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Intergroup relations in a super-diverse neighbourhood: the dynamics of population composition, context and community

Abstract

There is now an extensive literature demonstrating that experiences of migration and diversity differ significantly between and across local geographies. Three broad explanations for differences in local outcomes have been put forward (Robinson, 2010): first, population composition – the characteristics of individuals living in the neighbourhood; second, context – the social and physical environment; and third, community – socio-cultural histories and collective identities. Few studies examine the linkages between all three explanations and their relative importance. This article applies all three explanations to intergroup relations in a super-diverse context. It draws on data from a mixed methods case study of a neighbourhood in Glasgow, Scotland where long-term white and ethnic minority communities reside alongside Central and Eastern European migrants, refugees, and other recent arrivals. The evidence comprises local statistics and documentary evidence, participant observation, qualitative and walk-along interviews with residents and local organisations. The findings highlight the different ways in which people respond to super-diversity; and the importance of the neighbourhood context and material conditions for inter-group relations. The paper thus demonstrates the ambiguities that arise from applying the dynamics of population composition, context and community to neighbourhood analysis, with implications for the study of neighbourhoods more widely.
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Introduction

This paper contributes to knowledge (Vertovec 2007; Phillips and Robinson 2015; Wessendorf 2014a) on the causes of outcomes for intergroup relations between migrants and settled communities living in super-diverse areas. It highlights the role of housing conditions and examines how the experience of worsening material conditions influences the nature of public discourse on issues of neighbourhood identity, diversity and community. In doing so, it moves the analysis towards a deeper understanding of complex processes of neighbourhood change and the influences of these processes on the ability for individuals to negotiate differences and overcome divisions within and between social groups. This study makes three key contributions to the literature. First, it provides support for the argument that increasing ethnic and migrant diversity effects different social groups in different ways, but is not in itself a sufficient explanation for reduced intergroup contact and trust. Second, this study explores the dynamics linking population composition, socio-economic context and place-based identities to outcomes for intergroup relations. Third, it applies the concept of social milieus (Vester 2005; Bourdieu 1984; Durkheim 2014a; 2014b) as a method of identifying and categorising migrant and settled populations in a super-diverse context. The evidence presented is relevant to international studies of intergroup relations, social capital, diversity and neighbourhoods.
The concept of ‘intergroup contact’ originated in the field of social psychology with the work of Allport (1979) on prejudice. There is now a wide-ranging literature that examines intergroup contact and the conditions by which individual experiences of contact with diverse others become generalised (Hodson & Hewstone 2013; Vezzali & Stathi 2016). The notion of intergroup contact is closely aligned to intergroup trust (or trust in members of out-groups), which, like contact, is highly contested. This article focuses mainly on intergroup contact, described here as face-to-face interaction between members of defined groups (Pettigrew & Tropp 2006). In the study of super-diversity, the term ‘intergroup’ is useful because it opens the analysis to a wider range of social differences besides ethnicity. The term ‘groups’ is used in this study to refer to social formations that are reified within a super-diverse context. It is not intended that these are understood as real groups or to ignore the existence of in-group differences.

There is now an extensive literature demonstrating that experiences of migration, diversity and outcomes for intergroup relations vary significantly across local geographies. Yet according to Robinson (2010) surprisingly few studies have attempted to explain these geographical variations. Drawing on the literature from public health (Cummins et al. 2007; Macintyre, Ellaway, and Cummins 2002), Robinson (2010) developed a framework to conceptualise place-effects on experiences of migration highlighting three broad themes from extant literature. First, population composition – the characteristics of individuals living in the
neighbourhood (who lives there?); second, context – opportunity structures in the local social and physical environment (what resources are there?); and third, community – socio-cultural histories, collective identities and cultures (who belongs?). These three themes, described here as ‘Robinson’s Framework’, provide an approach to organising and explaining why intergroup relations vary at a local level. They are conceptualised here not as ‘mutually exclusive or competing explanations’ but as ‘overlapping aspects of local context’ (Platts-Fowler and Robinson 2015, p.477). Previous studies have not fully examined the linkages and interrelations between these themes and their relative importance remains unclear. This paper seeks to examine these meta-explanations in relation to a single in depth case study in order to uncover the dynamics between them.

The findings from this study show that declining housing and environmental conditions and processes of neighbourhood change can counter an otherwise positive narrative of neighbourhood diversity as commonplace (Wessendorf 2014a). Poor material conditions weaken intergroup relations, leading to restrictive claims to membership of ‘the community’ and struggles to dominate and control representations of the neighbourhood. The driver of this change is not migration as is commonly assumed, but the outmigration of owner-occupiers from the neighbourhood followed by the back filling of vacant properties with poor quality private lets. Worsening housing conditions drive wider neighbourhood and environmental decline and serve to undermine social relations across all resident groups. The focus of this
article is on the mechanisms that link changing population composition, socio-economic and housing conditions, and the functioning of ‘community’. It highlights the importance of the contextual features of place, in particular material conditions for positive intergroup relations. The paper begins by reviewing the evidence on local outcomes for inter-group relations applying Robinson’s Framework (2010). This is followed by a description of case site selection, the methods used in this study and case study findings. The ensuing discussion considers the dynamics of neighbourhood effects and multi-level explanations for intergroup relations in super-diverse neighbourhoods.

**Intergroup relations in super-diverse neighbourhoods**

In contrast to the discrete and more or less homogenous and distinct cultural groups of the post-world war two era; super-diverse contexts are characterised by a proliferation of much smaller, more fragmented migrant groups (Vertovec 2007; Phillimore 2011). Within the city, they perform a function as a site of arrival and temporary settlement indicated by the range of terms used to describe them. They have been defined as ‘contact zones’ (Robinson, Reeve, and Casey 2007); ‘gateway neighbourhoods’ (Slater 2004); ‘global neighbourhoods’ (Logan and Zhang 2010); ‘escalator areas’ (Travers et al. 2007); and ‘high migration clusters’ (Poppleton et al. 2013). Pemberton & Phillimore (2016) note that there is no clear dividing line between a ‘multicultural’ area and one that is ‘super-diverse’. A key feature of super-diversity is
demographic over-layering – ‘accommodating both old (‘established’) and new (‘more recently arrived’) immigrants from multiple countries of origin, as well as long-standing non-migrant populations’ (p.2). Super-diversity is a neighbourhood characteristic contingent on the history, trajectory and global nature of local population change which results in individuals from very different social and ethnic origins living in propinquity. Recent ethnographic studies have shifted attention away from the experiences of specific groups to the encounters between individuals from diverse backgrounds within super-diverse neighbourhoods (see Berg & Sigona 2013; Jensen & Gidley 2016; Neal & Vincent 2013; Wessendorf 2016).

Super-diversity signals an increase in the range of categories that differentiate people living in close proximity within urban neighbourhoods. Although super-diversity is driven by recent patterns of migration, the range of social categories that are relevant to social interactions in a super-diverse context extend beyond ethnicity and migration to include, for example, legal status, gender, education, socio-economic status, religion, and sexuality (Vertovec 2007; Meissner & Vertovec 2015). Super-diversity also presents a theoretical challenge to the categorisation of populations. Fanshawe & Sriskandarajah (2010) have questioned the possibility of categorisation altogether, whereas Meer (2014) points to the continued political importance of social categories and group-based identification. Others, such as Brubaker (2004), have cautioned against the assumption that social categories and groups are similar, arguing that social categories allow researchers to focus their analyses on enduring
inequalities rather than the political projects of social groups. Where there appears to be some agreement is in the recognition that identities are formed and ascribed in ways that are complex and ambiguous. The challenge for researchers is to examine not only formations and manifestations of difference but importantly the dynamic processes and relations through which commonalities and differences are constructed (Phillips & Robinson 2015). At the same time there remains a need for an approach to categorisation that recognises the role of local context in shaping identities. Wessendorf (2014b) applies the concept of social milieus (Vester 2005) to her study of Hackney, a super-diverse neighbourhood in London. She argues that social milieus make it possible to retain the use of group-based identification and at the same time to extend the use of social categories to provide a more contextually relevant description of social differences at a local level.

The neighbourhood context provides an important site for examining the aspects, manifestations, functioning and consequences of super-diversity for intergroup relations. Research on interethnic and intergroup relations at a local level can be aligned to Robinson’s (2010) three themes of population composition, context, and community, discussed below.

**Population composition – who lives in the neighbourhood?**
One explanation for the differences in outcomes for positive intergroup relations at a local level is the argument that the characteristics of the established population and arriving populations influence the nature and extent of social interactions. Most of the empirical research in this field has examined intergroup relations at the neighbourhood level using measures of social capital (social contact, trust and norms). Studies from the US tend to support the hypothesis that increasing ethnic diversity lowers contact and trust between all social groups (Putnam 2007; Alesina and La Ferrara 2002). Some scholars explain this is as a compositional effect. Trust is strengthened by individuals who form interethnic friendships (Górny and Toruńczyk-Ruiz 2014) and weakened by individuals who experience discrimination and poor socio-economic outcomes (Sturgis et al. 2011; Gijsberts, van der Meer, and Dagevos 2011). Other studies show that the extent of interethnic trust may be influenced by the proportionate size of one’s own group in relation to other groups, particularly for majorities.

As the proportion of migrant groups in the area increases relative to the majority group, social contact and trust is predicted to decline (Bakker and Dekker 2011). These studies are limited by their focus on interethnic relations obscuring the importance of other social categories for intergroup relations.

**Context - the physical and social environment**

Another explanation for observed differences in intergroup relations at a local level lies in the physical resources and social environment such as housing, employment, public services and
community activities. In contrast to the ‘diversity erodes trust’ thesis argued by scholars from 
the US, European scholars tend to argue that deprivation, not diversity, causes lower levels of 
social contact and trust (Gundelach and Freitag 2014; Becares et al. 2011; Havekes, Coenders, 
and Dekker 2014). In theory, super-diverse neighbourhoods offer greater opportunities than 
other contexts to meet and interact with people from other social and ethnic backgrounds 
(Amin 2002). Although as Reeve (2008) points out, those neighbourhoods that are apparently 
well equipped, with culturally sensitive public services, are often areas with high levels of 
deprivation, where the arrival of new groups can be a perceived as a threat to the social order 
of established groups. Intergroup trust is likely to be higher in contexts where there is social 
order, where intergroup conflicts are low, social networks are dense and civic norms are well 
established and accepted (Oberg, Oskarsson, and Svensson 2011). The physical appearance of 
the neighbourhood indicates the extent of civic cooperation and the nature of intergroup 
relations (Bakker and Dekker 2011; Sampson 2012).

Community - socio-cultural histories and collective identities

Hickman et al (2008) argue that the way in which neighbours represent their neighbourhood 
within local narratives is key to understanding intergroup relations in diverse contexts. They 
describe two distinct narratives of place: that of ‘being from here’ and that of ‘being from here
and elsewhere’. The ‘being from here’ narrative refers to neighbourhoods with limited historical experience of diversity in which there is cultural closure and an emphasis on social bonding. In the ‘from here and elsewhere’ neighbourhood, the majority of settled residents acknowledge the intrinsic diversity of the local community and there is a tendency for local attitudes to promote tolerant social norms (Hickman and Mai 2015). In the formation of collective identities, ethnicity may be less important than length of residence (Wallman et al. 1982; Hudson 2007). High levels of residential mobility and population churn usually lower neighbourhood attachment and weaken collective identity (Oliver 2010; Bailey, Kearns, and Livingston 2011). On the other hand, residential dispersal to other parts of the city reduces the likelihood of minorities becoming segregated in deprived neighbourhoods (Finney and Simpson 2009).

The three themes of Robinson’s Framework discussed above contribute in important ways towards explaining outcomes for intergroup relations in super-diverse neighbourhoods. Yet, there have been few studies that have examined the patterns, overlaps and linkages between these explanations in-depth. This article addresses this gap by drawing on primary data from a single case study of a super-diverse neighbourhood. The research was framed by the following questions: How do people respond to super-diversity? How do people perceive others and behave towards each other? What influences intergroup relations in a super-diverse neighbourhood?
Case study selection and methods

Case study selection

The case site neighbourhood of Govanhill is located in the city of Glasgow, in Scotland.

Population trends indicate an increasingly global neighbourhood population with diversifying
channels of migration in keeping with the characteristics of super-diversity. Local statistics for
the neighbourhood are usually based on the boundaries of the ‘Govanhill Neighbourhood
Area’, a sub-district defined by the local authority. Most of the research for this study was
conducted within a 12-block of tenement housing in the south west of the Govanhill
Neighbourhood Area, in a locality in which can be traversed on foot within ten minutes. Data
for 2011, shows that approximately a third of the population in the Govanhill Neighbourhood
Area was from an ethnic minority (33%) compared to the city average of 11%. There are less
people aged over 65 in the area than the average for the city and economic activity is close to
the city average. At least one quarter of the neighbourhood population is Pakistani, Indian or
other Asian with a large other-white population (See Table 1). Reluctance to disclose
ethnicity, coupled with the need for some families to move frequently means that accurate
data on vulnerable new migrants such as Roma, asylum seekers and refugees can be difficult
to obtain. An exercise to ‘map’ the Roma population (SMG 2013) estimated that between 3-
4,000 Slovakian and Romanian Roma were living in Glasgow, mainly concentrated in Govanhill.
From 2001-2011 the percentage of ethnic minorities (including new migrants and ‘other’
white) increased from 19% to 33% and there were signs of ‘white flight’ with a reduction in the
white Scottish, British, Irish population (Glasgow City Council 2012). A local primary school
recorded over 57 different home languages spoken by pupils, 25 of which are frequently used,
with only 4% of children speaking English at home (ODS 2013).

Methods

There are a number of challenges for empirical studies examining intergroup relations in
superdiverse neighbourhoods. Amongst the difficulties are first, diversity is sometimes used as
a proxy for ‘non-white’ meaning that some studies are examining long settled ethnic
communities but not migrant diversity (Laurence 2009). Second, the distinction between
inter-group interactions and intra-group interactions is not always made explicit (Li 2015). And
third, the extent of residential segregation or mixing in the local area can be difficult to
determine (Li and Wang 2016). Statistical models at this level of abstraction are arguably weak
in their ability to describe accurately the intensity, nature and frequency of interactions across
social groups. The best they can do is to estimate the likelihood of exposure to social
differences. This paper draws its evidence from an ethnographic case study in which the
overall intention was to gain a multi-layered understanding of social contact, the meaning and
effect of trust, and the relationship between everyday interactions and wider social and
material conditions.
The author had previously worked in the area as a community worker. This professional experience offered a unique opportunity to become embedded in the case site and to learn about the topics of interest. The research was carried out within micro-contexts that were theorised as potential sites for intergroup contact: streets, housing blocks, and group-based activities. The data comprised documentary evidence, local statistics, participant and direct observations, semi-structured interviews and walk-along interviews with residents and local organisations. Fieldwork took place between February and December 2013.

Ethical approval was given for the study by the author’s academic institution. Language interpreters were used when required. Interviews with residents examined influences on residential choice; intentions to settle; perceptions of other social groups in the area; perceptions of neighbourhood change; involvement in local groups and activities; and contact with immediate neighbours. Employee interviews were used to explore narratives of place, the nature of the relationships and, where appropriate, experiences of facilitating intergroup contact. The semi-structured interviews lasted approximately 45-60 minutes. Walk-along interviews varied in length from 10 to 30 minutes. Interviews were recorded on an audio device and then transcribed.
An on-going analytical task of this study was to organise the local population into identifiable ‘groups’ for the purposes of the description and analysis of data. The complex nature of social relations in super-diverse contexts required a context-specific approach to understanding social differences and inequalities. The concept of social milieu (Vester 2005) was used as an analytical tool for researching intergroup relations. This allowed the possibility of combining external, ‘objective’ social categories with the reported ‘subjective’ categories of research participants while recognising that individuals identify in different ways and according to different types of interaction and contexts. The identified milieus are likely to be broadly representative of the neighbourhood population yet they do not aim to be an exhaustive categorisation of all residents. Five social milieus were identified (see Table 2).

In total 57 people were interviewed in this study, 35 local residents and 22 local businesses and community organisations. The approach to sampling research participants was to achieve a spread of participants across the five social milieus. The final sample was skewed in favour of Kinship-sited Roma and Liberal Homeowners. The former expressed a preference for group-interviews, increasing the sample size. The later were highly motivated to participate. Across the residents sample, one third of interviewees were Scottish Asian and Nostalgic Working class; one third were Kinship-sited Roma and Global Migrants; and one third Liberal Homeowners. Resident participants were selected on the basis that they were aged between
18 and 65 and lived within the 12 block tenement housing area. This criteria was met except for 3 participants who lived in the streets bordering the housing area.

An integrative approach was taken to analysis of the data. Although the generation of themes was mainly data driven, the themes selected through analysis were chosen on the basis of their explanatory value as well as frequency of occurrence and coverage. For ethical reasons, identifiers such as names have been removed and replaced with pseudonyms.

Findings

Scotland is a country with historically low-levels of migration although, in recent years, the rate of population increase in the non-UK born population in Scotland has been faster than the rest of the UK with the city of Glasgow experiencing the largest numerical increase of all Scottish cities (Krausova and Vargas-Silva 2013). Govanhill is widely recognised as one of the most diverse neighbourhoods in Scotland (Ross 2013). It has a long-history of migration rooted in coal mining and the pre-industrial era when Irish migrants and Highlanders built its tenement housing. Later, Jewish communities settled in the area followed by migrants from the Indian subcontinent (Edward 1993). In the 1960s and 70s, with the demolition of the ‘slum’ tenements in neighbouring areas such as the Gorbals, new Irish and Asian families arrived (Kearsley and Srivastava 1974). Over recent decades, the availability of low cost private rents,
proximity to the city centre, community and religious facilities has contributed to its attraction for new migrants. In the following section, Robinson’s framework is applied to the case study data to reveal how different population groups respond to changes in population diversity, neighbourhood context and community.

**Nostalgic Working Class**

For residents in this milieu, diversity in the neighbourhood was taken for granted. Mary, had lived in the area all her life: ‘We grew up with it. The shops it was always a Pakistani man that had the shops. You were used to it, it wasn’t nothing unusual….It has never been a white community, Govanhill, never’. Despite this acceptance of diversity, these residents felt negatively towards recent population changes, in particular the arrival of Roma migrants. Isabel, described how she went out less often and had lost her confidence to walk in the street. ‘I’m looking over my shoulder all the time. Quite often I will not go to the cash line because there are too many of them hanging about’. Mary bemoaned the loss of her friends and neighbours: ‘my sister…. she is moving house at the weekend because of the state of the place’.

A key aspect of the neighbourhood context that shaped intergroup relations for this milieu was the density of tenement housing which increased sensitivity to the activities of people living in
These research participants lived in small tenement flats which they rented from the local housing association or had bought from the local authority. Isabel, like others in this milieu, spent long hours at home. According to her neighbour ‘she knows who is coming and going at all times of the day, she doesn’t keep very well so she’s always at home, so she knows people’s footsteps’. The visible presence of groups of Roma migrants in the streets, escaping the cramped conditions of tenement housing, increased feelings of insecurity. The response of residents like Mary and Isabel to super-diversity was to ‘hunker down’ (Putnam 2007), to stay at home and withdraw from face-to-face interaction. Although this withdrawal did not apply to all forms of social contact. For Mary, on-line community Facebook group provided a way of reconnecting with old friends and expressing her feelings of loss and nostalgia for the past.

Nostalgic Working Class participants aligned to a narrative of ‘community’ in which belonging was conferred through length of residence, shared memories and conformity to local norms of behaviour. Scottish Asian residents were accepted as part of ‘the Govanhill community’ and Global Migrants were largely ignored. Roma, on the other hand, were regarded as ‘outsider groups’ and were judged uncivilised or immoral. They were excluded from ‘The Community’ and compared unfavourably to ‘junkies’ [drug users] and ‘wrong-uns’ [immoral people]. This narrative of community resonated strongly with Anderson’s (2013) description of the ‘Community of Value’ as defined from the outside by the Non-Citizen (the Migrant), and from
the inside by the Failed Citizen (the Criminal, Benefit Scrounger, the Prostitute); and with Wimmer’s (2004) schema of inclusion and exclusion based on perceived morality.

**Scottish Asian**

Scottish Asian participants expressed ambivalence towards the changing population of the neighbourhood. Saqid, was both a resident and a private landlord. Born in Govanhill to parents from Pakistan, he grew up a muslim boy attending a catholic school. He explained that this experience in childhood helped him to understand the isolation which was now felt by his white Scottish neighbours. At the same time he recognised that the contact he had with Slovakian and Romanian tenants through his letting business, had helped him to adapt to the changing population. In common with others in this milieu, he deliberated over how to judge the negative reaction of his neighbours.

‘I don’t think they welcome other people. They have this sort of, I wouldn’t call it racism, but, apprehension of the new people. What are they going to be like? But to be honest when you get to know them they are just like everybody else, they have kids, they have got their own lives and concerns, the bills to pay, they have got jobs to go to, the kids to go to school. Basically they are getting on with life.’
Aspects of the neighbourhood context that shaped intergroup relations for this milieu were the opportunities to run local businesses such as retail or letting property. Estimates show that between 2001-2011 there was an increase in the size of the private rented sector in Govanhill of 52% and a concurrent decrease in the owner occupation by 17% (Glasgow City Council 2012). Interviewees reported that white Scottish and Scottish Asian owner-occupiers had been leaving and moving to neighbouring areas. Young professionals had bought some of the vacant properties, while other properties had been retained by their owners as private lets. Officers from the City Council attributed the subsequent declining material conditions to ‘bad landlords’ and ‘lack of effective community resistance to their activities’. Scottish Asian residents cited a wider range of causes including economic recession and irresponsible tenants. For Sadiq, another cause of social tensions was the lack of enforcement of housing laws. ‘I wouldn’t say the laws are not there, they are just not enforced. Homeowners complain about tenants. Nothing gets done. There’s no real power in the authority to do anything’.

According to a local letting agent the falling property prices provided little economic incentive to maintain housing. ‘The maintenance cost and the housing value just don’t add up’.

Despite concerns over personal safety and material decline, Scottish Asian residents and businesses expressed reluctance to get involved in community dialogue on neighbourhood issues. They cited long working hours, business competition, language barriers, and lack of
trust in the competence of public services. According to another local businessman ‘this is the biggest problem in our Asian community. We never report the matters’.

**Liberal Homeowners**

Most Liberal Homeowners said they had moved to Govanhill to buy their first property seeking a cheaper alternative to the ‘gentrified’ west end of the city. There was an attraction to the idea of a neighbourhood that had a multicultural ‘buzz’. One interviewee felt that as a lesbian, she would be safer in a diverse area. ‘Being queer, as long as there is diversity you are just one of the diversities and so you are safer’. Yet the normative expectation of greater tolerance did not always match the experience. Another woman described how her friends, a gay couple, were selling up because they had suffered violence and homophobic abuse.

Aspects of the neighbourhood context that strongly influenced the intergroup relations of Liberal Homeowners were problems with property maintenance in mixed tenure. These residents had moved to the neighbourhood to buy their first property seeking a cheaper alternative to the ‘gentrified’ west end of the city. Yet at the time of this study, many were planning to move out of the area. The most common reason for leaving was the strain of ongoing housing and property maintenance problems. Jan, a young professional, explained:

‘This is a beautiful area to live in and yet no-one is taking care of it and at some point it’s just
going to crumble’. She described how a close friendship with her Scottish Asian neighbours had changed when they moved out and let their flat: ‘They are behaving in the same way as absent landlords are behaving’. With the fall in house prices many homeowners were in negative equity and were unwilling to invest in their properties. Court orders from the local authority had forced some to undertake structural repairs adding to their housing debt. Those that wanted to leave the area were often unable to sell and were faced with potential bankruptcy or becoming private landlords themselves.

Those Liberal Homeowners who remained were highly motivated to volunteer in collective efforts to improve the neighbourhood. Many joined the local Resident’s Group. It’s members were described by one interviewee as ‘likeminded, professional people, who are able to grasp systems and take advantage of whatever is out there’. According to another member ‘It’s like the sort of 30-40 somethings, owner occupiers, readers of the Guardian, liberal lefties’. The negative media and public discourse was affecting the neighbourhood’s desirability. These residents sought to counter this negativity by promoting a narrative of community founded on diversity and inclusion. Yet this positive representation of Govanhill was highly contested. The struggle was particularly intense between Nostalgic Working Class and Liberal Homeowners who often held opposing views on what type of place Govanhill was and should aspire to be.

Kinship Sited Roma
As a result of persecution and exclusion in Central and Eastern Europe, the nature of Roma migration to the UK might be seen to occupy a grey area between ‘voluntary’ and ‘forced’ migration (Poole & Adamson 2008). Roma residents in Govanhill lived close to their extended family and maintained trans-local ties to their home villages. Kinship was not simply a biological and emotive tie but also a form of in-group economic and social security. Many Roma interviewees felt that the super-diversity of the neighbourhood offered them the possibility of greater equality. Radomir, from Slovakia, believed that the authorities were less likely to discriminate against Roma in a super-diverse area. ‘Everyone is from somewhere... so everyone is kind of equal in that sense that no one community from the variety of communities within Govanhill is standing out’.

Aspects of the neighbourhood context that shaped the intergroup relations for Roma were poor material conditions and housing deprivation. Most Roma interviewees were living in overcrowded conditions in poor quality private rented housing and had very limited knowledge of their legal housing rights. Housing problems included front doors and windows without locks, rising and penetrating damp, falling plaster, poor states of repair and safety standards, homes lacking smoke detectors, double-glazing, extractor fans and gas safety checks. A submission from the local authority to the Scottish Government (2010) described ‘extreme overcrowding’ and ‘problems relating to health and safety, privacy, cleanliness,
comfort, noise, wear and tear on the common parts, perceived threat, infestations, standards of behaviour, management problems, and creation of the need for major works or demolition’ (see also Phillimore 2013). Despite these unsafe housing conditions, local community workers explained that Roma participation in community activism was limited by low levels of personal confidence and self-efficacy, language barriers and future settlement uncertainty. In a group interview, a Slovakian Roma woman explained that Govanhill ‘was home’ until the authorities forced them to move. ‘There are words going around that people who don’t have a job, they will send those people away.’

Global Migrants

Global Migrant interviewees believed that super-diversity provided some protection from discrimination, although in common with other residents they expressed feelings of insecurity and lack of personal safety. Aziz, a refugee from Somalia, had moved many times to different cities in the UK seeking a safe place for her children to grow up: ‘I moved here because there were shops near, and I was near Queen’s Park for my kids to get fresh air. Somewhere where no-one is pushing or attacking us’. A key aspect of neighbourhood context that shaped intergroup relations for Global Migrants in this study was the nature of housing. Global Migrants usually lived in private rented accommodation. The increasing number of poor quality lets and falling housing prices, encouraged high levels of residential churn and
population instability. Yet these difficult material and social conditions occasionally prompted
greater intergroup cooperation as neighbours worked together to improve building security
and maintenance of the communal areas such as the hall, stairs and back garden. Global
Migrants interviewees had established friendships with their neighbours, often Liberal
Homeowners. Neighbours would support each other with small acts of kindness and
cooperation such as shopping, taking in parcels, supervising children, and helping to fix
practical problems.

Global Migrant residents said they were unlikely to attend a community meeting unless
accompanied by a Scottish friend or neighbour. Jaz, an Indian Sikh, explained: ‘Actually, I’m
scared...I think it will be all Scottish people there and only me standing out, I’ll look different’.
Informal community activities were more popular. The Women’s Drop In, held in a church hall,
provided a convivial space for knitting and chatting as well as English language classes. This
was one of the few community spaces where Global Migrant, Scottish Asian and Roma
women came into regular contact and built familiarity.
Discussion

Applying Robinson’s Framework, this paper has explored intergroup relations in a single superdiverse neighbourhood and highlighted the various responses to increasing superdiversity; the importance of the neighbourhood context, the role of housing, out-migration and the link to community narratives and public dialogue. In relation to population composition, residents within different social milieus responded to super-diversity in strikingly different ways. Nostalgic Working Class residents were comfortable with the old and familiar diversity they had grown up with, but reacted negatively to the arrival of Roma migrants, leading to withdrawal, ‘hunkering down’, out-migration and increased in-group bonding. Liberal Homeowners promoted a community narrative of diversity and inclusion, which likewise increased their in-group bonding and preference for neighbours who were ‘likeminded’. Scottish Asian residents expressed ambivalence towards increasing super-diversity and empathy with the different perspectives of both long-settled residents and new arrivals. For Kinship-sited Roma and Global Migrants, super-diversity held the promise and expectation of greater protection from discrimination, although in practice inequality was experienced by residents across all social milieus and across a range of diversity dimensions including ethnicity, sexual orientation, housing tenure and socio-economic status. Attitudes towards super-diversity were contradictory and ambivalent across social milieus suggesting that the influence of population composition on outcomes for intergroup relations is difficult to determine.
This analysis provides support for the thesis that the neighbourhood context drowns out other effects on intergroup relations (Letki 2008) but takes this further by highlighting how the material conditions within a super-diverse neighbourhood influence the nature of interactions between neighbours. Housing density and proximity to neighbours increased the anxiety of Nostalgic Working Class residents and avoidance of social contact. Scottish Asian residents interacted with other residents through their local businesses, although private letting was an ongoing source of social tension. Despite the initial optimism of Liberal Homeowners, the stress and financial burden of property maintenance took its toll and they began to leave the area. Even those liberally minded individuals who had chosen to live in a superdiverse area found that their positive feelings towards diversity were tested when population change was associated with material decline and financial loss. Roma migrants struggled with housing deprivation and overcrowding and were made scapegoats for neighbourhood decline by other residents. Global Migrants, like Roma, sought safe and secure homes, free from discrimination. Across all social milieus, declining housing and environmental conditions usually had a negative influence on intergroup relations. Yet at a micro level, within residential buildings, this study found that poor material conditions could occasionally lead to greater inter-group cooperation as residents struggled together to solve housing problems. This suggests that the micro contexts for social interactions – the buildings, streets, and group-based activities -
change the nature of intergroup relations, reifying some social differences while diminishing others.

The findings here demonstrate how neighbourhood context and changing population composition inter-relate to shape collective narratives. The out-migration of owner-occupiers caused a change in the balance of housing tenures, increasing private renting. Material decline, in turn, drove a further acceleration in the rate of out-migration by owner-occupiers and a process of ‘gentrification failure’. Efforts to arrest neighbourhood decline played out in contrasting narratives of community, with diversity and openness pitched in opposition to security and belonging. These contrasting narratives suggest that the challenge for inclusive notions of community in a super-diverse neighbourhood may be as much about overcoming boundaries of social class as bridging other social differences such as ethnicity.

Despite pro-migration attitudes in Scotland (McCollum, Nowok, and Tindal 2014) this case demonstrates that at a local level the direct experience of material decline can have a profound effect on attitudes. At the city scale, the impact of new migration is likely to be more contested in a city that faces significant economic challenges, such as Glasgow, than in a city at the top of the global economic hierarchy, such as London (Schiller and Çağlar 2009). Reliance on a form of voluntary cooperation within mixed tenure buildings to maintain housing standards may run counter to wider economic conditions in the city. Where this collective
responsibility breaks down a ‘tragedy of the commons’ occurs leading to an accumulation of negative externalities. Coordination failure (Cooper & John 1988) accelerates material decline which arguably pertains to a wider problem of housing and de-regulation. In a super-diverse neighbourhood, coordination failure in housing can have serious consequences for intergroup relations.

**Conclusion**

This article contributes to the literature on migration by highlighting that neighbourhood context and material conditions are more important for positive intergroup relations across social milieus than super-diversity. Further, this case demonstrates that in the study of neighbourhoods, population composition, context and community are so deeply entwined they cannot be treated as separate entities. It is empirically very difficult to demonstrate that one of these dynamics has an independent effect. Super-diversity is a process driven by mobility resulting in a set of complex and situated social relations in which shifting boundaries of commonality and difference are interlinked with changing physical and social contexts. Application of Robinson’s Framework to intergroup relations in a super-diverse context illuminates the interrelations between social milieus; residential mobility; tenure change; housing deprivation; declining material conditions; and the nature of collective identities and public dialogue. Superdiverse neighbourhoods perform functions within the city that are
complex and at times contradictory - as arrival zones for new migrants, starter and transitional
areas for first time buyers and private renters, and places of security and belonging for ethnic
minorities and long-settled residents. Super-diversity, in itself, is not the driver of negative
intergroup relations. It is the changing neighbourhood context that emerges from this study as
more important.

Early indications of the potential for material decline at a neighbourhood level are the
outmigration of long-settled owner-occupiers and increases in poor quality private renting.
For policy makers concerned to improve inter-group relations in super-diverse
neighbourhoods, it may be necessary to intervene early to retain higher levels of owner
occupation within the neighbourhood. The nature of housing deprivation in super-diverse
areas may not be picked up by standard quantitative measures and the lack of data available
at a local level on residential mobility means that public services may be limited in their ability
to plan for changing needs (Reeve 2008). Increasing the range of local data sources and linking
socio-economic data to individual properties could enable public services to intervene earlier.

Robinson’s Framework draws attention to the contextual, compositional and collective aspects
of place and how these inter-relate to shape social relations. The Framework exposes the
ambiguities and difficulties with predicting local outcomes and uncovers some of the reasons
why intergroup relations differ across localities. While the Framework provides a useful ‘route map’ (Robinson 2010), for studying neighbourhoods and intergroup relations, there are difficulties with the conceptual distinctions within the Framework. Population composition is both an influence and an outcome of social relations; and context is both physical (the built environment), and social (opportunities for social interactions). The Framework encourages a localised analysis, which may not sufficiently account for broader spatial and historical drivers. Further, the Framework does not explain the ways in which the micro contexts – the buildings, streets, and community activities - change the nature of intergroup relations in the neighbourhood.

The extent to which we can draw broad conclusions from the application of the data from this study to Robinson’s Framework is inevitably limited by the size of the sample and the scope. Future studies could extend this work by applying Robinson’s Framework to other neighbourhood types. This would deepen our understanding of the interrelations between different concepts and methods of neighbourhood analysis and the relative importance of historical and multi-scalar influences on outcomes for neighbourhoods.
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The term ‘super-diversity’ is hyphenated by some scholars and is written without the hyphen by others. The reason given by some writers for consciously removing the hyphen is to seek to avoid super-diversity being misinterpreted as ‘more ethnic diversity’ (Meissner and Vertovec 2015).

The two forms of intergroup trust that are most widely discussed in the literature are ‘knowledge-based trust’ (Yamigishi & Yamigishi 1994) and generalised trust, also known as ‘trust in strangers’ (Uslaner 2002).

The ‘Other White’ category refers to all white people who are not Scottish, British or Irish. In Glasgow the rise in the ‘other white’ population can be attributed to people arriving from Central and Eastern Europe and Western and Southern European countries (Glasgow City Council 2012).

The word ‘tenement’ comes from the medieval Latin ‘tenementum’, meaning a property held by tenure; a house divided into separate, rented homes (Worsdall 1989).

The ‘tragedy of the commons’ is an economic theory of a shared-resource system where individuals acting in self-interest behave contrary to the common good and degrade the shared resource (see Hardin, G., 1968. The Tragedy of the Commons. Nature, 162, 1243-1248).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Glasgow</th>
<th>Govanhill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>593,245</td>
<td>14,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age and employment</td>
<td>16.1% &lt;15</td>
<td>17.0% &lt;15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.9% &gt;65</td>
<td>11.0% &gt;65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.5% economically active</td>
<td>63.3% economically active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% BME</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
<td>33.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>White British or Irish 84.6%</td>
<td>White British or Irish 60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White-Other 3.9%</td>
<td>Pakistani 21.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pakistani 3.8%</td>
<td>White-Other 6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>African, Caribbean or Black 2.4%</td>
<td>Other Asian 3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese 1.8%</td>
<td>Indian 2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indian 1.5%</td>
<td>African, Caribbean or Black 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Born outside of the UK</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 City and neighbourhood profiles (source National Records of Scotland 2011 Census – estimates for datazones amalgamated to estimates for neighbourhoods)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social milieu</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nostalgic Working Class</td>
<td>Mainly small households and older people, living in socially rented housing with strong attachment to the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scottish Asian</td>
<td>Long-settled ethnic minority families running local businesses and often owning and renting older tenement properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Homeowners</td>
<td>First-time owner-occupiers, mostly young professional couples and single people, often with an interest in the creative arts, gardening and community projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinship-sited Roma</td>
<td>Roma people who have migrated from Central and Eastern Europe living in close proximity to extended family. Mostly living in poor quality private rented accommodation and working in low-paid, informal and insecure forms of employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Migrants</td>
<td>Residents with global origins and small-dispersed social networks usually living in private rented housing with weak attachment to the neighbourhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 Descriptions of Social Milieus