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Abstract

Information studies have identified numerous needs and barriers to the integration of asylum seekers and refugees; however, little emphasis has been placed thus far on their need to keep their own culture, values, and traditions alive. In this work we use ethnographic constructivist grounded theory to explore the place of heritage in the information experience of people who have sought asylum in the United Kingdom. Based on our findings, we propose to conceptualise heritage as an affective and meaningful information literacy practice. Such conceptualisation fosters integration by allowing people to simultaneously maintain their own ways of knowing and adapt to local ones. Our research approach provides scholars with a conceptual tool to holistically explore affective, meaningful, and cultural information practices. This study also reveals implications for policymakers, third sector organisations, and cultural institutions working towards the more sustainable integration of asylum seekers and refugees.
BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

This study investigates how defining heritage from an information perspective contributes to building a comprehensive understanding of the integration of asylum seekers and refugees. To settle down in a new life after seeking asylum is a difficult process that often involves dealing with post-traumatic disorders while facing socioeconomic hardship, having to navigate complex administrative procedures, together with a new language and different cultural codes (Priebe, Giacco & El-Nagib, 2016). Scholars have increasingly investigated the information experience of asylum seekers to understand how host societies can best help them to face these challenges and integrate more fluidly.

Scholarship in this area stems from an understanding of integration as an information problem (Caïdi & Allard, 2005). When settling in a new country, individuals may be unfamiliar with the way the information around them is shaped and transmitted. This leads to difficulties in finding, understanding, and using the information they need to take an active part in society. Lloyd (2017a) refers to this process as having a “fractured information landscape”: as individuals transition from one information environment to another, the way they understand and interact with information is shattered. This can be particularly problematic for asylum seekers and refugees, for the traumatic circumstances of their departure from their homeland may affect their information needs and the capacity to cope with a new information environment (Lloyd et al., 2013). By understanding how they seek, use, and share information, and what the barriers to information activities are, host societies can adapt their services in a more inclusive way, enabling newcomers to participate in society.

Studies of the information experience of asylum seekers and refugees have highlighted a variety of practical information needs, such as physical and mental healthcare, housing, education, employment, finances, legal processes, daily life, children services, mobility, and language (Alam & Imran, 2015; Allen et al., 2004; Diaz Andrade & Doolin, 2018; Kaufmann, 2018; Kennan & al., 2011; Lloyd & Wilkinson, 2016; Lloyd et al., 2017; Mansour, 2018; Martzoukou & Burnett, 2018; Oduntan & Ruthven, 2019; Schreieck, et al., 2017; Silvio, 2006). Social needs also appear particularly important, as studies show that social contact is the main channel of information used by asylum seekers and refugees (Alam & Imran, 2015; Diaz Andrade & Doolin, 2018; Lloyd & Wilkinson, 2016; Martzoukou & Burnett, 2018; Oduntan & Ruthven,
Among these social networks, the importance of connecting with people from the same cultural background is often emphasised as a way to overcome information gaps and to negotiate information literacy (Kennan & al., 2011; Lloyd et al., 2017; Mansour, 2018; Oduntan & Ruthven, 2017; Quirke, 2012; Silvio, 2006). Studies also mention the need to seek information about one’s home country and to communicate with family abroad (Díaz Andrade & Doolin, 2016; Kaufmann, 2018; Mansour, 2018; Mehra and Papajohn, 2007; Schreieck et al., 2017; Silvio, 2006; Wilding, 2012).

Overall, these studies show how host societies can help refugees and asylum seekers to adapt to new environments. However, less emphasis is placed on how these societies can enable newcomers to keep alive their own culture, values, and traditions. Integration is a two-way process, which includes both “a preparedness on the part of refugees to adapt to the host society without having to forego their own cultural identity, and a corresponding readiness on the part of host communities and public institutions to welcome refugees and to meet the needs of a diverse population” (UNHCR, 2014, p.1). Moreover, information scholars have argued that in order to fully comprehend the complexity of human life, information studies should not be limited to utilitarian needs, but should also encompass information activities that are driven by the need for “higher things” in life, which are pleasurable and profound (Kari & Hartel, 2007).

Refugee information studies have highlighted the role of leisure and “information grounds” (Pettigrew, 1999) in facilitating social interactions and thus fostering integration (Elmore, 2017; Oduntan & Ruthven, 2021; Quirke, 2012; Varheim, 2014). However, such social interactions are mainly framed as “social capital” (Bourdieu, 1986): their benefit to the integration process is seen as resulting from an understanding of socialization as a resource that facilitates information access and literacy. Yet the pleasurable and profound dimension of these interactions has not been fully investigated. A number of studies have explored the need for refugees to maintain and express a sense of cultural identity and belonging through the lens of information and communication technologies (Díaz Andrade & Doolin, 2016; Gifford & Wilding, 2013; Wilding, 2012). We argue that in order to achieve a comprehensive picture of refugees information experiences, the role of “higher things” in their life should be considered. This approach avoids “othering” refugees by framing their experience as strictly different from that of people living with a different legal status (Awad & Tossel, 2019).
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FOCUS OF THIS WORK

In order to address this research gap, our study frames heritage as one of the “higher” dimensions of human life, forming an integral part of the information experience of asylum seekers and refugees.

Outside the information field, heritage has been shown to be a key aspect of the integration of people in exile (Ashley, 2016; Chatelard, 2017; Innocenti, 2015; Labadi, 2018; Le Louvier, 2019). Such works builds on a definition of heritage that encompasses intangible forms of heritage practices, identified by UNESCO (2003) as: “(a) oral traditions and expressions, including language as a vehicle of the intangible cultural heritage; (b) performing arts; (c) social practices, rituals and festive events; (d) knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe; (e) traditional craftsmanship.” Such a definition has led to the recognition of heritage as a human right (Council of Europe, 2005), and as a key component of physical and mental wellbeing (O’Neill, 2010). Conceptualising heritage as a cultural practice rather than a product also allows investigation of what heritage means for people who have been uprooted from their homelands, and how heritage travels with them through the migration journey. Research has shown that for migrants, refugees, and asylum seekers, heritage can constitute an act of citizenship that enhances their sense of belonging and recognition, helping them to respond to the social, economic, and psychological shocks that they face in exile (Chatelard, 2017; Ashley, 2016; Innocenti 2015). From this perspective, the affective quality of heritage (Ashley and Frank 2016) and its capacity to give meaning can be instrumental to the integration process.

We first discuss how similarities between the fields of information practices and critical heritage studies can allow us to bring the two approaches together. We then explore what characterises heritage from an information perspective, and how heritage contributes to the integration of asylum seekers and refugees, using part of the data collection (observation vignettes and interviews) and findings of a larger ethnographic study on the everyday information experience of asylum seekers in England (UK) (Le Louvier, 2020). Finally, we develop a conceptual framework of heritage as an affective and meaningful information literacy practice, which fosters integration by allowing people to simultaneously maintain their own ways of knowing and adapt to local ones. We conclude by discussing the contributions to both refugee information studies
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and information literacy research, together with the implications for policymakers and heritage actors.

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN HERITAGE AND INFORMATION APPROACHES

Connections between heritage and information are mostly investigated via the lens of information management and technology, as seen in the fields of digital heritage, digital museums, and cultural informatics. However, from an information perspective heritage has not been widely explored in relation to asylum seekers and refugees. To integrate heritage studies with information works on asylum seekers and refugees, we first show how the two disciplines have evolved. Then, we discuss the connections and similarities that emerge from the use of a practice theory approach to both fields.

Over time, both information and heritage evolved from a material approach to an anthropological perspective. In the 1970s, information research shifted from concentrating on “artifacts and venues of information seeking” to a focus on individuals as information agents (Case & Given, 2016, p.6). Around the 2000s, the definition of heritage as monuments, sites, and groups of building that had dominated the Western discourse since the 19th century, and was universalised by the UNESCO’s “World Heritage Convention” (1972), evolved to include intangible practices and focus on people as heritage actors (UNESCO, 2003; Council of Europe, 2005). This shift came with a “heritage from below” movement, which emphasised the role of individuals’ everyday life stories as forms of heritage equally valuable to the grand narratives of national heroes (Robertson, 2012). This turn to ordinary life contexts can also be seen in information research, where models such as information poverty (Chatman, 1996) or the Everyday Life Information Seeking model (Savolainen, 1995) moved the focus from libraries, educational and workplace settings to socially excluded groups and daily life. In both disciplines, the turn to a more anthropological approach came with a conception of information and heritage being increasingly defined as practices.

Practice theory (Schatzki, 2002) considers that human action is always determined by a structure that is specific to a unique social site. The norms and rules that constitute this structure do not have meaning per se, but are enacted through a nexus of actions that form a practice (Giddens, 1984). This means that although it is constrained by a larger structure, a practice is never static. When enacting it, people have the agency to both reproduce and transform the practice. Thus,
practice is not simply about doing but also “doing in a historical and social context that gives structure and meaning to what we do” (Wenger, 1999, p.47). People who are engaged in the same practice build, over time, a special way of knowing and doing that shapes the specific landscape of the practice. This landscape is negotiated through interpersonal relations and exchanges of information. Someone new to the community builds an understanding of the landscape by engaging in the practice with others; this shared history of learning fosters a sense of belonging that makes one part of the community of practice (Wenger, 1999). Therefore, the community emerges through the enactment of the practice.

Within practice theory, an information practice corresponds to the ways in which people interacting within a same information environment enact its structure, that is its legitimised way to “identify, seek, use and share information” (Savolainen, 2008, p.2). Information practices are not synonyms of information activities: they do not refer to seeking, using, or sharing information, but to the rules and norms that structure these activities within a specific context, and that individuals enact through them. Thinking along those lines, information practices are not universal but specific to each sociocultural contexts. This means that when people immigrate into a “culturally alien information environment” (Mehra and Papajohn, 2007, p.13), they may not be familiar with its legitimised information practices, leading them to experience a “fractured information landscape” (Lloyd, 2017a).

Adopting this practice approach to information, Lloyd (2010a) considers an information landscape as the way in which a particular social group builds a collective way of knowing within a specific spatio-temporal context, corresponding to a specific information environment. This landscape represents “an intersubjective space that reflects the taken for granted and agreed modalities and sources of information that people who are engaged in collective enterprises and performances agree upon and legitimise” (Lloyd, 2017a, p.39). Within this framework, information literacy is not a set of universal skills that individuals acquire, but a practice co-constructed by people sharing the same information landscape (Lloyd, 2010a). An information literacy practice is a collective way of knowing about how information is shaped and enabled, what constitutes legitimate information sources, and how to operationalise that landscape’s information skills and activities (Lloyd, 2012). When entering new information environments, refugees need to reconstruct these landscapes around them. They learn to understand and integrate information landscapes by engaging with the practices that structure them through
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activities such as information sharing and mapping, and observing and listening (Lloyd et al., 2013). They become information literate by being situated in the landscape, interacting with other members of the practice, and developing a mastery of what constitutes the practice and how to know about it. Through this shared history of learning, information literacy practice allows refugees to become members of the specific community of practice of that landscape.

According to Lloyd, information literacy practice is made possible through “affordances” (Lloyd and Wilkinson 2016; Lloyd, et al, 2017). The term “affordance” is a relational property that refers to the latent meaning of the environment, and which corresponds to what the elements of the environment call us to do (Gibson, 2015). In the information context, affordances correspond to the elements of a setting, or information environment, that invite individuals to interact with information and construct meaning in certain ways. Individuals only seize these affordances if they perceive them as meaningful and valuable, a judgment that is shaped within a specific information literacy practice (Lloyd, 2010a). The UK asylum system, as a specific information environment, is constituted of various material (such as asylum claims) and interpersonal elements (for example authorities, charity workers, asylum seekers) (Le Louvier, 2020). For individuals to learn how to navigate the information environment of the asylum system and rebuild their information landscape within it, they need to identify which of these elements will help them to understand the practice. Charity workers play an important role in that process, but only if individuals exchange information with them – that is, only if they recognise them as important sources of information within this practice and therefore seize the affordance they provide. By learning to recognise and seize these affordances, asylum seekers enact the information literacy practice of the asylum system, and become members of its community of practice.

The practice approach to information literacy has similarities with the field of critical heritage studies, which highlights its socio-political complexities (Gentry & Smith, 2019). Within this field, heritage has also been described as “a way of knowing and seeing” (Smith, 2006, p.54). Smith (2006) considers heritage as always intangible, for it is not an external monument, artefact or immaterial form of culture, but the value created when people experience these elements. Scholars have defined heritage as a verb (Harvey, 2001), a “process of engagement, an act of communication and an act of making meaning in and for the present” (Smith, 2006, p.1). Heritage is thus understood as a practice: it corresponds to the rules and norms according to
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which a community values, legitimises, and safeguards certain ways of knowing and doing. These are not fixed, as through the enactment of heritage, people negotiate these rules and norms inherited from the past in the context of the needs of the present (Gentry & Smith, 2019). The Council of Europe (2005) defines a “heritage community” as a group of people identifying with a same heritage, which they safeguard through their actions, or practice. Heritage forms part of people’s identity and can furnish people who, like refugees, face particular hardship, with a sense of pride, belonging, and continuity (Chatelard, 2017; Le Louvier, 2019). In this context, the concept of affordances has been defined in two ways: as the relation between the physical properties of a heritage landscape and the human being that prompts the act of heritage (Alves, 2014), and as the external stimuli that provoke the possibility of a biographic narrative (Candau and Ferreira, 2015).

In both disciplines, heritage and information literacy are defined as embodied sense-making practices. People learn how to understand and navigate new information environments by interacting with other people and elements of their environment, and recognising what are the collectively valued and legitimatised information practices within that environment. They perform their heritage by engaging their body in actions such as singing or cooking, to which they attribute meaning and affect. In both cases, the practice links people to their communities. This enables refugees to become part of new information communities of practice by learning to value and enact its specific ways of knowing, while heritage connects people who value and enact the same aspects of their past together as part of specific heritage communities. In this paper we investigate these links by analysing the place of heritage in the information experience of asylum seekers and refugees.

METHODOLOGY

In order to generate a comprehensive account of the information experience of people in exile that encompasses both utilitarian requirements and “higher” necessities, we conducted a twenty-one month ethnographic investigation into the everyday life of people who have sought asylum in Newcastle-Gateshead, England (UK) (Le Louvier 2020). In this paper we focus on heritage as affective and meaningful information literacy practice and discuss some of the data collected and analysed in that larger study.
We used an ethnographic constructivist grounded theory to analyse information and heritage as practices, because we wanted to focus on how individuals interact and negotiate meaning within a specific context (Charmaz, 1995, p.28).

The ethnographic immersion in the field involved four types of data collection techniques:

1. Three two hour long sensitising workshops that engaged four participants in participatory information mapping and diagramming activities (Le Louvier & Innocenti, 2019).

2. Unobtrusive participant observations conducted by the first author who acted as a part-time volunteer on the sites of four local third sector organisations supporting refugees and asylum seekers. This took place for an average of six hours per week over an eighteen month period.

3. Fifteen in-depth, audio-recorded and semi-structured interviews with insiders who came from diverse cultural backgrounds and who had experienced the asylum process in England, with an average of one hour and twenty-one minutes for each interview.

4. Twelve in-depth, audio-recorded and semi-structured interviews with practitioners and volunteers in local third sector organisations and local authorities, with an average of one hour and thirty-six minutes for each interview.

The three types of data collected through these techniques (diagrams, interview transcripts, and observation field notes) were combined and analysed using the constructivist grounded theory’s constant comparison method (Charmaz, 2006). This led to the creation of a broad and rich picture of the field. A variety of information needs, barriers, and enablers were identified that related to the political, practical, social, and affective aspects of the asylum process that the participants experienced in relation to the UK asylum system and the local third sector (Le Louvier, 2020). Among the different parts of the participants experience that were analysed in this study, one category referred to the participants’ relation to their past, culture, and heritage. This paper solely focuses on this category, and discusses the findings that emerged from the analysis of the observation field notes and insider interview transcripts on which this category is based.

**Participant observations**
In ethnography, observations constitute a popular technique to “discover how people behave and interact in particular situations” (Pickard, 2013, p.225). In our study, this technique was used to observe how people who have settled in Newcastle-Gateshead after seeking asylum experienced and interacted with information across various settings.

Participant observations were conducted by the first author on the sites of four local third sector organisations supporting refugees and asylum seekers through advice, English language practice, music, gardening, and craft activities. These social situations had been identified by initial research as meaningful and recurrent activities that structured the everyday life of different groups of local asylum seekers and refugees. The aim was not to use each individual site as a case study to compare with others, but to draw from their differences in activities, size, structure, locations, and membership to add depth to the ethnography.

We argue that conducting observations is particularly important in the context of asylum seekers and refugees in the UK, because in this country the procedure for refugee status determination via multiple interviews and questioning is blighted by ‘cultures of denial and of disbelief’ (Souter 2011, p.57; see also Schuster 2018).

Participant observations were designed to be unobtrusive. The level of participation depended on the position of the first author within these organisations, and varied from facilitating language activities to learning to play the violin alongside other participants. Most of the field notes were taken immediately after the event occurred, allowing the first author to fully participate in these interactions.

Various observations were recorded: impressions, interactions with participants, interactions between participants or between the participants and their environment, together with observations related to the structure of the organisation, as well as reflections on the first author’s position in the field. When an event seemed particularly meaningful, it was described as a vignette, using an ethnographic narrative style to convey the participants’ individuality and agency, and best describe interactions with their environment (Emerson, Fretz & Shaw, 2011).

**Semi-structured interviews with insiders**

Semi-structured interviews were conducted by the first author with fifteen people who had an insider experience of the asylum process in the UK. The aim was to record different perspectives on the process of settling in Newcastle-Gateshead after claiming asylum, and to contrast
observations with the informants’ interpretations of their own experience, in line with constructivist grounded theory (Charmaz, 2006). Interviews proves useful in learning about the personal experiences and feelings of the participants (Kvale, 1996), and let them express and interpret their life stories in their own words.

Interviewees were recruited via word of mouth across local third sector organisations, and at two different English language classes. Most of the interviewees were people who the first author had met during her volunteering activities. This familiarity facilitated in-depth discussion, while our reflexive approach maintained the distance between balance and empathy (O’Reilly 2009).

In line with previous refugee information studies (see Alan & Imran, 2015; Lloyd et al, 2013; Lloyd et al, 2017; Oduntan & Ruthven, 2019), we used a combination of convenience and maximum variation purposive sampling to include participants that reflected a diversity of individual experiences:

- Male and female interviewees came from eight of the most common countries of origin for asylum seekers in the region (WERS, 2018): Bangladesh, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Iran, Iraq, Libya, Sri Lanka and Syria; one interviewee was stateless and two chose not to disclose this information;
- Seven out of fifteen interviewees had not yet been recognised as refugees.

Participants were over eighteen years old, had settled in the UK through the asylum route, lived in Newcastle-Gateshead, and had a reasonable command of either English or French (the first author is a native French speaker and fluent in English). When the interview was conducted in a language that was not the participant’s first language, the length of the interviews facilitated the mitigation of communication barriers to further explanations oneself, repeat, and/or use an online translator when needed.

The interview covered four main themes: the local area, the asylum system, information practices, and cultural practices. Each theme was first explored through an open-ended question, such as “do you remember your first day in Newcastle?”, “what was your experience of the asylum process?”, “where do you go when you need information?”, or “what element of your culture is important for you to keep?”. These questions intended to leave space for the interviewees to explore the topics they deemed relevant, to avoid those they did not wish to disclose, to develop their own interpretation, and to “encourage unanticipated statements and
stories to emerge” (Charmaz, 2006, p.26). They were followed by more specific questions, which were based on the interviewee’s input and aimed at exploring these themes in greater depth.

**Data analysis**

The simultaneous data collection and analysis phase comprised four iteratively conducted stages: initial, focused, axial and theoretical coding (Charmaz, 2006).

Each time a new piece of data was collected (field note or interview), an initial coding of that material was done, using the qualitative data analysis software NVivo. The aim of initial coding was to create code names that were as close as possible to the data in order to avoid theoretical bias (Charmaz, 2006). We conducted incident-by-incident coding to break down each meaningful unit of data into different codes.

Across the 1,814 initial codes created during the analysis, 154 codes related to the participants’ relationship to their past, culture, and heritage. They represented a variety of practices, which related to clothes, drawing, the environment, family, food, gardening, healthcare, hospitality, language, memory, music, smells, spirituality, traditional celebrations, and values. These initial codes were grouped under the “enacting heritage” focused coding category. The latter formed an important part of the axial coding category that was labelled as “healing” and encompassed the practices used by the participant to heal the fracture created by the asylum process.

Through the theoretical coding process, “enacting heritage” became “heritage literacy enactment”, one of the key components of our grounded theory of information inclusion (Le Louvier, 2020). This theory was developed together with that of information exclusion to explain how certain communities of practice structure information in ways that enhance or fracture asylum seekers’ sense of agency, belonging, and identity. Here we discuss this category to provide an empirical and conceptual dialogue around the role of heritage in the information and integration experience of asylum seekers.

**Methodological considerations**

By sharing contexts with research participants for almost two years, building trustful relationships, and using a variety of research techniques that adapt to the iterative analysis of the data, we were able to uncover both explicit and implicit aspects of these experiences. This time in the field allowed us to gain a nuanced comprehension of the settings, avoiding
misinterpretations, and verifying some of the accounts given. Long-term engagement also meant that we could gain some distance and thus the ability to adopt a more critical perspective on what the first author was witnessing.

We explored the role of heritage in the participants’ information experience using a combination of different data collection techniques. Interviews allowed incorporation of the direct voice of the participants, while observations permitted interpretations to be refined over time, gathering a variety of perspectives, and bypassing some of the language and cultural barriers that stood between the participants and the researcher.

Heritage is an abstract concept that has specific connotations in the English language, UK context, and academic terminology; it may not make sense to people outside the context of heritage professionals and academics. Moreover, heritage can be a problematic idea for people who were forced to flee their home country and whose belonging to the local community might be contested. During the interviews, various participants minimised the importance of keeping a bond to their culture, emphasising their motivation to integrate to the local culture and to look to the future. For instance, one interviewee stated:

>The war, like my life was really difficult. So if I forget these things, only the clean things will stay. And then it’s better to think about the future, to have a different life, to make yourself stronger, to thinking of what you will do.

Yet, later in the interview, the participant came back to this topic with more nuance:

> We have different food cultures. Maybe because of when I grew up, the flavours are still in my mind. I don’t care about food at all but, when I eat, I remember different times in my life.

Another participant similarly said that, for them, “celebration was dead”, as they did not want to take part in celebrations related to a country that had forced them to flee. Yet, one week later, they organised and invited people to a festive event (Vignette 1). Although talking about heritage was often difficult, it was still very much part of the participants’ everyday life. Combining interviews with observations revealed that in some instances, what people said was at odds with what they did, and observations were the most useful technique to capture these implicit behaviours.

Participant observations placed the first author in the position of a human instrument immersed in the field, attuned to the emotions and sensations of the participants (Darling, 2014). This was important in order to understand the multi-sensory and affective aspects of the participants’
heritage-associated information experiences. Narrative vignettes were particularly useful to convey these characteristics, and to best show how heritage functions as a practice and communicative act afforded in a specific context.

Writing field notes is an interpretive process, not a neutral transcription of events. What was remembered and found meaningful, as well as the way in which it was transcribed, resulted from the first author’s own perspective and interpretation, and was therefore neither complete nor absolute. Moreover, access to the participants’ everyday life was only possible through specific social situations framed by local third sector organisations, providing a fractured and partial view of their experiences. These limitations were partly mitigated by adding insider interviews, where the participants’ experiences was recorded directly, without the extra layer of interpretation that field notes enjoin. Some observations were also discussed with the interviewees, in order to triangulate the researcher’s interpretation, assess whether they related to common experiences, and ask for more details.

**Ethical considerations**

During the interviews, participants provided signed and informed consent. However, this type of consent was not appropriate with our participant observations. The aim of the observations was to be able to share activities and experiences with participants on an equal footing. While most participants were aware of the first author’s position as a researcher, asking for signed consent in the contexts where the observations took place would have distorted the relational dynamics between the parties and may have led participants to modify their behaviour (Hammersley and Atkinson, 2007; Oliver & Eales, 2008). The position of the first author as a new volunteer, rather than as a researcher who may be viewed as a knowledge holder, helped mitigate some of the power dynamics that can be involved in this kind of research: she could learn how the organisations worked or how to perform some of the activities offered therein (e.g., playing the violin, harvesting potatoes, learning English idioms) either *from* the other participants or *alongside* them. Further, the nature of the organisations where observations took place made obtaining signed consent very challenging, as participants were engaged in different activities and new people could arrive every week. This means than some of the participants were well aware of the researcher’s aim and took part in interviews in which they could discuss the observations, while other participants only came to these organisations once and were not aware...
of the research project. Thus, our participant observations were neither fully overt nor fully
covert: they constantly moved across this continuum (Roulet et al., 2017).

To mitigate the ethical challenges associated with the lack of informed consent with partially
covert participant observations, we adopted a “situated ethics” approach (Nyberg, 2008; Roulet
et al., 2017). This meant constantly reflecting on the ethics of the researcher’s actions and
decisions, and establishing procedures to alleviate risks and protect the participants’ safety and
confidentiality through institutional ethics approval, data anonymisation, data minimisation, and
involvement beyond the research. The first step was to receive ethical approval from the ethics
board of the Faculty of Engineering and Environment at the University of Northumbria. Then,
we ensured that all the data resulting from participant observations was fully anonymised.
Furthermore, no information that was too personal, or may have compromised the participants’
personal safety or asylum claim was recorded. This means that the vast majority of the
information gathered through the researcher’s long-term engagement in the field was not
recorded. Nevertheless, it contributed to the research by providing a more nuanced understanding
of the participants’ everyday life. Finally, the first author was a volunteer before, during, and
after she conducted the participant observations. This avoided employing extractive data
collection methods whereby researchers take advantage of participants’ data without providing
any mutual benefits (Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995).

To preserve the participants’ safety and confidentiality, the data presented in this paper is fully
anonymised; the pronoun “they” is used as a gender-neutral identifier that preserves anonymity.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Our constructivist grounded theory study of the information experience of asylum seekers allows
us to better understand what heritage means from an information perspective, and how it
contributes to the process of integration. Findings show that heritage is an affective and
meaningful information literacy practice: through heritage enactments afforded by
environmental, contextual, and organisational factors, participants are able to rebuild a sense of
meaning and identity. These enactments allow to bridge the gap between the meaningful ways of
knowing they carry with them into exile and the challenging information environments they
encounter in their host societies.
We discuss these findings through the analysis of three narrative vignettes extracted from the field notes (Table 1) and related insider’s interview excerpts taken over a twenty-one months ethnographic immersion in the field. Through the coding process, these vignettes and interview excerpts became part of the “heritage literacy enactment” component of our theory of information inclusion, as practices respectively important for the participants to enhance their sense of agency, belonging, and identity. The three vignettes selected in this paper were chosen because they represent three forms of intangible heritage (knowledge practices concerning nature and the universe, festive events, and performing arts, as defined by UNESCO, 2003), that frequently appeared in our fieldnotes and interviews. As such, they illustrate the participant’s relation to their past, culture, and heritage, and the sensory and dialogic dimensions of the heritage practices observed throughout our larger ethnographic fieldwork.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vignette 1</th>
<th>Vignette 2</th>
<th>Vignette 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Festive events</strong></td>
<td><strong>Performing arts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Knowledge practices concerning nature and the universe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heritage as affective and meaningful information literacy practice</strong></td>
<td>• Sharing familiar multisensory information</td>
<td>• Identifying meaningful information in music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Enacting political heritage</td>
<td>• Enacting knowledge about nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strong affective component</td>
<td>• Strong affective component</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bridging the gap between ways of knowing and new information environments</strong></td>
<td>• Enacting hospitality</td>
<td>• Connecting to community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Recreating a familiar multisensory environment</td>
<td>• Sharing autobiographical information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regaining social status</td>
<td>• Asserting identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sharing autobiographical information</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1 – Overview of key insights from vignettes and interview data presented in this paper**

We build on these vignettes and interview excerpts to 1) develop a characterisation of heritage as an affective and meaningful information literacy practice; 2) analyse how it contributes to the participants’ sense of integration.
Heritage as an affective and meaningful information literacy practice

Our study shows that heritage enactments involve a variety of information activities (for example information seeking, sharing, and using) which are experienced as affective and meaningful. This is notably illustrated in the following vignette, which presents a festive event organised by a member of a local language group:

Vignette 1

They prepared a lot of food: a delicious aubergine puree with peanut butter, a similar dish made with black beans, a huge salad, and a tahini smoothie, all served with the traditional bread. They insisted that I had to finish my plate and had more food, although I clearly could not. They said that in their culture, guests had to finish their plate, and that they could come whenever they wanted to, but the host was to decide when they could leave. Then, they made a delicious coffee with ginger, cinnamon and cardamom. They also burned some sandalwood on a tin to perfume the room, and put some music on.

For the participant, the traditional celebration is a way to share information with their guest through various forms, including food, smells, music, and dialogue. The information they share is not only verbal, but also includes a variety of sensory feelings. Heritage enactment thus allows them to recreate a multi-sensory information environment that they are familiar with. For other participants, heritage involves sharing information through specific clothes, a song, or a drawing of a childhood memory.

Whatever form they take, the multi-sensory information activities through which heritage is enacted are always imbued with affect. Across the field notes and insiders’ interviews, heritage was associated with a variety of feelings, including comfort, familiarity, happiness, identity, luck, nostalgia, pride, purpose, relaxation, and self-worth. Affect is also visible in Vignette 2, which takes place during a music workshops for migrants, asylum seekers, and refugees:

Vignette 2

After the choir, one of the members performed a song with their guitar. They dedicated it to their friends, who are political prisoners. They named them one by one, and told us about the horrible conditions of prisoners in that country. The person sat next to me gave them a very warm and genuine applause. Then, the performer sang a song from one of their favourite artists, who seemed to be a political resistant. My neighbour was again really touched and joined the tribute. At the end, they went to see the singer to congratulate and thank them. It was interesting to feel the emotion, to feel that something deeply meaningful and emotional was happening that only these two people could really understand. This emotion was probably amplified by the fact that for my neighbour, this was an unexpected encounter. They only came to the open-mic to follow their friends, and did not know they would experience this connection with someone who shared the same
political and musical heritage, and would express it in such a powerful way. After this performance, they started telling me about their life, as if the music had awakened memories of their past that they needed to share.

This vignette begins with a participant listening to someone else singing a song they know. They identify this verbal and musical information as meaningful, for it resonates with their language and political identity. Reception of this linguistic and musical information is experienced as strongly emotional. For critical heritage scholars, “our engagements with heritage are almost entirely figured through the politics of affective registers such as pain, loss, joy, nostalgia, pleasure, belonging or anger” (Tolia-Kelly et al, 2017, p.1). The registers are clearly visible in vignette 2, as the political and cultural heritage enacted by the participant when they listen to the song brings up bitter-sweet emotions that permeate their behaviour. This affect brings back memories that led the participant to share autobiographical information with the first author.

The link between heritage, affect, memory and autobiographical account is also visible in Vignette 3, which presents a scene of everyday life at a local charity providing therapeutic horticultural activities for people who have sought asylum in the UK. Each weekly session is punctuated by a communal meal, followed by dishes duties. The vignette occurs in a small kitchen where dishes are cleaned; a window, placed above the sink, provides a view on the allotment. The first author discusses with one regular member of the charity, who has struggled with a long asylum process that negatively impacted their mental health:

Vignette 3

On that day, after lunch, they were doing the dishes, I was drying them, and we started talking. They told me that when they arrived in the UK, they used to be very depressed. This changed when they started to join the charity’s sessions. Here, they were able to socialise with other people and, more importantly, they could reconnect with nature. Nature had talked to them and showed them the way. They said that they no longer needed to take medications. They looked strong and confident, and encouraged me to have trust in myself in order to be successful in life.

In this vignette, the participant talks about their relationship with nature, which the horticultural charity allowed them to nurture; their remark indicates that being in nature is for them a communication experience through which they seek information in the environment. They interpret this information as meaningful according to their own knowledge about nature, and in
doing so, enact an animistic spiritual practice. The difficulties of exile and of going through the
UK asylum system led them to battle through mental health issues. Being able to enact their
spiritual practice by finding information in their environment allows them to see “the way”, and
to build the resilience they need to cope with their situation. The heritage enactment is
experienced as an affective activity as well as a meaningful one: the participant uses heritage to
find the meaning they need in their life.

This search for meaning is also visible in the story of an interviewee, whose asylum application
had been rejected:

> When my lawyer brought me the news, I thought I should commit suicide to stop living.
> But I was right to pray, because if I commit suicide, I will go to hell, I won’t go to heaven.
> [...] I would die in peace, while back home I would be tortured [...] But when I read the
> Bible, I thought: no, the struggle continues. God is with me.

Here, the interviewee does not seek information in nature, but in the Bible. They interpret this
information through the prism of their own Christian spiritual practice: this allows them to find
hope and strength. Heritage also helps them to assert their identity as someone who belongs to
the Christian heritage community. The link between heritage and identity is also visible in
Vignettes 2 and 3, where the heritage enactment leads to participants to narrate their personal
story, as if heritage had helped them to make sense of who they are. These examples show that
the information activities involved in the enactment of heritage are experienced as meaningful
and profound. As the higher contexts described by Kari & Hartel (2007, p. 1133) these activities
constitute “the special ‘ingredients’ that make human life meaningful, shape our very identity,
and give us the reason to live in the first place”.

In our examples participants do not just seek information but rather enact their knowledge of
what information activities can allow them to perform this meaning-making and identity-making
process. In this context, heritage is neither an information activity (e.g., seeking information),
nor an information practice (e.g., seeking information in nature in a way that references the rules
of one’s heritage community of practice). Instead, we define heritage as an information literacy
practice, that is the enactment of one’s knowledge about what is a valued and meaningful way of
knowing within a specific community of practice. In Vignette 3, the heritage information literacy
practice is the participant’s enactment of their knowledge about how to seek information in
nature and how to perform it as a spiritual act.
Participants describe their heritage as coming from their family and their culture. Not everyone experiences nature as a spiritual practice, or a political song as a deeply meaningful tribute: nature, songs, food, traditional events, the Bible or a piece of African clothing, do not constitute affective and meaningful information per se. They become affective and meaningful because of their significance to one’s cultural and familial memory. Therefore in this paper we do not consider heritage as a context for personally meaningful information activities, as in Gorichanaz’s (2019) conceptualisation of Bible reading or ultradistance running. Instead, we consider heritage as a type of information literacy practice that involves affective and meaningful information activities. Participants have learnt to recognise what constitutes affective and meaningful information in an information environment, and what is the best way to seek, use and share this information, by socialising within their own heritage community. When they enact their heritage, they enact the knowledges, activities, skills and affects that are normalised, legitimised, and valued within this heritage community. Through the enactment of heritage as an information literacy practice, participants also experience their belonging to this community. In the next section, we show how this contributes to the processes of integration.

**Bridging the gap between ways of knowing**

According to Lloyd (2017b), an information literacy practice is negotiated through the embodied knowledges of a social site, and therefore requires presence. While this is also true for individuals who learn to become information literate within a specific heritage community, the experience of exile means that asylum seekers and refugees are uprooted from their heritage communities. Consequently, they do not usually enact their heritage information literacy practices in an environment where they constitutes the norms of the majority. Our study shows that this distant enactment allows participants to bridge the gap between distinct ways of knowing. In particular, we see that heritage facilitates two types of connection for asylum seekers and refugees:

1. *Connection to the remote past.* Heritage allows participants to maintain a connection to meaningful aspects of their familial and cultural history and to give space to these meaningful and affective information literacies in their new, at times hostile, environment.
2. **Connection to the local present.** Heritage enables participants to adapt to their new environment through the prism of familiar ways of knowing and doing. They create a meaningful link with members of their heritage community who share the same context, as well as with members of other heritage communities.

Lloyd (2017a) shows that exile causes a “disjunction between the familiar and unfamiliar which fractures [refugees’] way of knowing” (p.40). This is a particularly challenging experience for asylum seekers and refugees who are confronted with both unfamiliar information environments, and practices which are at times hostile (Le Louvier, 2020). As seen in the examples above, this leads some of the participants to experience mental health issues. In contrast with these challenges that force participant to adapt to new ways of knowing, heritage allows them to enact information literacies practices that they master and value.

For many participants, becoming an asylum seeker in the UK meant losing everything they had: adopting a new status, in a new society, is often experienced as a downgrade. Hospitality appears to allow some of them to reverse this situation. In Vignette 1, for instance, the participant enacts their heritage by recreating a familiar multisensory information environment. This allows them to reverse their social position: within the heritage practice, they are the literate person, while guests who are not part of the same heritage community face an unfamiliar information environment. Similarly, an interviewee said that as a Kurd living in Iran, they already used to be treated like a second-class citizen, but that as an asylum seeker in the UK, they even felt like a third-class citizen. Through hospitality however, they could regain the sense of social status they used to have within their home community:

Why is it so important for you to invite people over?

[…] this is important for culture for Kurdish people, because […] Kurdish people they have lords and peasants, and my family, they are lords. For example, my grandfather, my family, they are lords and one lord has some children, they are family, and you know, this is different life because if you are a tribe and you are the lord you have to support your peasants about everything. […] In my family, all the time people came. […] You get used to have people coming to your house. […] Now, if for example, if a lot of people eat together, if I eat, for me it's very good. But if I’m alone, really I cannot eat.

Similar to what Chatelard (2017) observes in reference to Syrian refugees, the provision of hospitality appears in this interview as in Vignette 1 as a meaningful heritage practice, which allows participants to assert their identity, be proud of who they are despite their situation of
marginalisation, and rebuild a sense of self-worth by regaining a sense of social status that reflects their values.

A related process is described by this interviewee, whose heritage enactment allowed them to be proud of their identity:

> I used to be ashamed [...]. I don't want people to know I am Muslim, I don't want people to know I am African. Because the picture that people have of African, you know. So I used to pretend I'm English [...] I was going mad. [...] Then I started to follow my culture, to come back to what I used to know. So I started praying, I started cooking my own food and being proud of who I am. I stopped drinking. I stopped smoking. I changed friends. And then what my eyes used to beautify for me before, it doesn't beautify for me anymore. [...] I got this traditional clothing from back in Africa and I always wear it in town [...] I learned that if I left by culture behind, then I can never go forward. [...] I learned that my power is in my culture, and my strength is there.

Here, the interviewee enacts their heritage by ostensibly sharing cultural information through their clothes, food, and religious practice. They use these signs to feel more rooted and confident, and more connected to their self.

While familiarity is often seen as mundane, our study shows that for people in exile, who are uprooted from the grounds of their information literacy practice communities, the experience of familiarity is rare, and therefore particularly valued. Familiarity also enables a sense of continuity: the positive aspects of the participants’ past are not erased, for they are bearers of their memory. This sense of continuity appears to help participants to find the dignity, self-confidence and strength that they need to cope with their situation. The enactment of a heritage information literacy practice can therefore be seen as a time to rest and restore oneself that is necessary for people to be able to face up more difficult moments.

Through the heritage information literacy practice, different information literacy practices are not only placed in a state of superposition, they are also bridged. By mostly using non-verbal, sensory information, heritage allows sharing personal, cultural and affective information that people pertaining to a different linguistic and cultural community of practice can still understand. When witnessing a heritage information literacy practice, such as a traditional event or a music performance, one can recognise the importance and affect of the moment without fully understanding its meaning. Even when expressed through words, heritage is particularly valued when it is shared. Interviewees notably refer to celebrations as particularly enjoyable event, as it facilitates this bridging process:
If you are in environment or in situation like meeting, like celebration, [...] we share anything that we know. So we share songs, I share dance steps of traditional dance, I share food and also they do the same thing, the people who are in the celebration. [...] So we are just having fun you know, we just enjoy, we are expressing human life stuff. So this is the way of life, this is how people enjoy, how people express things, how people are happy.

We have special celebration, it's important for me to keep it, and some food as well. I like to show my culture to other and some celebration, and some sweets, or some food. My culture is very important, and I like to show it to others. [...] And I like new cultures, I like to try other cultures, but I like to keep my culture and show it to others. Because I'm proud about it.

Heritage also appears as a way to enact an information literacy practice that references a distant social site within a local, but unfamiliar, information environment. In Vignette 2, a connection is established between the two heritage actors present in the scene, as well as with other members of that heritage community, even though they are not located in the territory where that community emerged. In Vignettes 2 and 3, the heritage enactment leads participants to sharing autobiographical information, which anchors their past in the local moment. As an act of “past-presencing” (MacDonald, 2012), heritage thus appears as a way for individuals living in exile to bring the distant closer, by enacting the information literacy practice of their heritage community within a different social site. By allowing people’s past and distant literacies to anchor in an unfamiliar local information environment, heritage enhances participants’ sense of belonging to both their heritage community and the local one.

By facilitating both adaptation to the local ways of knowing and perpetuation of familiar ones, heritage enactments afford two different information literacy practices to integrate with each other: the information literacy practice of the local context and that of the individual’s heritage community. This allows participants to reconstruct information landscapes where both information literacy practices can coexist. Participants then gain a confidence that is visible in the assertiveness of their movement and voice. Heritage thus facilitates the two tenets of integration (Castles et al., 2002): it enables individuals to both adapt to the local society and to maintain a link to their cultural identity.

CONCLUSIONS

Building on the conception of information literacy as an embodied practice (Lloyd, 2010b) and of heritage as always intangible (Smith, 2006), this paper shows the connection and synergy between both processes using observation vignettes and interview excerpts of a larger
ethnographic grounded theory study. Within our proposed conceptual framework, heritage is defined as a specific type of information literacy practice that involves affective and meaningful ways of knowing and doing, shaped by specific heritage communities. This means that a heritage enactment such as a traditional celebration, or a spiritual communication with nature is an expression of a specific knowledge regarding how to perform information activities referencing experiences that are identified and transmitted as meaningful and affective within a specific community. The enactment of a heritage information literacy practice enables asylum seekers and refugees to find meaning, rebuild their identity in exile, and reconstruct information landscapes where both the information literacy practice of their local context and that inherited from their past are integrated.

By showing the importance of heritage within the life of asylum seekers and refugees, this paper joins the calls in information studies to further investigate these meaningful aspects of life (Kari & Hartel, 2007; Gorichanaz, 2019). This is especially important when looking at disadvantaged populations for whom the focus tends to be on practical needs rather than on other human experiences involving pleasurable and profound dimensions. Such focus also contributes to advancing knowledge in this area by characterising the specificity of heritage as a type of affective and meaningful information practice that connects individuals to their heritage communities. Our work provides further evidence of the beneficial effects of heritage in a context of forced displacement (Chatelard, 2017; Le Louvier, 2019), by showing how it allows people to develop resilience in the midst of a difficult process of resettlement.

By highlighting the effects of heritage within the information experience of refugees and asylum seekers, this paper demonstrates that a comprehensive approach to integration necessitates a consideration of the various aspects of human life, ranging from functional needs, to emotional and cultural ones. Lloyd & Wilkinson (2016) observe that upon resettlement, refugees must reconstruct new information landscapes that combine the way of knowing of their host society with their previous landscapes, and other studies highlight the importance for them to express their cultural identity (Díaz Andrade & Doolin, 2016; Gifford & Wilding, 2013; Wilding, 2012). By conceptualising heritage as an affective and meaningful information literacy practice, this paper provides a tool for a deeper investigation of the simultaneous process of cultural maintenance and adaptation. It shows that heritage provides ways for individuals to develop a sense of inclusion by allowing meaningful and familiar literacies inherited from the past to
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integrate within a less familiar local environment, thus rebuilding information landscapes where both local and heritage information literacy practices can coexist.

Such interdisciplinary framework allows considering the emic perspective of people going through exile: not only investigating what host societies require for them to adapt to their new environment, but also what individuals themselves find meaningful and essential to their personal sense of belonging. This can inform policymaking by highlighting domains of inclusion such as affect, meaning and culture, not as secondary needs but as aspects of life that are necessary for people to develop their resilience.

Considering heritage as an information literacy practice also means characterising heritage as a way of knowing, emerging from a variety of everyday life contexts that are not commonly considered as heritage sites or institutions. In particular, this study showed that local charities were particularly prone to facilitate heritage enactments, although they were not explicitly dedicated to safeguarding heritage. Promoting access to, and enhancing the sustainability of, small organisations that provide space for asylum seekers and refugees to enact their heritage, be it through knowledge practices concerning nature and the universe, festive events, performing arts, or any other heritage activity, thus appears essential for host societies to foster a more sustainable integration.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to the University of Northumbria for supporting this research and to the four anonymous reviewers, the review editor, the managing editor, the immediate past Editor and the new Editor in Chief for the very insightful and constructive comments on this paper. Ed Hyatt (University of Northumbria) and Ian Ruthven (University of Strathclyde) provided useful feedback in revising the manuscript. Our deepest thanks goes to the asylum seekers and refugees for generously giving their time and sharing their experiences in this study.

References


HERITAGE AS A MEANINGFUL INFORMATION LITERACY PRACTICE


HERITAGE AS A MEANINGFUL INFORMATION LITERACY PRACTICE


HERITAGE AS A MEANINGFUL INFORMATION LITERACY PRACTICE


