Homemaking in Superdiverse Public Space

Paolo Boccagni

The Oxford Handbook of Superdiversity
Edited by Fran Meissner, Nando Sigona, and Steven Vertovec

Subject: Political Science, Ethnic Diversity, Political Behavior
Online Publication Date: May 2022 DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780197544938.013.20

Abstract and Keywords

This chapter invites a systematic exploration of the interplay between superdiversity and homemaking in the public urban space. The notion of home, as a form of special place attachment, also involves the public sphere and lies at the root of contrasting ways of perceiving, claiming, and using public sphere. Drawing on a literature review and original research on home and migration, this chapter discusses the factors whereby different social actors and groups have unequal rights and opportunities to make themselves at home in public regions, such as streets, parks, amenity infrastructures, or entire cities. In the lived experience of the public space, different social actors and groups claim or at least perceive certain portions of it as *their* home, where they hold a higher or even exclusive right to stay, be in control, and belong. Such processes tend to go unnoticed as long as they involve the ethnic and long-resident mainstream, but they become more visible and contentious when there is no self-evident majority group—no group that, by habituation if not by legal entitlement, is in a stronger position to call a certain place home. Overall, a critical emphasis on *home(making) in the public* scales "up" the metaphor of home to capture competing views of superdiverse public spaces and of the appropriate ways to use them. This raises substantive issues on the access, use, recognition, and even ownership of the public.

Keywords: superdiversity, homemaking, immigration, majority-minority relations, public space, home, city

Introduction

How (far) people feel and make themselves at home in public space, wherever there is no self-evident majority group, is an intriguing question for research on superdiversity. This chapter outlines a framework for the study of attachment and appropriation of public space in superdiverse urban areas, with the attendant claims for visibility, belonging and control. It does so through the lens of homemaking in the public (Blunt and Sheringham 2019; Boccagni and Duyvendak 2021), which scales "up" the notion of home to capture competing views and uses of superdiverse public space, given the infrastructures avail-

able and the power (un)balances between groups of residents and users. Such a lens raises substantive issues on the access, use, recognition and even “ownership” of urban public space.

The notions of both superdiversity and home hold a remarkably evocative power, albeit to different audiences, and are often taken as self-evident—which, in fact, they are not. It is important to discuss not only their meanings and implications but also the potential of their intersection in research on the lived experience of urban diversity. This chapter provides, on one hand, a conceptual overview (“A Conceptual Background: Why Homemaking and Superdiversity?”), which extends also to public space as a “stage” for negotiating the meanings, locations, scales, and infrastructures of home (“Unpacking the ‘Public’ as a Stage for Homemaking in Superdiverse Urban Space”). On the other hand, the chapter outlines a comparative research agenda on the ways in which home is framed, felt, and claimed, at the core of majority-minority relations in the city (Approaching the Superdiverse Public Space as Home: Framing, Feeling, Claiming). This is a precondition for exploring the factors whereby different social actors and groups have unequal rights, opportunities, and inclinations to feel at home in superdiverse public regions such as streets, parks, and leisure or shopping facilities. Such an effort is revealing of the prospects and dilemmas for identification and engagement with public space as a proxy of home, both within and across groups.

In principle, the empirical field of reference of this argument is as large as the one to which the notions of homemaking in the public and superdiversity apply—that is, large-scale metropolises, wherever they are located. In practice, due both to the uneven distribution of empirical research so far and to my own research limitations, I will use mostly examples from multiethnic urban areas in Western countries.

A Conceptual Background: Why Homemaking *and* Superdiversity

Home, as an idea and a lived experience of place, does not necessarily overlap with domestic space, if any. It may also stretch to people’s ways of being in the public space and inform them with its imaginative, emotional and moral underpinnings. The city, in particular, can be approached as a “geography of home” in its own right (Blunt and Bonnerjee 2013). This is particularly relevant to the negotiation of public space in a superdiverse neighborhood. However, what home means and how it is “made” under conditions of superdiversity, and how the latter notion contributes to the social study of home, are questions that await a specific conceptualization. As a way to advance this, I revisit the debate on superdiversity, drawing from the recent literature on homemaking in Western cities (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2017; Blunt and Sheringham 2019; Wilkins 2019; Boccagni and Duyvendak 2021). This includes several illustrations of how different people and groups, including marginalized ones, articulate a sense of home and struggle to emplace it in the public space in which they live, hang out, or gather together.

As a category of analysis, *home* can be seen precisely as a joint exercise of attachment to and appropriation of places, potentially interweaving multiple scales (Boccagni and Kusenbach 2020). It highlights how people try to subject a particular place to a sense of security, familiarity, and control that should set it apart—make it more special, one's "own," and potentially more exclusive than the surrounding environments (Douglas 1991). Home is therefore a matter of social practices that *make* it from the point of view of particular actors and are not necessarily restrained to the domestic domain (see Yeoh, this volume).

But if the notion of home has a powerful impact on the collective imaginary, the same cannot be said for the derivative notion of *homemaking*. Once understood not as a gendered set of domestic practices, but as an umbrella term for all the ways in which people try to make themselves at home, this concept has certainly not "captured the imagination of social scientists" in a way comparable to superdiversity, particularly in Europe (Foner et al. 2019, 1). However, homemaking should not be seen only as a matter of individual choices or constraints. It has also an aggregate and societal dimension, particularly whenever it unfolds in the public domain, which lies at the core of research on superdiversity.

Talking about homemaking in the public space is not simply a way to acknowledge that a given population is more or less well-settled in a certain area, which is thus (nonliteral) *home to* that group. It is, rather, a matter of exploring whether people feel *at home* there, are recognized as "belonging" or as a legitimate presence there and can make themselves substantively at home—exert a sense of attachment and appropriation in some portion of, or an event in, the public space. This is critically affected by the predominant atmosphere in intergroup relations (Peterson 2017) and by the underlying structure of opportunities (Caponio et al. 2019). The question is how, if at all, does a sense of home emerge from the interplay between how people feel (together) in a certain social, natural, or built environment, what they do to that environment and what the environment "does" to them.

Homemaking in public is by no means specific to immigrants or other minorities. It is as pervasive, though far more legitimate and less noticeable, in the ethnocultural mainstream. Precisely for this reason homemaking gets more intriguing and complex when it is enacted, or at least attempted, by minority members and their descendants (Blunt and Sheringham 2019). In practice, the ways of articulating and emplacing a sense of home by different groups or categories of users of the same public space are not necessarily in accord with each other or with those of their majority counterparts. This is enough to show the potential of a systematic exploration of the interplay between superdiversity, as a societal condition and a representation of it, and homemaking, as a set of practices whereby people feel at home by using certain urban infrastructures in a given time-space.

The notion of superdiversity itself is not self-evident once it is taken as category of analysis rather than as a vague and evocative byword. Out of many different ways to understand it (Vertovec 2019), my approach points primarily to a descriptor of any local sociodemographic arrangement with no majority ethnic or sociodemographic group, numer-

ically speaking (Crul 2016). This does not entail the absence or the reconfiguration of significant unbalances of power and opportunities between residents, whether in terms of legal status, length of stay, ethnic background, or social class—most fundamentally, between "white" long-settled residents and the rest (Foner et al. 2019; Alba and Duyvendak 2019).

In more analytical terms, I stick to the use of *superdiversity* as a catchword for the "transformative diversification of diversity" (Vertovec 2007, 1025): an invitation to acknowledge the complex interaction between a number of axes of societal diversification within the same setting. In this optic, the local battlefield of who has a right, an opportunity, or an interest in making themselves at home cuts across several lines of differentiation between the mainstream and minorities in terms of immigrant background, religion, sexual orientation, legal status, and so forth. At the same time, dealing with superdiversity for research purposes, no less than for policy ones, may well require some parsimony—the need and ability to prioritize some lines of diversification over others (Crul 2016; Berg et al. 2019), instead of surrendering to the perceived societal complexity "out there."

At a subjective level, furthermore, superdiversity is a conceptual toolkit to research the stretching of individual and group alignments beyond a "tick box" view of reality (Fanshawe and Sriskandarajah 2010)—that is, beyond a neat compartmentalization of diversity in homogeneous and mutually exclusive categories. For sure, this is only a possible development, and it calls for empirical confirmation. That said, how does it affect views, feelings, and claims about home in the public?

Unpacking the "Public" as a Stage for Homemaking in Superdiverse Urban Space

That the public space should be universally accessible, home *to* anyone and *of* no one in particular, is a common-sense idea that obscures the stratified social patterns that tend to make public space highly differentiated, fragmented, and far from neutral. There is a mainstream subtext in the predominant and expected ways to stay in the public space and use it, which emerges only wherever the mainstream itself loses prevalence in terms of demographics and numbers—that is, under conditions of superdiversity. Much of this subtext of "normality" is the cumulative outcome of everyday and elementary forms of domestication (Koch and Latham 2013) whereby some social actors and groups are used to seeing certain portions of public space as *their* place, where they have an obvious right to stay, belong, and be in control. Instances can be found on all scales, from a street corner to an entire city, and beyond, in ways that tend to go unnoticed as long as they involve ethnic and long-resident majorities.

In fact, the very meaning of public space is nothing obvious, as much literature has shown (Mitchell 1995; Lofland 1998; Bodnar 2015), and as the emergence of superdiversity further reveals (Vertovec 2015). For the purpose of this chapter, public space designates any place and setting that, at least in theory, is equally accessible for ordinary

people's transition, use, and consumption; more metaphorically, as an open stage where a variety of superficial encounters take place across and within groups, with some potential to turn into more meaningful ones (Valentine 2008; Koch and Latham 2013). Urban squares, streets, and parks, as well as transportation facilities or buildings associated with shopping or leisure are all cases in point.

Across these settings, the boundaries of what is public are shifting over space and time, but also in the here-and-now. A particular public place or infrastructure may be simultaneously experienced as "public" and "parochial" (Lofland 1998) by different social actors and groups (Peterson 2017). Put otherwise, it may be home-like, irrelevant, or utterly unhomely depending on its interlocutors, given the different configurations of superdiversity they articulate; home-like in some moments and unhomely in others, based precisely on the presence of some and the absence of others.

Relative to the notion of domestication, homemaking emphasizes the emotional bases of the experience of place, but also the different meanings and understandings of home that inform it. Its empirical relevance, however, has not to do only with abstract emotions and imaginaries, but also with observable practices—including the simple act of staying in a place—and materialities, that is, infrastructures that afford an emplaced sense of home. As an category encompassing people's various ways of approaching certain public settings as proxies of home, homemaking operates at several levels:

1. The translation and extension into the public of supposedly private practices, such as personal conversations (Kumar and Makarova 2008), but also the literal reproduction of domestic routines (eating, sleeping, washing, cultivating intimacy, etc.) outside a domestic setting. This is most visible in cities with large informal settlements and for those marginalized from formal housing (Mitchell 1995; Parsell, 2012);
2. The nourishment of a sense of being at home there-and-then, based on "positive" locally emplaced emotions like familiarity, security, and comfort. This is not infrequent as people get accustomed to public locations such as bars (e.g., Hall 2009), squares (Kuurne and Gómez 2019) or parks (Neal et al. 2015);
3. Particularly for international migrants, the reiteration of activities that made them feel at home in their countries of origin, produce positive resonances with their everyday lives prior to migration, and enable symbolic or instrumental connections with people living elsewhere (Mazumdar et al. 2000). Migrant collective practices in the sphere of religion, leisure, food, or consumption are exemplary of their possibility to reproduce certain patterns, possibly essentialized but meaningful, nonetheless, of their own lifestyles (Law 2001; Hondagneu-Sotelo 2017; Miranda-Nieto and Boccagni 2020). In doing so, migrants make the public sensorially, mnemonically, or emotionally home-like for a while, only to leave it to slip back to its mainstream neutrality in the everyday. At the same time, the cumulative habituation of these practices may result in some claim of "ownership" or control over a public space as the home of certain people, prior to others.

In all these respects, homemaking in the public space involves “empty” or “neutral” areas or infrastructures as much as semipublic settings such as shops, places of worship, libraries, community centers, and the like, whether under dedicated or mainstream arrangements.

Importantly, minority homemaking in the public operates also as a reaction to substandard or severely inadequate housing conditions, as well as to marginalization or stigmatization by the mainstream. In a deeper and more existential sense, the need to attach a sense of home to a public space may reflect the failure of one’s domestic space to meet the normative ideal of home. Particularly for women who suffer domestic violence, or youth who struggle to negotiate a personal space of autonomy, certain public spaces or infrastructures can provide an ancillary sense of home, at least for a while. This is mediated by shared social practices along all the degrees of a continuum between mimicry and hypervisibility (Valentine 2008; Ahmet 2013; Back and Sinha 2016; Damery 2020).

Summing up, minority homemaking in the public is generally a matter of asserting visibility and recognition but also more explicit forms of control over a space, starting from a marginal position. This tends to be done along lines of similarity and group homogeneity (whether this is based on a shared immigrant or ethnic background, religious belief, sexual orientation, etc.), rather than by acknowledging, let alone valorizing superdiversity. The latter is at best a backdrop that minorities themselves may well “naturalize” over time. I return to this important point below.

Approaching the Superdiverse Public Space as Home: Framing, Feeling, Claiming

Under societal conditions of superdiversity, and to do justice to superdiversity as an optic, research on homemaking can be fruitfully conducted on three analytical levels (Boccagni and Duyvendak 2021). These are meant to allow ideal-typical configurations of homemaking to emerge from, and be comparatively investigated across, superdiverse arrangements. Along a continuum of perceptions, emotions, and practices, research can be done simultaneously on the ways to frame, feel, and claim some portion of public space as home.

Framing Home in the Public

The first level, that is, *framing* public space as home, speaks to the ascriptive view of home as origin—where one comes from or, at least, where one has long been resident. Framing a national or local space as home comes simply from being or being considered native to it. This feeds into the long-standing debate on autochthony, rootedness and attachment to the homeland or, anyway, to a bounded territorial scale, as the foundations of individual and group identity (Zenker 2011). This implicit and unreflexive understanding of the public space as home out of cumulative habituation is the least likely to be shared by international migrants, including long-settled ones. As long as being born in a place is

what makes a difference, autochthony is a powerful marker of who is expected to have a right to be at home in that place It is on this marker that the jargon of domopolitics builds, thereby making the presence of outsiders subordinate and contingent on the good will of the host and the “appropriate” behavior of the guest. Framing the public space as home along these lines, across the class spectrum, articulates both an emotional attachment and an expectation of legitimate priority. It “not only means that the setting is familiar, safe and predictable but also that one feels in control: one belongs, and one believes (perhaps incorrectly) that one has the power to define who else belongs” (Alba and Duyvendak 2019, 110).

There is certainly no paucity of critical literature on the essentialized foundations of place-based identity politics, or on its exclusivist implications (e.g., Yuval-Davis 2010; Drozdewski and Matusz 2021). What is interesting, however, is that sociocultural and demographic superdiversity inherently challenges this frame of public space as home. Although erstwhile majority populations may keep seeing themselves as the owners of the public space, their perception of it as an ethnically homogeneous “home” corresponds less and less to the social fabric around them. Societal conditions that academics might label superdiversity—the everyday sensorial experience of “so many” nonnative faces, languages, and habits—are often blamed by right-wing populist actors as the culprit when local inhabitants no longer feel at home in their day-to-day life environments (Back and Sinha 2016; Hochschild 2016).

As important, superdiversity may undermine the very notion (if not the self-conception) of “native.” Once generations of migrants have settled in certain neighborhoods of superdiverse cities such as Amsterdam, Brussels, or London, the question of who is considered native becomes contentious. It may be that the descendants of the migrants’ themselves have been living there the longest. This does not imply, however, that they are seen as the most native or that they see themselves as such. By all measures, their claims for belonging and recognition continue being contentious. Put differently, superdiversity in itself may make little difference to the preexisting power asymmetries between White/native and other groups (Foner et al. 2019). Nor does it necessarily make intergroup relations less prone to exhibit conflicts and prejudices (Valentine 2008), or less exposed to the “paradoxical coexistence of racism and urban multiculture” (Back and Sinha 2016, 518).

In short, the superdiversification of society, even only at a neighborhood scale, has a twofold implication for the framing of public space as home. First, it is no longer so obvious who the autochthons are and what claims they may raise; second, their habituation and ambition to frame the public space as home clashes with the fact that it is increasingly faceted and multivocal—as such, hard to bring down to an exclusive and special place for someone to feel at home in. This also reveals the interplay with the emotional side of homemaking in the public.

Feeling at Home in the Public

Feeling at home in a city, as a matter of "urban dwelling," can be seen as a form of spatial attachment in its own right (Wilkins 2019). However, this feeling is not necessarily in synch with either a domestic or a national scale of belonging, particularly among immigrant newcomers (Blunt and Bonerjee 2013; Damery 2020). It is in the public space of a city, rather than in an entire country, that immigrants live, encounter majority populations, and negotiate mutual expectations, rights, and obligations. It is on a city level that the recent debate on integration has focused, particularly in Europe (Caponio et al. 2019). However, the argument presented here involves one step ahead into the local and the everyday—how specific areas and settings allow some to feel at home there-and-then (Kuurne and Gómez 2019) and how their sense of being at home is affected by superdiversity.

One could well maintain that in superdiverse cities, "when no one is integrated, then non-integration becomes the norm" (Damery 2020, 155). Put differently, the ingrained cultivation of a pragmatic acceptance of diversity may facilitate people's feeling at home, regardless of their background. However, feeling at home, or not, in a superdiverse public space is revealing of a whole range of social questions. An example from the fieldwork of HOMInG (the Home-Migration Nexus ERC project) on the experience of home in multiethnic neighborhoods can be of help here (Massa and Boccagni 2021).

Among the project's Somali informants in the superdiverse Stockholm district of Rinkeby the notion of home was frequently associated with that district, almost as much as with Somalia, albeit in a radically different sense (the latter being the ancestral and original home "given by God"; the former being an acceptable place to be at home in the here and now). In feeling at home in Rinkeby's town square, streets, or parks, possibly more than in their own dwellings, Somali immigrants and their descendants attached plural meanings and functions to the neighborhood; it is an arena for everyday hanging out with people with a similar language, religious, and ethnic background; an infrastructure that provides easy access to "ethnic" and cheap shops, bars, and restaurants; an array of local institutions that are attended in common, such as schools, community centers, and places of worship; a hub in the transnational "migration industry" (e.g., remittance and phone agencies) that makes it possible for them to stay connected with kin in Somalia or elsewhere in the diaspora. The latter aspect, in particular, revealed the need for a multiscalar approach to the neighborhood (Glick-Schiller and Caglar 2009), against the temptation to see it as an isolated and self-sufficient unit (Berg et al. 2019).

In all these respects, as many of our respondents used to say, living in Rinkeby "feels like being in Somalia"—that is, like being at home. However, this view of the neighborhood as home away from home(land) had to do with its being instrumental to the production of different forms of "Somaliness." This feeling was not related to Rinkeby's superdiversity, except on one major point: the possibility it afforded of seeing themselves and being seen by the others as *not* out of place since nobody was really *in* place. No majority group could claim to embody the mainstream, let alone autochthony, in a district where more

than 50 percent of the population was not from the EU or Nordic countries. Again, this feeds into the critical role of perceived normality in minority groups' ability to feel at home in a city or, at least, a neighborhood. For the local inhabitants, there is nothing "super" or "special" in what academics might call superdiversity, though. This is simply a "commonsense" experience that produces habituation but not necessarily support, whether in Rinkeby or in many other comparable local contexts (cf**.** Wessendorf 2014).

Furthermore, the sense of normality that emerged from our case study was contingent on staying in the neighborhood and also operated by opposition to a broader urbanscape perceived as distant and hostile. It was a normality that did not question either Rinkeby's overexposure to poverty, unemployment, and crime or its construction as a dangerous and undesirable ghetto from mainstream Stockholmers. Recognition as ordinary inhabitants of the city, on equal footing with the others, is precisely what was missing for our research participants to feel at home *out* of the comfort zone of the district.

As this example shows, people from ethnoracial or other stigmatized minorities may feel at home in a heterogeneous urban environment, in the sense of seeing themselves as "normal" or no more different than the others. This, however, does not necessarily protect them from the discrimination, let alone the long-term inequalities, associated with both their minority status and their context of settlement. Generally speaking, superdiverse sociodemographic arrangements remain deeply stratified in terms of social class, rights, and opportunities associated with a given position. That diversity, "super" or not, is considered normal or even irrelevant does little to challenge the deep-rooted inequalities associated with it.

Claiming Home in the Public

Yet another level of analysis involves the ways in which people may *claim* some superdiverse public space as home—"theirs" more than of other inhabitants or users. These derive from extended habituation and possibly, for minority groups, from the lack of alternative settings for sociability, recognition, or even only basic protection. Claiming home in the public may result in place-based mobilization, with stances ranging from visibility and recognition to appropriation and control. In this optic, even micro claims for being at home on a particular public turf have their own social and political significance. At the most basic level, minorities' extended presence and gatherings in the urban "socioscape" already make a claim for visibility, recognition, and diversification. Across immigration countries, case studies abound of forms of homemaking in the public based on temporary occupation of certain portions of public space—plazas (Law 2001), parks (Mitchell 1995), urban gardens (Hondagneu-Sotelo 2017), streets (Botticello 2007), and so forth—along lines of in-group commonality, ethnic or otherwise.

Place-specific forms of more explicit political mobilization are also relevant here. These can articulate a whole spectrum of political agendas, relative to, for instance, legal status, housing, and access or use of some space of their own. The local mobilization of minority and twice-stigmatized groups such as second-generation immigrants, LGBTQ peo-

ple, or religious minorities are exemplary in this respect (e.g., Becerra 2014; Damery 2020). The question is whether and how superdiversity, as a discursive and emotional repertoire and as an empirical reality, shapes these claims along lines other than collective categorization or group belonging. How far do forms of occupying public space cut across group alignments, unless in exceptional circumstances, such as mass protests?

On the one hand, the claim for recognition of one's difference and specificity—as, say, a group of undocumented migrant youth—is consistent with the argument that the increasing diversification of differences is something legitimate and worthy of recognition. "As long as we're all diverse here," the argument goes, "we can claim we all have a stake, in fact a right, to stay (possibly in some place of our own)." On the other hand, superdiversity as a discourse undermines all claims for home as an essentialized notion, including at a city or national level. It is, rather, an invitation to consider cross-cutting forms of mobilization in lieu of traditional group-based ones. If people cultivate or are attributed different identities or alignments at the same time, they may have little reason to mobilize as full-fledged members of one particular group. We could expect them, instead, to engage in shifting alliances across groups—for instance, as members of discriminated-against immigrant, sexual, or religious minorities (Gallegos 2019; Wimark 2019). Wherever people do mobilize along these lines, the stake of recognition involves less a group identity than an undifferentiated right to be accepted and included as different from the mainstream. However, superdiverse mobilization is likely more complex and selective than along the strong lines of traditional identity politics.

Back to the "Politics" of Home

At all these levels, and most visibly at the last one, the political significance of homemaking calls for attention to the local structure of opportunities, as defined by public services and policies (including welfare, immigration and social cohesion ones), housing arrangements, and by the scope for inclusion of immigrant or other minorities.

Moreover, the development and accessibility of local infrastructures has a critical role in the spatialization and reach of homemaking in the public sphere. This involves how different public areas facilitate or hinder the extended presence of a diverse arena of users—what Koch and Latham (2013) call the "furnishings" of public space. This infrastructural aspect, which varies across neighborhoods and cities, is, at least in part, a matter of top-down urban design. It does affect the possibility of feeling at home and making oneself at home, or not, in the public. At the same time, the assumption that feeling at home in public space should be a direct and desirable aim of public policy has gained some currency, particularly in Northern Europe, and yet has been widely criticized for a number of reasons (Duyvendak et al. 2016).

All this being said, there is a potential in local policies to facilitate, in terms of community work and development, forms of togetherness in the public—indirectly contributing to make it home-like—that try precisely to meet the needs and interests of a superdiverse audience. Investments in semipublic spaces like community centers and parks, but also

sport and recreational facilities, can pave the way toward a “superficial familiarity with diversity” out of people’s own participation, up to more “amicable encounters.” The key variable for success, Peterson (2017, 1077) suggests, is “not the degree of mixing.” It is rather “the extent to which people have something in common to bond over … a common goal of a higher emotional quality,” with a potential to cut across categorical divides (Kuurne and Gómez 2019). As important is the time spent there—hence the cultivation of routines of familiarity and personal acquaintances—for people to develop nonexclusive and light forms of attachment to the public space. This prospect is particularly challenging and elusive wherever superdiversity is associated with transient and fragmented migration pathways, rather than with linear trajectories of long-term settlement.

Conclusion

As this chapter has shown, the ways in which immigrants and other minority groups try to make themselves at home in superdiverse urban environments still suffer from a deficit of systematic investigation. More in-depth and comparative research is necessary on how a sense of home is negotiated in the public sphere across groups, rather than only within specific ethnically categorized collectivities. Exploring this in terms of framing, feeling, and claiming home helps to capture the situated interaction between cognition, emotions, and the practices of home, and the variation within and between groups. Both variations can be appreciated precisely in terms of superdiversity as an invitation to explore the significance of contrasting affiliations or markers of difference for people’s life opportunities, and for their ways of making sense of themselves and of their social positions.

As a proper concept, superdiversity is arguably “still in its infancy” (Foner et al. 2019, 2). It is also not easy to operationalize and hence to be empirically captured in terms of its macro, meso, and micro determinants and then compared across groups, locations, and time periods. It has, however, a key merit in itself, which is possibly part of its success story: its “potential to widen possibilities for individuals with migrant backgrounds to be acknowledged as human beings with a plurality of affiliations” (Foner et al. 2019, 14). Again, which of these affiliations are or should be privileged relative to the others is a question for which there is no blueprint for the answers, yet it is a very critical question for both practical and epistemological purposes (Berg et al. 2019).

All this being said, how does superdiversity affect people’s desire and need to make themselves at home within their social environments? As the available research suggests, stronger recognition and mainstreaming of superdiversity may facilitate minority people’s emplaced sense of home in the basic sense of feeling “normal,” that is, not stigmatized because of their difference. Everyday exposure to superdiverse environments can indeed lead to “greater recognition of diversity as normalcy” (Meissner and Vertovec 2015, 550), although it is not clear under which circumstances this is more likely the case. Yet more ambitious but equally fundamental dimensions of feeling at home, such as attachment, belonging, and control, are typically more difficult to cultivate outside one’s in-group and comfort zone. Achieving them, for immigrant or other minorities, may demand a capabili-

ty to revisit and make more flexible and inclusive their own views of home as an ascriptive, identity-foundational notion. This requires, in turn, that people be in a position to cultivate a long-term perspective of upward integration, whereby they can construct home as an achievement that lies ahead of them and is within their reach, rather than only a legacy or a burden from the past. Wherever such a perspective is unrealistic, and particularly in fragmented and transitory migration pathways, there is no reason to expect that everyday exposure to superdiversity makes people feel at home—unless, at best, in the pragmatic terrain of learning civil inattention to multiple, growing, sometimes hard-to-grasp forms of difference around them.

Acknowledgments

Research for this chapter has been done in the framework of HOMInG—ERC StG 678456 (2016-2022).

References

Ahme, A. 2013. “Home Sites: The Location(S) of “Home” for Young Men.” *Urban Studies* 50 (3): 621–634.

Alba R., and Jan W. Duyvendak. 2019. “What about the Mainstream?” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (1): 105–124.

Back, L., and S. Sinha. 2016. “Multicultural Conviviality in the Midst of Racism’s Ruins.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 37 (5): 517–532.

Becerra, M. 2014. “Performing Belonging in Public Space.” *Politics and Society* 42 (3): 331–357.

Berg, U. et al. 2019. “Welfare Micropublics and Inequality.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (15): 2723–2742.

Blunt, A., and J. Bonnerjee 2013. “Home, City and Diaspora.” *Global Networks* 13 (2): 220–240.

Blunt, A., and O. Sheringham. 2019. “Home-City Geographies.” *Progress in Human Geography* 43 (5): 815–834.

Boccagni, Paolo, and Jan W. Duyvendak. 2021. “Homemaking in the Public.” *Sociology Compass*, 15(6): 1–14. **https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12886**.

Boccagni, Paolo, and M. Kusenbach. 2020. “For a Comparative Sociology of Home.” *Current Sociology* 68 (5): 595–606.

Bodnar, J. 2015. “Reclaiming Public Space.” *Urban Studies* 51 (12): 2090–2104.

Botticello, J. 2007. “Lagos in London.” *Home Cultures* 4 (1): 7–23.

Caponio, T., et al. 2019. *The Routledge Handbook of the Governance of Migration and Diversity in Cities*. London: Routledge.

Crul, Maurice. 2016. “Super-Diversity vs. Assimilation.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 42 (1): 54–68.

Damery, S. 2020. “At Home ‘Outside’: Young Migrants Aligning Their ‘Home Orbits’ in the City of Brussels.” PhD thesis. Université de Liege.

Douglas, M. 1991. “The Idea of a Home: A Kind of Space.” *Social Research* 58 (1): 287–307.

Drozdewski, D., and P. Matusz. 2021. “Operationalising Memory and Identity Politics to Influence Public Opinion on Refugees.” *Political Geography*. **https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102366**.

Duyvendak, Jan W., et al. 2016. “Homing the Dutch.” *Home Cultures* 13 (2): 87–100.

Fanshawe, S., and D. Sriskandarajah. 2010. “You Can’t Put Me in a Box.” London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Foner, N., et al. 2019. “Super-Diversity in Everyday Life.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (1): 1–16.

Hall, Suzanne. 2009. “Being at Home.” *Open House International* 34 (3): 81–87.

Hochschild, A. 2016. *Strangers in Their Own Land*. New York: New Press.

Gallegos, L. 2019. “Conflicts of Homemaking.” *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 40 (2): 225–238.

Glick-Schiller, N., and A. Çağlar. 2009. “Towards a Comparative Theory of Locality in Migration Studies.” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (2): 177–202.

Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. 2017. “At Home in Inner City.” *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment* 32 (1): 13–28.

Koch, R., and A. Latham. 2013. “On the Hard Work of Domesticating a Public Space.” *Urban Studies* 50 (1): 6–21.

Kumar, K., and E. Makarova. 2008. “The Portable Home: The Domestication of Public Space. *Sociological Theory* 26(4): 324–343.

Kuurne, K., and M. V. Gómez. 2019. “Feeling at Home in the Neighborhood.” *City and Community* 18 (1): 213–237.

Law, L., 2001. “Home Cooking.” *Ecumene* 8 (3): 264–283.

Lofland, L. 1998. *The Public Realm*. New Jersey: Transaction.

Massa, A., and P. Boccagni. 2021. “The Neighborhood as Home Away from Home?” *Anthropological Journal of European Cultures* 30 (1): 1–26.

Mazumdar, S., et al. 2000. “Creating a Sense of Place.” *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 20: 319–333.

Meissner, Fran, and Steven Vertovec. 2015. “Comparing Super-Diversity.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 38 (4): 541–555.

Miranda-Nieto, A., and Paolo Boccagni. 2020. “At Home in the Restaurant.” *Sociology* 54 (5): 1022–1040.

Mitchell, D. 1995. “The End of Public Space?” *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 85 (1): 108–133.

Neal, S., et al. 2015. “Multiculture and Public Parks.” *Population. Space and Place* 21: 463–475.

Parsell, C. (2012). “Home Is Where the House Is.” *Housing Studies* 27(2): 159–73.

Peterson, M. 2017. “Living with Difference in Hyper-diverse Areas.” *Social and Cultural Geography* 18 (8): 1067–1085.

Valentine, G. 2008. “Living with Difference. *Progress in Human*.” *Geography* 32 (3): 323–337.

Vertovec, Steven. 2007. “Super-Diversity and Its Implications.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (6): 1024–1054.

Vertovec, Steven, ed. 2015. *Diversities Old and New*. London: Palgrave.

Vertovec, Steven. 2019. “Talking around Super-Diversity.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 42 (1): 125–139.

Wessendorf, Susanne. 2014. *Commonplace Diversity*. London: Palgrave.

Wilkins, A. 2019. *Migration, Work and Home-Making in the City*. London: Routledge.

Wimark, T. 2019. “Homemaking and Perpetual Liminality among Queer Refugees.” *Social and Cultural Geographies*. Online first.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2010. “Theorizing Identity. *Patterns of Prejudice* 44 (3): 261–280.

Zenker, O. 2011. “Autochthony, Ethnicity, Indigeneity and Control.” *Critique of Anthropology* 31 (1): 63–81.

Paolo Boccagni

Paolo Boccagni is Professor of Sociology and PI of ERC HOMInG (University of Trento). His research is mainly about migration, transnationalism, social welfare, diversity, and home-making. He has recently done fieldwork into the lived experience of home and the contentious field of views, emotions and practices associated with it, particularly in majority-minority relations and among immigrant and refugee newcomers.