Migrant place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods: moving beyond ethno-national approaches

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Migrant place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods: moving beyond ethno-national approaches

Abstract: Whilst attention has previously focused on the importance of monolithic ethnic identities on migrant place-making less attention has been paid to how place-making proceeds in super-diverse urban neighbourhoods where no single ethnic group predominates. This paper makes an original contribution by identifying the factors that shape migrants affinity with, or alienation from, super-diverse neighbourhoods. Through using and critiquing an analytical framework developed by Gill (2010) that identifies 'ideal' and 'pathological' place-making strategies, the paper contrasts two super-diverse neighbourhoods in the UK with different histories of diversity. We show how 'ideal' migrant place-making is more likely to occur where there is a common neighbourhood identity based around diversity, difference and / or newness, and where those with 'visible' differences can blend in. In contrast, 'pathologies' are more likely where the on-going churn of newcomers, coupled with the speed and recency of change, undermine migrant's affinity with place and where the diversity of the neighbourhood is not yet embedded. Even where neighbourhood identity based on diversity is established, it may alienate less visible migrants and culminate in a new form of (minority) white flight.

Keywords – Super-diversity; neighbourhood; migrant place-making

1. Introduction

This paper contributes new knowledge about the ways in which migrant place-making proceeds in super-diverse areas. It highlights how multiple aspects of super-diversity and the visibility of individuals can be equally important as ethno-national identity in shaping attachment and affinity to the neighbourhood. In so doing, it moves beyond existing analyses of migrant place-making that focus on single ethnic groups.

The paper identifies experiences of place-making in two different areas: one with a long history of diversity and another more recently diversifying. It extends existing knowledge to long-standing interests on the influences shaping place-making in the United States (U.S.) and Western Europe (see Amith, 2005; Juan, 2005; Fortier, 2000; Ryan et al., 2008).

Migrant place-making has been recognised as a way for migrants to forge and assert a collective identity amongst host populations, and particularly when faced with issues of discrimination (Castles and Davidson 2009; Gill, 2010). In addition, place-making amongst migrant populations can be understood as a mechanism – both physically and conceptually - to establish the validity and aspirations of a new community (Gill 2010). However, place-making can be both constructive and destructive. It can provide the opportunity for migrants to retain a national identity in their destination countries, lead to conflict and issues of exclusion, alienation, resistance and can become a catalyst for racism (Amith, 2005; Castles and Davidson, 2009). The majority of research that has focused on migrant place-making involves single, relatively large, bounded (and concentrated) ethnic groups building distinctive migrant places or neighbourhoods, reflecting this single ethno-national identity. Such neighbourhood identities involve understanding how individuals relate to where they live and to each other, and in what

ways a neighbourhood identity may evolve (Robertson et al., 2008). But to date, little attention has focused on migrant place-making in areas that are increasingly super-diverse.

The concept of super-diversity was introduced by Vertovec (2007) to describe a demographic condition in which populations are more diverse than ever before. Whilst super-diversity encompasses the idea of individuals arriving from many places, it is simultaneously conceptualised as "the diversification of diversity" wherein populations are diverse in multiple and intersecting ways, for example by ethnicity, faith, immigration status, rights and entitlements, gender and age, and patterns of spatial distribution (Vertovec, 2007). Super-diversity moves beyond the idea of multicultural communities consisting of a small number of ethnic groups frequently living in close proximity to each other as distinct diaspora. Instead, communities are so diverse that there are no dominant ethnic groups. Super-diversity extends Logan and Zhang's (2010) idea of global communities residing in mixed race neighbourhoods. Rather, super-diverse neighbourhoods are demographically 'layered', accommodating both old ('established') and new ('more recently arrived') immigrants from multiple countries of origin, as well as long-standing non-migrant populations.

Such places are frequently fast changing and termed by Robinson (2010) as "arrival zones" – housing new arrivals in the initial stages of their residence. As yet, no tipping-point between being a multicultural and a super-diverse neighbourhood has been identified. However, it is widely recognised that the scale, complexity, heterogeneity, fragmentation of populations and speed and spread of change exceeds anything

previously experienced (Meissner and Vertovec, 2015), outpacing attempts to understand new and evolving representations of place (Massey, 2013).

This paper fills an important gap in knowledge about how place-making proceeds when no single ethnic group predominates. It shows how affinities (or alienation) to place can be built around multiple ethnic identities as neighbourhoods become super-diverse. While our primary focus is upon increased ethno-national diversity we do, however, acknowledge the importance of other dimensions of diversity and highlight the need to include these in future research. We utilise Gill's (2010) ideal and pathological place-making framework which focuses upon four stages of migrant place-making as a heuristic framework for our analysis. The next part of the paper explores the importance of place and processes of place-making, elaborating Gill's (2010) framework. Following details of the methods utilised, we analyse the ways in which place-making proceeds in the two neighbourhoods. We highlight how issues concerned with the 'newness' of super-diversity and population churn, that is high levels of population turnover (Scanlon, Travers and Whitehead, 2010) – and to a lesser extent faith and language - impinge on the extent to which 'ideal' or 'pathologies' of place-making emerge. The ensuing discussion draws attention to the differences between the neighbourhoods in respect of the 'visibility' or 'invisibility' of migrants, and associations for place-making. A conclusion considers the implications arising from the research, including the adequacy of Gill's framework in capturing the full complexity of place-making in super-diverse areas.

2. The importance of place and place-making

This paper builds on a long tradition of research around place. These include interests in the importance of *place and residential mobility* (Coulter, van Ham and Findlay, 2015). Such work conceived residential mobility as the outcome of the interplay between people and places but also influenced by power relations and wider structural forces that shape opportunity and need (Halfacree and Boyle, 1993). This work has been further developed to consider influences on *ethnic minority residential mobility and place* (see Rex and Moore 1967). Whilst some offer a *preferences perspective*, arguing that ethnic minorities prefer to live close to their own ethnic group and therefore select minority concentration neighbourhoods (Bolt et al., 2008; Phillips, 2007), a particular focus has been paid to the 'protective' effect of ethnic clustering against racism and discrimination. Fear or experience of racism has been viewed as an influence on mobility patterns (Boschman and van Ham, 2015; Becares et al., 2012). Conversely, there is also a large body of research on 'white flight' focusing on native white residents leaving the neighbourhood when the proportion of minority ethnic residents increases (Boschman and van Ham, 2015).

Most research examines the mobility of single ethnic or racial groups within deprived inner city neighbourhoods. Such neighbourhoods have been described as 'zones of transition' positioned on the initial rungs of a stepladder which immigrants were expected to climb as they assimilated and moved through the city's zones (Schwirian, 1983). More recently, Logan and Zhang (2010) charted the emergence of 'global neighbourhoods' in the U.S. wherein racial diversity was the norm and no majority group was evident. Frey (2001) also identified the emergence of 'melting pot' suburbs driven by new patterns of ethnic mobility. Similar work on 'contact zones' (Robinson et

al., 2007), or 'escalator areas' (Travers et al., 2007) in which immigrants first reside has been developed in the UK (Catney and Simpson, 2010; Bowes et al., 2002). But little attention has been paid to the relationship between increased neighbourhood diversity and place.

Place has been shown to play an important role in social organization, reflecting social and cultural variation and providing a territorial focus for migrant identity (Logan et al., 2002; Finney and Jivraj, 2013; Valentine, 2001). Places are the product of 'roots' and 'routes' and are the site of multiple identities and histories (Massey, 2005). The assumption frequently made in the literature is that migrants cohere in distinct ethnic communities within which a process of place-making occurs (Boschman and van Ham, 2015). Place-making implies the development of a collective identity articulated through expressions such as monument building and festivals (Edensor, 2002). The predominance of shops and other facilities based around a distinct ethnicity – for example, the 'Chinatowns' and 'Little Indias' of global cities - are clear indications of place-making (Friedmann, 2010; Ip, 2005). Soja (1996) describes such places as 'third-spaces' – spaces on the edge of dominant culture where particular representations of ethnic difference are tolerated. Arguably in some places acceptance moves beyond tolerance as a kind of exoticised ethnicity is celebrated and promoted as part of a city's identity (Leary and McCarthy, 2013). Whether such places are mainstream or marginal, the literature works on the assumption that place is an expression of a single ethno-national identity (Edensor, 2002). Place-making has often been portrayed a new minority identity replacing that of the previous identity (Massey and Denton, 1993). But what happens when identities are layered upon one another as diversity increases and populations become more fragmented? What emerges when rather than identities

displacing one another they become more mixed and intermingled? Indeed, in this respect, work by individuals such as Wessendorf (2014), Neal et al. (2013) and Wise (2009) highlights how many neighbourhoods have become super-diverse, housing mixed communities and diverse facilities.

Gill (2010) identifies 'ideal' and 'pathological' processes of place-making. Idealised place-making is portrayed as a four-stage linear process beginning when migrants are able to agree upon, or project, a common identity through place (Stage 1; see Table 1). This can include the availability of particular types of spaces / places that help to facilitate and project identity where projection involves "*both practical and public...and calculated as well as the automatic result of migrant clustering......for example, through signs on shops and restaurants, ethnic markets and a different use of public space*" (p1160).

Stage 2 involves new arrivals associating with the place, and not being excluded from specific places or having to abandon important aspects of their own identity (Gill 2010). As such, places generally represent the migrant cohort. Veronis (2010) highlights how there is always some compromise between individual and group identity but generally costs are worth the gains providing compromise does not involve loss of important identity facets.

Stage 3 assumes there is a coherent existing community, generally the dominant community (and receiving community organisations) that is accepting of migrant place-making. Such acceptance depends upon factors such as local history of cosmopolitanism, an economy needing migrants, an ageing population or resistance to

right wing moral panics (Gill, 2010). Official discourses around place can shape ability

to imagine place according to migrant identities. Finally for Stage 4 to occur, newly

arriving migrants must develop an affinity with existing migrant places, and identities

be sustained by subsequent migrant groups. Indeed, places may facilitate interactions

and attachments that may not have occurred otherwise, for example in countries of

origin (Gill 2010). Affinity with place is generated and then sustained by old and new

migrants.

However, it must be recognized that some migrants may have little choice over

expression of identity. Indeed, Veronis' (2010) idea of spatial essentialism implies that

even when migrants have similar origins power dynamics can constrain ability to shape

place. Furthermore, the emergence of social networking websites may reduce the

importance of place, particularly for younger people (Massey, 2013).

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

But place-making may not progress along the ideal model. Gill offers a pathological

alternative for each stage (Table 1) and illustrates how these play out in his discussion

of place-making in Polish migrant communities in Northern England. He highlights

cleavages between long-established and younger Polish migrants who arrived post-EU

Accession in 2004. Rather than projecting common identities through Catholicism he

finds younger migrants expressed themselves through social media while class

differences generated discord between newcomers. He argues the failure of English

institutions to accept the diversity of identities, and an over-emphasis on the Catholic

church as an expression of Polish place serves to alienate recently arrived individuals.

In conclusion, Gill (2010, p.1170) contends that migrant place-making is "*prone to difficulties, beset by contingencies and risks and often very exclusionary*".

There is a need to examine how such complexities play out when neighbourhoods are super-diverse. Whilst Gill (2010) acknowledges that some nationalities may have intra-community cleavages and not cohere around a similar nationalistic identity, his overall focus relates to the idea that single ethnic groups make place. Given the rapid emergence of super-diversity in many of the world's cities it is important to revisit Gill's (2010) framework to examine how place-making proceeds in neighbourhoods where multiple ethnicities co-exist and multiple 'within group' differences are evident.

3. Case study selection and methods

i) Case study selection

We compare the key factors shaping migrant place-making in two super-diverse neighbourhoods: Handsworth and East Lozells (herein, and locally, termed Handsworth) in Birmingham and Kensington and Fairfield (herein, and locally, termed Kensington) in Liverpool. Both neighbourhoods have experienced a growth in the scale and diversity of their minority populations with Handsworth having a longer history of super-diversity and Kensington more recently diversifying. They both have youthful populations and lower economic activity rates than their city average. The ethnic composition of each is very different. Handsworth's majority population is largely comprised of Asian 'old' migrants, with white British numbers very low and high proportions of 'Other' ethnicities, a category used by the Office for National Statistics

(ONS). This is a clear indication of increased super-diversity. Kensington, has a majority, albeit declining, white population. 'Black African' and 'White Other' form a key part of the diverse population (see Table 2).

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

In Birmingham, GP registration data[1] shows that 41,318 migrants moved to the city from 187 different countries between 2007 and 2010. In Handsworth, immigration has occurred in three main phases: the arrival of post-Commonwealth migrants from the 1950s to 1970s, the dispersal of asylum seekers from 1990 to the present day, and the arrival of European Accession country migrants from 2004[2]. Super-diversity is particularly apparent. For example, there has been a rise of 70% in the number of people identified with a 'Mixed' ethnic category since 2001, whilst people born in Poland and Somalia increased nine fold and those in born in China, Nigeria, Zimbabwe and Iran three fold between 2001 and 2011 (Birmingham City Council, 2013). Some 88% of the population identifies as minority ethnic (42% Birmingham) with key languages spoken (in rank order) including English, Bengali, Panjabi and Urdu, Pakistani Pahari, Polish and Somali (ONS, 2011). Two-thirds of the resident population are Muslim, followed by Christian (21%), No religion (5%) and Sikh (4%) (ONS, 2011). 44.9% of the population (13,859) were born overseas and the neighbourhood now houses residents from 170 different countries (Phillimore, 2013).

---

[1] GP registration data are not complete. Migrants generally choose to register with a GP only if they need medical attention. Undocumented migrants are reluctant to register at all. Furthermore the database only includes those migrants who have registered directly after arriving from overseas. Nonetheless GP registration data are the best source of data for identifying the nature of the new migrant population. It should be viewed as partial and a picture of the minimum levels of diversity.

[2] Accession countries are those Eastern and Central European countries which joined the EU in its first major expansion in 2004

Liverpool's engagement with migration began as a port city (ExUrbe 2013). Over the past 50 years the same three channels of migration have contributed to the increasing diversification of the population which has led to individuals being increasingly differentiated according to immigration / legal status, as well as diverging patterns of gender and age, and variance in human capital. However, this has been on a much lower scale than Birmingham. The speed and spread of change of Liverpool's diversification has increased in last decade when the city experienced the greatest increase in the proportion of residents born overseas of all of the major UK cities. Its immigrant population more than doubled from 4.8% of the population in 2001 to 9.9% in 2011. Liverpool's population is also less ethnically diverse than the population as a whole. 13.6% of the population is defined as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME), compared with 18.8% nationally. However Liverpool's BME population more than doubled between 2001 and 2011, increasing by 33,700 people (Liverpool City Council, 2013). Indeed, there are now 250 self-declared ethnicities in Liverpool according to the 2011 Census (ONS, 2011). Two fifths (19,600 people) of Liverpool residents born outside the UK identified that they had lived in the UK for less than five years (Liverpool City Council, 2013).

Many newcomers have moved into Kensington, with the proportion of ethnic minorities in the area increasing from 5% to 25.2% between 2001 and 2011. Those born in EU Accession countries constituted 5.2% of the total population in 2011 with 23.4% born outside of the UK. Key languages spoken include English, Polish, Arabic, Chinese, Slovak and French. Over two-thirds (69%) of the population were Christian, followed by No Religion (17%) and Muslim (4.9%) (ONS, 2011).

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ii) Methods

All of the primary data reported in this paper were collected from five studies that focused upon understanding the residential choices of migrants who had arrived in the UK since 2004. Questions asked included: *What attracted you to the area you currently live in? What aspects of the local neighbourhood are important in making you feel at home? What makes you want to stay/leave the neighbourhood?* Full ethical approval was received for each study from the respective institutions of the authors. Each participant was fully briefed on the purposes of each research study and were required to complete and sign a consent form indicating their willingness to participate and which authorised anonymised pieces of information and quotations to be reported. Such newcomers contributed to the super-diversification of many parts of the UK and Europe, including the patterns observed in the two neighbourhoods. The data on Birmingham are taken from two qualitative studies focusing on Handsworth. The studies engaged with new migrants from a maximum variation sample of countries of origin, and with differing characteristics (for example, age, gender, duration in UK), and explored their attitudes and identifications to the area, as well as their future intentions in terms of whether to stay or leave the neighbourhood. The Liverpool data are taken from three qualitative studies conducted in Kensington, with a similar variety of individuals and focussing upon issues of identification and neighbourhood attachment and aspirations. Details of the sample and approaches adopted are summarised in Table 3.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

A total of 166 respondents engaged in the research: 70 in Liverpool and 96 in Birmingham. Where appropriate, the interviews were conducted in migrants' mother tongue by university trained multi-lingual community researchers. Data were coded by the research investigators using Nvivo (a software package supporting qualitative data analysis). In particular, a systematic thematic analysis approach was adopted (Guest, 2012) to identify the key issues raised by respondents. The quotations used in this paper were selected on the basis of their ability to illustrate the issues raised by respondents. Through combining our datasets we sought to identify key trends rather than achieve data saturation or to generalise. The scope and focus of the studies were analogous and questions sufficiently open to elicit comparable information drawing some broad conclusions about the aspects of super-diverse neighbourhoods shaping migrant place-making. The studies were undertaken over a period of four years during which the economic crisis in the UK emerged and intensified. Assessing the impact of crisis and associated austerity was beyond the scope of the studies. All respondents resided within the neighbourhoods enabling us to explore aspects of place-making and future aspirations. Clearly without longitudinal work to examine whether aspirations were realised we can only draw tentative conclusions about future actions.

4. Findings

Through utilisation of Gill's (2010) framework, we uncover the ways in which place-making proceeds in the neighbourhoods and the extent to which similarities or differences emerge according to area and / or the characteristics of migrants.

(i) Projecting place identity in super-diverse neighbourhoods?

The long-standing diversity of Handsworth combined with the ongoing immigration of people from many countries appeared to project a neighbourhood identity of diversity which was sufficiently broad to appeal to different individuals. In the words of one interviewee: "*people are like me, the place is home because everyone is from a black minority*" (African-Caribbean man). There were signs of a common identity being based around diversity, and which was played out through wide ranging retail and cultural facilities, as reported elsewhere by Saunders (2011) and Castles and Miller (2009), and stated by another interviewee: "*We are gathered here now as there are facilities, coffee shops, Internet café, bakery*" (Kurdish man). Diversity was projected through the nature of individuals themselves and which reflects the "commonplace diversity" described by Wessendorf (2014) - for example, through the sheer variety of people walking along the busy main street, the Soho Road.

Whilst all the visible minority newcomers we interviewed were comfortable with Handsworth's projection of diversity, Accession migrants (white and arguably less visible) were more ambivalent with this image. They were less familiar with visible difference. Indeed, while some outlined the emergence of facilities that met their needs and had the potential to add an Eastern European dimension to the mix (and which included a linguistic landscape (Blommaert, 2015) encapsulating notices written in Polish), the majority outlined a preference for places projecting a more distinctively Eastern European identity: "*I want to move to a place where I can find some people who relate to us. We feel completely isolated*" (Bulgarian man). Certainly, McDowell (2009) and Stenning et al. (2006) have indicated that 'whiteness' and the relative invisibility of Accession migrants can provide them with wider residential choices than those who are

more visible. There appeared to be no general consensus amongst Accession migrants of a desire to project their identity within the already very diverse neighbourhood of Handsworth.

In Kensington, no coherent neighbourhood identity was acknowledged by respondents, despite the emergence of Polish shops "*that can make you feel a little bit like home*" (Polish man). A combination of the transience and ongoing churn of newcomers moving into and through the neighbourhood, as well as the recency of change undermined the prospects of projecting a common identity. Rather than identifying as diverse, respondents felt that the emergent super-diversification of the neighbourhood challenged the possibility of identity formation. Some suggested there were "*too many new immigrant groups*" (Somali man). There were also signs of tension emerging between different groups. For example, one interviewee explained she had "*a bad experience with Polish people.....they form something like a closed group and they constantly seek for troubles*" (Lithuanian woman). Another respondent noted how "*all the Polish people are complaining there are a lot of Black people*" (Polish woman).

Nevertheless, some respondents commented on emergent identities in micro-places, such as individual streets, and where a semblance of identity was being created through cluster migration: "*this street called Galloway Street is like little Czech world, most of the families are Czech Roma*" (Czech Republic woman). Any projection of identity appeared to be scale-dependent.

(ii) Connecting with place-identity in super-diverse neighbourhoods?

In Handsworth many respondents expressed that the neighbourhood and its facilities represented and reflected their identity but also the broader identity of diversity mentioned above. On the one hand, those interviewed referred to the presence of people, and associated facilities, from their ethnic or national or speaking their language which reflected their identity. For example, one individual noted that "*mainly the Afghan people who speak my language has attracted me to the area*" (Afghan man), whilst another interviewee noted how with "*shops with African food, you don't feel alone*" (Eritrean man). But over and beyond this – and reflecting the super-diversity of the neighbourhood, specific reference was made to the importance of diversity itself. One interviewee stated "*I like my area….It's alright: different nationalities. Some people think it's rough but I like it*" (Iranian man). Another participant highlighted how "*it's important we know each other's cultures and share food*" (Bulgarian man).

However, a degree of resentment was evident in the prevalence of specific facilities for Pakistani and Bangladeshi people who had, until the advent of new migration, been one of the dominant communities in the neighbourhood. This was exemplified by a statement from an individual who argued that "*there are no services for Africans and none have developed in the seven years I have been here……the area feels mainly Pakistani*" (Burundian man). Some felt that the Handsworth neighbourhood and its facilities needed to adapt faster to reflect increased diversity. Furthermore, there were some indications that individuals connected with the neighbourhood not because it represented their identities particularly well, but that it did so better than in other parts

of the city which were less diverse. As expressed by an interviewee: "*One of the reasons I*

say I'm happy with Lozells³ is because at least there's no racists in Lozells" (Iranian man).

In Kensington the picture was more mixed. A few EU migrants and non-EU migrants

reported feeling included to some extent because of the emergence of religious and

retail facilities that met the specific needs of their community "*we've got quite a few*

African shops and Internet cafes that weren't here five years ago so I suppose there is a

sense that it's a place where you might fit in" (Somali woman). In addition, some EU

migrants also noted how they liked the emergent diversity, the associated facilities and

opportunities to mix with many different people: "*I prefer a mixed community where you*

can meet different people and local people too" (Polish man). However, the dominant

sentiment was that the neighbourhood was changing too quickly with the arrival and

departure of both new migrants and students, or was too focused around the needs of

locally born people. Thus many felt they were excluded and were not connecting with

the neighbourhood. This was encapsulated in responses by interviewees that stated that

"*the population changes so fast, nobody stays for that long*" (Polish woman); "*you are*

always a foreigner here, it's like being a visitor" (Czech Republic man); and "*there is a*

hierarchy – if you are Liverpool-born Black then you know you've got more status"

(Yemeni man).

(iii) Acceptance of migrant place making in super-diverse neighbourhoods?

---

³ Lozells is a particular street in Handsworth although the name is also used to refer to the area around the street.

Almost without exception, newcomers to Handsworth felt that the local population was receptive to their arrival and to the development of facilities meeting their needs. Respondents explained "*the neighbourhood is welcoming"* (Nigerian man)*; "people are friendly*" (Jamaican man); and "*they are from all different backgrounds but all get on together and help each other*" (Cameroonian woman). The importance of acceptance was highlighted but also the absence of racism. One individual identified how the area was "*multi-cultural, not much racism, all kinds of people*" (Rwandan woman); another interviewee argued that the "*UK people hate Afghanis but I feel safe here*" (Afghani man). A further participant noted how "*people don't pick on you or give you a negative look*" (Polish woman). One Polish respondent felt that people from his country were treated less favourably than longer established migrants. But on the whole, the diverse local population was viewed as positive and welcoming of diversity and newcomers. The long history of immigration into the area informed a situation whereby the ongoing arrival of people from new countries and / or the presence of many newcomers were perceived as being unremarkable because newness was one of the identifying characteristics of the local population (Phillimore, 2015). These identifications are consistent with Vertovec and Cohen's (2002) "history of cosmopolitanism" which they argue helps to improve the chances of a successful acceptance of place-based migrant identities.

The story in Kensington was very different. Although three EU migrants described how those working in local shops and the local authority were not racist – i.e. "*when I go shopping or to the council I have never come across disrespect or racism*" (Polish man), there were extensive accounts of negativity from local residents towards respondents. Accession migrants expressed concerns about tensions with neighbours. For example, one individual stated that "*the tension is strong with my neighbours and I am thinking of*

moving to another place" (Czech Republic man) whilst another noted how they "*had experienced racism from young people and old people*" (Indian man).

A key message emerging from respondents was that the speed and recency of change in Kensington meant that it was simply too early to project any migrant identity and that people in the neighbourhood needed time to adjust to the new inflows of migrants. This was summarised by one interviewee: "*it's perhaps unsettling for some of the longer-term community to see the diversity of some of the shops that they're getting*" (Somali woman). In contrast to Handsworth, Kensington's relatively recent diversification was too new to be seen as one of the defining characteristics of the neighbourhood.

(iv) Affinity or alienation of new migrants in super-diverse neighbourhoods?

In Handsworth it was clear that many new non-EU migrants felt an affinity with the neighbourhood. Important factors that influenced this affinity included "*the presence of my people (which) will make me feel at home*" (Afghani man); that other people were new like them; that they were from overseas; that they were working class or Muslim and the overall diversity of the neighbourhood, which made it easy for anyone to fit in: "*most of them, 70% are foreigners like me*" (Bangladeshi, man). However Polish migrants were less at ease because they were generally less familiar with such diversity. As stated by another participant: "*this is a problem for some Poles, there is a little bit of racism, they do not view Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities in a good light*" (Polish man).

Conversely, no respondent interviewed in Kensington expressed feeling an affinity for the neighbourhood and some reported that they had not even built connections with other migrants from the same country. In the words of one individual: "*I haven't built any strong links to people here. The communication goes on the phone most of the time and is definitely not a reason for keeping me here*" (Czech Republic man). Hence many newly arrived migrants felt alienated and noted how they had clustered together to feel safe and used alternative networks and structures – such as the internet – to connect with individuals beyond the neighbourhood.

Thus in Handsworth, a long history of immigration into the area as well as a widely-held perception of the area as being super-diverse were important elements in shaping neighbourhood identity and provided scope for affinity, at least for those comfortable with diversity. But in Kensington the neighborhood functioned more like a dormitory – a cheap place to live. The high turnover of new residents plus the racism that permeated everyday life provided fewer opportunities for the development of affinity. Perhaps over time, as diversity becomes less remarkable, this may change.

5. Discussion

We have summarised the points emerging from the analysis into three key themes: place-making and identity; the temporality of place-making and neighbourhood change; and migrant visibility, local infrastructure and place-making.

The research highlighted competing representations of place in super-diverse areas. There were clear differences in the extent to which Handsworth and Kensington

neighbourhoods projected a place identity for new migrants. In addition, there were differences in relation to the extent to which they facilitated ideal or pathologies of place-making between visible or less visible migrants. The relative newness of diversity to Kensington and of exposure to diversity for Accession country migrants meant as yet there was no real projection of common identity. This provides an important insight into how residential mobility may be shaped by identity, perceptions and interpretations of place (Hickman et al., 2007). The neighbourhood was in a state of flux and with those resident generally lacking any place-based affinity. The main processes of place-making - if occurring at all - operated at a micro level based around clusters and networks of people rather than place.

With reference to Gill's (2010) place-making framework, two points of relevance also emerged. First, the focus on super-diverse neighbourhoods unveiled the particularities of the everyday lived experiences of those residing in each area (Hall 2015). These everyday lived experiences both inform – and indeed may be informed by - the extent of visibility of migrants. Such visibility can significantly impinge on both individual and place identity and which, in turn, may significantly re-shape the ways in which the different stages of ideal or pathologies of place-making identified by Gill (2010) proceed. Second, it was apparent that place-making was not necessarily the linear process outlined by Gill. For example, some migrants had moved to the neighbourhood given their perceptions of neighbourhood diversity and the opportunity to develop an affinity with such diversity (stage 4); however, they had not necessarily agreed and projected a common identity first (stage 1). In turn, this highlights how in super-diverse neighbourhoods 'diversity identity' place-making is more of a concern than 'migrant

identity' place-making, and which has been reported more broadly in studies focusing

upon neighbourhoods with a dominant ethnic or national identity.

A further point relates to the temporality or newness of place-making and

neighbourhood change. The recency of diversity to the Kensington neighbourhood

highlights an important temporal dimension that demands recognition. The increasing

yet embryonic super-diversity of Kensington made projection of a common identity

difficult. High levels of population 'churn' and instability (see Cole, 2007) frequently

hindered the development of an identity or affinity to the neighbourhood conducive to

place-making. As such, Kensington exemplified the 'escalator area' identified by Travers

et al. (2007), particularly given the flows of less visible EU8 migrants in and out of the

neighbourhood. This meant that pathologies of place-making were likely to dominate

until either some kind of stabilization occurs or the diversity of the neighbourhood

becomes established and embedded as the dominant identity.

It was also apparent that the establishment of ethnic shops was helping to facilitate the

projection of a common identity which may ultimately be conducive to more positive

identity formation. Having said this, in Handsworth the presence of Polish and other

Accession country shops had not yet led to an affinity with neighbourhood diversity.

Consequently, this meant that the neighbourhood did not have an identity that

Accession respondents could relate to in order to feel sufficient attachment to want to

remain.

A final issue of relevance relates to migrant visibility and place-making. Handsworth -

with its long history of multiculturalism and acceptance of newcomers - was so diverse

that the diverse identity of the neighbourhood attracted migrants who came both to access its facilities and so they could blend in. Thus its identity developed based around diversity, difference and / or newness rather than ethnicity. But for Accession migrants there was a contradiction – on the one hand they felt some affinity with local resources– such as the food and retail offer – which emerged in response to their arrival and potentially helped to include them in the neighbourhood's super-diverse identity. However, long-standing and visible diversity itself repelled many (although not all) new Accession migrants because, as respondents highlighted, some were unfamiliar with visible difference and could not identify with it. They felt the identity presented in the neighbourhood was predominantly Black or Asian meaning they did not fit. So they sought where possible to move to places they perceived as less diverse. They were able to move elsewhere because as less visible migrants they did not need to reside somewhere super-diverse in order to blend in. In contrast, more visible migrants were clear that they needed to live somewhere where visible difference was unremarkable in order to avoid racial harassment. They felt a stronger sense of affinity and identity with Handsworth because they were unable to identify with less diverse neighbourhoods which had a perceived reputation for racism. This finding supports Boschman and van Ham's (2015) discrimination perspective and highlights a weakness in Gill's framework. As such, the pathologies set out in the framework perceive negative identity in terms of the lack of acceptance of a particular ethnic identity rather than avoidance or experience of racism. More visible migrants developed affinities with the neighbourhood based around difference, newness, faith and language as well as, and often instead of, ethnicity.

However, the difference of Accession migrants was more evident when they spoke and may lead to them feeling out of place with regards to language. This distinction needs to be recognized as it has implications in respect of further processes of place-making in less diverse neighbourhoods, and suggesting there may be a linguistic dimension to pathologies of place-making for Accession migrants. Certainly in Handsworth the ability to speak or at least understand a shared language was highlighted as an affinity that crossed ethnic boundaries.

In Handsworth the interactions described by interviewees were akin to the "commonplace diversity" described by Wessendorf (2014). Interactions were described as being largely convivial as people mixed on the streets, to some extent in places of worship, in shops or at the school gate. The legacy of multiculturalism meant that most community spaces were associated with faith groups or long-established ethnic groups. Consequently, residents, including one or two of the Accession respondents, talked of the need for social spaces in which people could mix across cultures. On the whole, they were keen to avoid the development of ethnically defined social spaces. The ever-changing nature of diversity was such that it can be suggested that the expression of the neighbourhood as being super-diverse needs to be accompanied by facilities that are flexible enough to evolve with diverse populations, and can be utilized by local people to further the super-diverse identity of the neighbourhood.

6. Conclusions

Earlier studies have emphasized the importance of ethno-national identity on migrant place-making (Logan et al., 2002). This paper has significantly extended such ideas

through capturing the ways place-making proceeds in super-diverse neighbourhoods. Importantly, we have illustrated that multiple aspects of super-diversity and the extent to which individuals are more or less visible may be equally, if not more important in shaping neighbourhood affinity or alienation. Moving beyond Soja (1996) we argue that super-diverse neighbourhoods are not just third spaces where diversity is tolerated but liminal spaces where no dominant neighbourhood identity becomes embedded. Thus once established as such, they are places that new arrivals can identify with in various ways – through newness, ethnicity, faith or language.

Our research highlights how EU migrants - in this study exclusively white - were sometimes alienated by features such as the diversity and liminality with which they had little experience (see Nowicka and Vertovec, 2014). Their responses may be described as a new form of (minority) 'white flight' as reported extensively in U.S. cities (Massey and Denton, 1993) and a response to emergent super-diverse neighbourhood identity rather than (and as previously reported in the literature), a single ethnic identity. Such 'white flight' was encountered in relation to the migrant, rather than the host, population, and reflects the contingencies, risks and exclusionary nature of 'diversity identity' place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods. In contrast, for non-EU migrants who were visibly different, neighbourhood super-diversity provided the invisibility – albeit across a reduced territorial scale - that EU country migrants may have at a city (and beyond) level. Hence they are attracted by the super-diversity of place because they were constrained by their own visible difference.

Notwithstanding such arguments, we acknowledge that categorising new migrants into 'visible' and 'less visible' is somewhat blunt (Bhopal 2012). Such issues need to be

explored in greater detail with larger numbers of respondents, and in a wider range of areas in order to identify differences in place-making within and between groups, and taking into account other characteristics such as age and gender. Indeed, it is possible that the degree of affinity to the (super-diverse) neighbourhood may be developed around religion, class, sexual orientation and age, or the intersections between several characteristics. Clearly, it is unlikely that all visible migrants will want to leave and less visible migrants will wish to stay. Our binary provides a heuristic lens to begin to think about different responses to projection of super-diversity as a characteristic of place.

Gill's conceptual framework provided a useful heuristic to help us examine place-making in super-diverse areas but its linear nature and focus on processes underway within neighbourhoods does not capture the full complexity of migrant place-making. We suggest the model might be expanded to take into account the history and familiarity of places with diversity, the speed of change, the openness of neighbouring places to diversity, the power dynamics operating within places between established and new migrants and the experiences of migrants themselves of living in/with diversity. Further, it is important to acknowledge that in super-diverse places both ideal and pathological processes of place-making can occur simultaneously for different groups of migrants and that given rapid super-diversification, place-making may not necessary proceed in a linear fashion. For example, the arrival of newcomers at Stage 1 has the potential to undermine the affinity with place of those who had reached later stages. Thus more work is needed to develop Gill's model and increase its usefulness for understanding place-making in superdiverse neighbourhoods.

Finally, given long-established diversity in countries such as the US, Australia, Singapore, South Africa, Argentina and Canada and rapidly emerging super-diversity in Europe, our work has considerable potential to be expanded beyond the UK to examine in other contexts the representations of super-diverse places which influence residential attachment, and the relative effects of such dimensions on different migrant characteristics.

References

Amith J (2005) Place making and place breaking: migration and the development cycle of community in colonial Mexico. *American Ethnologist* 32 (1), 159-179.

Becares L, Shaw R, Nazroo J, Stafford M, Atkin K, Albor C, Kiernan K, Wilkinson R and Pickett K (2012) Ethnic density effects of physical morbidity, mortality and health behaviors: A systematic review of the literature. *American Journal of Public Health* 102 (12), 33-66.

Bhopal, K and Preston, J (2012) *Intersectionality and 'race' in Education* (Vol. 64). New York: Routledge.

Birmingham City Council (2013) *Population and Migration Topic Report*. Birmingham: Birmingham City Council.

Blommaert J (2015) Commentary: Super-diversity old and new. Language and Communication, 44 (1), 82-89.

Bolt G, Kempen R, van Ham M (2008) Minority ethnic groups in the Dutch housing Market; Spatial segregation, relocation dynamics and housing policy. Urban Studies. 45 (7), 1359-1384.

Boschman S and van Ham M (2015) Neighbourhood selection of non-western ethnic minorities. Testing the own-group effects hypothesis using a conditional logit model. *Environment and Planning A* 47 (5), 1155-1174.

Bowes A, Dar N and Sim D (2002) Differentiation in housing careers: the case of Pakistanis in the UK. *Housing Studies* 17 (3), 381-400.

Castles S and Davidson A (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics of Belonging*. London: Routledge.

Castles S and Miller MJ (2009) *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World (4th edition)*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.

Catney G and Simpson L (2010) Settlement area migration in England and Wales: assessing evidence for a social gradient. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 35 (4), 571-584.

Cole I (2007) Shaping or shadowing? *Understanding and responding to housing market change*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Coulter R, Van Ham, M and Findlay, A M (2015) Re-thinking residential mobility Linking lives through time and space, *Progress in Human Geography*. 0309132515575417, DOI: 10.1177/0309132515575417.

Edensor T (2002) *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford and New York: Berg.

Exurbe (2013) *Liverpool City Region and the Immigration Issue*. London: Exurbe.

Finney N and Jivraj S (2013) Ethnic Group Population Change and Neighbourhood Belonging. *Urban Studies* 50 (16), 3323-3341.

Friedmann, J. (2010) Place and Place-Making in Cities: A Global Perspective. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 11 (2), 149-165.

Fortier A (2000) *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity.* Oxford: Berg.

Frey WH (2001) *Melting pot suburbs: A Census 2000 study of suburban diversity*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Guest, G (2012) *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Gill N (2010) Pathologies of migrant place making: the case of Polish migrants to the UK. *Environment and Planning A* 42 (5), 1157-1173.

Halfacree KH and Boyle PJ (1993) The challenge facing migration research: The case for a biographical approach. *Progress in Human Geography* 17 (3), 333-348.

Hall S (2015) Super-diverse strret: a 'transethnography' across migrant localities, *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (1), 22-37.

Hickman P, Robinson D, Casey R, Green S and Powell R (2007) *Understanding Housing Demand: Learning from rising markets in Yorkshire and the Humber.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Ip D (2005) Contextualizing the Emergence of New Chinatowns. *GeoJournal* 64 (1), 63-74.

Juan K (2005) Staying Vietnamese: community and place in Orange County and Boston. *City and Community* 4 (1), 37-65.

Leary ME and McCarthy J (2013) *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration.* London: Routledge.

Liverpool City Council (2013) *2011 Ward Summary: Kensington and Fairfield.* Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Logan J and Zhang C (2010) Global neighbourhoods: New pathways to diversity and separation. *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (4), 1069–1109.

Logan J, Zhang W and Alba R (2002) Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review* 67 (2), 299- 322.

Massey D (2013) *Space, Place and Gender*. Chichester: John Wylie and Sons.

Massey D (2005) *For Space*. Sage: London.

Massey D and Denton N (1993) *Apartheid American Style*. Cambridge: MA, Harvard University Press.

McDowell L (2009) Old and new European economic migrants: whiteness and managed migration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (1), 19-36.

Meissner F and Vertovec S (2015) Comparing super-diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38 (4), 541-555.

Neal S, Bennett, K, Cochrane, A and Mohan G (2013) Living multiculture: understanding the new spatial and social relations of ethnicity and multiculture in England, *Environment and Planning C* 31 (2), 308–323.

Nowicka M. and Vertovec S (2014) Introduction. Comparing Convivialities: Dreams and Realities of Living-With-Difference. *European Journal of Cultural Studies,* 17 (4), 341–356. DOI:10.1177/1367549413510414.

Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2013) Neighbourhood Statistics. Available at: http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/ (accessed 30 October 2015).

Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2011) Census Data. Available at: http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/census-data/index.html (accessed 30 October 2015).

Park RE and Burgess EW (1925) *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment.* Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.

Phillimore J (2015) Delivering maternity services in an era of superdiversity: the challenges of novelty and newness. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies.* Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01419870.2015.980288 (accessed 2 January 2016).

Phillimore J (2013) Housing, Home and Neighbourhood Renewal in the Era of Superdiversity: Some Lessons from the West Midlands. *Housing Studies* 28 (5), 682-700.

Phillips A (2007) *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rex J and Moore R (1967) *Race, Community and Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robertson D, Smyth J and McIntosh, I (2008) *Neighbourhood identity: People, time and place.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Robinson D (2010) The neighbourhood effects of new immigration. *Environment and Planning A* 42 (10), 2451-2466.

Robinson D, Reeve K and Casey, R (2007) *The Housing Pathways of New Migrants.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Ryan L, Sales R, Tilki M and Siara B (2008) `Social networks, social support and social capital: the experiences of recent Polish migrants in London. Sociology 42 (4), 672-690.

Saunders D (2011) *Arrival City: How the largest migration in history is reshaping our world.* London: Windmill Books.

Scanlon K., Travers A and Whitehead C (2010) *Population churn and its impact on socio-economic convergence in the five London 2012 host boroughs.* London: Department for Communities and Local Government.

Schwirian KP (1983) Models of neighborhood change. *Annual Review of Sociology* 9, 83-102.

Soja E (1996) *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places.* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Stenning A, Champion T, Conway C, Coombes M, Dawley S, Dixon L, Raybould S and Richardson, R (2006) *Assessing the local and regional impacts of international migration*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies.

Travers T, Tunstall R, Whitehead C and Pruvot S (2007) *Population Mobility and Service Provision: A report for London Councils*. London: LSE.

Valentine G (2001) *Social geographies: Space and society*. Harlow: Pearson Education.

Veronis L (2010) Immigrant Participation in the Transnational Era: Latin Americans' Experiences with Collective Organising in Toronto. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de la migration international.* 11 (2), 173-192.

Vertovec S (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6), 1024-1054.

Vertovec S and Cohen R (2002) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wessendorf S (2014) *Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-diverse Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wise A (2009) Everyday multiculturalism: transversal crossings and working class cosmopolitans. In A Wise and S Velayutham (eds) *Everyday Multiculturalism.* Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan. pp.21-45

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Ideal and pathological place-making strategies (after Gill, 2010)

	Stage 1	Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4
Ideal	Migrants agree and attempt to project a common identity via place	Migrant places generally represent the cohort	Receiving community organisations are receptive and positive about migrant place-making	New migrants feel affinity with existing migrant places
Pathology	Migrants struggle to agree or project a group identity	Some elements of cohort feel excluded	Some host communities misinterpret or are more negative towards projected migrant place-making	New migrants feel alienated from existing migrant places

Table 2: Characteristics of case study cities and neighbourhoods

	Birmingham	Handsworth	Liverpool	Kensington
Population	1.074m	31074	466415	15377
Age and employment	19.6% <15 12.9% >65 64.5% economically active	28.6% < 15 8.5% > 65 57.5% economically active	16.7% <15 14%> 65 64.3% economically active	18.1%<15 11.4% > 65 60.9% economically active
% BME	42%	88%	13.6%	25.2%
Ethnicity	White British 53.1% Pakistani 13.5% Indian 6% Other 6.7% Mixed 4.4% Black Caribbean 4.4%	Pakistani 25.8% Indian 14.7% Bangladeshi 14.4% Black Caribbean 12.2% Other 10.7% White British 7%	White British 86.2% White Other 2.6% Mixed 2.5% Black African 1.8% Asian Chinese 1.7% Arab 1.1%	White British 68.1% African 8.9% White Other 6.7% Mixed 3.6% Chinese 2.3% Indian 1.8% Arab 1.7%
% Born overseas	22%	44.9%	9.9%	23.4%
Countries of origin	187	170	125	c.120

Source: ONS Census data (2013)

Table 3: Details of sampling and respondents

City		Methods	Sampling	Respondents gender	Respondents Country of Origin	Immigration Status
Birmingham	Study 1 2008	Focus group (9 participants) and interviews (75)	Main populations identified in administrative data. Sampling via community groups, word of mouth, leafleting	48 women 36 men	Iran (9) Kurdistan (11) Africa (Ethiopia, Eritrea, Congo, Burundi, Rwanda, Cote D'Ivoire) (42) Somalia (11) Poland (11)	Refugees, spousal migrants, economic migrants from EU Accession countries and non-EU countries
	Study 2 2010	Interviews (12)	Maximum variation sampling by immigration status and country of origin. Community researchers' networks and community organisations	6 women 6 men	Nigeria Bangladesh Bulgaria Ghana Jamaica Afghanistan Iraq India Pakistan Guinea Somalia Poland	

Liverpool	Study 1 2009	Interviews (43)	Snowball sampling of migrants but based around securing maximum variation in immigration status, age, gender and country of origin.	19 men 24 women	Poland (12) Ukraine (7) Russia (6) Iran (6) Africa (Somalia, Yemen) (7) India (5)	Economic migrants – Accession and non-EU, migrants, refugees
	Study 2 2010	Focus group (7 participants)	Sampling of migrants via community groups, word of mouth, leafleting	4 men 3 women	Somalia (2) Iran (2) Poland (3)	
	Study 3 2010	Interviews (20)	Maximum variation sampling of Accession migrants by age, gender, country of birth, family status, employment status, duration in UK	11 men 9 women	Poland (5) Czech Republic (4) Slovakia (3) Slovenia (3) Estonia (2) Lithuania (2) Latvia (1)	EU Accession country migrants