

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

Research at Birmingham

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

Phillimore, Jennifer; Pemberton, Simon

DOI:

[10.1177/0042098016656988](https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016656988)

License:

None: All rights reserved

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Phillimore, J & Pemberton, S 2016, 'Migrant place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods: moving beyond ethno-national approaches', *Urban Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098016656988>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

Publisher Rights Statement:

Checked 13/07/2016

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.



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

Journal:	<i>Urban Studies</i>
Manuscript ID	CUS-124-16-02.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Discipline: Please select a keyword from the following list that best describes the discipline used in your paper.:	Geography
World Region: Please select the region(s) that best reflect the focus of your paper. Names of individual countries, cities & economic groupings should appear in the title where appropriate.:	Western Europe, North America
Major Topic: Please identify up to two topics that best identify the subject of your article.:	Neighbourhood, Built environment
Please supply a further 5 relevant keywords in the fields below.:	Super-diversity, Neighbourhood, Migrant, Identity, Place-making

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Title: Migrant place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods: moving beyond**
4 **ethno-national approaches**
5
6
7
8

9
10 **Abstract:** Whilst attention has previously focused on the importance of monolithic
11 ethnic identities on migrant place-making less attention has been paid to how place-
12 making proceeds in super-diverse urban neighbourhoods where no single ethnic group
13 predominates. This paper makes an original contribution by identifying the factors that
14 shape migrants affinity with, or alienation from, super-diverse neighbourhoods.
15 Through using and critiquing an analytical framework developed by Gill (2010) that
16 identifies 'ideal' and 'pathological' place-making strategies, the paper contrasts two
17 super-diverse neighbourhoods in the UK with different histories of diversity. We show
18 how 'ideal' migrant place-making is more likely to occur where there is a common
19 neighbourhood identity based around diversity, difference and / or newness, and where
20 those with 'visible' differences can blend in. In contrast, 'pathologies' are more likely
21 where the on-going churn of newcomers, coupled with the speed and recency of change,
22 undermine migrant's affinity with place and where the diversity of the neighbourhood
23 is not yet embedded. Even where neighbourhood identity based on diversity is
24 established, it may alienate less visible migrants and culminate in a new form of
25 (minority) white flight.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Keywords** – Super-diversity; neighbourhood; migrant place-making
49
50
51

52 **1. Introduction**
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 This paper contributes new knowledge about the ways in which migrant place-making
4 proceeds in super-diverse areas. It highlights how multiple aspects of super-diversity
5 and the visibility of individuals can be equally important as ethno-national identity in
6 shaping attachment and affinity to the neighbourhood. In so doing, it moves beyond
7 existing analyses of migrant place-making that focus on single ethnic groups.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 The paper identifies experiences of place-making in two different areas: one with a long
17 history of diversity and another more recently diversifying. It extends existing
18 knowledge to long-standing interests on the influences shaping place-making in the
19 United States (U.S.) and Western Europe (see Amith, 2005; Juan, 2005; Fortier, 2000;
20 Ryan et al., 2008).
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Migrant place-making has been recognised as a way for migrants to forge and assert a
31 collective identity amongst host populations, and particularly when faced with issues of
32 discrimination (Castles and Davidson 2009; Gill, 2010). In addition, place-making
33 amongst migrant populations can be understood as a mechanism – both physically and
34 conceptually - to establish the validity and aspirations of a new community (Gill 2010).
35 However, place-making can be both constructive and destructive. It can provide the
36 opportunity for migrants to retain a national identity in their destination countries, lead
37 to conflict and issues of exclusion, alienation, resistance and can become a catalyst for
38 racism (Amith, 2005; Castles and Davidson, 2009). The majority of research that has
39 focused on migrant place-making involves single, relatively large, bounded (and
40 concentrated) ethnic groups building distinctive migrant places or neighbourhoods,
41 reflecting this single ethno-national identity. Such neighbourhood identities involve
42 understanding how individuals relate to where they live and to each other, and in what
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ways a neighbourhood identity may evolve (Robertson et al., 2008). But to date, little
4
5 attention has focused on migrant place-making in areas that are increasingly super-
6
7 diverse.
8
9

10
11
12 The concept of super-diversity was introduced by Vertovec (2007) to describe a
13
14 demographic condition in which populations are more diverse than ever before. Whilst
15
16 super-diversity encompasses the idea of individuals arriving from many places, it is
17
18 simultaneously conceptualised as “the diversification of diversity” wherein populations
19
20 are diverse in multiple and intersecting ways, for example by ethnicity, faith,
21
22 immigration status, rights and entitlements, gender and age, and patterns of spatial
23
24 distribution (Vertovec, 2007). Super-diversity moves beyond the idea of multicultural
25
26 communities consisting of a small number of ethnic groups frequently living in close
27
28 proximity to each other as distinct diaspora. Instead, communities are so diverse that
29
30 there are no dominant ethnic groups. Super-diversity extends Logan and Zhang’s (2010)
31
32 idea of global communities residing in mixed race neighbourhoods. Rather, super-
33
34 diverse neighbourhoods are demographically ‘layered’, accommodating both old
35
36 (‘established’) and new (‘more recently arrived’) immigrants from multiple countries of
37
38 origin, as well as long-standing non-migrant populations.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Such places are frequently fast changing and termed by Robinson (2010) as “arrival
47
48 zones” – housing new arrivals in the initial stages of their residence. As yet, no tipping-
49
50 point between being a multicultural and a super-diverse neighbourhood has been
51
52 identified. However, it is widely recognised that the scale, complexity, heterogeneity,
53
54 fragmentation of populations and speed and spread of change exceeds anything
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 previously experienced (Meissner and Vertovec, 2015), outpacing attempts to
4 understand new and evolving representations of place (Massey, 2013).
5
6
7

8
9
10 This paper fills an important gap in knowledge about how place-making proceeds when
11 no single ethnic group predominates. It shows how affinities (or alienation) to place can
12 be built around multiple ethnic identities as neighbourhoods become super-diverse.
13
14 While our primary focus is upon increased ethno-national diversity we do, however,
15 acknowledge the importance of other dimensions of diversity and highlight the need to
16 include these in future research. We utilise Gill's (2010) ideal and pathological place-
17 making framework which focuses upon four stages of migrant place-making as a
18 heuristic framework for our analysis. The next part of the paper explores the
19 importance of place and processes of place-making, elaborating Gill's (2010)
20 framework. Following details of the methods utilised, we analyse the ways in which
21 place-making proceeds in the two neighbourhoods. We highlight how issues concerned
22 with the 'newness' of super-diversity and population churn, that is high levels of
23 population turnover (Scanlon, Travers and Whitehead, 2010) – and to a lesser extent
24 faith and language - impinge on the extent to which 'ideal' or 'pathologies' of place-
25 making emerge. The ensuing discussion draws attention to the differences between the
26 neighbourhoods in respect of the 'visibility' or 'invisibility' of migrants, and associations
27 for place-making. A conclusion considers the implications arising from the research,
28 including the adequacy of Gill's framework in capturing the full complexity of place-
29 making in super-diverse areas.
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 **2. The importance of place and place-making**

58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 This paper builds on a long tradition of research around place. These include interests
6
7 in the importance of *place and residential mobility* (Coulter, van Ham and Findlay,
8
9 2015). Such work conceived residential mobility as the outcome of the interplay
10
11 between people and places but also influenced by power relations and wider structural
12
13 forces that shape opportunity and need (Halfacree and Boyle, 1993). This work has
14
15 been further developed to consider influences on *ethnic minority residential mobility*
16
17 *and place* (see Rex and Moore 1967). Whilst some offer a *preferences perspective*,
18
19 arguing that ethnic minorities prefer to live close to their own ethnic group and
20
21 therefore select minority concentration neighbourhoods (Bolt et al., 2008; Phillips,
22
23 2007), a particular focus has been paid to the 'protective' effect of ethnic clustering
24
25 against racism and discrimination. Fear or experience of racism has been viewed as an
26
27 influence on mobility patterns (Boschman and van Ham, 2015; Becares et al., 2012).
28
29 Conversely, there is also a large body of research on 'white flight' focusing on native
30
31 white residents leaving the neighbourhood when the proportion of minority ethnic
32
33 residents increases (Boschman and van Ham, 2015).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Most research examines the mobility of single ethnic or racial groups within deprived
42
43 inner city neighbourhoods. Such neighbourhoods have been described as 'zones of
44
45 transition' positioned on the initial rungs of a stepladder which immigrants were
46
47 expected to climb as they assimilated and moved through the city's zones (Schwirian,
48
49 1983). More recently, Logan and Zhang (2010) charted the emergence of 'global
50
51 neighbourhoods' in the U.S. wherein racial diversity was the norm and no majority
52
53 group was evident. Frey (2001) also identified the emergence of 'melting pot' suburbs
54
55 driven by new patterns of ethnic mobility. Similar work on 'contact zones' (Robinson et
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 al., 2007), or 'escalator areas' (Travers et al., 2007) in which immigrants first reside has
4
5 been developed in the UK (Catney and Simpson, 2010; Bowes et al., 2002). But little
6
7 attention has been paid to the relationship between increased neighbourhood diversity
8
9 and place.
10

11
12
13
14 Place has been shown to play an important role in social organization, reflecting social
15
16 and cultural variation and providing a territorial focus for migrant identity (Logan et al.,
17
18 2002; Finney and Jivraj, 2013; Valentine, 2001). Places are the product of 'roots' and
19
20 'routes' and are the site of multiple identities and histories (Massey, 2005). The
21
22 assumption frequently made in the literature is that migrants cohere in distinct ethnic
23
24 communities within which a process of place-making occurs (Boschman and van Ham,
25
26 2015). Place-making implies the development of a collective identity articulated
27
28 through expressions such as monument building and festivals (Edensor, 2002). The
29
30 predominance of shops and other facilities based around a distinct ethnicity - for
31
32 example, the 'Chinatowns' and 'Little Indias' of global cities - are clear indications of
33
34 place-making (Friedmann, 2010; Ip, 2005). Soja (1996) describes such places as 'third-
35
36 spaces' - spaces on the edge of dominant culture where particular representations of
37
38 ethnic difference are tolerated. Arguably in some places acceptance moves beyond
39
40 tolerance as a kind of exoticised ethnicity is celebrated and promoted as part of a city's
41
42 identity (Leary and McCarthy, 2013). Whether such places are mainstream or marginal,
43
44 the literature works on the assumption that place is an expression of a single ethno-
45
46 national identity (Edensor, 2002). Place-making has often been portrayed a new
47
48 minority identity replacing that of the previous identity (Massey and Denton, 1993). But
49
50 what happens when identities are layered upon one another as diversity increases and
51
52 populations become more fragmented? What emerges when rather than identities
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 displacing one another they become more mixed and intermingled? Indeed, in this
4
5 respect, work by individuals such as Wessendorf (2014), Neal et al. (2013) and Wise
6
7 (2009) highlights how many neighbourhoods have become super-diverse, housing
8
9 mixed communities and diverse facilities.
10

11
12
13
14 Gill (2010) identifies 'ideal' and 'pathological' processes of place-making. Idealised
15
16 place-making is portrayed as a four-stage linear process beginning when migrants are
17
18 able to agree upon, or project, a common identity through place (Stage 1; see Table 1).
19
20 This can include the availability of particular types of spaces / places that help to
21
22 facilitate and project identity where projection involves "*both practical and public...and*
23
24 *calculated as well as the automatic result of migrant clustering.....for example, through*
25
26 *signs on shops and restaurants, ethnic markets and a different use of public space*"
27
28 (p1160).
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Stage 2 involves new arrivals associating with the place, and not being excluded from
36
37 specific places or having to abandon important aspects of their own identity (Gill 2010).
38
39 As such, places generally represent the migrant cohort. Veronis (2010) highlights how
40
41 there is always some compromise between individual and group identity but generally
42
43 costs are worth the gains providing compromise does not involve loss of important
44
45 identity facets.
46
47
48
49

50
51 Stage 3 assumes there is a coherent existing community, generally the dominant
52
53 community (and receiving community organisations) that is accepting of migrant place-
54
55 making. Such acceptance depends upon factors such as local history of
56
57 cosmopolitanism, an economy needing migrants, an ageing population or resistance to
58
59
60

1
2
3 right wing moral panics (Gill, 2010). Official discourses around place can shape ability
4
5 to imagine place according to migrant identities. Finally for Stage 4 to occur, newly
6
7 arriving migrants must develop an affinity with existing migrant places, and identities
8
9 be sustained by subsequent migrant groups. Indeed, places may facilitate interactions
10
11 and attachments that may not have occurred otherwise, for example in countries of
12
13 origin (Gill 2010). Affinity with place is generated and then sustained by old and new
14
15 migrants.
16
17

18
19
20
21 However, it must be recognized that some migrants may have little choice over
22
23 expression of identity. Indeed, Veronis' (2010) idea of spatial essentialism implies that
24
25 even when migrants have similar origins power dynamics can constrain ability to shape
26
27 place. Furthermore, the emergence of social networking websites may reduce the
28
29 importance of place, particularly for younger people (Massey, 2013).
30
31
32

33
34
35 **INSERT TABLE 1 HERE**
36
37
38

39
40 But place-making may not progress along the ideal model. Gill offers a pathological
41
42 alternative for each stage (Table 1) and illustrates how these play out in his discussion
43
44 of place-making in Polish migrant communities in Northern England. He highlights
45
46 cleavages between long-established and younger Polish migrants who arrived post-EU
47
48 Accession in 2004. Rather than projecting common identities through Catholicism he
49
50 finds younger migrants expressed themselves through social media while class
51
52 differences generated discord between newcomers. He argues the failure of English
53
54 institutions to accept the diversity of identities, and an over-emphasis on the Catholic
55
56 church as an expression of Polish place serves to alienate recently arrived individuals.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In conclusion, Gill (2010, p.1170) contends that migrant place-making is "*prone to*
4
5 *difficulties, beset by contingencies and risks and often very exclusionary*".
6
7

8
9
10 There is a need to examine how such complexities play out when neighbourhoods are
11
12 super-diverse. Whilst Gill (2010) acknowledges that some nationalities may have intra-
13
14 community cleavages and not cohere around a similar nationalistic identity, his overall
15
16 focus relates to the idea that single ethnic groups make place. Given the rapid
17
18 emergence of super-diversity in many of the world's cities it is important to revisit Gill's
19
20 (2010) framework to examine how place-making proceeds in neighbourhoods where
21
22 multiple ethnicities co-exist and multiple 'within group' differences are evident.
23
24

25 26 27 28 **3. Case study selection and methods** 29

30 31 32 *i) Case study selection* 33 34 35

36
37 We compare the key factors shaping migrant place-making in two super-diverse
38
39 neighbourhoods: Handsworth and East Lozells (herein, and locally, termed
40
41 Handsworth) in Birmingham and Kensington and Fairfield (herein, and locally, termed
42
43 Kensington) in Liverpool. Both neighbourhoods have experienced a growth in the scale
44
45 and diversity of their minority populations with Handsworth having a longer history of
46
47 super-diversity and Kensington more recently diversifying. They both have youthful
48
49 populations and lower economic activity rates than their city average. The ethnic
50
51 composition of each is very different. Handsworth's majority population is largely
52
53 comprised of Asian 'old' migrants, with white British numbers very low and high
54
55 proportions of 'Other' ethnicities, a category used by the Office for National Statistics
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (ONS). This is a clear indication of increased super-diversity. Kensington, has a majority,
4
5 albeit declining, white population. 'Black African' and 'White Other' form a key part of
6
7 the diverse population (see Table 2).
8
9

10
11
12 **INSERT TABLE 2 HERE**
13

14
15
16 In Birmingham, GP registration data¹ shows that 41,318 migrants moved to the city
17
18 from 187 different countries between 2007 and 2010. In Handsworth, immigration has
19
20 occurred in three main phases: the arrival of post-Commonwealth migrants from the
21
22 1950s to 1970s, the dispersal of asylum seekers from 1990 to the present day, and the
23
24 arrival of European Accession country migrants from 2004². Super-diversity is
25
26 particularly apparent. For example, there has been a rise of 70% in the number of
27
28 people identified with a 'Mixed' ethnic category since 2001, whilst people born in
29
30 Poland and Somalia increased nine fold and those in born in China, Nigeria, Zimbabwe
31
32 and Iran three fold between 2001 and 2011 (Birmingham City Council, 2013). Some
33
34 88% of the population identifies as minority ethnic (42% Birmingham) with key
35
36 languages spoken (in rank order) including English, Bengali, Panjabi and Urdu,
37
38 Pakistani Pahari, Polish and Somali (ONS, 2011). Two-thirds of the resident population
39
40 are Muslim, followed by Christian (21%), No religion (5%) and Sikh (4%) (ONS, 2011).
41
42 44.9% of the population (13,859) were born overseas and the neighbourhood now
43
44 houses residents from 170 different countries (Phillimore, 2013).
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52
53 ¹ GP registration data are not complete. Migrants generally choose to register with a GP only if they need
54
55 medical attention. Undocumented migrants are reluctant to register at all. Furthermore the database only
56
57 includes those migrants who have registered directly after arriving from overseas. Nonetheless GP registration
58
59 data are the best source of data for identifying the nature of the new migrant population. It should be viewed
60
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

1
2
3
4
5 Liverpool's engagement with migration began as a port city (ExUrbe 2013). Over the
6
7 past 50 years the same three channels of migration have contributed to the increasing
8
9 diversification of the population which has led to individuals being increasingly
10
11 differentiated according to immigration / legal status, as well as diverging patterns of
12
13 gender and age, and variance in human capital. However, this has been on a much lower
14
15 scale than Birmingham. The speed and spread of change of Liverpool's diversification
16
17 has increased in last decade when the city experienced the greatest increase in the
18
19 proportion of residents born overseas of all of the major UK cities. Its immigrant
20
21 population more than doubled from 4.8% of the population in 2001 to 9.9% in 2011.
22
23 Liverpool's population is also less ethnically diverse than the population as a whole.
24
25 13.6% of the population is defined as Black and Minority Ethnic (BME), compared with
26
27 18.8% nationally. However Liverpool's BME population more than doubled between
28
29 2001 and 2011, increasing by 33,700 people (Liverpool City Council, 2013). Indeed,
30
31 there are now 250 self-declared ethnicities in Liverpool according to the 2011 Census
32
33 (ONS, 2011). Two fifths (19,600 people) of Liverpool residents born outside the UK
34
35 identified that they had lived in the UK for less than five years (Liverpool City Council,
36
37 2013).
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Many newcomers have moved into Kensington, with the proportion of ethnic minorities
47
48 in the area increasing from 5% to 25.2% between 2001 and 2011. Those born in EU
49
50 Accession countries constituted 5.2% of the total population in 2011 with 23.4% born
51
52 outside of the UK. Key languages spoken include English, Polish, Arabic, Chinese, Slovak
53
54 and French. Over two-thirds (69%) of the population were Christian, followed by No
55
56 Religion (17%) and Muslim (4.9%) (ONS, 2011).
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 *ii) Methods*
6
7
8
9

10 All of the primary data reported in this paper were collected from five studies that
11 focused upon understanding the residential choices of migrants who had arrived in the
12 UK since 2004. Questions asked included: *What attracted you to the area you currently*
13 *live in? What aspects of the local neighbourhood are important in making you feel at*
14 *home? What makes you want to stay/leave the neighbourhood?* Full ethical approval was
15 received for each study from the respective institutions of the authors. Each participant
16 was fully briefed on the purposes of each research study and were required to complete
17 and sign a consent form indicating their willingness to participate and which authorised
18 anonymised pieces of information and quotations to be reported. Such newcomers
19 contributed to the super-diversification of many parts of the UK and Europe, including
20 the patterns observed in the two neighbourhoods. The data on Birmingham are taken
21 from two qualitative studies focusing on Handsworth. The studies engaged with new
22 migrants from a maximum variation sample of countries of origin, and with differing
23 characteristics (for example, age, gender, duration in UK), and explored their attitudes
24 and identifications to the area, as well as their future intentions in terms of whether to
25 stay or leave the neighbourhood. The Liverpool data are taken from three qualitative
26 studies conducted in Kensington, with a similar variety of individuals and focussing
27 upon issues of identification and neighbourhood attachment and aspirations. Details of
28 the sample and approaches adopted are summarised in Table 3.
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 **INSERT TABLE 3 HERE**
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 A total of 166 respondents engaged in the research: 70 in Liverpool and 96 in
4
5 Birmingham. Where appropriate, the interviews were conducted in migrants' mother
6
7 tongue by university trained multi-lingual community researchers. Data were coded by
8
9 the research investigators using Nvivo (a software package supporting qualitative data
10
11 analysis). In particular, a systematic thematic analysis approach was adopted (Guest,
12
13 2012) to identify the key issues raised by respondents. The quotations used in this
14
15 paper were selected on the basis of their ability to illustrate the issues raised by
16
17 respondents. Through combining our datasets we sought to identify key trends rather
18
19 than achieve data saturation or to generalise. The scope and focus of the studies were
20
21 analogous and questions sufficiently open to elicit comparable information drawing
22
23 some broad conclusions about the aspects of super-diverse neighbourhoods shaping
24
25 migrant place-making. The studies were undertaken over a period of four years during
26
27 which the economic crisis in the UK emerged and intensified. Assessing the impact of
28
29 crisis and associated austerity was beyond the scope of the studies. All respondents
30
31 resided within the neighbourhoods enabling us to explore aspects of place-making and
32
33 future aspirations. Clearly without longitudinal work to examine whether aspirations
34
35 were realised we can only draw tentative conclusions about future actions.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 **4. Findings**

45
46
47
48 Through utilisation of Gill's (2010) framework, we uncover the ways in which place-
49
50 making proceeds in the neighbourhoods and the extent to which similarities or
51
52 differences emerge according to area and / or the characteristics of migrants.
53
54
55
56

57 *(i) Projecting place identity in super-diverse neighbourhoods?*
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 The long-standing diversity of Handsworth combined with the ongoing immigration of
6
7 people from many countries appeared to project a neighbourhood identity of diversity
8
9 which was sufficiently broad to appeal to different individuals. In the words of one
10
11 interviewee: "*people are like me, the place is home because everyone is from a black*
12
13 *minority*" (African-Caribbean man). There were signs of a common identity being based
14
15 around diversity, and which was played out through wide ranging retail and cultural
16
17 facilities, as reported elsewhere by Saunders (2011) and Castles and Miller (2009), and
18
19 stated by another interviewee: "*We are gathered here now as there are facilities, coffee*
20
21 *shops, Internet café, bakery*" (Kurdish man). Diversity was projected through the nature
22
23 of individuals themselves and which reflects the "commonplace diversity" described by
24
25 Wessendorf (2014) - for example, through the sheer variety of people walking along the
26
27 busy main street, the Soho Road.
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Whilst all the visible minority newcomers we interviewed were comfortable with
36
37 Handsworth's projection of diversity, Accession migrants (white and arguably less
38
39 visible) were more ambivalent with this image. They were less familiar with visible
40
41 difference. Indeed, while some outlined the emergence of facilities that met their needs
42
43 and had the potential to add an Eastern European dimension to the mix (and which
44
45 included a linguistic landscape (Blommaert, 2015) encapsulating notices written in
46
47 Polish), the majority outlined a preference for places projecting a more distinctively
48
49 Eastern European identity: "*I want to move to a place where I can find some people who*
50
51 *relate to us. We feel completely isolated*" (Bulgarian man). Certainly, McDowell (2009)
52
53 and Stenning et al. (2006) have indicated that 'whiteness' and the relative invisibility of
54
55 Accession migrants can provide them with wider residential choices than those who are
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more visible. There appeared to be no general consensus amongst Accession migrants
4
5 of a desire to project their identity within the already very diverse neighbourhood of
6
7 Handsworth.
8
9

10
11
12 In Kensington, no coherent neighbourhood identity was acknowledged by respondents,
13
14 despite the emergence of Polish shops *“that can make you feel a little bit like home”*
15
16 (Polish man). A combination of the transience and ongoing churn of newcomers moving
17
18 into and through the neighbourhood, as well as the recency of change undermined the
19
20 prospects of projecting a common identity. Rather than identifying as diverse,
21
22 respondents felt that the emergent super-diversification of the neighbourhood
23
24 challenged the possibility of identity formation. Some suggested there were *“too many*
25
26 *new immigrant groups”* (Somali man). There were also signs of tension emerging
27
28 between different groups. For example, one interviewee explained she had *“a bad*
29
30 *experience with Polish people.....they form something like a closed group and they*
31
32 *constantly seek for troubles”* (Lithuanian woman). Another respondent noted how *“all*
33
34 *the Polish people are complaining there are a lot of Black people”* (Polish woman).
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Nevertheless, some respondents commented on emergent identities in micro-places,
42
43 such as individual streets, and where a semblance of identity was being created through
44
45 cluster migration: *“this street called Galloway Street is like little Czech world, most of the*
46
47 *families are Czech Roma”* (Czech Republic woman). Any projection of identity appeared
48
49 to be scale-dependent.
50
51

52
53
54
55 *(ii) Connecting with place-identity in super-diverse neighbourhoods?*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In Handsworth many respondents expressed that the neighbourhood and its facilities
4 represented and reflected their identity but also the broader identity of diversity
5 mentioned above. On the one hand, those interviewed referred to the presence of
6 people, and associated facilities, from their ethnic or national or speaking their language
7 which reflected their identity. For example, one individual noted that "*mainly the Afghan*
8 *people who speak my language has attracted me to the area*" (Afghan man), whilst
9 another interviewee noted how with "*shops with African food, you don't feel alone*"
10 (Eritrean man). But over and beyond this – and reflecting the super-diversity of the
11 neighbourhood, specific reference was made to the importance of diversity itself. One
12 interviewee stated "*I like my area....It's alright: different nationalities. Some people think*
13 *it's rough but I like it*" (Iranian man). Another participant highlighted how "*it's important*
14 *we know each other's cultures and share food*" (Bulgarian man).
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 However, a degree of resentment was evident in the prevalence of specific facilities for
33 Pakistani and Bangladeshi people who had, until the advent of new migration, been one
34 of the dominant communities in the neighbourhood. This was exemplified by a
35 statement from an individual who argued that "*there are no services for Africans and*
36 *none have developed in the seven years I have been here.....the area feels mainly*
37 *Pakistani*" (Burundian man). Some felt that the Handsworth neighbourhood and its
38 facilities needed to adapt faster to reflect increased diversity. Furthermore, there were
39 some indications that individuals connected with the neighbourhood not because it
40 represented their identities particularly well, but that it did so better than in other parts
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the city which were less diverse. As expressed by an interviewee: *“One of the reasons I*
4 *say I’m happy with Lozells³ is because at least there’s no racists in Lozells”* (Iranian man).
5
6

7
8
9
10 In Kensington the picture was more mixed. A few EU migrants and non-EU migrants
11 reported feeling included to some extent because of the emergence of religious and
12 retail facilities that met the specific needs of their community *“we’ve got quite a few*
13 *African shops and Internet cafes that weren’t here five years ago so I suppose there is a*
14 *sense that it’s a place where you might fit in”* (Somali woman). In addition, some EU
15 migrants also noted how they liked the emergent diversity, the associated facilities and
16 opportunities to mix with many different people: *“I prefer a mixed community where you*
17 *can meet different people and local people too”* (Polish man). However, the dominant
18 sentiment was that the neighbourhood was changing too quickly with the arrival and
19 departure of both new migrants and students, or was too focused around the needs of
20 locally born people. Thus many felt they were excluded and were not connecting with
21 the neighbourhood. This was encapsulated in responses by interviewees that stated that
22 *“the population changes so fast, nobody stays for that long”* (Polish woman); *“you are*
23 *always a foreigner here, it’s like being a visitor”* (Czech Republic man); and *“there is a*
24 *hierarchy – if you are Liverpool-born Black then you know you’ve got more status”*
25 (Yemeni man).
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 *(iii) Acceptance of migrant place making in super-diverse neighbourhoods?*
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56

57 ³ Lozells is a particular street in Handsworth although the name is also used to refer to the area around
58 the street.
59
60

1
2
3 Almost without exception, newcomers to Handsworth felt that the local population was
4 receptive to their arrival and to the development of facilities meeting their needs.
5 Respondents explained "*the neighbourhood is welcoming*" (Nigerian man); "*people are*
6 "*friendly*" (Jamaican man); and "*they are from all different backgrounds but all get on*
7 "*together and help each other*" (Cameroonian woman). The importance of acceptance
8 was highlighted but also the absence of racism. One individual identified how the area
9 was "*multi-cultural, not much racism, all kinds of people*" (Rwandan woman); another
10 interviewee argued that the "*UK people hate Afghanis but I feel safe here*" (Afghani man).
11 A further participant noted how "*people don't pick on you or give you a negative look*"
12 (Polish woman). One Polish respondent felt that people from his country were treated
13 less favourably than longer established migrants. But on the whole, the diverse local
14 population was viewed as positive and welcoming of diversity and newcomers. The long
15 history of immigration into the area informed a situation whereby the ongoing arrival of
16 people from new countries and / or the presence of many newcomers were perceived
17 as being unremarkable because newness was one of the identifying characteristics of
18 the local population (Phillimore, 2015). These identifications are consistent with
19 Vertovec and Cohen's (2002) "history of cosmopolitanism" which they argue helps to
20 improve the chances of a successful acceptance of place-based migrant identities.
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 The story in Kensington was very different. Although three EU migrants described how
47 those working in local shops and the local authority were not racist – i.e. "*when I go*
48 "*shopping or to the council I have never come across disrespect or racism*" (Polish man),
49 there were extensive accounts of negativity from local residents towards respondents.
50 Accession migrants expressed concerns about tensions with neighbours. For example,
51 one individual stated that "*the tension is strong with my neighbours and I am thinking of*
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *moving to another place*" (Czech Republic man) whilst another noted how they *"had*
4
5 *experienced racism from young people and old people"* (Indian man).
6
7

8
9
10 A key message emerging from respondents was that the speed and recency of change in
11
12 Kensington meant that it was simply too early to project any migrant identity and that
13
14 people in the neighbourhood needed time to adjust to the new inflows of migrants. This
15
16 was summarised by one interviewee: *"it's perhaps unsettling for some of the longer-term*
17
18 *community to see the diversity of some of the shops that they're getting"* (Somali woman).
19
20 In contrast to Handsworth, Kensington's relatively recent diversification was too new to
21
22 be seen as one of the defining characteristics of the neighbourhood.
23
24

25
26
27
28 *(iv) Affinity or alienation of new migrants in super-diverse neighbourhoods?*
29
30

31
32 In Handsworth it was clear that many new non-EU migrants felt an affinity with the
33
34 neighbourhood. Important factors that influenced this affinity included *"the presence of*
35
36 *my people (which) will make me feel at home"* (Afghani man); that other people were
37
38 new like them; that they were from overseas; that they were working class or Muslim
39
40 and the overall diversity of the neighbourhood, which made it easy for anyone to fit in:
41
42 *"most of them, 70% are foreigners like me"* (Bangladeshi, man). However Polish migrants
43
44 were less at ease because they were generally less familiar with such diversity. As
45
46 stated by another participant: *"this is a problem for some Poles, there is a little bit of*
47
48 *racism, they do not view Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) communities in a good light"*
49
50
51 (Polish man).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Conversely, no respondent interviewed in Kensington expressed feeling an affinity for
4
5 the neighbourhood and some reported that they had not even built connections with
6
7 other migrants from the same country. In the words of one individual: *"I haven't built*
8
9 *any strong links to people here. The communication goes on the phone most of the time*
10
11 *and is definitely not a reason for keeping me here"* (Czech Republic man). Hence many
12
13 newly arrived migrants felt alienated and noted how they had clustered together to feel
14
15 safe and used alternative networks and structures – such as the internet – to connect
16
17 with individuals beyond the neighbourhood.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Thus in Handsworth, a long history of immigration into the area as well as a widely-held
24
25 perception of the area as being super-diverse were important elements in shaping
26
27 neighbourhood identity and provided scope for affinity, at least for those comfortable
28
29 with diversity. But in Kensington the neighborhood functioned more like a dormitory –
30
31 a cheap place to live. The high turnover of new residents plus the racism that permeated
32
33 everyday life provided fewer opportunities for the development of affinity. Perhaps
34
35 over time, as diversity becomes less remarkable, this may change.
36
37
38
39

40 41 **5. Discussion**

42
43
44
45
46 We have summarised the points emerging from the analysis into three key themes:
47
48 place-making and identity; the temporality of place-making and neighbourhood change;
49
50 and migrant visibility, local infrastructure and place-making.
51
52

53
54
55 The research highlighted competing representations of place in super-diverse areas.
56
57 There were clear differences in the extent to which Handsworth and Kensington
58
59
60

1
2
3 neighbourhoods projected a place identity for new migrants. In addition, there were
4
5 differences in relation to the extent to which they facilitated ideal or pathologies of
6
7 place-making between visible or less visible migrants. The relative newness of diversity
8
9 to Kensington and of exposure to diversity for Accession country migrants meant as yet
10
11 there was no real projection of common identity. This provides an important insight
12
13 into how residential mobility may be shaped by identity, perceptions and
14
15 interpretations of place (Hickman et al., 2007). The neighbourhood was in a state of flux
16
17 and with those resident generally lacking any place-based affinity. The main processes
18
19 of place-making - if occurring at all - operated at a micro level based around clusters and
20
21 networks of people rather than place.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 With reference to Gill's (2010) place-making framework, two points of relevance also
29
30 emerged. First, the focus on super-diverse neighbourhoods unveiled the particularities
31
32 of the everyday lived experiences of those residing in each area (Hall 2015). These
33
34 everyday lived experiences both inform – and indeed may be informed by - the extent of
35
36 visibility of migrants. Such visibility can significantly impinge on both individual and
37
38 place identity and which, in turn, may significantly re-shape the ways in which the
39
40 different stages of ideal or pathologies of place-making identified by Gill (2010)
41
42 proceed. Second, it was apparent that place-making was not necessarily the linear
43
44 process outlined by Gill. For example, some migrants had moved to the neighbourhood
45
46 given their perceptions of neighbourhood diversity and the opportunity to develop an
47
48 affinity with such diversity (stage 4); however, they had not necessarily agreed and
49
50 projected a common identity first (stage 1). In turn, this highlights how in super-diverse
51
52 neighbourhoods 'diversity identity' place-making is more of a concern than 'migrant
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 identity' place-making, and which has been reported more broadly in studies focusing
4
5 upon neighbourhoods with a dominant ethnic or national identity.
6
7

8
9
10 A further point relates to the temporality or newness of place-making and
11
12 neighbourhood change. The recency of diversity to the Kensington neighbourhood
13
14 highlights an important temporal dimension that demands recognition. The increasing
15
16 yet embryonic super-diversity of Kensington made projection of a common identity
17
18 difficult. High levels of population 'churn' and instability (see Cole, 2007) frequently
19
20 hindered the development of an identity or affinity to the neighbourhood conducive to
21
22 place-making. As such, Kensington exemplified the 'escalator area' identified by Travers
23
24 et al. (2007), particularly given the flows of less visible EU8 migrants in and out of the
25
26 neighbourhood. This meant that pathologies of place-making were likely to dominate
27
28 until either some kind of stabilization occurs or the diversity of the neighbourhood
29
30 becomes established and embedded as the dominant identity.
31
32
33

34
35
36
37 It was also apparent that the establishment of ethnic shops was helping to facilitate the
38
39 projection of a common identity which may ultimately be conducive to more positive
40
41 identity formation. Having said this, in Handsworth the presence of Polish and other
42
43 Accession country shops had not yet led to an affinity with neighbourhood diversity.
44
45 Consequently, this meant that the neighbourhood did not have an identity that
46
47 Accession respondents could relate to in order to feel sufficient attachment to want to
48
49 remain.
50
51

52
53
54
55 A final issue of relevance relates to migrant visibility and place-making. Handsworth -
56
57 with its long history of multiculturalism and acceptance of newcomers - was so diverse
58
59
60

1
2
3 that the diverse identity of the neighbourhood attracted migrants who came both to
4 access its facilities and so they could blend in. Thus its identity developed based around
5 diversity, difference and / or newness rather than ethnicity. But for Accession migrants
6 there was a contradiction – on the one hand they felt some affinity with local resources–
7 such as the food and retail offer – which emerged in response to their arrival and
8 potentially helped to include them in the neighbourhood’s super-diverse identity.
9 However, long-standing and visible diversity itself repelled many (although not all) new
10 Accession migrants because, as respondents highlighted, some were unfamiliar with
11 visible difference and could not identify with it. They felt the identity presented in the
12 neighbourhood was predominantly Black or Asian meaning they did not fit. So they
13 sought where possible to move to places they perceived as less diverse. They were able
14 to move elsewhere because as less visible migrants they did not need to reside
15 somewhere super-diverse in order to blend in. In contrast, more visible migrants were
16 clear that they needed to live somewhere where visible difference was unremarkable in
17 order to avoid racial harassment. They felt a stronger sense of affinity and identity with
18 Handsworth because they were unable to identify with less diverse neighbourhoods
19 which had a perceived reputation for racism. This finding supports Boschman and van
20 Ham’s (2015) discrimination perspective and highlights a weakness in Gill’s framework.
21 As such, the pathologies set out in the framework perceive negative identity in terms of
22 the lack of acceptance of a particular ethnic identity rather than avoidance or
23 experience of racism. More visible migrants developed affinities with the
24 neighbourhood based around difference, newness, faith and language as well as, and
25 often instead of, ethnicity.
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

1
2
3 However, the difference of Accession migrants was more evident when they spoke and
4 may lead to them feeling out of place with regards to language. This distinction needs to
5 be recognized as it has implications in respect of further processes of place-making in
6 less diverse neighbourhoods, and suggesting there may be a linguistic dimension to
7 pathologies of place-making for Accession migrants. Certainly in Handsworth the ability
8 to speak or at least understand a shared language was highlighted as an affinity that
9 crossed ethnic boundaries.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 In Handsworth the interactions described by interviewees were akin to the
22 “commonplace diversity” described by Wessendorf (2014). Interactions were described
23 as being largely convivial as people mixed on the streets, to some extent in places of
24 worship, in shops or at the school gate. The legacy of multiculturalism meant that most
25 community spaces were associated with faith groups or long-established ethnic groups.
26 Consequently, residents, including one or two of the Accession respondents, talked of
27 the need for social spaces in which people could mix across cultures. On the whole, they
28 were keen to avoid the development of ethnically defined social spaces. The ever-
29 changing nature of diversity was such that it can be suggested that the expression of the
30 neighbourhood as being super-diverse needs to be accompanied by facilities that are
31 flexible enough to evolve with diverse populations, and can be utilized by local people to
32 further the super-diverse identity of the neighbourhood.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **6. Conclusions**

52
53
54

55 Earlier studies have emphasized the importance of ethno-national identity on migrant
56 place-making (Logan et al., 2002). This paper has significantly extended such ideas
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 through capturing the ways place-making proceeds in super-diverse neighbourhoods.
4
5 Importantly, we have illustrated that multiple aspects of super-diversity and the extent
6
7 to which individuals are more or less visible may be equally, if not more important in
8
9 shaping neighbourhood affinity or alienation. Moving beyond Soja (1996) we argue that
10
11 super-diverse neighbourhoods are not just third spaces where diversity is tolerated but
12
13 liminal spaces where no dominant neighbourhood identity becomes embedded. Thus
14
15 once established as such, they are places that new arrivals can identify with in various
16
17 ways – through newness, ethnicity, faith or language.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Our research highlights how EU migrants - in this study exclusively white - were
24
25 sometimes alienated by features such as the diversity and liminality with which they
26
27 had little experience (see Nowicka and Vertovec, 2014). Their responses may be
28
29 described as a new form of (minority) 'white flight' as reported extensively in U.S. cities
30
31 (Massey and Denton, 1993) and a response to emergent super-diverse neighbourhood
32
33 identity rather than (and as previously reported in the literature), a single ethnic
34
35 identity. Such 'white flight' was encountered in relation to the migrant, rather than the
36
37 host, population, and reflects the contingencies, risks and exclusionary nature of
38
39 'diversity identity' place-making in super-diverse neighbourhoods. In contrast, for non-
40
41 EU migrants who were visibly different, neighbourhood super-diversity provided the
42
43 invisibility – albeit across a reduced territorial scale - that EU country migrants may
44
45 have at a city (and beyond) level. Hence they are attracted by the super-diversity of
46
47 place because they were constrained by their own visible difference.
48
49
50
51

52
53
54
55 Notwithstanding such arguments, we acknowledge that categorising new migrants into
56
57 'visible' and 'less visible' is somewhat blunt (Bhopal 2012). Such issues need to be
58
59
60

1
2
3 explored in greater detail with larger numbers of respondents, and in a wider range of
4
5 areas in order to identify differences in place-making within and between groups, and
6
7 taking into account other characteristics such as age and gender. Indeed, it is possible
8
9 that the degree of affinity to the (super-diverse) neighbourhood may be developed
10
11 around religion, class, sexual orientation and age, or the intersections between several
12
13 characteristics. Clearly, it is unlikely that all visible migrants will want to leave and less
14
15 visible migrants will wish to stay. Our binary provides a heuristic lens to begin to think
16
17 about different responses to projection of super-diversity as a characteristic of place.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Gill's conceptual framework provided a useful heuristic to help us examine place-
24
25 making in super-diverse areas but its linear nature and focus on processes underway
26
27 within neighbourhoods does not capture the full complexity of migrant place-making.
28
29 We suggest the model might be expanded to take into account the history and
30
31 familiarity of places with diversity, the speed of change, the openness of neighbouring
32
33 places to diversity, the power dynamics operating within places between established
34
35 and new migrants and the experiences of migrants themselves of living in/with
36
37 diversity. Further, it is important to acknowledge that in super-diverse places both ideal
38
39 and pathological processes of place-making can occur simultaneously for different
40
41 groups of migrants and that given rapid super-diversification, place-making may not
42
43 necessary proceed in a linear fashion. For example, the arrival of newcomers at Stage 1
44
45 has the potential to undermine the affinity with place of those who had reached later
46
47 stages. Thus more work is needed to develop Gill's model and increase its usefulness for
48
49 understanding place-making in superdiverse neighbourhoods.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, given long-established diversity in countries such as the US, Australia,
4
5 Singapore, South Africa, Argentina and Canada and rapidly emerging super-diversity in
6
7 Europe, our work has considerable potential to be expanded beyond the UK to examine
8
9 in other contexts the representations of super-diverse places which influence
10
11 residential attachment, and the relative effects of such dimensions on different migrant
12
13 characteristics.
14
15
16
17

18 19 **References**

20
21
22
23 Amith J (2005) Place making and place breaking: migration and the development cycle
24
25 of community in colonial Mexico. *American Ethnologist* 32 (1), 159-179.
26
27

28
29
30 Becares L, Shaw R, Nazroo J, Stafford M, Atkin K, Albor C, Kiernan K, Wilkinson R and
31
32 Pickett K (2012) Ethnic density effects of physical morbidity, mortality and health
33
34 behaviors: A systematic review of the literature. *American Journal of Public Health* 102
35
36 (12), 33-66.
37
38

39
40
41 Bhopal, K and Preston, J (2012) *Intersectionality and 'race' in Education* (Vol. 64). New
42
43 York: Routledge.
44
45

46
47
48 Birmingham City Council (2013) *Population and Migration Topic Report*. Birmingham:
49
50 Birmingham City Council.
51
52

53
54
55 Blommaert J (2015) Commentary: Super-diversity old and new. *Language and*
56
57 *Communication*, 44 (1), 82-89.
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Bolt G, Kempen R, van Ham M (2008) Minority ethnic groups in the Dutch housing
6 Market; Spatial segregation, relocation dynamics and housing policy. *Urban Studies*. 45
7 (7), 1359-1384.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 Boschman S and van Ham M (2015) Neighbourhood selection of non-western ethnic
15 minorities. Testing the own-group effects hypothesis using a conditional logit model.
16
17 *Environment and Planning A* 47 (5), 1155-1174.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Bowes A, Dar N and Sim D (2002) Differentiation in housing careers: the case of
24 Pakistanis in the UK. *Housing Studies* 17 (3), 381-400.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Castles S and Davidson A (2000) *Citizenship and Migration: Globalization and the Politics*
31 *of Belonging*. London: Routledge.
32
33
34

35
36
37 Castles S and Miller MJ (2009) *The Age of Migration: International Population*
38 *Movements in the Modern World (4th edition)*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
39
40
41

42
43
44 Catney G and Simpson L (2010) Settlement area migration in England and Wales:
45 assessing evidence for a social gradient. *Transactions of the Institute of British*
46 *Geographers* 35 (4), 571-584.
47
48
49

50
51
52
53 Cole I (2007) *Shaping or shadowing? Understanding and responding to housing market*
54 *change*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
55
56
57

1
2
3 Coulter R, Van Ham, M and Findlay, A M (2015) Re-thinking residential mobility Linking
4 lives through time and space, *Progress in Human Geography*. 0309132515575417, DOI:
5 10.1177/0309132515575417.
6
7
8

9
10
11 Edensor T (2002) *National Identity, Popular Culture and Everyday Life*. Oxford and New
12 York: Berg.
13
14
15

16
17
18 Exurbe (2013) *Liverpool City Region and the Immigration Issue*. London: Exurbe.
19

20
21
22
23 Finney N and Jivraj S (2013) Ethnic Group Population Change and Neighbourhood
24 Belonging. *Urban Studies* 50 (16), 3323-3341.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Friedmann, J. (2010) Place and Place-Making in Cities: A Global Perspective. *Planning*
31 *Theory and Practice*, 11 (2), 149-165.
32
33
34

35
36
37 Fortier A (2000) *Migrant Belongings: Memory, Space, Identity*. Oxford: Berg.
38
39

40
41 Frey WH (2001) *Melting pot suburbs: A Census 2000 study of suburban diversity*.
42 Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
43
44
45

46
47
48 Guest, G (2012) *Applied thematic analysis*. Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.
49
50

51
52
53 Gill N (2010) Pathologies of migrant place making: the case of Polish migrants to the UK.
54 *Environment and Planning A* 42 (5), 1157-1173.
55
56
57

1
2
3 Halfacree KH and Boyle PJ (1993) The challenge facing migration research: The case for
4 a biographical approach. *Progress in Human Geography* 17 (3), 333-348.
5
6

7
8
9
10 Hall S (2015) Super-diverse strret: a 'transethnography' across migrant localities, *Ethnic
11 and Racial Studies* 38 (1), 22-37.
12
13

14
15
16 Hickman P, Robinson D, Casey R, Green S and Powell R (2007) *Understanding Housing
17 Demand: Learning from rising markets in Yorkshire and the Humber*. York: Joseph
18 Rowntree Foundation.
19
20
21

22
23
24
25 Ip D (2005) Contextualizing the Emergence of New Chinatowns. *GeoJournal* 64 (1), 63-
26 74.
27
28
29

30
31
32 Juan K (2005) Staying Vietnamese: community and place in Orange County and Boston.
33 *City and Community* 4 (1), 37-65.
34
35
36

37
38
39 Leary ME and McCarthy J (2013) *The Routledge Companion to Urban Regeneration*.
40 London: Routledge.
41
42
43

44
45
46 Liverpool City Council (2013) *2011 Ward Summary: Kensington and Fairfield*. Liverpool:
47 Liverpool City Council
48
49

50
51
52 Logan J and Zhang C (2010) Global neighbourhoods: New pathways to diversity and
53 separation. *American Journal of Sociology* 115 (4), 1069-1109.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Logan J, Zhang W and Alba R (2002) Immigrant enclaves and ethnic communities in
4
5 New York and Los Angeles. *American Sociological Review* 67 (2), 299- 322.
6
7

8
9
10 Massey D (2013) *Space, Place and Gender*. Chichester: John Wylie and Sons.
11
12

13
14 Massey D (2005) *For Space*. Sage: London.
15
16
17

18
19 Massey D and Denton N (1993) *Apartheid American Style*. Cambridge: MA, Harvard
20
21 University Press.
22
23

24
25 McDowell L (2009) Old and new European economic migrants: whiteness and managed
26
27 migration policies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (1), 19-36.
28
29
30

31
32 Meissner F and Vertovec S (2015) Comparing super-diversity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*,
33
34 38 (4), 541-555.
35
36
37

38
39 Neal S, Bennett, K, Cochrane, A and Mohan G (2013) Living multicultural: understanding
40
41 the new spatial and social relations of ethnicity and multicultural in England,
42
43 *Environment and Planning C* 31 (2), 308-323.
44
45

46
47
48 Nowicka M. and Vertovec S (2014) Introduction. Comparing Convivialities: Dreams and
49
50 Realities of Living-With-Difference. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 17 (4), 341-
51
52 356. DOI:10.1177/1367549413510414.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2013) Neighbourhood Statistics. Available at:
4
5 <http://www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/> (accessed 30 October
6
7 2015).
8
9

10
11 Office for National Statistics (ONS) (2011) Census Data. Available at:
12
13 <http://www.ons.gov.uk/ons/guide-method/census/2011/census-data/index.html>
14
15 (accessed 30 October 2015).
16
17
18

19
20
21 Park RE and Burgess EW (1925) *The City: Suggestions for Investigation of Human*
22
23 *Behavior in the Urban Environment*. Chicago, IL.: University of Chicago Press.
24
25

26
27
28 Phillimore J (2015) Delivering maternity services in an era of superdiversity: the
29
30 challenges of novelty and newness. *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*. Available at:
31
32 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01419870.2015.980288> (accessed 2
33
34 January 2016).
35
36

37
38
39 Phillimore J (2013) Housing, Home and Neighbourhood Renewal in the Era of
40
41 Superdiversity: Some Lessons from the West Midlands. *Housing Studies* 28 (5), 682-700.
42
43
44

45
46 Phillips A (2007) *Multiculturalism without culture*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University
47
48 Press.
49

50
51
52 Rex J and Moore R (1967) *Race, Community and Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University
53
54 Press.
55
56

1
2
3 Robertson D, Smyth J and McIntosh, I (2008) *Neighbourhood identity: People, time and*
4 *place*. York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
5
6
7

8
9
10 Robinson D (2010) The neighbourhood effects of new immigration. *Environment and*
11 *Planning A* 42 (10), 2451-2466.
12
13

14
15
16 Robinson D, Reeve K and Casey, R (2007) *The Housing Pathways of New Migrants*. York:
17 Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
18
19

20
21
22
23 Ryan L, Sales R, Tilki M and Siara B (2008) 'Social networks, social support and social
24 capital: the experiences of recent Polish migrants in London. *Sociology* 42 (4), 672-690.
25
26
27

28
29
30 Saunders D (2011) *Arrival City: How the largest migration in history is reshaping our*
31 *world*. London: Windmill Books.
32
33
34

35
36
37 Scanlon K., Travers A and Whitehead C (2010) *Population churn and its impact on socio-*
38 *economic convergence in the five London 2012 host boroughs*. London: Department for
39 Communities and Local Government.
40
41
42

43
44
45
46 Schwirian KP (1983) Models of neighborhood change. *Annual Review of Sociology* 9, 83-
47 102.
48
49

50
51
52
53 Soja E (1996) *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and Other Real-and-Imagined Places*.
54 Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Stenning A, Champion T, Conway C, Coombes M, Dawley S, Dixon L, Raybould S and
4
5 Richardson, R (2006) *Assessing the local and regional impacts of international migration*.
6
7 Newcastle upon Tyne: Centre for Urban and Regional Development Studies.
8
9

10
11
12 Travers T, Tunstall R, Whitehead C and Pruvot S (2007) *Population Mobility and Service*
13
14 *Provision: A report for London Councils*. London: LSE.
15
16

17
18
19 Valentine G (2001) *Social geographies: Space and society*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
20
21

22
23 Veronis L (2010) Immigrant Participation in the Transnational Era: Latin Americans'
24
25 Experiences with Collective Organising in Toronto. *Journal of International Migration*
26
27 *and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale*. 11 (2), 173-192.
28
29

30
31
32 Vertovec S (2007) Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6),
33
34 1024-1054.
35
36

37
38
39 Vertovec S and Cohen R (2002) *Conceiving cosmopolitanism: theory, context and*
40
41 *practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
42
43

44
45
46 Wessendorf S (2014) *Commonplace Diversity: Social Relations in a Super-diverse*
47
48 *Context*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
49
50

51
52
53 Wise A (2009) Everyday multiculturalism: transversal crossings and working class
54
55 cosmopolitans. In A Wise and S Velayutham (eds) *Everyday Multiculturalism*.
56
57 Basingstoke, Palgrave Macmillan. pp.21-45
58
59
60

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