being spoken about, particularly in the analysis and discussion in chapter three.

Embodying NA, I have reflected upon the stories around my identity as a researcher and how this has shaped my stance. When studying Psychology at undergraduate level, my relationship to research was from a quantitative lens and I believed that research needed to be measurable. This shifted when I saw how research could be used in clinical practice. For example, the utility of service evaluations gathering qualitative data to influence practice and policies. My alternative view of research was strengthened when I started my Doctorate in Clinical Psychology. I connected with papers such as “Is Science Multi-cultural?” (Harding, 1994) and “Colouring Epistemologies” (Young & Scheurich, 2001), which helped reframe my relationship with research as a way to facilitate dialogue around topics and to try to do so ethically. I have begun to pay attention to how I can hold onto my values in research. I have begun to understand that research can be an act of resistance. I wanted this research to go beyond my experiences of intergenerational trauma, and instead be meaningful for communities. I wanted to hold onto my value of collaboration, as I did not want to replicate the harm research has caused and ensure that this project is meaningful. This shaped the active co-production by EbEs in this research.
Chapter Three: Analysis and Discussion

3.1 Chapter Overview

Individual stories of each participant are presented, aligning with Riessman’s (2008) framework. Pseudonyms are used for confidentiality. Quotes from participants are in brackets and/or speech marks alongside my reflections. Codes for transcripts are in Appendix L. Collective stories across the WG and descendants are presented, where similarities and differences across stories are highlighted. As NA involves situating the stories that are told within the wider context (Squire et al., 2014), the analysis and discussion are presented together, with links to empirical literature embedded.

Acknowledging my outsider status, I consulted with my supervisory team about my interpretations. I previously believed that steps could be taken in research to eradicate bias. Aligning with a social constructionist approach, my understanding now is that, whilst measures can be taken to incorporate alternative perspectives and acknowledge how one’s lens influences research (e.g. reflective diaries, consultation), eradicating bias can never be achieved. I hope that my interpretations are respectful to the participants, EbEs and the Windrush and African-Caribbean community.

This thesis aligns with a constructionist approach to NA, therefore there is an acknowledgement that the stories voiced by participants may not reflect everyone in the Windrush community and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage.

3.2 Summary of Individual Stories

3.2.1 Windrush Generation

3.2.1.1 Thérèse’s Story. Thérèse identified as a Black Caribbean female in her early-sixties. Thérèse presented a coherent and chronological story with thick descriptions, exemplified by her recall of dates, ages and details.

Thérèse’s story of Windrush began in 1963 and coming to England. Thérèse brought her family into her speech and presented a story of separation (“we left one sister behind”). Thérèse periodically returned to separation and the difficulties with this (“AND when she arrived, I’d forgotten her”), with her repetition signifying importance. Thérèse narrated stories of deprivation, poor housing, employment injustice and connection to the white Irish community (“we played with white kids, um, but when I think about it they were all Irish”). I interpreted that bonding with another oppressed group was meaningful for Thérèse (“I’m grateful to the neighbourhood, um, even though it was dingy”).

At times, Thérèse used pronouns such as “we”, “their” and spoke collectively (“Caribbean children”), which gave a sense of distancing. Other times, Thérèse expressed her emotional
experiences (“I was a very, very, very angry little girl”). This fluctuation between connection and disconnection in content was mirrored in her interactional style, as she often laughed when recalling serious stories (“going around almost my whole childhood with my fists balled (laughs)”).

Thérèse often rationalised her experiences (“it makes sense to me now”), which was mirrored in the way that she appeared to justify her actions to me (“they would, you know, try to push their way in, if there was, if you didn’t stand against them”). These justifications often came after anger, which conveyed something about her relationship to anger. This could be interpreted within her view of gender roles, which she brought into her stories (“little girls only wore dresses”), of how women should express emotion, and perhaps around the ‘angry black woman’ stereotype (Kilgore et al., 2020). I wondered whether my whiteness impacted Thérèse’s story of anger and whether she wanted to distance herself from this discourse.

Thérèse’s connection and disconnection constructed a binary state. This seemed to fit with her stories of Windrush, as she described ambivalence and oscillating between happier and negative memories (“fun times and loving times, so I know there must have been those times, but generally speaking, the whole aura of that time was dull and dark”). Thérèse spoke of how her feelings towards Windrush may be unique (“when people were celebrating Windrush, um, 60, or even, Windrush, 50, 20 years ago, why it didn’t fill me with joy”).

Thérèse acknowledged that she did not want to linger on her experiences of Windrush “because it was unpleasant”. This may be reflected in her vague descriptions of racism. Thérèse frequently mentioned racism, however, there were assumptions made about what I would know (“even the teacher was openly racist, um, so you could imagine (laughs)”). Not lingering may connect with Thérèse “deliberately not speaking” to her children about racism unless things prompt conversation. When conversations are had with her children, Thérèse presented this to me as playful (“BUT he understands, EVEN though it’s something that I laugh at with him”) and did not mention stories of trauma across generations.

When considering what is said in her family, Thérèse’s story shifted to family celebration. She spoke about her family unifying over adverse experiences (“it’s made us quite tight knit”) and recalled family gatherings, where reminiscing on Windrush involved stories of cooking, music and memorabilia (“this whisk, um, which has a whole history in it, um, and the kids laughed at this”).

4 *The arrows next to speech indicate that the word(s) was vocalised in a higher pitch.*
Whilst Thérèse acknowledged the pain experienced by her and her family during Windrush (“I think my dad had 5 strokes”), there was a sense of a redemption narrative (McAdams et al., 1997) towards the end, which involves narrating negative circumstances that lead to positive circumstances. Thérèse began her story with separation and struggle, yet ended with family closeness, connecting with traditions and pride for her and her families’ experiences (“I DRAG them over to the plaque and show them, they had no idea that it was there ↑so↑, I'm, I'm proud”).

3.2.1.2 Laura’s Story. Laura identified as a Black Caribbean female in her mid-seventies. Laura was an enthusiastic speaker, which perhaps mirrored her joy in her stories of Windrush.

Laura’s story began in 1965. She recounted this chronologically from preparing to arrive in England, travelling over and her experiences of settling. Laura framed her stories of Windrush around nursing. Laura positioned England as the “best training” for nurses and I wondered how this perception connected to the colonisation of her home country by the UK.

Laura set the scene (Labov, 1972) by describing the process she undertook to come to England. Active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992) was used to bring others into her story and this contributed to her rich descriptions. Laura’s active voicing gave a sense of respect (“yes mama”) and status (“but they look important”) as integral to her. She demonstrated an awareness of hierarchy (“matrons don’t laugh”) and this was mirrored in her interactional style, as she often checked if I was happy with her answers.

Laura spoke fondly of Windrush (“wonderful Southampton”). Laura storied the sacrifices that had been made for her to reach England, expressing gratitude to her family (“you don’t forget it”). Laura referenced working hard and made comments such as “I didn’t get it for free”, “I was not coming here to waste my time” and “I had to be properly screened.” This invited me to consider the context of how people who move to England are stigmatised. Fox (2018) found that British newspapers use language such as ‘burden’, ‘crime’ and ‘benefits’ when describing people who move to England. I wondered if Laura wanted to illustrate to me that she does not align with this discourse.

Laura did not present stories of separation (“you stick with your family”) nor stories of racism and trauma unless prompted by an interview question. When discussed, Laura used vague descriptions and seemed to place racism away from her (“terrible things were happening out there”). At times, Laura voiced stories that implied a cultural context of being strong (“big girls don’t cry”) and not rising to things (“you step back and you let them”). I wondered if this linked to a possible minimisation of her experiences of racism (“I had nothing to complain”). Her use of repetition led me to wonder whether she was trying to persuade me that she was unaffected by racism (“it didn’t bother me, it didn’t, it didn’t bother me”), and it was difficult to ascertain whether this was the case, whether
this could be a defence, or whether Laura did not want to adhere to the ‘angry black woman’ stereotype. Laura presented contradictions in her talk, which contributed to my uncertainty, where she mentioned that she did not experience racism and then went onto talk about such encounters (“these people did not want to associate with me or talk to me”) and spoke of indifference (“I didn’t take any notice”), to later acknowledge an emotional response (“I remember being very ↑upset↑”).

When considering messages to subsequent generations, Laura echoed working hard (“use the opportunities that are there”). Her story ended with an emphasis on being “guided by the principles” of her family and how these carried her through Windrush, her nursing career and enabled her to fulfil her ambitions (“I've had a tight family behind me. I have passed through hands within the profession that have put me where I am today and it was wonderful”).

3.2.1.3 Lydia’s Story. Lydia identified as a British citizen in her late-sixties. Lydia was a polite speaker. Her story included many pauses, which perhaps reflected her confusion around being labelled as part of the WG (“I don’t understand some way suddenly being called that”) and signified disjointedness (Rogers et al., 1999). Her pauses may have illustrated that Lydia found the questions difficult to answer, which I inferred from her interactional style, as she often asked me what I wanted from the questions. Her confusion may have been mirrored in her structure, as there was not always clear chronicity or beginning, middle and end to her stories.

Lydia’s story of Windrush started when she came to England in 1961. Lydia’s stories were focused on hard work and she situated this around her nursing career (“I always knew that it was nursing”). Lydia described feeling “honoured” and “proud” for her contribution to the UK. Lydia spoke about uniting with her family and the wider community (“I grew up in a community that all stayed together”), which seemed to be protective for Lydia’s relationships (“it hasn’t made a difference to my, me and my family”) and an important aspect of her Windrush experiences (“everyone knew each other, um, but it that, that’s the Windrush generation”).

Lydia presented stories of racism throughout (“they were all laughing at me because of my accent”) and gave thick descriptions (“you’re afraid to walk, you're afraid to go shopping, school wasn't nice”). Occasionally, Lydia emphasised her words during these stories, which suggested frustration at the injustice that she experienced (“and the headmaster caned me”). However, Lydia mostly spoke in a gentle tone. I wondered if this related to how Lydia feels that she has been perceived by white people (“if I tried to speak, and I spoke in a bit of a higher pitch that I’m speaking now, it comes out that you're arguing”) and whether this impacted her interaction with me, in that she wanted to avoid being perceived in an argumentative way.
Lydia has not spoken about racism and trauma to subsequent generations (“I’ve never actually spoken about it”). Lydia attributed this to not wanting to remember her negative experiences and expressed that her way of coping is to “turn a blind ear”. Lydia articulated that conversations around racism are not a focus, only occurring when prompted. There seemed to be a sense that Lydia’s view of racism has changed over time (“nobody asks you that now”), which may relate to her decision not to talk about her encounters with racism. Instead, stories around Windrush have involved the excitement of travelling to England (“getting on to that big boat with the white tablecloths and the cornflakes”) and the differences in Caribbean and English culture (“the different meals like sausage and mash”). Lydia echoed communicating messages of hard work across generations (“you’re doing the job that you’re employed to do”).

Lydia recalled stories of adapting to racism (“ignore what people are doing around, around you”). Despite reporting not talking about racism across generations, she mentioned stories of caution in conversations with subsequent generations (“careful what you say to people”). I wonder if this linked to Lydia feeling powerless to fight racism (“it didn’t get me anywhere when I try to defend”) and others changing (“I don’t know how we change how people feel and how people think”). There was an acknowledgement that her approach differs from subsequent generations (“they’re not taking that slap and turning the other way”). Therefore, Lydia’s story showed a redemption narrative (McAdams et al., 1997), with progression from her experiences of racism to ending with confidence that subsequent generations can contribute to change.

3.2.1.4 Miriam’s Story. Miriam identified as a 60-year-old Black Caribbean female and was an engaging speaker. Miriam switched between talking about her, her parents and her children’s experiences, ergo there was less of a time-bound chronology to her stories. This may have mirrored her fluctuating feelings towards Windrush, as she spoke of pride and hardship and adapting to and fighting racism.

Miriam presented stories of Windrush as an opportunity for work and creating “a better life.” Miriam situated her stories within her family, as she discussed parting from her parents before reuniting in England. Miriam spoke about separation from the viewpoint of her mother (“she found it really, really ↑difficult↑”) and I wondered if this indicated distancing. Miriam talked about the impact that travelling to England had for her and her family relating to cultural differences (“there was always that clash of cultures”). She spoke about her parents’ expectations for her relationships related to Caribbean culture (“that was kind of embedded in Caribbean culture at the time, you know, what are other black people going to say about your kids”), which led Miriam to feel that she was “living two ↑lives↑” and to temporary estrangement from her family (“they didn’t see me again for about 3
Miriam did not use active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992) when talking about her parents, and I wondered if this mirrored the distance she has felt in family relationships.

Miriam discussed detailed stories of racism, in the school context (“I had a Jamaican accent... when I did say something, they would actually taunt me”), community (“scrawling N/F on your wall, you know National Front”) and workplace (“tried to make it seem as if I’d stolen cash from the office”). Miriam presented stories of strategies to survive (“not really get involved in too much conversation, and that was probably me, just, you know, my way of actually, sort of, protecting myself”), however, there was a sense that racism was something that was endured (“we basically just, you know, had to deal with it”). Miriam voiced a story of fighting (“there was that confrontation with, with other students”), justified in the context that there was no systemic help (“a lack of acknowledgement of racism by teachers”).

Miriam explained that attributable to her experiences of Windrush, she has made decisions about her environment (“wherever I lived it needed to be a mixed community”), which she believes has been protective for her children (“in terms of them you know kind of facing the level of racism that I did (shakes head), no”). Miriam described not telling stories of Windrush across generations, yet she has spoken about her experiences of racism (“I’VE ALWAYS TALKED TO MY BOYS about, about racism because for me that was a way of preparing them for what might happen”). Miriam discussed the messages she has communicated to subsequent generations (“had to bring them up so that they were in a position to challenge any kind of racism that they faced”), including that “they may face racism”, for them to actually become independent as others “might actually turn, turn against you” and “to be themselves.”

Miriam ended by discussing the changes since Windrush in terms of racism, including institutional policies (“legislation has, has, um, has re-created that change”) and how this has allowed movement in terms of education, housing and career opportunities. Ergo, Miriam’s interview followed a redemption narrative (McAdams et al., 1997), beginning with the hostility during Windrush and ending with a sense of hope that things are progressing.

3.2.2 Descendants of the Windrush Generation

3.2.2.1 Rachel’s Story. Rachel was an interesting speaker who identified as a Black British female, aged 50. Her story was fragmented and the use of ‘um’ and ‘I think’ were signs of disjointedness (Rogers, et al., 1999). The oscillation between past and present suggested that it was harder for Rachel to organise her story. Her structure perhaps mirrored Rachel’s reflection that she did not know much about her heritage.
Rachel’s mother passed away when she was 4 years old, so her story centred on her grandmother. Rachel understood her mother and grandmother’s journeys to England as related to a better life. Rachel told a story of separation (“she came on her own”) yet viewed this positively (“I think that’s the bravest thing”).

Rachel said that stories of Windrush, racism and trauma were not told during her childhood and it was in adulthood that Rachel spoke with her grandmother about Windrush (“it was really hard for me to talk to her about it”). Rachel discussed how this has impacted her parenting style (“not sharing things and not telling stories and stuff, and I probably overshare with my daughter because of that”).

Rachel articulated that stories of “protection” and “safety” were prominent in her childhood (“all about keeping me safe, from the world, which was a bad place”). Rachel recalled that she was advised by her grandmother to fit in (“keeping your head down, not, not, uh, not drawing attention to yourself”) and was not encouraged to have ambition (“get a job somewhere where you can work for your whole life”). She stated that this impacted her confidence (“I rarely make eye contact with people”). Rachel presented her encounters with racism at school (“teachers thinking that I’m stupid and that all I can do is play ↑sport↑”) and the workplace (“[my boss] who knows my medical issues is actually another, an example of that kind of micro-aggression”) and how these connect to current insecurities (“people thinking I’m stupid, I’ve got a real issue with that”).

Rachel recalled a story of difficulty with marrying cultural differences and being raised with Caribbean values in an English context. Rachel spoke about her grandmother’s religious views (“it’s really strict like you weren’t allowed to wear any makeup”) and attitudes towards white people (“she was quite subservient to white people”), which Rachel believes were influenced by Windrush (“her sort of views and stuff were very shaped by coming over”). This felt hard for Rachel to navigate (“I didn’t understand why she was doing that”) and made it difficult for Rachel to make sense of her and her family’s experiences (“you don’t know what was fact”). This has left her with a void (“not having any clue like about your own family, um, it’s, it’s not, it’s not great”), a desire to know more (“what she went through when she came over here would have been nice to know a bit more”) and to connect to her heritage (“I’ll have to start from scratch to find out our family history”).

Rachel stated how her understanding of her childhood and Windrush has changed through events such as the murder of George Floyd (“made me go back and re-examine my childhood”). Rachel expressed that experiences of racism and trauma have permeated through generations, with her daughter having similar experiences to herself (“she went through loads of stuff at school”). At this point, Rachel’s story shifted as she spoke of a “re-awakening”, she and her daughter undergoing
counselling and doing anti-racism work. Rachel’s story transitioned from describing a state of “helplessness” around racism to taking “control” and she described that this has been “healing” for her. Rachel showed a redemption narrative (McAdams et al., 1997), ending with pride for her generation (“people that are in my age group that have done, that are doing amazing things”) and a sense of progress that her generation and future generations can evoke change.

3.2.2.2 May’s Story. May identified as an African-Caribbean female in her early-sixties. May was a confident speaker. This was mirrored in the structure of her stories, which flowed, and in her expressive interactional style, which perhaps symbolised her security in being connected to the WG.

May described being a “second-generation member of the Windrush community”, which seemed an integral part of her identity (“that’s how I’ve always seen my, seen myself”). May brought in her family and frequently used active voicing (Wooffitt, 1992). Her use of a Jamaican accent when bringing her ancestors into her speech indicated her closeness to Windrush.

May recounted many vivid stories of her parents’ experiences of Windrush from light-hearted stories to stories of racism (“you’re black, you can’t be an engineer”). May connected her parents’ encounters with racism to her own (“we’ve had like our windows smashed in”). She presented stories of her mother standing up for herself at work and standing up for her (“mum went nuts, went down to school and, um, that was changed”). This gumption seemed a focal part of May’s stories of her childhood (“she was a frequent face at school (laughs)”) and she spoke with pride, describing her mother as a crusader.

When discussing racism, this was intertwined with stories of community (“depending on how isolated you were you couldn’t necessarily feel comfortable about your heritage”), where her experience of cohesion seemed to enable her to have security in her heritage (“the camaraderie between, um, for ↑Italians↑, people from the Caribbean, the I-Indian”). May’s use of language signified a distancing from being British, perhaps solidifying her connection to the Caribbean (“it was all of us versus the English children”). May discussed the juggling of Caribbean and English culture (“trying to marry those two ↑worlds↑”) in terms of food, chores, church and discipline. May often discussed this fondly (“we’d have a little competition to see who had suffered the most that Saturday with mum shopping”) and expressed an appreciation to her family for encouraging her connection to the Caribbean. This seemed to manifest in more joyous stories about Windrush (“there’s that lovely time because we were brought up on our reggae music”).

Whilst May acknowledged that her experiences related to Windrush were of togetherness, she narrated stories of separation in the Caribbean community (“the main trauma was from the
children that were left behind”). May added that feelings of “deep resentment” have contributed to some children having difficulties with their parents. May brought in the history of enslavement related to discipline across subsequent generations (“the whipping that humiliated, hurt, maimed, um, was then visited on the children”). It seems that the open discussions that May has had, however, has enabled her to process this and consider her parenting (“I am not doing this to my children and we didn’t”). May felt that these stories are not really talked about among the WG and descendants and that this could be a future goal.

Considering what was less told, May shifted to stories around the Windrush scandal, describing this as “Britain's shame” and spoke of this in the context of the British government (“I wish those transcripts were even more readily available for people to actually see what this Government thought of us”). Despite an acknowledgement that racism is still prevalent, similar to a quest narrative (Frank, 1995) that denotes how someone with a physical illness can fight against their pain, May ended her story by reflecting on how she can advocate for social justice and change in the future (“it needs to be in our curriculum about the Windrush, the truth”). This included teaching Caribbean culture and history in schools to break-down barriers. May credited her open upbringing for developing strength against racism (“what my mum brought me up with, that sense of me”). May’s story finished with a sense of gumption, mirroring that of her mother, around the contribution of the WG and the need for this to be acknowledged more widely (“I want the value of what my parents, um, my ancestors, and I say, my slave ancestors, I’ve made for this country to be recognised”).

3.2.2.3 Alicia’s Story. Alicia identified as a Black British female in her early-sixties and was a friendly speaker.

Alicia began talking collectively of the context surrounding Windrush (“short of workers and I know there was a lot of adverts that went out”), reiterating hard work (“they did not come to sponge off the country”) and respect for her ancestors. Her story was not located in time and this, alongside the use of “they/their” pronouns, suggested a distancing. This could be understood in the context of Alicia not feeling impacted by experiences relating to Windrush and racism (“because besides that the rest of the life, our life was ↑wonderful↑”).

In terms of Windrush and racism, Alicia presented her parents’ experiences (“when my dad came he had a lot of ↑aggro↑”), institutional racism (“as a black person, you were beaten up and you couldn’t even rely on the police”) and gender differences (“it was mainly the boys”). Alicia understood her parents’ openness regarding racism as safeguarding her (“making us aware of what’s happening was their way of protecting ↑us↑”). Alicia chronicled stories of her encounters with racism and name-
calling, however, she seemed distant from this in her worldview ("colour never came into anything at all, it never came into it when I was growing up").

Her distance in stories may connect to the messages that she received from her ancestors. Alicia commented that her parents ‘weren’t ↑reactive↑’ towards racism and whilst stories of racism were told in her family, she added that “you don’t take it on board”, and from this I inferred a sense of powerlessness (“people couldn’t do ↑anything↑ and when people, those people who tried, it just, nothing happened”). She told stories of her parents avoiding situations where she could come to harm from racism (“it’s all white and we never went up into that area”) and the importance of connecting to British culture (“you are ↑British↑, you are going to a British school to understand the ways the systems work there and you need to be integrated into that”).

There was a sense that Alicia used her parents’ experiences of racism and Windrush to act differently ("nobody is going to stop me doing what I wanna do because of my dad having all that aggro"), with stories of assertiveness against racism (“I looked at him and said this interview is over, I’m off, I didn’t come for this and walked out”), through the use of occupational policies (“went straight over to the school of nursing to speak to my tutor”). There was a sense that her assertiveness would not have been possible without her ancestors’ sacrifice (“it didn't break his spirit he just carried on and wanted us to achieve better”). Alicia’s passion seemed important in her identity as the first-generation born in England (“I need to prove that it can be done because we were like the, the first-generation and we’re gonna have others behind us”) to progress against racism. Stories of institutional injustice were brought in around the Windrush scandal (“a lot of those documents were destroyed anyway, by the ↑Government”) and an acknowledgement that this is hindering societal change.

Alicia ended by commenting on passing down messages of the experiences of herself and her ancestors (“I had to tell them about my history... I told him about my dad’s history”) and considering how subsequent generations can carry forward the fight towards change (“youngest son always had this thing about justice and you have to do things the right ↑way↑”). Alicia indicated that whilst there may be elements of managing racism in the present, progress is a strong focus for descendants of the WG.

3.2.2.4 Tolerant1’s Story. Tolerant1 was an enthusiastic speaker who identified as a Black British female in her late-forties. Her interview was the shortest facilitated and her stories were not time-bound nor chronological. Tolerant1 began with collective descriptions and logical responses, her personal experiences and emotions followed later. Initially, I wondered whether this structure signified distancing. However, I wonder if it could relate to the messages of caution she received from
family around interactions with white people, and whether this was mirrored in her interactional style with me, as she became more open as rapport developed.

Tolerant1 began her story of Windrush with a vague description of her mother and grandparents settling in England and spoke of collective perceptions (“it’s always considered the Jamaican Caribbean islanders who came over”) and working hard. Tolerant1 presented stories of cultural differences (“Anglo-Saxon looking people, they only know that a small pocket of the family, but we know our wider family”) and a mismatch between pre-travelling expectations versus residing in England (“to be told one thing and then you get to England and Enoch Powell’s gone and told everybody that all the women in the Caribbean are prostitutes, all the men are thieves”). Tolerant1 spoke of how cultural differences contributed to a sense of exclusion in her and her ancestors’ experiences (“we’re noticeably different, so there’s almost a sense of, you’ve, you’re a visitor ↑here↑”). Tolerant1 connected this to the impact on her identity (“you need to know your place, or you’re a secondary”).

Tolerant1 relayed stories of her ancestors’ experiences of racism (“being spat at in the street”) and her own (“I was told to go back to my country”). These were discussed in relation to media rhetoric and her perception that these contribute to racism in the past and present (“that’s all because of what was said about us, as a people, by Enoch Powell to the rest of Britain, so that is part of the trauma”).

When considering stories across generations, Tolerant1 mentioned gender differences (“the men were very silent about it”). She spoke of an oscillation in her childhood between open stories of Windrush and racism (“the mother went and slapped my mum”) combined with a sense of secrecy (“the men started talking about it and I stayed near and I wanted to listen ‘cause I wanted to know”). Tolerant1 spoke of how this has left her with a desire to know more. Tolerant1 presented shared messages across her ancestors of “don’t say anything, just turn your head and walk off”, which were seen as pertinent to her ancestors’ survival of racism during Windrush. Tolerant1 located these messages in the context of systemic racism (“the police were always watching them ready to catch them during their way home, or Teddy boys”) and a sense of powerlessness to fight institutions (“when you’re black and Windrush... you can’t go and complain”). Tolerant1 spoke of receiving messages as a child around trust (“be very careful of somebody who might rip you off or harm you”) and this was viewed as protection. Tolerant1 linked this to her actions (“I had to be more street smart”).

Tolerant1 told stories of pride (“despite all that the strength of their character to teach all of us to not show difference”), linking this to her experiences with her ancestors (“my mother taught me, we don’t treat anybody like that, it’s beneath us to treat anybody like that”). Tolerant1 spoke of how the open communication she received from her ancestors has helped her. She mentioned she
has taken forth the messages from her ancestors yet has adapted these (“that’s how they’ve coped and that’s what they think is your safety, but it’s always good to research things yourself”) and how legislation has aided her.

The end of Tolerant1’s story saw a shift back to collective talk, considering change from a systemic perspective (“the press are controlling everything, and the narrative that they put in”). Tolerant1 linked this to the Windrush scandal and the context of England maintaining her fear of exclusion (“I actually fear that I could be kicked out with my British passport”). Language was viewed by Tolerant1 as crucial and her pseudonym represented a need for England to move away from tolerating difference towards authentic inclusivity.

3.3 Collective Stories

This section presents points of connection and divergence in stories across each generation collectively. Links to the broader context and empirical literature are made. The stories and sub-stories are summarised below.

Table 17:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generation</th>
<th>Story</th>
<th>Sub-story</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windrush Generation/ first generation</td>
<td>Stories of opportunity and hard work</td>
<td>“I have never forgotten the sacrifices”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stories of challenge</td>
<td>“This gamut of racist torment”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descendants of Windrush Generation/ second-generation</td>
<td>Stories of ancestors’ experiences during Windrush</td>
<td>“The stories that were shared” versus “that’s not really talked about”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“There’s so many different places where you can pick up the trauma”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stories of racism</td>
<td>“They taught us their survival”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stories of strength</td>
<td>“I want things to change, I want people to challenge”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.1 Windrush Generation

3.3.1.1 Stories of Opportunity and Hard Work. All participants spoke of Windrush synonymously with achieving a better life, which echoes literature that moving to another country by choice has been associated with social and economic opportunities (Sangalang et al., 2019).

Thérèse spoke of “a better chance of education, life, um, to improve our potential” and she situated her stories of opportunity around herself (“the opportunities that she could see for us when we were young people she never had”) and her children (“the opportunities that, my children have, I never saw as a young person”). Thérèse did not elaborate on what these opportunities looked like for her during Windrush, instead focusing on what she did not have and facing adversity.

For Laura, opportunity was framed around occupational advancement and she connected this to nursing. There was a sense for Laura that travelling to England was associated with opportunities around status, as she referenced the ranking of Universities and middle-upper class British culture (“I just had this wonderful idea, you know, that we would meet in the park, and we’d have tea and scones”).

Lydia located her story of opportunity with developing her nursing career (“and made my way up”) and that England would provide this platform (“I knew from a very young age before even coming to England, I knew I wanted to be a nurse”). It seemed that this opportunity perhaps felt reparative for her, as she recalled losing her maternal grandmother at a young age and this being motivation for her career.

Miriam storied work and educational opportunities as she discussed the barriers that can prevent one’s access to opportunities. Miriam noted that her family were not helped to understand the educational system, which contributed to her not attending a grammar school. Miriam said that the intersection of one’s identity can influence opportunities, such as gender (“women should actually be going into, to become a secretary”).

There was divergence around the emotions associated with opportunities and Windrush. For Laura and Lydia, emotions of excitement seemed present, which was demonstrated by performative aspects of emphasis and laughter. This was mirrored in the content of their stories, detailing the preparation to travel to England and setting the scene (Labov, 1972):

Laura: “I would like you to go to Southampton, there’s this wonderful hospital.”

Lydia: “we had 21 days on sea, and it was 21 fabulous days.”
Thérèse and Miriam recalled the opportunity that Windrush afforded, however, their stories were framed around separation and a sense of what was lost for these opportunities to be seized:

Thérèse: “when she returned I was, um, 2 and a half, and I didn't know who the hell she was (laughs).”

Miriam: “she was crying at the airport because she was the main person who looked after me.”

In this way, Thérèse’s story contained more anger and sadness. This was shown through her structure, as the first half of her interview mirrored a tragedy narrative (Benish-Weisman, 2009), where her stories described difficult times without a resolution. Miriam too differed from the pattern of excitement as she, at times, showed a disconnection to Windrush, which I inferred from her vague stories and descriptions around Windrush:

Miriam: “I wouldn’t necessarily say I’ve had conversations about Windrush.”

This was similar for Thérèse, who expressed ambivalence around her ties to Windrush. This contrasted Laura, whose identity and life experiences seemed greater connected to Windrush. Interestingly, whilst Lydia expressed similar excitement around opportunities to Laura, she did not share a similar connection to Windrush and she did not feel this was a dominant part of her identity (“it was all very new, and still ↑very confusing↑”).

A possible factor that may have confounded these stories of opportunity and Windrush could be the intersectionality of identity with class. Thérèse emphasised the deprivation that she lived in, Lydia spoke of struggling without heating and Miriam mentioned living on a council estate. Laura spoke about flying to England and living in the nurse’s quarters, which she believed was protective (“I lived in the nurses’ home, and therefore I missed the no dogs, no Irish, no blacks”). One’s social class influences the availability of opportunities that aid social mobility (Stephens et al., 2019). This could explain why, despite having the same perception of opportunity related to Windrush before moving, participants had a different relationship to Windrush.

Perhaps underneath stories of Windrush and opportunity was a mismatch of pre-travelling expectations and post-settling experiences. For Thérèse and Lydia, they spoke of the opportunities for a better life and went on to discuss adversity. I inferred this mismatch from the content of their speech:

Thérèse: “we were told we that was nice and sunny in in August. It's summer. You'll be nice and warm. Hmm. We weren't.”
Lydia: “they were talking about streets are paved with gold”, “going to school I thought I was going to be excited because I loved school back in the Caribbean.”

This notion fits with literature around people’s experiences of moving to the UK being worse than expected, such as working low-income jobs in harsh conditions (MacKenzie & Forde, 2009). Ergo, these stories of opportunity and hard work made inferences to being deceived around the move to England.

3.3.1.1.1 “I have never forgotten the sacrifices”. Irrespective of the valence of the stories of opportunity, all participants linked this to working hard, with sacrifice and “not wasting” the opportunity presented to them:

Thérèse: “a couple of years to save that amount.”

Lydia: “I didn’t go back to the Caribbean like I said after my grandmother died, I stayed here and gave all my life, all my working life in the hospitals here for the people in this country.”

These stories may reflect values that some members of the Caribbean community hold around sacrifice for the benefit of children and families (Yarris, 2014) and around “non-entitlement” (Archibald, 2011. P.5), where people of African and/or Caribbean heritage can pride themselves on not being given free handouts.

Akin to stories of opportunity, stories of sacrifice had a mixed valence. Sacrifice was approached by Laura with gratitude whereas for Thérèse this was a reminder of discord in family relationships. There was a sense from participants’ stories that to work hard and have opportunities through Windrush, they made self-sacrifices. All participants told stories of cultural differences between England and the Caribbean, such as weather, food and social practices.

Thérèse: “we arrived in August, and it was freezing.”

Laura: “and one of the things in [country of origin], you say hello to somebody.”

It is well-documented that people who move countries navigate a dance between their culture and the culture of their new country (Kil et al., 2019). Berry (2011) stated that this can result in either adopting the new culture whilst maintaining one’s own, abandoning one’s culture to conform to the new culture, living in line with one’s cultural origins with minimal engagement with the new culture and no engagement with either culture.

There was a sense that participants had to sacrifice some of their needs or desires as an adjustment to England. This ranged from food choices to abandoning aspirations to go home,
sacrificing a sense of togetherness that existed when living in the Caribbean and having to accept that others would form opinions on their identity and this could not be challenged:

Miriam: “all they knew was Jamaican, and, and I used to, sometimes lie and say yes.”

This may have been a survival strategy that participants of the WG employed to minimise differences between themselves and British-born individuals, which can occur when migrating to a new country (Andits; 2017).

Thérèse also shared a story of the sacrifice around physical health. Literature has shown that one’s health deteriorates after moving country the longer that a person resides in a foreign country (Bousmah et al., 2019).

Thérèse: “it killed him. The stress of it. He had a stroke, massive stroke and he never recovered.”

Despite this, sacrifice was also connected to stories of strength, as participants discussed that holding onto the principles of sacrifice and hard work held them during challenges. All participants spoke of the importance of communicating messages of sacrifice and hard work to subsequent generations. Holding onto values can play a key role in resistance to adversity (Manning et al., 2019). This highlighted another dichotomy in the stories of how sacrifice can be both sustaining and depleting for the WG.

3.3.1.2 Stories of Challenge. All participants spoke of challenges that they faced during Windrush. These included stories of racism, living in deprivation, occupational inequalities and difficulties at school. Moving to another country can evoke great stress (Sanchez et al., 2019) and people can encounter difficulties related to isolation, feeling homesick, language barriers impacting work and education and an unfamiliarity with the new culture (Wang, 2020).

3.3.1.2.1 “This gamut of racist torment.” Each participant disclosed stories of racism alongside stories of Windrush. All participants spoke about a sense of not belonging or feeling different:

Thérèse: “I remember being the only black kid in my class.”

Laura: “and there was nobody on the street that looked like me.”

Lydia: “my first day at school, I got a sense of not belonging.”

Miriam: “we were the only black family in that ↑area↑.”
For Thérèse, Lydia and Miriam, their stories of racism related to their own experiences whereas Laura spoke of racism more widely. The difference in speaking about experiences of racism from a personal versus collective perspective produced a dichotomy of whether participants presented as connected or disconnected to racism. This was evident in the structure of participants’ stories. Laura changed her usual pattern of storytelling during stories of racism, giving short examples that seemed to move on quickly from each other in pace, which prevented her stories from progressing (Benish-Weisman, 2009). Laura commented “so long as they’re not going to lynch me” and perhaps this conceptualisation influenced a minimisation of her own experiences and disconnection. This contrasted Miriam’s stories of racism, which showed coherence, where she described the experience of racism and the process that followed, indicating a progressive narrative (Gergen, 1998):

Laura: “they would just continue, and you’d have to step into the street, and, um, you know, hopefully, I suppose they hopefully wished that he would be run over, when you go to the shops, going into British Home Stores or something like that, and you see the queue and you’re queuing, the person from behind came, they they they, you know that they you, you realize that they thought they had the right to be served before you.”

Miriam: “and part way through the investigation, um, she indicated that she’d found the missing money, um, but there was no money that was missing to begin with, she, the woman had just basically, basically lied, she’d lied about it, um, and the whole issue was actually picked up with the unions and so on and it resulted in her, um, having to make a formal apology to me.”

Despite differences in how racism was spoken about, all participants spoke of how they managed challenges. Thérèse spoke of fighting with others and framed this as the only option that she had. Her use of emphasis and language (“exponentially”, “rage”) conveyed her anger. Her stories of racism thickened the idea of a tragedy narrative (Benish-Weisman, 2009) as she spoke of no escape from racism and feeling trapped in England.

Laura spoke of a quiet noticing of the actions of others, yet mirroring others’ actions back to them (“you step back and you let them, I could do that very nicely, pretend I don't see you”). Laura’s actions seem to align with acts of resistance put forward by the co-ordinated management of meaning model in Liberation Psychology (Afuape, 2012), where one resists oppression in subtle ways against the operations of power. For example, Laura’s action of pretending not to see others is a subtle way of her challenging racism, without explicitly confronting this.
Lydia spoke of a sense of powerlessness (“you couldn't go into it”) and not verbalising things that happened to her to people in her support network. Lydia linked these stories to emotions of fear around what would happen if one were to speak out.

Miriam oscillated between describing having no choice but to fight (“fighting individuals who called me a name”), yet also keeping quiet (“I’m just not gonna say anything.”). Perhaps Miriam’s actions sat in the context of how one behaves with authority, as she described feeling able to challenge her peers outside of the classroom, yet not inside the classroom. Indeed, literature highlights that individuals can remain quiet in unequal power imbalances, including the teacher-student dyad (Ladkin, 2017).

Within stories of challenge, all participants spoke about decisions around whether to talk about their experiences, including trauma and racism, with subsequent generations. Miriam was the only participant who has actively spoken with subsequent generations about racism. I wonder if this links to Miriam being the youngest participant interviewed from the WG. Anecdotally, UK society, is beginning to have more open conversations around racism (Gillborn et al., 2023). Perhaps Miriam experienced less silence around racism compared to the other members of the WG, which aided her openness. Discussions of racism in childhood can help children who are ethnically diverse feel validated and feel more able to dismantle subtle discrimination (Copenhaver-Johnson, 2006).

Thérèse, Laura and Lydia shared that their experiences of trauma and racism are only discussed when prompted. For Laura, I wonder if this related to the fact that she did not feel that she had experienced racism, so in this sense, there was nothing to share across generations. For Thérèse and Lydia, I wonder whether this was linked to their redemption narratives (McAdams et al., 1997), where they transitioned from a story of difficulty to a story of resolve. I wonder if it feels counter-productive to connect with stories of racism as it may destabilise the place that they have reached. Both participants expressed a belief that racism is less overt, and I wonder if this has contributed to a sense that they believe racism does not need to be as talked about. Irrespective of why these differences occurred, Thérèse, Laura and Lydia articulated a preference for discussing celebration and strength with subsequent generations. All four participants discussed stories of celebration or positive memories of Windrush. This included family and community cohesion, meeting new people, travelling to new places, music, dancing and food. The wish to focus on these stories could reflect how some members of the Caribbean community want to shift away from a narrative that they are a traumatised community, linked to family separation and to the history of enslavement (Thomas, 2002) and revive their culture (Hassan, 2020).
It seems important to consider my identity as an interviewer in relation to how stories of challenge were told. I observed with all participants that there was a possible reservation to be seen as aggressive or complaining. For Thérèse and Miriam this seemed evident through their justifications of fighting. For Laura, Lydia and Miriam this appeared evident through stories of letting things go. Whilst literature has found that female researchers interviewing females can develop greater trust (Edwards, 1990), my whiteness may supersede this trust. Related to gaslighting, there are many instances when people of African and/or Caribbean heritage have been viewed as complaining for expressing their needs – such as in healthcare (Frimpong, 2022) and by police (Ritchie, 2017). I wonder whether this could lead to an internalisation of who is ‘allowed’ to complain and whether there was a worry that, as a white person, I could dismiss their experiences.

3.3.2 Descendants of the Windrush Generation

3.3.2.1 Stories of Ancestor’s Experiences. Every second-generation participant presented stories of their ancestors’ experiences of Windrush. This echoed talk of opportunities and a better life. All participants storied the challenges that their ancestors faced. Rachel discussed her ancestors’ struggles with family loss and separation. May spoke of her mother’s experiences of racism and confronting school and workplace systems. Alicia mentioned her father’s difficulties with housing and racism in his workplace. Tolerant1 told stories of her ancestors’ isolation and losing a sense of community. All participants articulated the pride that they felt towards their ancestors for working hard.

3.3.2.1.1 “The stories that were shared” versus “that’s not really talked about.” There were differences in whether participants felt that the stories of their ancestors’ experiences during Windrush were accessible to them or were less available.

Rachel voiced a story of continuously trying to speak with her grandmother about Windrush, however, this would not be responded to (“it was quite hard to find out”), or they would begin a conversation and the subject would change (“if I tried to talk to her about the past, she would talk a little bit, very little, and then she’d just go straight back onto my mum dying”), which seemed to leave Rachel with gaps in her knowledge of her ancestors’ experiences. Rachel spoke about cherishing moments when she spoke with her grandmother (“I actually recorded ↑it↑ because it was the first time I’ve got her to speak”). There was a sense that despite having greater information as an adult, this came too late and has left her with a desire to know more about her heritage (“ARGGH, if I got to you 10 years ago with these questions”). The notion that Rachel was not able to have these conversations until adulthood could be understood in the context of cultural scripts in some Caribbean
families, where children may not be involved in conversations of a serious nature, as this is reserved for adulthood (Archibald, 2011).

Perhaps the closed communication Rachel experienced influenced the content and style of her storytelling. She spoke less about her grandmother’s Windrush experiences. This may be because she could only draw on the information that she had access to. I was curious about an association between closed communication and whether this linked to Rachel’s identity. For example, she spoke about struggling with confidence and I noticed that she minimised her achievements at times (“it was only a polytechnic, and it was only doing, um, textiles”). Structurally, Rachel interrupted herself during her narratives, which can be a signifier of negative self-feelings (Kleres, 2011). I wonder whether not having the opportunity to hear her ancestors’ stories of how they navigated challenges during Windrush may have prevented Rachel from learning how to navigate her challenges and I wonder if this contributed to more negative stories of Windrush.

May discussed that she had access to a variety of stories of her ancestors’ experiences (“there are funny ones, there are not so funny ones, there were deadly serious ones and, uh, um, the ones that fill you with a sense of belonging to the Caribbean”). I wonder whether the open communication that she experienced with her mother may have contributed to the rich and coherent stories of Windrush, with a clear beginning, middle and end and less of an oscillation through time. The openness from ancestors, including an emphasis on culture, may have influenced May’s greater sense of self-esteem. This could have connected to the idea that May did not have the desire to know anything about the past. May focused her attention on the future and how institutions would be held accountable for the injustice that the WG endured (“WHAT I’D LIKE TO KNOW IS WHAT they’re gonna do about this scandal ↑now↑”). I wonder whether there was an association between the open communication May received and her perception of Windrush, as she viewed Windrush as a positive part of history (“we have enhanced this country”), perhaps because stories of celebration were told by her ancestors.

Alicia said that her parents would talk about their experiences during Windrush, including stories of racism (“getting it out in the open, so we are aware”). There was a sense from Alicia that a lot was communicated indirectly by witnessing her parents’ avoidance of situations and her parents not verbally responding to challenges. Alicia felt that she did not need to know further details of her parents’ past during Windrush. The transparency experienced from her parents may have related to Alicia’s sense of self. Alicia presented as a strong individual (“I won’t have it anyway; I won’t have it”) and she seemed to have a more distant relationship to racism and its impact. Perhaps open communication has enabled her to process her relationship to racism. Similar to May, Alicia spoke
more from a collective perspective and her stories were less focused on her lens and she felt that Windrush was a positive moment in history (“I think it was a benefit”).

Tolerant1 explained a mixture of open and closed communication with her ancestors, in that the women in her family were more forthcoming about talking about Windrush and racism, yet men were more silent. There was a sense that when communication was present, Tolerant1 would not always understand the rationale behind this as a child (“I didn’t understand why she’d ask me that”). The mixture of communication was mirrored in the mixture of emotions that Tolerant1 felt around Windrush. She expressed sadness about the unjust treatment that her ancestors received, yet she felt a sense of pride at her ancestors’ contribution. Tolerant1 felt that the open communication and messages shared within her family have impacted her in a positive sense with how she was “raised to behave and treat people” and “to cope with that kind of treatment.” In terms of her relationship with Windrush, she could see both a positive and negative impact. Therefore, there was a sense for Tolerant1 that her communication and relationship with Windrush were mixed and nuanced, akin to the communication that she received.

Regardless of the communication exhibited by their ancestors, every second-generation participant presented a story of attempting to understand the communication styles of their ancestors. It has been reasoned that humans endeavour to know why something has happened as a way to process events (McKiernan & McCarthy, 2010). Following adversity, individuals can aspire to understand why events happened and once this understanding has been achieved, individuals consider how this relates to their worldviews as a way of reaching a place of growth (Joseph & Linley, 2006). Rachel conceptualised her grandmother’s closed communication as a consequence of trauma, as she felt that her grandmother was preoccupied with Rachel’s mother’s death and this prevented her from being able to share stories of Windrush. May viewed her mother’s open communication as necessary to keep May connected to her Caribbean heritage (“mum was like, no, you need to have a sense of self”). Alicia understood her parents’ open communication as a form of protection (“so we don’t fall”). Tolerant1 conceptualised her experience of open and closed communication to be linked to differences in gender identity.

All participants spoke about being open with their children about their experiences and those of their ancestors. For Rachel, this was to compensate for the closed stories in her childhood. For May, this was to keep her children connected to their culture, in the same way she was. For Alicia and Tolerant1, this decision was around warning their children about the mistreatment that they may encounter, similar to the messages that they had. It seems that, based on their experiences of
communication, participants wanted to replicate their childhood or modify their experiences, which are common choices seen in intergenerational patterns of family scripts (Byng-Hall, 1995).

3.3.2.1.2 “There’s so many different places where you can pick up the trauma”. When presenting stories of their ancestors’ experiences, May and Tolerant1 spoke about possible trauma transmission across generations.

May related intergenerational trauma to separation and attachment difficulties. This is in line with theories that posit that separation from caregivers can result in insecure attachment styles (Mcleod, 2023) and that our attachment styles can be transmitted across generations (Fearon & Roisman, 2017). Literature has found that separation due to migration can adversely impact attachment and that this may not be repaired following reuniting (Venta & Cuervo, 2022). Whilst attachment theory has been criticised for its lack of cultural validity outside of Eurocentric communities, there have been recent arguments that it can be useful for understanding group processes, including in people of African and/or Caribbean heritage (Causadias et al., 2022). May linked intergenerational trauma to physical discipline connected to enslavement. May spoke about people of African and/or Caribbean heritage using harsh discipline across subsequent generations, which mirrors the physical chastisement inflicted upon people who were enslaved. Graff (2014) debated similar notions when they discussed that the shame felt from enslavement can be transferred inter-generationally through parents feeling less shame in their parenting style, which could lead to harshness.

Tolerant1 focused on the representation of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and the WG in the media. She reasoned that pejorative language functions to ensure continued division and that trauma stems from this (“you can pick up the trauma, in, from how you’re referred to as a human being, as in less than human”). Bilewicz and Soral (2020) found that derogatory language regarding people who move countries is associated with a breakdown between different groups and Wypych and Bilewicz (2022) found that derogatory language is linked with acculturation stress, PTSD and depression. Concerning transmission across generations, Tolerant1 spoke of how the repeated use of offensive language could result in subsequent generations being impacted, however, it was less clear how this related to trauma transmission within families. Reflecting on what this trauma may look like, Tolerant1 spoke of living in fear, which she linked to rhetoric in the media around deportation.

3.3.2.2 Stories of racism. All participants told stories of their ancestors and their own experiences of racism. I observed that participants presented thicker stories of racism than the WG. NA posits that stories are told to the present audience (e.g. me as an interviewer) and a wider audience consisting of real and fictional individuals in the past and future (Squire, 2008). I wonder whether the pattern observed connects to the context of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage having their
experiences of racism denied. Klein et al. (2021) found that individuals are more likely to explain things when they believe that the function is to rectify a flawed belief. I wonder if the detail seen in these stories was influenced by my whiteness and if participants were driven to communicate their and their ancestors’ pain in a detailed manner to feel believed by myself and those that may read this.

All second-generation participants displayed more emotion in their stories of racism. All expressed a form of anger$^5$ that racism still operates. This was either named or suggested through the performance of participants’ stories, including higher pitch, louder volume, faster pace and emphasis on words, which are signifiers of frustration in narratives (Kleres; 2011).

Rachel: “IT’S JUST LIKE having to talk to people and say ↑why↑.”

May: “the scandal that we face ↑now↑, um, which yeah angers me a lot.”

Alicia: “these poor people ↑suffered↑ unnecessarily, that side is the downside for me, and that should never have happened.”

Tolerant1: “how we’re depicted and how we’re viewed and I’m, I’m sick of hearing it.”

The frustration in their stories was verbalised in a contained manner. Anger is linked with difficulties with self-regulation and a loss of control (Edwards, 2010). I wonder how the gender identity of participants and the prolonged battle with racism influenced their performance in stories of emotion. Budziszewska and Hansen (2020) found that when describing anger, outbursts in narratives were associated with males. The authors added that anger in women’s narratives was presented as a more subtle burden and linked to chronic, long-term feelings of anger that women struggled to solve. This may connect with the exhaustion that I inferred from their stories:

Rachel: “SOMETIMES I CAN’T, sometimes I do, I just regress back into I’m not doing this for a few weeks, just have a break from it.”

May: “the attitude still is, um, you know, having to prove ourselves ↑more↑.”

It is well-documented that prolonged experiences of racism and battling racism lead to fatigue (Quaye et al., 2020). This pattern seemed to be evident in second-generation participants, as the thicker the stories of racism, the more emotion was felt, yet the more fatigue was expressed.

$^5$Given the earlier remarks around the ‘angry black woman’ stereotype, it feels important to note that this frustration/anger was interpreted by myself as the interviewer as passionate. I conceptualised this emotional response as a valid, appropriate outlet of emotion in response to systemic injustice.
3.3.2.2.1 “They taught us their survival”. Within stories of racism, participants presented how their ancestors survived these encounters and how these messages of survival were communicated to them. All mentioned hearing stories of protection or experiencing their ancestors as protective in their parenting. Everyone linked this to how their ancestors’ survived experiences of challenge during Windrush. All participants told stories that their ancestors stuck together with the wider African-Caribbean community as a means of protection. This could be connected to cultural practices for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage, where childrearing often goes beyond the caregiver-infant dyad to a collective practice (Nelson, 2020).

There were diverging messages within stories of protection. Rachel discussed her mother communicating messages of caution concerning how to interact with strangers, with a message about “not drawing attention to yourself”. Rachel noted that she observed that her ancestors “didn’t ↑mix↑ with many white people” and how this may have linked to fears around safety concerning racism. Rachel spoke about initially adopting these same messages, yet this changing across age (“I'm a LOT MORE CONFIDENT, I'm 50”, “at 25, you know it was more trying to fit in”).

May voiced communication around caution in relation to the school context, however, this was framed differently in that protection was connected to resistance. May recalled stories that her mother had told her (“she started telling us of other things that she used to do that she had to stand up for herself”), including May’s mother advocating for fair pay at work. May spoke of resistance shown by white people (“all of the white people on the street came out and they started starting standing next to mum”). Therefore, an important aspect implied in May’s stories of protection was overt action. May reflected on how she has valued taking action in relation to racism against her children (“show him his own law would hold him to account”).

Alicia mentioned messages of caution about the police (“police vans, as I call them were always patrolling”) and how this impacted her during her childhood (“English girls would go out late at night, my dad used to say no”), related to fears of safety. The form of protection that Alicia’s parents communicated was similar to Rachel, in that Alicia was told not to react. Alicia understood this as linked to survival (“the person saying what they’re saying isn’t the one that's gonna to end up in jail, it’s going to be my parents”). Alicia oscillated between her own stories of adopting these messages (“there’s no point getting het up”) and acting against injustice (“I ended up fighting”).

Tolerant1’s stories of caution were situated around her relationships with peers. Tolerant1 presented stories of her mother checking how Tolerant1 was being treated by friends, behavioural protection (“I was never allowed to have a sleepover at a white friend’s house”) and noticing fear in her mother. Tolerant1 spoke of the impact of these messages around choosing her friends carefully
(“I wanted to know that my friends are gonna be by my side”) in the context of anticipating racism. These stories of caution expanded to institutions (“parents would have a, have the talk about how to behave if you’re in an account with the police”). Tolerant1 recounted messages from her ancestors about not reacting to racism as a means of protection and survival (“very much instilled in the rest of the family, you work, you do your job, you turned a blind eye”). Tolerant1 described how she previously adopted these messages, however, like Rachel and Alicia, has shifted away from this (“I’m able to speak about it more in the 2020s than I was in the 1990s”).

Ergo, there appeared to be a difference in the function of the messages of protection. For Rachel, Alicia and Tolerant1, this was around how to blend in and survive, yet for May, this was around how to stand up for yourself. For all, there was a balance in how much these messages were adopted and how their relationship to caution and protection changed over time.

3.3.2.3 Stories of strength. All descendants presented stories of strength alongside challenges. Mirroring the WG, “sticking together” was considered by descendants as enabling strength amidst adversity, which corroborates empirical literature on how some ethnically diverse individuals cope with adversity (Hufana & Morgan Consoli, 2020). Rachel and May spoke about attending church as facilitating cohesion with the black community in their childhoods. Tolerant1 and Alicia discussed connecting with other communities, which prevented experiences of isolation (“where I lived we had Polish, Czechs, Asians” - Alicia). Social connection has been linked to better emotional wellbeing and post-traumatic growth* (Rimé et al., 2010).

3.3.2.3.1 “I want things to change, I want people to challenge”. Intertwined with stories of strength were stories of social justice. All participants linked stories of social justice with historical and current policies in UK government, including the Windrush Scandal, reforms to the immigration bill (UK Parliament, 2023), nationality and borders bill (UK Parliament, 2022) and Suella Braverman’s language around deportation (Bland, 2023). Themes of social justice were connected to the murder of George Floyd, inequalities in healthcare during Covid that impacted people of African and/or Caribbean heritage (Razai et al., 2021). Many participants related social justice to rhetoric in UK TV shows, such as Bridgerton (Leigh, 2023), in sport such as the Football Euro’s 2020 tournament (Holden & Philips, 2021) and wider society, including the Royal Family and Meghan Markle (Davies, 2022) and by public figures including Priti Patel (Frodsham, 2022) and Jeremy Clarkson (White, 2022). All participants expressed values related to human rights. Tolerant1 spoke of values being cardinal to stories of strength, as she discussed respect and being raised to treat people nicely despite injustice.

---

*Post-traumatic growth has been defined as the “positive psychological changes experienced as a result of the struggle with traumatic or highly challenging life circumstances” (Tedeschi et al., 1998, P. 3).
Tolerant1 mentioned how principles of Caribbean culture are conducive to strength through a sense of community and belonging ("when you see someone who’s from the Caribbean or something, you’ll just say hello, whether you met that person before or not"). There was something about how participants used their ancestors, their communities and their own experiences to motivate them towards change:

Rachel: “I don’t just sit there waiting for God to change it for me, because that’s how that my Nan raised, did, do you know I mean, she didn’t do anything she didn’t take action.”

Alicia: “so I was wary of dad, dad’s struggles and I wanted to to prove that you can \uparrow progress\uparrow.”

Tolerant1: “they didn’t deserve it and have died not being able to see the wrong being put right.”

There was also a sense that participants were motivated to act for social change to help future generations:

May: “a lot of children out there that are still suffering the racism.”

Regardless of the motivations, all participants spoke about resistance to oppressive practices. For Rachel and May, this involved anti-racism work in schools and their local community. For Alicia, this involved challenging the status-quo in the nursing profession. For Tolerant1, this was around challenging racism at work and workplace legislation.

All participants spoke of a sense of wanting to rectify false ideas in wider society. Everyone referred to the fact that their ancestors and people of the WG entered England legally, despite rhetoric that suggests otherwise. Rachel, May and Tolerant1 mentioned that the educational system has taught a biased view of colonisation (“not the little nice version of came here with a suitcase and look at me now, it’s all of the things that led up to it, you know, the truth needs to be told”) or has missed out important aspects of history (“completely missed that slavery stuff out of her education”). May and Tolerant1 spoke about language and the word immigrant being used incorrectly to describe the WG and descendants:

May: “at school we were called immigrant children.”

It felt instrumental for Tolerant1 that this language is changed so that in turn it could help change people’s perception of the WG and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage (“that will help longer down the line of how we’re seen as a people, by changing some of those negative words”). The way that people are described links to their emotional wellbeing, which feels of particular importance when considering the current UK political climate. For example, the plan to send all individuals seeking asylum in the UK to Rwanda (Syal & Badshah, 2022) and how Suella Braverman’s use of language
towards ethnically diverse individuals has been criticised for evoking hate (Forrest, 2023). The British Government and its policies struck a chord for most participants, such as May (“what Suella’s doing, it is wrong that you can use people in this way”), which perhaps links to the vilification of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and the WG through the Windrush Scandal. Indeed, it has been noted that witnessing one form of trauma can prompt memories of another (Rothberg, 2011).

The drive for social justice may be protective of the emotional wellbeing of the second-generation. All descendants reframed their experiences of racism as connected to a purpose to act or teach others. Jordan-Zachery (2017) reasoned that people can find liberation when they turn their frustration into action. In this sense all descendants mirrored a quest narrative (Frank, 1995) where they described a desire to get to a place of change, why they want to see this, the barriers that could interfere and their motivations (Foster, 2014) and redemption narratives (McAdams et al., 1997), which are turning negative events into positive. Quest narratives give a sense of purpose, as people believe that their suffering will provide wisdom and knowledge (Tye-Williams & Krone, 2015). Redemption narratives are associated with hope (Stone, 2016). As purpose and hope are linked to greater psychological wellbeing (Macaskill & Denovan, 2014), this may explain the strength of descendants of the WG.

3.4 Ending Reflections

Despite differences in the attention given to stories of challenge versus strength, all eight participants presented their stories as a journey. For Thérèse, she voiced a personal journey away from anger at the hostility she spoke of her and her family experiencing in the UK, to reaching a place of pride for what she and her family endured to contribute to employment equality. Thérèse’s story showed a journey in the relationship she spoke of with her family, moving from stories of separation difficulties to passing down traditions to subsequent generations and family cohesion. Laura narrated a journey of taking the step to move abroad alone and the adjustment to this, including staying connected with her family. This included adjusting to cultural differences related to Caribbean and English social practices. Lydia described a journey of navigating her expectations of the UK schooling system and the racism that she encountered. Lydia discussed a journey in her understanding of racism and appreciating new strategies for how racism is managed by subsequent generations. Miriam presented a journey of navigating racism as she grew older and reaching a place of feeling more able to challenge this as she progressed through her career. Rachel chronicled a journey of self-exploration, transitioning from not knowing much about her heritage, to connecting with her father and engaging in anti-racism work as a way to heal. May discussed a collective journey towards increased advocacy for justice in the Windrush community and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage. Alicia spoke of a journey of using the difficult experiences of her ancestors as motivation to become more assertive
in challenging racism and passing these messages down to subsequent generations so that they can continue to fight for equality. Tolerant1 spoke of a journey to a greater understanding of the systemic contributors that maintain racism and challenging the use of language by the media and society to work towards authentic change.

It is interesting to reflect upon why participants’ stories represented a journey through personal and community struggle to reach a place of (despite further work being expressed as needed by participants) strength and resistance. As Archer (2003) discusses, my white identity and inexperience with racism may contribute to the absence of certain views by interviewees. I wonder whether my whiteness is connected to the more positive ending of participants’ stories and their constructions of being in a more settled place. Perhaps this could be seen as attempts to move away from being perceived by white people as a community that are vulnerable and deprived (TED, 2009). I have contemplated whether my identity as a therapist related to this. For example, whether participants were concerned that I would ‘psychoanalyse’ their responses and therefore it was important for them to be perceived by me as ‘together’. I wonder about the nature of research interviews being a single session that there was something about communicating a ‘complete’ story. Perhaps this served a function for participants, in that when telling stories of Windrush it was important to emphasise that things have progressed personally, collectively or societally, as ending on a story of pain could have felt difficult. Therefore, participants were telling the stories that they could hold in this context, as opposed to stories that could have left them in a negative space. Regardless of the reasons for communicating this journey, participants showed great strength in navigating adversity and continuing to advocate for the rights of the WG, descendants and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage.
Chapter Four: Conclusions

4.1 Chapter Overview

This chapter summarises the findings, with connections made to the SLR. The strengths, limitations, ethical process and implications of the project are discussed. My reflections and directions for future research are embedded.

Links to psychodynamic literature from the introduction will not be revisited. The inclusion of this literature was to situate the reader to one approach to understanding intergenerational trauma, given its resonance with understanding my own experiences. Under a social constructionist stance, I cannot make conclusions about unconscious mechanisms. As social constructionism reasons that the model of an individual is bound historically and culturally (Burr & Dick, 2017), it seems counter-intuitive to generalise participants’ stories to fit within a psychological model, as these conclusions would change across time and context.

4.2 Summary of Findings

Eight interviews were conducted to explore: “What stories do people tell of Windrush in the Windrush Generation and descendants of the Windrush Generation?” The findings will be discussed regarding the research question and sub-questions.

4.2.1 What stories do people tell of Windrush in the Windrush Generation and descendants of the Windrush Generation? Do people tell stories of trauma and/or racism across generations?

4.2.1.1 Windrush Generation. Participants brought individual stories of their experiences during Windrush. This included pre-migration preparation, reasons for moving, first impressions of England, stories of adversity and how they managed this, such as experiences of racism. Collectively, two broad stories were described: stories of opportunity and hard work and stories of challenge. Participants’ stories of moving to England connected to the SLR (Chou et al., 2023) in that participants spoke of subsequent generations having the opportunities they had not. The decision to move to England was constructed as a thoughtful process. Dialogically and structurally, the emphasis on words and reiteration of hard work indicated that conscientiousness was important for participants. I interpreted that participants were not only portraying their attributes of diligence but that these traits can be valued in the wider African-Caribbean community. This may connect to the highly problematic rhetoric that people of African and/or Caribbean heritage are ‘lazy’ (Lane et al., 2020) and that people who move countries are taking resources without giving back (Kapoor, 2021).
All participants discussed racism as part of Windrush stories. For Thérèse and Laura, vague descriptions were given, yet Lydia and Miriam gave detailed descriptions. Despite differences in content, there were structural and performative similarities. Stories of racism were told with more pauses, indicating disjointedness, and all participants made assumptions about what I would know, signified by phrases such as “you know” and vague descriptions (“it wasn’t a positive experience”), which left me wondering what this meant. All participants seemed more reserved in their interactions with me whilst telling stories of racism, implied through less expression in body postures and facial expressions and justifications around anger. Despite participants discussing racism, the WG tended not to speak about this across generations. Aligning with a social identity approach to trauma, this may be because the WG did not speak to adversity impacting participants’ group-based identity. Instead, the WG spoke to building a meaningful identity of strength and being honourable, which can be connected with post-traumatic growth (Muldoon et al., 2019). Stories of family, Caribbean culture, community and resistance were presented. Contrasting the structure of how stories of challenge were told, stories of strength seemed to be told more fluently, with fewer pauses. As discussed, these stories of celebration and strength may connect to moving away from a single-story of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage being a traumatised community, smoothing the lived experience of racism and emphasising the focus for some members of the WG to concentrate on values. Indeed, “stories help communities to pass their spiritual, moral, and cultural heritage from generation to generation” (Gabriel, 2000, P.88). Focusing on resistance could have served a function to communicate to descendants a sense of empowerment. Ergo, there was a sense that stories were reclaiming heritage for participants and their community, which has been associated with growth (Atalay, 2019).

Participants spoke of the challenges that they faced during Windrush, yet all discussed their persistence in committing to their values and goals of opportunity. I interpreted that participants wanted to represent themselves and the wider African-Caribbean community as people not to be underestimated, perhaps linked to wider historical discourses that people of African and/or Caribbean heritage are ‘inferior’ in the context of white supremacy (Evans-Winters, 2019). There was a sense that participants wanted to be seen as holding integrity and humility. Respect for others irrespective of how they are treated can be a value pertinent to some members of the African-Caribbean community (Archibald, 2011). Aligning with narrative therapy, re-storying dominant, problem-saturated stories can help individuals and groups construct a preferred identity and/or story, which over time can become more salient (White, 2011). This could help explain the shift away from telling stories of trauma and racism across generations.
Akin to the SLR, there were several dichotomies: whether participants were open or closed in their communication to subsequent generations around Windrush and/or racism and whether memories of Windrush were joyful or unpleasant or contained elements of both. There were oscillations between opposing states, such as fighting racism while feeling powerlessness, connection or disconnection to racism, separation yet closeness to family and stories of pride for Windrush yet sadness or frustration. This suggests that one’s stories of Windrush are idiosyncratic and nuanced.

4.2.1.2 Descendants of the Windrush Generation. The descendants of the WG brought individual stories of growing up with their ancestors, what they were told about their ancestors’ time during Windrush and their experiences of racism. Participants acknowledged Windrush and racism as collective trauma for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage and some hypothesised how this could be transmitted inter-generationally. Participants also brought stories of their own encounters with racism and articulated how they talk about these stories with their children. Contrasting the WG, descendants of the WG expressed more emotion in the performance of their stories of racism, implied through using more hand gestures and changes in facial expressions, tone of voice and pitch. Structurally, the stories of racism told by descendants included fewer pauses, indicating fluency. Additionally, whilst participants across both generations verbalised a sense of racism changing over time, descendants seemed to move beyond strategies expressed by the WG of turning away from racism by discussing overt actions they take around social justice. This may reflect changes in context across generations, where it has been reasoned that the increased use of social media has empowered people of African and/or Caribbean heritage to take more action (Gatwiri & Moran, 2022).

Collectively, three broad stories were told: stories of their ancestors’ experiences during Windrush, stories of racism and stories of strength. Akin to the SLR and the WG, dichotomies were present such as receiving open or closed communication, adopting parental messages versus distancing, connection or disconnection with Caribbean heritage and the focus on Windrush and the past versus current and future change.

4.2.2 How do stories told by the WG influence the second-generation?

4.2.2.1 Descendants of the Windrush Generation. When participants spoke about their ancestors moving to England, all mentioned that they came legally and some spoke of England as the “mother country” calling their ancestors for help. It seemed important for descendants to ensure that their ancestors were perceived as being invited to move to England. Perhaps this related to people of African and/or Caribbean heritage being positioned as an ‘out-group’ (Hughes et al., 2019), and
participants were re-telling the longstanding relationship between the Caribbean and the UK (e.g. the Caribbean helping the Royal Air Force in World War I and II - Johnson, 2014). All participants spoke of pride for their ancestors and how this linked to their pride for their heritage, which mirrors previous research that perceiving ancestors positively can enable growth (Braga et al., 2012) and having awareness of ancestors’ experiences can facilitate a stronger affiliation to one’s heritage (Dikyurt, 2023; Wirth, 2022).

Similar to the findings presented in the SLR, I interpreted a pattern from participants’ stories between the communication second-generation participants received and their identity. Those who spoke about having open conversations with their ancestors also told stories of Windrush that were positive. This was illustrated through less of a focus on finding out personal history and the past and more of a focus on future goals for the collective community. For participants who received open communication, there were no stories of voids in their sense of self, which supports previous research that open communication is associated with growth in subsequent generations (Braga et al., 2012; Lin & Suyemeto, 2015). For participants who described closed communication with their ancestors, they told stories of Windrush with more of a negative valence and told stories of feeling less secure in their identity. This was exemplified through a greater inwards focus, more preoccupation with the past and desire to know oneself and heritage. Contrasting the SLR, which found that silence was linked to intergenerational trauma transmission through feelings of fear, anxiety and disconnection, participants did not present stories that silence was linked to symptoms of trauma. However, it could be reasoned from the aforementioned interpretations that the communication received by ancestors is linked to participants’ identity. Aligning with Narrative Therapy, the most salient stories people are told impact their perceptions (Ackerman, 2017) and identity (White, 1995). For participants who were told more problem-saturated stories of Windrush, this could connect to their perceptions of Windrush in this way and a more problem-saturated view of their identity, with the opposite being expressed in participants who were told stories of celebration, and a combination of both poles being seen in those with mixed communication.

There were some stories of patterns being passed down inter-generationally, which links to literature in the introduction, such as social learning theory (Pop-Jordanova, 2021). Some descendants told stories of their ancestors displaying behavioural avoidance, fear and communicating caution and subsequently described adopting these behaviours. When considering how descendants managed this inter-generationally, all expressed talking with subsequent generations around Windrush and racism. This mirrors findings from the SLR that silence decreases across generations (Kizilhan et al., 2022). Similar to the SLR, there were stories of a balance between participants adopting messages of caution and/or protection versus advocating for change through acts of social justice. Echoing the SLR (Cohn
& Morrison, 2018; Zasiekina et al., 2021), the focus on social justice seemed protective for
descendants as they described this as “healing”. I inferred from this dichotomy that Windrush was
one significant aspect of second-generation participants’ identity, but perhaps did not define them,
with the current context and politics (e.g. the murder of George Floyd, Suella Braverman) contributing
to their sense of self.

4.3 Quality Assessment

Consistent with the SLR, I reviewed this research using the CASP (2018) qualitative studies
framework, as discussed in chapter two.

4.3.1 Strengths

This research adds value to the existing literature as it is the first of its kind to look at stories of
Windrush and is the first research project to explore possible intergenerational trauma in the
Windrush community. The qualitative interviews enabled an in-depth exploration of these constructs.
A further strength is the inclusion of two generations, as the SLR identified that most previous research
has focused on a single generation. Capturing the voices of the WG and descendants is timely, relevant
and significant given the ongoing political context related to the Windrush Scandal. Rigour has been
attended to by ensuring an equal number of quotes across individual and collective stories for the WG
participants and descendants. The extensive accounts of the findings, and attention to converging and
diverging stories, contribute to the credibility of this research.

A drawback of the literature in the SLR was the absence of self-reflection by authors. A strength
of this project is the sincerity and attention given to my role as a researcher, biases and context and
the transparency with including extracts of my reflective log in the appendices.

A strength of this research is the use of EbEs to co-produce the project. This ensured rigour when
devising the research question and sub-questions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, recruitment
strategy, interview schedule and dissemination.

4.3.2 Limitations

All participants identified as cisgender females. Intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989) has been
described as how facets of identity co-exist, with people being shaped by the intersection of their
characteristics (e.g. ethnicity, gender identity, sexuality, class), in the context of power (Hankivsky,
2014). It would have been interesting to consider whether stories of Windrush differ for individuals
who do not identify as cisgender and hold other protected characteristics. Relatedly, it is noteworthy
that no men participated. It has been reasoned that men can be less likely to talk about their emotional experiences (Sagar-Ouriaghli et al., 2019). This may be amplified by the intersectionality of having African-Caribbean heritage, as Bauer et al. (2020) found that some black males value autonomy following adversity. As alluded to in Alicia and Tolerant1’s interviews, perhaps men’s experiences during Windrush could feel hard to talk about, which contributed to their absence. Future research may wish to look at men’s stories of Windrush.

Considering intersectionality, stories were told of participants’ connection with White Irish communities. The link between Irish and Caribbean communities is well-documented, as Oliver Cromwell forcibly relocated many White Irish individuals to work in the Caribbean as indentured labourers (Collins, 2019). The second-generation participants interviewed had two ethnically diverse parents. Future research may wish to interview individuals with mixed White Irish and African-Caribbean heritage to consider how this could influence stories of Windrush.

Whilst a strength of this study was looking at stories across two generations, the aim was to interview family ‘pairs’ of first-generation and second-generation participants. This proved difficult to recruit with limited time. Future research may wish to recruit individuals across generations who are of the same family. For instance, it is interesting that the WG in this research mainly reported not talking about trauma and racism across generations, yet descendants of the WG reported that they received some open communication with their ancestors who were not interviewed. All descendants of the WG discussed the messages that they communicate to their children. Future research may wish to extend interviews across three generations.

4.3.3 Ethics

Throughout this thesis, I have reflected on my journey as a researcher. Considering relational ethics and connecting to how stories of challenge were told by participants, an aspect that I grappled with during interviews was how much to prompt participants. I wonder if my preoccupation with interviews being standardised led me to neglect potentially meaningful avenues related to the challenges that participants encountered. For instance, some participants brought emotions of anger and sadness into their stories of Windrush and inquiring more about this could have allowed for deeper exploration.

I was conscious of my therapist background and slipping into this role. The challenge of responding as a researcher or therapist when one has experience with both has been documented (Hart & Crawford-Wright, 1999). I wonder how my drive to maintain this ethical boundary hindered me from delving deeper. This could have been impacted by the research context, in that interviews took place
over a single session. Research contexts differ from therapy where collaborative hypotheses can be formulated and re-formulated, and therefore there is less space for deeper emotional processing in interview settings. I wonder how operations of power and my whiteness came into this. I was conscious not to replicate harm and perhaps my concern with this prevented me from going deeper into potentially painful emotions for participants. I have reflected on whether my preoccupation with my behaviour during interviews impacted participants’ stories. Taking principles from psychoanalysis, my awareness of my inner conflicts could have influenced my presence during interviews. I may have unconsciously projected my anxieties onto participants, which could connect to some of the disjointedness interpreted in stories.

4.3.4 Dissemination

Considering ethics, it is important to ensure meaningful dissemination of the research, so that participants were not left sharing their stories without something tangible evolving. Plans for dissemination include publication in a peer-reviewed journal. The journal will be chosen alongside EbEs. The research will be shared with the organisations and websites linked to EbEs. I will present at the UH Research Conference on 21st September 2023 and EbEs will be invited. I will attend the anniversary of Windrush with Bedfordshire’s Legacy of Windrush Descendants and Friends on 22nd June 2023. I will meet with EbEs following dissemination of the thesis to create a podcast that will be shared with the organisations and websites linked to EbEs and possibly The Human Library.

4.4 Implications of the Research

The stories presented by the WG and descendants were multi-faceted, involving individual and community perspectives, with aspects of challenge and strength. These included stories of racism, community isolation, systemic inequalities, family relationship difficulties and the physical health impact of racism, alongside stories of family and community cohesion, cultural traditions, celebrations and advocating for social justice. This research found that, whilst collective trauma and racism were acknowledged, interviewees from the WG did not tend to talk about trauma and racism across generations. Stories of trauma and racism across generations may not have been present because storytelling in people of African and/or Caribbean heritage can have a unique focus on values and morality, which take precedence (Tuwe, 2016). This could be compounded by the notion that there can be cultural norms for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage around keeping problems within families (Gopaul-McNicol, 1998) and stigma around talking about trauma (Phillips, 2022). Instead, the WG preferred to tell stories of celebration and strength. All participants spoke of community, connection, cultural traditions being passed across generations and using one’s mother tongue. This affiliation with heritage can be reparative for people of African and/or Caribbean
heritage, in the context of these connections to heritage being denied during enslavement (Henderson et al., 2021). Second-generation participants spoke more openly about trauma related to their identity, such as its impact on their sense of self and connection their heritage. They also discussed communicating stories of adversity and racism to their children. For descendants of the WG, their own and their ancestors’ experiences were linked to future goals around social justice. Overall, these results indicate that rather than stories of trauma and racism being told across generations, there is a focus on intergenerational stories of strength and resistance.

This has led me to reflect on how I may have assumed that there was a story of trauma to be told. This could link to my experience of intergenerational trauma, as stories in my family were focused on trauma. This chimes with empirical literature, which has found that the focus in individualist cultures can concern problems over strengths (Seligman & Csikszentmihalyi, 2000). Perhaps I approached this research under a lens that assumes that people who move countries have only adverse experiences to tell (Cobb et al., 2019). I wonder whether my emphasis surrounding trauma and racism limited stories of strength. Henderson et al. (2021) note that there is a paucity of literature illustrating the protective factors that have enabled the prosperity of people of African and/or Caribbean heritage. This could be a valuable avenue for future studies.

The focus on stories of strength and resistance has implications for clinical practice. The method of storytelling in this research could be an implication in itself, where this thesis has demonstrated the potential utility of using stories for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage to speak about their experiences. This could have implications for making Narrative Therapy interventions more widespread in the NHS to explore resistance, racism and trauma with ethnically diverse individuals. This approach may not have as much influence in NHS services as other therapies (Brown et al., 2016). National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) Guidelines (2018) recommend trauma-focused CBT, eye movement desensitisation reprocessing (EMDR) therapy and narrative exposure therapy (NET) for individuals who have experienced trauma, none of which are based upon Narrative Therapy principles. Given the focus on strength and resistance in participants’ stories, I wonder if this has implications for individual or group-based Tree of Life (ToL) intervention to be used to discuss experiences of racism and trauma for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage. The approach can work well with communities who have experienced collective trauma (Jacobs, 2018). For example, ToL has been used in a North London school and was found to be effective at developing children’s self-esteem and self-concept relating to racism (German, 2013). Byrne (2011) facilitated a 5-session ToL intervention with men of African and/or Caribbean heritage in Tower Hamlets to promote talking therapies in this population and participants reported it contributed significantly to their recovery.
Stories could be explored with people of African and/or Caribbean heritage using genograms (McGoldrick et al., 2020). Genograms can establish the structures of families and uncover generational patterns, such as those linked to oppression and resistance, accounting for social, historical and cultural contexts (Joseph et al., 2023). Using genograms to shift to conversations of intergenerational strength, acknowledging cultural history, may be an important avenue for clinical work, especially to promote culturally responsive engagement, as people of African and/or Caribbean heritage can be less likely to complete psychological interventions compared to white individuals (Lester et al., 2010). Henderson et al. (2021) described that asking people of African and/or Caribbean heritage about intergenerational strength can facilitate collaboration, uncover past patterns of healing and community resources, can generate narratives of strength that promote wellbeing and can scaffold treatment plans anchored in an individual’s cultural identity. Importantly, genograms can be used by clinicians in supervision, for practitioners to reflect on their context and how this influences decision-making as one way to remain ethical in clinical work (Bilot & Peluso, 2009).

This research has guided me to reflect upon how people conceptualise experiences as trauma. I wonder if defining things as trauma can be a ‘white’, Eurocentric concept that other communities may not always resonate with. Theories of trauma have been criticised for a Eurocentric bias in their conception (Crap, 2013). This is not to say that people of African and/or Caribbean heritage do not define their experiences as trauma, as such collective conceptualisations were used. However, the language used to conceptualise experiences can differ among people who are ethnically diverse. Krause (1989) found that some members of the Punjabi community used the phrase ‘sinking heart’ linked to the concept of depression. Krause highlighted that culturally-bound explanations of distress did not match Eurocentric criteria for psychological conditions. This emphasises the importance of language in constructing our experiences and that Eurocentric descriptions may not resonate across cultures. This has consequences for how clinicians describe psychological interventions offered in the NHS. Watson-Singleton et al. (2019) identified that culturally-familiar language is conducive to culturally sensitive therapy, as people of African and/or Caribbean heritage who were offered a mindfulness-based intervention associated the term ‘meditation’ with malicious spirits and preferred terms such as awareness or relaxation. The aforementioned ideas have implications for how clinicians take the time to understand different cultural approaches to distress and ways of conceptualising this. My view is that this could be approached within clinical psychology training, in addition to self-directed learning. Clinical psychology has been criticised for its Eurocentrism and exclusion of ethnically diverse groups and, as attempts to address this, discussions of diversity, social inequalities, racism, whiteness and learning non-Eurocentric psychological models have become prominent in training courses (Wood & Patel, 2017). Whilst I have found that these areas were covered during my training, less attention
was given to the history of ethnically diverse groups: of cultural traditions, spirituality, religion and normative practices. Arguably, a deeper awareness of this history could provide a foundation preceding conversations of diversity, to facilitate a deeper understanding of culture in such discussions. I am aware that this is a direction the British Psychological Society and Division of Clinical Psychology are recommending doctorate courses move towards through consultation on developing accreditation standards.

This leads me to reflect upon the disparity between clinical psychology training and NHS practice. Anecdotally, I have found that discussions around culture, diversity and non-Eurocentric ways of practicing psychology can be hard to translate into clinical practice. Mental health teams work using the DSM criteria for psychological conditions. This medicalised model has been criticised for locating distress, including trauma, within an individual (Gómez et al., 2016), ergo there has been a movement towards trauma-informed practice. The Power Threat Meaning Framework (Johnstone et al., 2018) has been used to conceptualise distress without diagnostic labels, accounting for power and societal discourses. Trauma-informed care should be relational (Gómez et al., 2016) and extend to the socio-political context that people exist in. There is critique that much of trauma-informed care is adapting individual interventions to better focus on an individual’s symptoms, perpetuating a medicalised model. For example, trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) has become a popular therapy, and whilst it can be effective (Cohen et al., 2016), it has been criticised for not accounting for barriers to accessing services, the therapeutic relationship between a therapist and service user and cultural differences (Carter, 2022). With CBT and other therapeutic models used in trauma-informed care being rooted in white, Eurocentric epistemology, this has implications for the applicability for people who are ethnically diverse. Aligning with decolonisation, and with the stories of strength and resistance communicated by participants, this has ramifications for moving away from problem-centred models, such as CBT, in clinical practice. For example, Liberation Psychology approaches could be more widely applied in clinical work, including focusing on spiritual needs and cultural history (Duran et al., 2008). Liberation Psychology acknowledges that oppressive systems impact the wellbeing of marginalised groups (Afuape, 2012) and is concerned with how people can emancipate themselves from oppression. Anecdotally, Liberation psychology approaches are not routinely used in NHS and it is not mentioned in NICE Guidelines. Peña (2021) presented his group work outside of the NHS with young male refugees who had experienced trauma using Liberation Psychology. In his intervention, dialogue was used to explore societal power and understand the causes and effects of trauma. The group involved generating collective understandings and resistance, creativity and linked participants to their preferred identities. Such group-based interventions for trauma could be
implemented in NHS practice, given that group therapy for trauma can facilitate change through resistance for people of African and/or Caribbean heritage (Manyam et al., 2020).

Given that collective practices were expressed by participants as being pertinent in developing strength amidst racism and trauma, this has implications for community psychology principles to become more widespread in the NHS. Community psychology opposes an individualistic focus, considering society and politics, and those who practice community psychology endeavour to work collaboratively with oppressed groups to confront structural inequalities (Evans et al., 2017). Community psychology principles are enacted in the NHS, such as bringing context into psychological formulations, addressing power in therapy, facilitating group work and liaising with legal, housing, employment and benefit systems. However, in my 7 years of employment in the NHS - across Birmingham, Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire and Essex - I am yet to see a psychologist work with groups of people in the community. Thompson et al. (2022) note that psychologists applying community psychology practice in the NHS feel limited by busy services, time constraints, an expectation to conform to dominant, 1:1 models, service cuts and restrictions by location. The authors found that psychologists tended to do most of their community psychology practice outside of their professional role, through activism and volunteering. It seems important for more grassroots, community work outside of the clinic space to be delivered by clinicians working in mental health teams as part of culturally responsive practices and decolonising approaches in the NHS. For example, Haaken et al. (2012) worked with black teenagers across Sierra Leone and America using hip-hop music and psychodynamic principles to explore identity, oppression, trauma and resistance, where themes formed a documentary ‘Moving to the Beat’ and Mbilishaka (2018) utilised hair salons and narrative therapy techniques to explore stories around ethnicity and trauma, creating a movement in America called PsychoHairapy.

When considering ways to engage people of African and/or Caribbean heritage in clinical interventions in a meaningful way, I would reason that this involves deconstructing whiteness, given that 74.3% of clinicians in the NHS are white (GOV.UK, 2023). During the WG interviews, stories of challenge appeared to be structurally disjointed, including more pauses and were often not orientated in time, whereas stories of strength seemed to be told more fluently. This has led me to reflect upon how stories of challenge, trauma and racism could be fostered in clinical practice. Bennett and Gates (2022) reason that decolonising trauma-informed practice involves “truth-telling” and challenging Eurocentric accounts of history (P. 10). Given that trust is an important factor in clinical work, and some people of African and/or Caribbean heritage struggle with trusting healthcare professionals (Planey et al., 2019), I wonder whether part of trust building with people of African and/or Caribbean heritage in clinical settings involves therapist’s naming their whiteness and acknowledging its history
during therapeutic work. Whilst deconstructing whiteness is a component of clinical psychology training, it could be useful to implement such reflective spaces in NHS settings. Indeed, it has been reasoned that mental health professionals do not have spaces to discuss ethnicity and culture in the NHS (Keating et al., 2002), further supporting this implication.

Reflecting upon stories of social justice has implications for Government policies including the Windrush Scandal. Human Rights Watch has emphasised the failures by the Home Office regarding the Windrush compensation scheme, as many of the Windrush community are waiting for compensation and are receiving inadequate financial compensation (Nagesh, 2023). Whilst it is beyond the scope of this research to influence Government change, this could have implications for reviewing the compensation scheme, in collaboration with the Windrush community, to ensure that individuals receive the compensation that they deserve.

4.5 Ending Comments

Hearing stories of Windrush from the WG and descendants feels long overdue. Participants’ stories highlighted the complexity associated with experiencing adversity and developing strength and resistance. Whilst the WG and descendants acknowledged the collective trauma and racism that the WG and people of African and/or Caribbean heritage have faced, this seemed only part of participants’ stories. A focus on values, family and community support were pertinent to stories of strength and celebration associated with Windrush. Ergo, the WG and descendants seemed to present stories of intergenerational resistance over intergenerational trauma transmission. This has implications for how clinicians conceptualise and work with trauma in clinical practice and maintain a balance between validating and exploring experiences of trauma whilst acknowledging and identifying strengths to facilitate liberation. Despite attempts for this through trauma-informed care, further decolonisation of these practices in clinical settings may be necessary. Future research may wish to consider mechanisms behind intergenerational strength of the WG and descendants.

“Let’s get together and design our own terms, sit alongside us and listen and you will learn. Nothing about us without us.” (Alyson Malach, personal communication, 21 March 2022).
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Appendices

Appendix A: Definition of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) (APA, 2013)

Criteria A: Exposure to actual or threatened death, serious injury, or sexual violence in one (or more) of the following ways:

1. Directly experiencing the traumatic event(s).
2. Witnessing, in person, the event(s) as it occurred to others.
3. Learning that the traumatic event(s) occurred to a close family member or close friend. In cases of actual or threatened death of a family member or friend, the event(s) must have been violent or accidental.
4. Experiencing repeated or extreme exposure to aversive details of the traumatic event(s) (e.g., first responders collecting human remains; police officers repeatedly exposed to details of child abuse).

Criteria B: Presence of one (or more) of the following intrusion symptoms associated with the traumatic event(s), beginning after the traumatic event(s) occurred:

1. Recurrent, involuntary, and intrusive distressing memories of the traumatic event(s).
2. Recurrent distressing dreams in which the content and/or affect of the dream are related to the traumatic event(s).
3. Dissociative reactions (e.g., flashbacks) in which the individual feels or acts as if the traumatic event(s) were recurring. (Such reactions may occur on a continuum, with the most extreme expression being a complete loss of awareness of present surroundings.)
4. Intense or prolonged psychological distress at exposure to internal or external cues that symbolize or resemble an aspect of the traumatic event(s).
5. Marked physiological reactions to internal or external cues that symbolize or resemble an aspect of the traumatic event(s).

Criteria C: Persistent avoidance of stimuli associated with the traumatic event(s), beginning after the traumatic event(s) occurred, as evidenced by one or both of the following:

1. Avoidance of or efforts to avoid distressing memories, thoughts, or feelings about or closely associated with the traumatic event(s).
2. Avoidance of or efforts to avoid external reminders (people, places, conversations, activities, objects, situations) that arouse distressing memories, thoughts, or feelings about or closely associated with the traumatic event(s).

Criteria D: Negative alterations in cognitions and mood associated with the traumatic event(s), beginning or worsening after the traumatic event(s) occurred, as evidenced by two (or more) of the following:

1. Inability to remember an important aspect of the traumatic event(s) (typically due to dissociative amnesia, and not to other factors such as head injury, alcohol, or drugs).
2. Persistent and exaggerated negative beliefs or expectations about oneself, others, or the world (e.g., “I am bad,” “No one can be trusted,” “The world is completely dangerous,” “My whole nervous system is permanently ruined”).
3. Persistent, distorted cognitions about the cause or consequences of the traumatic event(s) that lead the individual to blame himself/herself or others.
4. Persistent negative emotional state (e.g., fear, horror, anger, guilt, or shame).
5. Markedly diminished interest or participation in significant activities.
6. Feelings of detachment or estrangement from others.
7. Persistent inability to experience positive emotions (e.g., inability to experience happiness, satisfaction, or loving feelings).

Criteria E: Marked alterations in arousal and reactivity associated with the traumatic event(s), beginning or worsening after the traumatic event(s) occurred, as evidenced by two (or more) of the following:

1. Irritable behavior and angry outbursts (with little or no provocation), typically expressed as verbal or physical aggression toward people or objects.
2. Reckless or self-destructive behavior.
3. Hypervigilance.
4. Exaggerated startle response.
5. Problems with concentration.
6. Sleep disturbance (e.g., difficulty falling or staying asleep or restless sleep).

Criteria F: Duration of the disturbance (Criteria B, C, D and E) is more than 1 month

Criteria G: The disturbance causes clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.

Criteria H: The disturbance is not attributable to the physiological effects of a substance (e.g., medication, alcohol) or another medical condition.
Appendix B: Iterations of Search Process for Systematic Literature Review

Initial database search 25th June 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1: Experiences</th>
<th>Concept 2: Intergenerational Trauma</th>
<th>Concept 3: People of African and/or Caribbean Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienc* AND</td>
<td>“Intergenerational trauma” AND</td>
<td>Black* AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View* OR</td>
<td>Cross-generational OR</td>
<td>“People of colour” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude* OR</td>
<td>“Cross generational” OR</td>
<td>“People of colour” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion* OR</td>
<td>Generation* OR</td>
<td>BAME OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perce* OR</td>
<td>“Community trauma” OR</td>
<td>BME OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belie* OR</td>
<td>“Collective trauma” OR</td>
<td>Ethnic* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel*</td>
<td>Trauma OR</td>
<td>African* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family</td>
<td>Caribbean* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windrush*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second database search on 26th June 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1: Experiences</th>
<th>Concept 2: Intergenerational Trauma</th>
<th>Concept 3: People of African and/or Caribbean Heritage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienc* AND</td>
<td>“Intergenerational trauma” AND</td>
<td>Black* AND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View* OR</td>
<td>Cross-generational OR</td>
<td>“People of colour” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude* OR</td>
<td>“Cross generational” OR</td>
<td>“People of colour” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion* OR</td>
<td>Generation* OR</td>
<td>BAME OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perce* OR</td>
<td>“Community trauma” OR</td>
<td>BME OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belie* OR</td>
<td>“Collective trauma” OR</td>
<td>Ethnic* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel*</td>
<td>Trauma OR</td>
<td>African* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family</td>
<td>Caribbean* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Windrush*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Third database search 8th July 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1: Experiences</th>
<th>Concept 2: Intergenerational Trauma</th>
<th>Concept 3: People from minoritised groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Experienc* AND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perce* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belie* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience*</td>
<td>AND</td>
<td>“Intergenerational trauma”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cross-generational OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Cross generational” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opinion* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>Generation* OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perce* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Community trauma” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belie* OR</td>
<td></td>
<td>“Collective trauma” OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel*</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trauma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Final database search 15th July 2022*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept 1: Story (keywords/abstract/title)</th>
<th>Concept 2: Intergenerational (title)</th>
<th>Concept 3: Trauma Transmission (title)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stories OR story OR narrative* OR experience* OR understand* OR feel* OR perce* OR belie* OR tell* OR expos*</td>
<td>Intergenerational* OR transgenerational OR family OR families OR cross-generational OR &quot;Cross generational&quot; OR generation*</td>
<td>trauma OR “trauma transmission” OR &quot;intergenerational trauma” OR “intergenerational trauma transmission” OR &quot;historical trauma” OR &quot;complex trauma” OR &quot;community trauma&quot; OR &quot;collective trauma”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C: Systematic Literature Review Papers excluded during Quality Assessment

#### Summary of Excluded Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author, year and title of paper</th>
<th>Location of study</th>
<th>Aim</th>
<th>Population/sample</th>
<th>Data collection and analysis used</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Strengths and critique (as discussed by authors)</th>
<th>Reflections (own lens)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Hogman. (1998). Trauma and identity through two generations of the Holocaust | United States of America | To consider the resolution of trauma across generations. | 4 Jewish-American families:  
Family 1: Mother (50) and two daughters (26 and unknown)  
Family 2: Mother (48) and daughter (18) and son (14)  
Family 3: Mother (49) and two daughters (16 and 13) and one son (8)  
Family 4: Mother (52) and son (4)  
Parents all had at least one parent | Semi-structured interviews – two with each parent and one with each child (except for the 4-year-old son who was too young to participate). Case study. | Across the four families, there were themes of sadness and pain and difficulties with healing. In three families, there was a theme of silence and the Holocaust not being discussed. In one family there was a theme of over-disclosure that led to children feeling suffocated. Themes of over-protection and enmeshment permeated all experiences. An internal conflict of separating from families and | - Findings may not be generalisable. | It is unclear in the paper how the participants were chosen for the case study and the researcher’s decisions around this.  
The researcher comments on differing familial dynamics that distinguish the families; however this is not interpreted on in the context of the findings described.  
It is unclear what questions participants were asked/how the |
who were in concentration camps.

learning outside the family was observed.
Connection to heritage allowed for liberation.

Mozina et al. (2020).

Intergenerational transmission of trauma: The role of family and parenthood in post-traumatic growth.

Slovenia

To look at how families in Slovenia experience the trauma of living in a communist regime during and after World War 2 and how offspring consider the impact of this in their lives.
Another aim was to look at how

Two families, where the first generation experienced the war and/or inter and post-war communist violence.

Family 1: Grandmother, father, grandson and granddaughter.

Family 2: Grandmother and mother (third-

Semi-structured interviews.
Content analysis.

First-generation: strong narrative of survival and making sense of experiences. Family relationships felt key to this.

Second-generation: narratives around making sense of the trauma and connecting outside of the family to community

The author did not explore strengths and limitations.

It is credible that the paper is written in multiple different languages to increase accessibility.

It is interesting that part of the inclusion criteria was for the second and third-generation to recognise the first-generation as “victims” and I
trauma can be processed through communication in parent to child relationships. Activities and politics. Third-generation: narratives of gratitude and personal strength. Support came from outside as well as inside the family. Wonder how this language and conceptualisation influenced the findings described. There is no link back to the Slovenian context in the discussion of the findings.

**CASP (2018) Quality Framework Results for Excluded Studies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1) Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?</th>
<th>2) Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?</th>
<th>3) Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?</th>
<th>4) Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?</th>
<th>5) Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?</th>
<th>6) Has the relationship between the researcher and participants been adequately considered?</th>
<th>7) Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?</th>
<th>8) Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?</th>
<th>9) Is there a clear statement of findings?</th>
<th>10) How valuable is the research?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes = criteria met</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The author found an “approach-avoidance” conflict with suffering. The study highlights that suffering becomes part of identity and that the Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No = criteria not met</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The author found an “approach-avoidance” conflict with suffering. The study highlights that suffering becomes part of identity and that the Holocaust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot tell</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Can’t tell</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The author found an “approach-avoidance” conflict with suffering. The study highlights that suffering becomes part of identity and that the Holocaust</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
becomes part of a “story” and “a guide to live life rather than simply a recall of death.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mozina et al. (2020)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The authors do not discuss the implications or relevance of findings or give suggestions for future research. There is some connection to prior research and exploration of the pattern found across generations. For example, that separation from painful experiences is greater in subsequent generations than in first generations.
Appendix D: Interview Schedule Iteration

Table 1:

*Interview Schedule Initial Ideas*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windrush Generation</th>
<th>Descendants of Windrush Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview One (broader questions):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td>1. Tell me about your experiences as a child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tell me about any events that may have happened to you, your family or your community whilst living in England that stand out to you</td>
<td>2. Tell me about any events that may have happened to you, your family or your community whilst living in England that stand out to you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Two (more specific questions):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you talk about your experiences of racial trauma/racism within your family?</td>
<td>1. What do you know about the past/experiences of people in generations above you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Are there things you do not talk about?</td>
<td>2. What do you feel about the past and the relationship between the past, the present and the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has what you can and can’t (or do and don’t) talk about changed over time since Windrush Generation?</td>
<td>3. Is there anything that you want to know and/or don’t want to know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:

*Second Iteration of Interview Schedule*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Windrush Generation</th>
<th>Descendants of Windrush Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interview Questions (across one interview)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Tell me about your experiences of talking about racial trauma/ racism/ Windrush) with people in subsequent</td>
<td>2. Tell me about your experiences as a child with significant people in the Windrush generation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
generations, loved ones and community?

3. Has what you talk about with subsequent generations and communities changed over time since the Windrush Generation? If so, why?

3. What do you know about the past and the experiences of trauma and racism in the Windrush generations above you?

4. Is there anything that you want to know and/or don't want to know about the past, Windrush and trauma or racism in your family?

Table 3:

Final Iteration of Interview Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview Questions:</th>
<th>Windrush Generation</th>
<th>Descendants of the Windrush Generation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td>1. Tell me about your relationship to the Windrush Generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What may have impacted your experiences travelling to the UK, once settled here and in the present day?</td>
<td>2. Tell me about your experiences as a child with significant people in the Windrush generation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Do you have a similar or different experience to others in your family?</td>
<td>b) What may have impacted your experiences?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has Windrush and your experience as part of the Windrush generation had any impact on your relationships with your family?</td>
<td>3. What do you know about the past, Windrush and the experiences of racism or trauma in the Windrush generations above you?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tell me about your experiences of talking about Windrush/ racism/racial trauma with people in subsequent generations (and community)</td>
<td>4. Is there anything that you want to know and/or don't want to know about the past, Windrush and racism or trauma in your family?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Were there any messages that felt particularly important to share or to not share?</td>
<td>5. What do you feel about the past/ Windrush and the relationship between this and the present?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Has what you talk about with subsequent generations (and communities) changed over time since the Windrush Generation? If so, why?</td>
<td>6. What do you feel about the past/ Windrush and the relationship between this and the future?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Follow-up Probes:
What do you mean? How were you feeling? What emotions came up for you? I'm not sure that I am following you. Would you explain that? What did you say then? What were you thinking at the time? Give me an example. Tell me about it. Take me through the experience.
## Appendix E: Post-interview List of Organisations/ Support Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Contact Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Windrush National Organisation</td>
<td><a href="https://windrushnationalorganisation.com">https://windrushnationalorganisation.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windrush Foundation</td>
<td><a href="https://windrushfoundation.com">https://windrushfoundation.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality and Diversity UK</td>
<td><a href="https://www.equalityanddiversity.co.uk/">https://www.equalityanddiversity.co.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0161 763 4783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Business Club</td>
<td><a href="https://blackbusinessclub.org/">https://blackbusinessclub.org/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>07852 937 981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Founder@blackbusinessclub.org">Founder@blackbusinessclub.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIND</td>
<td><a href="https://www.mind.org.uk">https://www.mind.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Information/helpline open Monday to Friday, 9am to 6pm (except bank holidays): 0300 123 3393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritans</td>
<td><a href="https://www.samaritans.org">https://www.samaritans.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpline open 24 hours a day, 365 days a year: 116 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Black, African and Asian Therapy Network</td>
<td><a href="https://www.baatn.org.uk">https://www.baatn.org.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silverline (for older people)</td>
<td><a href="https://www.thesilverline.org.uk/">https://www.thesilverline.org.uk/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helpline open 24 hours a day, 7 days per week: 0800 4 70 80 90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Participant Information Sheet

Participant Information Sheet
A narrative analysis of told and untold stories within families of the Windrush Generation

Primary researcher: Jessica Blumsom (Trainee Clinical Psychologist, University of Hertfordshire)

Primary supervisor: Dr Emma Karwatzki (Clinical Psychologist and Senior Research Lecturer, University of Hertfordshire)

Secondary supervisor: Dr Aishath Nasheeda (Assistant Professor and Programme Co-ordinator, Bachelor of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Studies, Villa College QI Campus, Maldives)

Consultant on supervisory team: Dr David Herndandez-Saca (Associate Professor, University of Northern Iowa)

Purpose/rational for the project
The project aims to look at family and community stories of racial trauma in the Windrush Generation and the impact of these stories across generations on people’s identity.

The Windrush Generation and their loved ones have been significantly harmed on an individual and broader level. The trauma that people have experienced (e.g. from Windrush Scandal) has often been denied in society (e.g. gaslighting) and the racism experienced within this community is rarely spoken about. It is also not clear how this harm is spoken about (or not spoken about) across generations over time.

By people voicing stories of their lived experiences, this can shed light on the trauma experienced by Windrush Generation and their loved ones.

Why have I been invited?
You have been invited to participate in this as you are over the age of 18 and you identify as someone from the Windrush Generation (“older generation”) or you are a loved one of someone from the Windrush Generation (“younger generation”).

For those who identify as part of the Windrush Generation, you were born and have travelled from a country in the Caribbean to the United Kingdom. For those who are part of the younger generation, you were born in the UK.

I am looking for 5 people from the Windrush generation and 5 people from the younger generation.

What will happen if I decide to take part?
If you decide to take part then you will be invited to have an initial telephone or video call with Jessica to discuss the project and ask any questions. Following this, you will participate in one interview, lasting up to 2 hours, facilitated by Jessica. These will occur individually, however you do have the choice to bring someone close to you with you if you would like this for support.
The interview questions have been decided with the panel of consultants and there are slightly different questions depending on whether you are part of the “older” generation (who identifies as part of the Windrush generation) or “younger” generation (a loved one of someone who identifies as part of the Windrush generation).

**What happens to me and my data after I have taken part?**

After you have taken part in the interviews, you will receive an optional follow-up email of resources/organisations for support if you would like to access these. This list was co-created with the panel of consultants.

After the interviews, Jessica and the secondary supervisor, Aishath, will analyse all the audio-recordings of data and create a narrative around this.

**What are the possible advantages of me taking part?**

Your interview data will be adding to existing literature around racism and trauma in marginalised communities and particularly in the Windrush Generation. This can hopefully be used not only to raise awareness, but also to contribute broader change.

**What should I consider in terms of me taking part?**

The interviews will involve reflecting upon potentially painful experiences involving themes of racism and trauma, which may bring up painful memories and this may be uncomfortable. It is important to bear this in mind when considering participating in the research. Jessica can provide debriefs after interviews and can facilitate grounding/mindfulness exercise if needed, as well as signpost to helplines and contacts if this feels appropriate/helpful. If you do bring an advocate to your interviews, you can of course also process the interviews with this person too.

You can end the interview at any time without giving a reason. This will not impact on how you are treated during the project.

If you travel for an interview that is facilitated face-to-face, you will be paid up to £20 travel expenses. If interviews occur face-to-face, this has to be in a neutral location (e.g. Jessica cannot come to your home).

**Do I have to take part?**

No, participation in the project is completely voluntary.

**Will taking part in the project be confidential?**

Yes, confidentiality will be protected by using pseudonyms throughout, and identifiable information that could identify you within the write-up will not be included. If you choose to bring someone with you to the interview, both the “older” and “younger” generations in the pairing will need to consent to this and the advocate will also need to sign a consent and confidentiality form.

**What happens if I agree to take part and then change my mind?**

Your participation is voluntary and you can withdraw at any stage.

If your interview has already been conducted and you would like to withdraw, there is a timeframe in which you will need to let Jessica know if you would like your data to be destroyed. If you withdraw within 2 weeks after your interview, then your data will be permanently deleted. If you withdraw after
this point, then your data will still be used as it will have been analysed, but direct quotes that you have made will not be included in the write-up.

**Who reviews the project?**

The project has been approved by the ethical committee at University of Hertfordshire.

**Dissemination**

The project will be published in a peer-reviewed journal. The exact journal that it will be submitted to can be decided alongside participants and consultants in terms of what feels most meaningful. It’s also important for this project to be shared on non-academic platforms, and these can be decided with participants and consultants (e.g. conferences, podcasts).

The paper will be shared with the participants and consultants and the organisations that the consultants represent (e.g. on websites).

**Further information and contact details**

You can contact the primary researcher, Jessica Blumsom, via email on: Jb20adk@herts.ac.uk
Appendix G: Participant Consent Form

Participant Consent Form

A narrative analysis of told and untold stories within families of the Windrush Generation

Primary researcher: Jessica Blumsom (Trainee Clinical Psychologist, University of Hertfordshire)

Primary supervisor: Dr Emma Karwatzki (Clinical Psychologist and Programme Director, University of Hertfordshire)

Secondary supervisor: Dr Aishath Nasheeda (Assistant Professor and Programme Co-ordinator, Bachelor of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Studies, Villa College QI Campus, Maldives)

Consultant on supervisory team: Dr David Herndandez-Saca (Associate Professor, University of Northern Iowa)

If you agree, please initial in the box

1. I voluntarily agree to participate in the research project

2. I have read and understood the participant information sheet

3. In addition to the written participant information sheet, the purpose and nature of the research project has been verbally explained to me in a manner in that I have understood and I have had the opportunity to ask questions.

4. I understand that even if I consent to participate now, I can withdraw at any time or refuse to answer any question without any consequences of any kind. If I withdraw within two weeks of my interview, my data will be deleted. If I withdraw after two weeks, I understand that my data will still be used, but direct quotes will not be included in the write-up.

5. I understand that participation involves undergoing a semi-structured interview. This interview will be via video call or in-person depending on my preferences and in guidance with COVID-19 guidelines. The interview will be recorded and I agree to my interview being audio-recorded.
6. I understand that all information I provide for this research will be treated confidentially between the primary researcher, principal supervisor, secondary supervisor and the consultant panel. This will include the principal researcher and secondary supervisor viewing the interview data as part of data analysis. Your data will not be shared with the consultant panel.

7. If applicable – I consent to having an advocate to join the interviews as a source of support and I understand that they will maintain confidentiality throughout the interview process.

8. I understand that this research will lead to the write-up being published in an academic journal. It will also lead to dissemination in other methods (e.g. conferences, podcasts). I understand that identifiable information that could be used to identify me will not be included in the write-up.

9. I understand that I am free to contact the primary researcher, Jessica to seek further clarification and information: jb20adk@herts.ac.uk

10. There may the possibility for this research to lead into future projects. If you are not happy to be contacted for this, please leave this blank.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Participant</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jessica Blumsom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Person Taking Consent</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Appendix H: University of Hertfordshire Ethics Approval

HEALTH, SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY ECDA
ETHICS APPROVAL NOTIFICATION

TO: Jessica Blumson
CC: Dr. Jacqui Scott
FROM: [Redacted], Health, Science, Engineering & Technology ECDA Chair
DATE: 03/08/2022

Protocol number: LMS/PGT/UH/06076
Title of study: A narrative analysis of told and untold stories of pain, coping strategies and emotion within families of the Windrush Generation

Your application for ethics approval has been accepted and approved with the following conditions by the ECDA for your School and includes work undertaken for this study by the named additional workers below:

no additional workers named

General conditions of approval:

Ethics approval has been granted subject to the standard conditions below:

Permissions: Any necessary permissions for the use of premises/location and accessing participants for your study must be obtained in writing prior to any data collection commencing. Failure to obtain adequate permissions may be considered a breach of this protocol.

External communications: Ensure you quote the UH protocol number and the name of the approving Committee on all paperwork, including recruitment advertisements/online requests, for this study.

Invasive procedures: If your research involves invasive procedures you are required to complete and submit an EC7 Protocol Monitoring Form, and copies of your completed consent paperwork to this ECDA once your study is complete.

Submission: Students must include this Approval Notification with their submission.

Validity:

This approval is valid:

From: 03/08/2022
To: 31/12/2022
Appendix I: Reflective Log Example Questions and Extracts

Table 1:

*Examples Questions taken from Patel and Keval (2018)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions to reflect upon at an individual and research level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. What are the White privileges that I have and utilise in my personal and professional life?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What am I prepared to lose in order for Whiteness to be dismantled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What power structures and institutional practices am I involved in, recruited into, or collude with, which perpetuate racism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What can I do to help dismantle White privilege and dominance in my work?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do I utilise my experience of oppression on one axis (e.g. gender, class) to defend against challenges of Whiteness or to deny Whiteness and my part in race making and racism?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How does Whiteness impact on Black people?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Who and how does racism hurt and harm?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What knowledges have we assumed and perpetuate as ‘the’ knowledges and preferred theories?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Whom and which groups does this benefit, and at whose expense?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Who or what is de-centred and rendered invisible in the perpetuation of these dominant knowledges?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. How do we continue to reproduce Whiteness in the research process and knowledge production?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How do we advocate and perpetuate the application of dominant Eurocentric knowledges to the ‘other’, the ‘neglected 95%’ (Arnett, 2008)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What knowledges, experiences and practices do we ignore or disqualify?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. What happens when White privilege and dominance is named and challenged?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What are reactions and which defences are mobilised when Whiteness and racial oppression is named?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Who and where are there allies in this contestation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. When the challenging and decolonising is done by a Black person, what happens to the challenger(s), how do colleagues respond to them?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. When the challenging and decolonising is done by a White person, what happens to the challenger(s), how do colleagues respond to them?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20. What do we need to work together in staying in this journey of decolonising?

21. What may happen if we do not engage in decolonising? Where is the harm and who is likely to be disadvantaged, adversely affected and harmed?

Reflective Log Example Questions:

Individual Level

What are the White privileges that I have and utilise in my personal and professional life?

I have been reflecting on the privilege that my whiteness brings in both my personal and professional life and how this connects to power. For example, in a professional context, my ideas on formulations and care plans are less likely to be challenged or argued against, I’m more likely to be “taken seriously” when it comes to clinical work, case discussions and in team meetings. This enables me to use my position of power to advocate for views that I have around clients, in a way that perhaps others cannot. In my personal life, I’m less likely to be stopped by the police and, if I am, I’m more likely to be treated respectfully. In general, others in society will not view me with suspicion. If I speak out about injustice I am less likely to be seen as arguing or a “trouble maker.”

I have been thinking about how my whiteness has contributed to where I am today – how my whiteness has enabled me to progress through school and the education system, to be helped more by teachers, to be pushed more academically and seen as capable of achieving. Relatedly, I have been considering how my whiteness will have helped me to get jobs more easily and how this links to my quality of life (e.g. being able to work as a waitress whilst being an assistant psychologist helped me to save enough money for a deposit on a flat, and now I have more housing security).

I have also been thinking about what my whiteness allows me to step away from, when thinking about how I utilise the privilege in my personal life. I like to think that I am active in speaking out about injustice and inequality in society. I have often used social media, such as Instagram, to share posts and stories to be part of spreading awareness about injustice (e.g. the murders of ethnically diverse individuals in society) and I have given my reflections/views on political and societal matters (e.g. government policies around refugees and asylum seekers). However, I have the privilege of being able to step away from this when I feel fatigued, in a way that people who are ethnically diverse do not. If I want to take a break from social media and from speaking out I can, and there won’t be ramifications for me in this regard. I often hold onto the notion that any exhaustion I feel with trying to fight against systems and advocate for the rights of others, is minimal in comparison to having to live through experiences of injustice, in a way that I do not because of my whiteness.
Academics and Trainers Level

*What happens when White privilege and dominance is named and challenged?*

I think this may depend upon the context of who is having the conversation and in what setting. For example, I have found that when talking to mental health professionals, friends in psychology or social work or lecturers on the doctorate course, they are more likely to name and challenge white privilege and dominance, whereas people I have spoken to who do not work in these fields, where perhaps these conversations are not fostered as much, are more resistant to it.

I have been reflecting that often conversations regarding white privilege become intertwined with other aspects of intersectionality. A common experience that I have had when talking with colleagues in the workplace or on the doctorate course is that white privilege is related to class. For example, when people who are ethnically diverse have spoken about experiences of racism and white privilege, I have often heard white colleagues try to assume similarity and connection with their experiences by linking this to their experiences of oppression due to class. I think this relates to who is naming and challenging white privilege and who is part of these conversations. Whenever I have had these discussions, it is rare that someone who is ethnically diverse has disputed white privilege (although it has happened, and in these cases I wonder about assimilation and internalised racism), however it is the case that white people will often try to counter-argue the notion of white privilege. This takes me back to conversation I had with a white psychology colleague where we were talking about ‘reverse racism’ and I mentioned that I didn’t believe it existed because of white privilege and racism being about power. They gave an example about being the only white person in a team and feeling excluded, and also mentioned other parts of their intersectionality such as speaking English as a second language. They expressed that they felt they had no power in this situation. It made me reflect upon how in this situation, this colleague had one experience of feeling excluded in a way that people who are ethnically diverse regularly do when they enter white-dominated spaces. I also wondered about this distinction of power in a particular moment in time versus systemic power. I feel that even if a white person may be the only white person in a space, they still have more overall power contextually in UK society. These reflections have made me consider the defences that can be held onto when we name and challenge white privilege and how it can be difficult to look inwards as white people and accept that we are part of a system, particularly when we’ve had other experiences of oppression (e.g., class, learning English as a second language). I have heard, for example, white colleagues in psychology suggesting that white privilege should be called ‘white advantage’ as the notion of privilege made them feel uncomfortable. I think this is an interesting idea that white individuals would like the terminology to be changed, as I am not sure that this is appropriate for white people to choose how terms are defined, given that people who are impacted by white privilege should be able to define this in a way that resonates for them.

I wonder how naming and challenging white privilege relates to the way that racism and white privilege are spoken about in the media and society. For example, I think that most people agree that overt acts of racism are easier to identify and can be challenged more easily. However, the more subtle/covert acts of racism are less able to be challenged. This takes me back to the media rhetoric around Ukrainian refugees. I empathise with the ongoing war in Ukraine and I align with Ukraine and do not condone their suffering, however the way that Ukrainian refugees have been spoken about in the media and society and welcomed with open arms, in contrast to Syrian, Afghani and Sudanese individuals (as some examples), was a clear example to me of racism in the context of
white privilege. I recall talking to some of my family members about this at the time, and they dismissed this idea that it was anything to do with racism and white privilege. It makes me think about the fact that white privilege is a concept that has been misused in the media and I wonder if this connects to some white individuals wanting to steer away from this term when having conversations around racism.

I have also thought about the difference between naming white privilege and challenging it. I think it is easier to say white privilege exists and that white people hold more power and dominance in society, but challenging it is a much bigger step beyond this. I wonder how this links to who is part of conversations. For instance, I have been in all-white spaces where people have spoken in ways that they may not have if a person who is ethnically diverse was present. I wonder if there's a thought that white privilege and racism won't be challenged in these spaces. Again, I wonder how this links back to the media in that when racism/white privilege has been challenged, the conversations have turned onto the person who challenged it, as if this was worse than the racism/privilege enacted in itself. Perhaps this connects to people's definition of racism and that this isn't uniform. I think when there is a belief that racism is intertwined with attacking people's character, it can evoke defensiveness and then it is more difficult to challenge, whereas if it's seen as something socially constructed related to power in society, and can change by moment-to-moment (e.g. someone can do something racist the one day and anti-racist another), perhaps it is easier to challenge.

**Team Level**

When and why are conversations about Whiteness and racism confined to corridors, private offices or informal settings; and in hushed or speculative tones and with euphemisms, numerous qualifiers and declarations of "this is very sensitive", "we have to be careful" etc.? What does this do to race?

I think that when conversations around whiteness and racism are held in private spaces or are quietened, it can send a message that it could be dangerous to talk about racism and ethnicity. I wonder if it can contribute to an environment of fear, where naming racism and white privilege feels worse than the experiences that ethnically diverse individuals have in the workplace. I wonder if it continues to deny the lived experiences of people who are ethnically diverse, as it doesn't promote a firm stance of acknowledging the harm that racism causes. I wonder if it also serves to maintain cultures of racism in workplaces, as when this isn't spoken about and acknowledged in public spaces, this inadvertently allows racism to continue, as there is not an active stance to challenge it. I have reflected that looking back in all of the teams that I have worked in, conversations around whiteness and racism have been rare, or if they have taken place it's been in clinical sessions with service users, in supervision or the occasional psychology meeting, however there has never been a whole-team discussion or approach to this and it has not been brought up in reflective spaces.

I wonder how the quietening of conversations around whiteness and racism also shifts the responsibility onto people who are ethnically diverse to bring up these conversations, yet simultaneously also sends a message to not bring this up. By not bringing up whiteness and racism in public spaces and therefore leaving the onus on people who are ethnically diverse to bring this into conversation, it could continue the fatigue for people who are ethnically diverse to keep fighting for justice without support.
With regards to the why conversations around whiteness and racism may be quietened, I wonder if this too relates to fear – fear of “saying the wrong thing” and causing more harm – yet also perhaps to shame, where we (white people) can feel ashamed or embarrassed to acknowledge our own privilege and biases. It would be inauthentic if I said that I had never felt scared of saying the wrong thing during conversations around racism, however I think that this fear when talking about racism, privilege and whiteness serves to paralyse people from having conversations and moving forwards and it’s important that we push past it. I think that it is unfeasible to think that we will always get things right and we will never say things that are wrong and cause harm (and the same is true for any matter of social justice), however I think it comes back to what our intentions are and how we repair and manage any harm. I always think of the saying by Vikki Reynolds that if the harm is public, then the apology should be too. This is not to say that I think we can go in blindly, and one of the things that I have found uncomfortable in discussions of racism, whiteness and ethnicity on the doctorate course is that there was a phrase around being “clumsy” and allowing clumsiness. I think that we need to reflect on our personal context, biases and lens, however I think there is something about acknowledging that we will make mistakes. Being open with that, and in our repair, could help to reduce some of the fear and shame associated with these conversations.

**Institutional Level**

How is anti-racism watered down, drowned or made invisible in the diversity agenda (or its variants)?

I have reflected that I often find the diversity agenda within the NHS (alongside other institutions not related to healthcare) rather tokenistic, as I think that often institutions are focusing on increasing access for people who are ethnically diverse, without considering the environment that they are asking people to step into. For example, conversations around employing people who are ethnically diverse into workforces are not had in conjunction with considering the steps that will be taken to make these spaces feel safer, and what institutions will be doing to address whiteness in these spaces as one way of facilitating safety (e.g. considering organisational dynamics, leadership styles and attitudes of staff members).

Additionally, I think that there is something about the diversity agenda where white people do not engage in this space, or perhaps we do not think it is our responsibility or role to be a part of this. Whenever I have entered spaces that are usually termed ‘ethnic minority’ or ‘BAME’ networks/spaces within the NHS, there are a minority of white people in attendance. I think it is complex, as I believe that people who are ethnically diverse should have their own spaces where they feel safe and can talk about these concepts. However, I wonder how the lack of presence of white people in this network moves the responsibility onto ethnically diverse individuals as opposed to different ethnicities, particularly those who hold the most systemic power, coming together to work towards a common goal of equality. I know that I too am part of this as I have not always engaged in these spaces whilst on different placements and I have the privilege of stepping out of these spaces when other clinical commitments have clashed with meetings.
The notion of responsibility is an interesting one. It reminds me of a conversation that I have previously had with a psychology team that I have been a part of, where we were talking about how we could connect a service user to their faith community and work with local imams. I mentioned in the conversation that it not only felt important to help facilitate this connection, but also the importance of our psychology team – especially as an all-white team – to learn more about the Islamic faith ourselves through self-directed learning. The conversation transitioned into thinking about the make-up of our team and one of the members mentioned about wanting to hire someone who was ethnically diverse to join our team. For me, this comes back to the expectation we can have for people who are ethnically diverse to educate and teach us things, without doing the work ourselves and I wonder if there is something about the diversity agenda, which has a goal of encouraging people who are ethnically diverse to enter spaces, with a bi-product of that being that white people can learn from them. I, again, acknowledge that I’m not separate from this and I have had conversations with people who are ethnically diverse around racism, and I believe there is some merit in being able to hear from oppressed communities about their lived experiences (as long as there is consent for this and these conversations are held in a sensitive way). However, perhaps there is something about the diversity agenda that prevents/hinders white people from being encouraged to do their own anti-racism work.

I think it’s interesting to consider how the diversity agenda can prompt a narrative around positive discrimination and I have heard a number of white people talking about the ‘unfairness’ associated with people who are ethnically diverse ‘getting jobs over them’ because of their ethnicity. I think this can be a dangerous rhetoric for the anti-racism movement and it doesn’t account for the fact that the dominant, white group have had privileges for centuries, and there is an acknowledgement that this needs to be balanced, and those in power need to lose things, in order for change to occur. When I’ve had conversations about this in my personal life, people have often asked me whether I would have given up my place on the doctorate. Ultimately, my answer is yes as I know that it would be easier for me to re-apply and get another place the following year. Irrespective of this, I think it’s important to think about how the diversity agenda can actually prompt more racism with regards to people’s views on positive discrimination and how the diversity agenda can be used by people in power to fuel racist rhetoric that people who are ethnically diverse are ‘stealing our jobs’, for example.

I also wonder if there is something about the word ‘diversity’ that still looks at ethnicity from a position where whiteness is centred as a norm and people who are ethnically diverse are away from this norm. I’m aware this might seem ironic when I use the term ethnically diverse to describe people of the global majority, however I am using the language that the consultant panel felt best described their community. I think the issue is complex, as it’s incredibly important to acknowledge the nuances in people’s identity and if were to ignore people’s ethnicity, we are ignoring their experiences of oppression, however it’s something to consider about whether institutions are approaching diversity with a lens that whiteness is the norm instead of how communities are coming together collaboratively to advocate for equality.
Reflective Log Extracts:

18th January 2022 – searching for consultant panel

I was invited to a meeting this evening with some potential consultant panel members to share information about the project. The meeting prompted me to reflect about what my whiteness represents to people of African and Caribbean heritage. I was conscious that I was entering a protected space that was set-up for people of African and Caribbean heritage to discuss Windrush and wider social, cultural and political issues impacting ethnically diverse individuals. I was mindful of my outsider status and that I hadn’t attended before. I experienced during the meeting that there was some apprehension towards my motives for the project and there was some questioning around this. It has led me to think about how people who are ethnically diverse have been harmed in the past by research and science and how this perception has been maintained over time. It has led me to reflect that perhaps it would have been better to attend the meeting a couple of times beforehand, to introduce myself and spend time building rapport before introducing my research. The experience also led me to further reflect about my own emotions/physical sensations that arise in relation to my whiteness. I noticed that operations of white fragility were present at times as I felt uncomfortable with the questioning. During the meeting, I reminded myself that I was experiencing what people who are ethnically diverse experience the majority of the time in terms of being a minority in a space and being questioned. However, in an attempt to treat myself with compassion, I have thought about the fact that white people have been socialised into this fragility and guilt, and I went back to my values and intentions around this project. I thought about the fact that whilst I did have feelings of discomfort at times, I was able to recognise these in the moment and hold them privately, without allowing my reactions to influence how I interacted with the group. For example, I would like to think that I didn’t rush to defend myself and my position and instead answered the questions in an open way and I understood where this was coming from.

10th September 2022 – consultant panel meeting

I had a consultant panel meeting yesterday afternoon where we were discussing the set-up of the interviews and how these could be facilitated. We discussed having an initial telephone or video call prior to interviews to help build rapport. One of the consultants mentioned having the option for participants to bring another person to the interview. This was described by the consultant as having an ‘advocate’ present, in an observing role, who could be a source of support for the person following the interview. This has led to me reflect around how research is/ can be decolonising science and how we begin to work together to do this. When the consultant first mentioned this idea I noticed that I felt open to this, but I also began to worry about what the regulations were from the viewpoint of the University and whether rules around confidentiality would stop this idea from coming into fruition. I began to think about the friction between the bureaucracy of University legislation and the need to make adaptations to be more culturally sensitive and decolonise our ways of working. For example, I was considering the value placed in Caribbean cultures for community and collective practices, and the importance of coming together, and how having an advocate could be part of this. Following the meeting, I emailed my principal supervisor and explained the utility of this suggestion to help participants feel more comfortable. My supervisor responded with some hesitation around whether this could fit into a Narrative Analysis framework, so I took this to my secondary supervisor, who has expertise in Narrative Analysis, for clarification. It was agreed that we can include an advocate in interviews and I was told that I need to submit a new ethics form to confirm the changes. I have been reflecting that it was a shame that this decision has only been accepted as it doesn’t disturb the framework of the Narrative Analysis, and that I have to jump through the hoops of submitting further ethics forms. However, I feel glad that I was able to honour the suggestion of the consultant panel and to take this to University to campaign for this to become part of the project.
8th December 2022 – extending recruitment reflections

I submitted another ethics form to extend the recruitment process, as I have not yet conducted an interview and the ethics form is due to expire on 31st December 2022. I have two interviews booked in for mid-December, however I am hoping to recruit 10 participants and I am beginning to worry that this will not be achieved, as I have been trying to recruit since September 2022. I have found it a little surprising that I only have two interviews organised so far, as I know that the consultant panel have worked hard to distribute the participant information sheet and a poster/shortened version of this out to their networks. This has reached over 50+ people and so I am wondering if there is something about the poster or the way that the project is being described that is meaning people don’t want to come forward, or whether it’s due to my outsider status and perhaps trust. I have been thinking about the use of language in the description that may be alienating people. For example, the term “intergenerational trauma” is a psychological term/jargon and I wonder if this isn’t aligning with a decolonising stance of making psychology more accessible.

I have shared my concerns with my principal supervisor and with the consultant panel too. The consultant panel have been incredibly helpful in asking that information disseminated about the project is short/concise, which I have endeavoured to do. I have been reflecting about the utility in adding another recruitment strategy, such as sharing through social media and also through me emailing organisations too, to help spur on recruitment. This will be in addition to the consultant’s emailing their organisations and asking participants who are being interviewed to refer any participants to the study. I have taken these ideas to my principal supervisor and there were some initial concerns around previous trainees recruiting people using social media and participants perhaps not meeting the inclusion criteria. However, I reasoned that an important aspect of decolonising psychology/ research/ science is to use non-academic platforms and avenues to reach people that otherwise may not hear about the project. It was agreed that I will reach out to already established psychology pages and ask them if they can share the project information. I have discussed this with the consultants to check their views on this and they too believe that sharing the project on social media will be a good next step to try to find more participants for the study.

2nd February 2023 – following a narrative workshop

We have had two Narrative Analysis workshops now and I am feeling a little overwhelmed with the complexities of NA as an approach. I am mindful that this is a new method for me and I am still coming to terms with how to analyse research using this approach. In our most recent meeting earlier today, we began to go through an interview extract, to get an initial sense of how we could begin to code these – looking at content, structure, performance and wider meanings/context. I noticed that I found this exercise quite hard and perhaps this is in part because it wasn’t my data, but I have also realised that I am putting a lot of pressure on myself around doing justice to participant stories. I am worried that I might do the analysis ‘wrong’ and that participants could then be disappointed or upset in the analysis that has been written. Since the meeting, I have been trying to hold in mind my epistemological stance and using this to ground me when I am having these anxieties. For example, a social constructionist epistemology and a constructionist approach to Narrative Analysis acknowledges and reasons that people are limited by their own lens, biases and contexts and that this is appreciated as a double hermeneutics when facilitating research. This has made me feel slightly less pressured as I can understand that my interpretations are hypotheses, similar to the hypotheses I can make in clinical work in the NHS, and that it’s not about searching for ‘truth’ and ‘reality’ but more thinking about how these stories are situated and what they’re telling us about stories of Windrush.
### Appendix J: Interview Reflective Notes Extract

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview no.</th>
<th>Reflections throughout the interview</th>
<th>Other observations throughout the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Before – had to rush to find a room at University and so feel a bit stressed. Pink wall reminds me of mum’s office. Ask to clarify – worry questions not right Talking broadly – want her to talk about personal relationship/ own family. Dad’s side – relief Diverse/didn’t have racism – Alex and class debate Coloured – confused Community – tension as not about family Confused at nonchalance Feel like doesn’t want to go into racism No friend work – mum bullied 3rd year – me applying for jobs – scary Not good enough – agree/ like her tenacity/ fiery Cat sat on mat – shocked That man paid his money – feel good for her/him. Never went to London – feel taking my questions literally as opposed to thinking what could have been Felt tension when talking about Windrush in the general sense not parents in terms of what she knows Family tree – thought of maternal grandfather No aggro on street – thought of arguments at home that neighbours could hear Past – does she understand questions – literal – not about her past? Harden up – confusing why laughing Battery running low + no charger – distracted me from conversation Not going to change – feels hopeless Accept it – sad, contradiction to earlier?</td>
<td>Smiling a lot, speaking quite fast – nervous? Bubbly Some frustration when recalling stories of racism (e.g. bakery example)? Some eye rolling and grimacing/ pursing lips, raising eyebrows, shaking head. Feeling like I needed to prompt/guide more. I’m coming from a context of feeling worried about the data answering the question, am I changing my stance? Feels like it flows more than others – less um’s/ pauses in stories. Also maybe felt a bit rushed? Was she less connected and that’s why there’s less um’s?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix K: Interview Transcript Extracts

Transcript 1:

Sam: okay, so the first question, that is tell us about your relationship to the Windrush generation.

Tina: Yes, I grew up in Windrush, I suppose, because I arrived 2/7 days, um, in August 1963 with my mother and 2 of my siblings. My dad and older siblings, I believe, we left our sister behind in Dominica because they were too young, but they were born from England, um, she was about 11, um, and my brother, who was us, 12, 13, um, my sister, Ms, who was about 1, um, accompanied with my mother. My father was actually in England, he arrived in 1956, 7, 8 months before the ship, that is to say, in 1955. So, um, they lived here in London, in West London, actually, in Bayswater, not far from where I live now, um, until 1958, when my mom became pregnant with me, and, um, she said, he didn't want to see me when I was born until 1963, so he went back to Dominica, so I was actually conceived in England, um, so, yes, my 3 older siblings obviously were already born, um, my mother had left us with, had left them with my grandmother, I suppose, that the come back to England, um, and sort of, they wouldn't want to see that moment, um, so when the ship arrived they were, of course, left in England actually, um.

Isa: I was confused because we all had um, um, problems with attachment, um, and I suppose if you don't have anything about Windrush generation, then you'll probably think that there's a large problem with attachment with that generation of children, because so many children were left with relatives, sometimes not even relatives, just people. So, while those parents didn't have the time, they didn't have the opportunity to be there, to be with them, they were in England, which is something that happened, um, so when the British children were invited to meet the English children there's fiction as well sometimes, but I was confused because I didn't have the moment.

Sam: So, um, when I was 2 years and um, 9 months my mother took the 3 of us by boat to England, and left my sister behind in Dominica.

Transcript 4:

Contact – also something about meaning making

interaction (between speakers and myself)

Isa: Okay, so tell us about your relationship to the Windrush generation.

Marie: I grew up in Windrush, I suppose, because we became the children of the British people during that time that they called the Windrush Generation. I'm 2 of the children, so, I think that's my relationship to the Windrush generation.

Sam: Is there anything else that you want to say about, um, how you feel about Windrush, or about being a second generation?

Marie: It's a privilege to be part of this movement, and also something about being a second generation.

Isa: Go on, go on, go on, go on, go on, go on.

Marie: I’m going to bring up something that is important to me, how I feel, um, I feel that I grew up in the Windrush generation, and also something about the fact that I feel like I'm part of the Windrush community.

Sam: Is there anything else that you want to say about, um, how you feel about Windrush, or about being a second generation?

Marie: It's a privilege to be part of this movement, and also something about being a second generation.
M. Yeah, um, yeah, that did make me laugh because, she goes, she goes, she just said, in Jamaican accent, really it's, really, you know, and I mean like, and then she said the story and I went, I was just like, you know, that was it, and that was it. And then you know, she'd provide the excuse for the nose and everything else but she wouldn't, yeah, she just wouldn't, I mean, just a little bit...

J. A story?

M. Yeah...

J. A story, um, was it a quote, there's quote marks in here, but she was walking down a road and she actually ended up, going on. It's interesting, she used to wake up and find all the time, yes, and she ended up actually that
Appendix L: Codes/Symbols for Transcripts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speech marks - “”</td>
<td>The speaker is quoting another person</td>
<td>“excuse me, Mr. Judge, what you mean what you mean you’re not going to”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square brackets – []</td>
<td>Indicating that the person said part of a word and didn’t finish it</td>
<td>I don’t know whether that changed her mo[tives]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyphenated - -</td>
<td>Indicates a broken word</td>
<td>I sort of have this amb-ambivalence remembering them as well</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bold - bold</td>
<td>Meaning that the word highlighted in bold was emphasised</td>
<td>when I say memorial it sounds quite dirty,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upwards arrow - ↑word(s)↑</td>
<td>Meaning that the word(s) book-ended by two upwards</td>
<td>they lived here in London, in ↑West London↑ actually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downwards arrow - ↓word(s)↓</td>
<td>Meaning that the word(s) book-ended by two downwards arrows changed to a lower tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitals - CAPITALS</td>
<td>Meaning that the word with capitals was said in a louder volume</td>
<td>I suppose my parents didn’t have OTHER children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italics - italics</td>
<td>Meaning that the word in italics was said in a quieter volume</td>
<td>Um, some years ago, oh gosh what year was it, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underline - ________</td>
<td>Meaning that something was said in a faster pace</td>
<td>I’ll say, oh my gosh, yes, I remember those days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than and more than signs - &lt; &gt;</td>
<td>Meaning that something was said in a slower pace</td>
<td>I think she was a, a, &lt;Catholic&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward slash - /</td>
<td>For when people use an acronym and verbalise the letters of the acronym to shorten a longer word</td>
<td>and it was the, the National Rail, National Union of Railway, the n/u/r,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asterisk - *</td>
<td>For when people have used an offensive word that causes harm to others</td>
<td>you know you’re walking down the street and somebody turns round and calls you an f*****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>