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Abstract

This thesis is about spaces of multicultural encounter, and their potential to facilitate connections and relationships, of differing depth and duration, to emerge between individuals and groups who live in the North and West of Glasgow, nurturing precarious yet progressive forms of living together in the city.

Tracing people’s experiences of encounters across ethnic, cultural, religious and other differences, and their intersections, this thesis foregrounds the micro politics of encounter, connection making and belonging. I argue that emergent connections and relations, many of them seemingly banal and small, often bleed out beyond the immediate moment and specific site of encounter, impacting/changing wider socio-political imaginaries and narratives of nationhood, community and belonging in Scottish society. Critically, I can demonstrate that mundane and ‘everyday’ spaces of proximity and association play a key role in the unfolding of these processes. In accounting for the unevenness of people’s lived realities, and approaching encounters as sites of different co-existing trajectories, this thesis makes important contributions to relevant scholarship on the politics and geographies of everyday encounter, the spatialities of intersectionality, and the significance of localizing narratives of belonging and nationhood in specific contexts and localities in Glasgow and Scotland.

In three empirical chapters, this thesis draws upon feminist theories to dissect the various ways in which people’s complex and multi-layered identifications and positionalities intersect and become articulated in moments of multicultural encounter in mundane spaces, including local cafes, public libraries and community centers. Emphasizing the histories and geographies of place, it frames encounters with/across difference as moments of opportunity, holding the potential for both relations of connection and understanding and disconnection and tension to emerge between people differently situated in society, and towards each other. By making lucid the ‘practice’ of racialization, the thesis draws attention to embodied encounters and relational practices, always emotional and agentic, as small yet decidedly political acts that may unsettle, shift and disrupt wider discourses and dominant notions of place, identity and belonging in Glasgow, and wider society. In this respect, the thesis aims to explore contestations, articulations and entanglements of ‘being together in difference’ in and beyond local places, as people whose bodies and identities are constructed as other/visible/strange/different inhabit the city.
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1 Introduction

“…relational, embodied and emotional aspects of encounter [...] are central to how multi-culturalism, difference and diversity [are] lived.”

(Nayak 2017: 291)

1.1 Introduction

Today’s world is marked by migration, and the scale and extent of new and diversifying forms of human mobilities, migrations, settlements and resettlements increasingly re-shapes current (national) populations (Castles et al 2014). Unsurprisingly, then, these processes, and their implications, have been at the centre of heated political debates and public and academic discussions for some time, with the re/emergence of ethnic nationalism in Europe and the US being one aspect of these debates currently unfolding (Neal et al 2018). Yet, the anxieties surrounding anti-migration discourses and increasing levels of racist violence also always co-exist with the quotidian ways in which ethnically and culturally diverse populations peacefully live together. As the cultural differences and multicultural of modern urban life, evolved over decades of migration settlement, continue to shape ‘the micro, multifarious encounters, exchanges, tensions, activities that make up every day social worlds’ (Neal et al 2018: 1), it remains critical that ‘we define our collective identity through the way we live with difference rather than by the desperate assertion of sameness’ (Husband and Alam 2011: 223).

Geography has long been interested in the significance of contact in mediating difference and the implicit role of shared space in providing the opportunity for encounters between people who are differently situated. The body of work characterized as ‘geographies of encounter’ focuses explicitly on the ways in which people negotiate social diversity, urban difference, and prejudice, in and across everyday places and spaces (e.g. Neal et al 2015; Wilson 2011; Valentine 2008). This research centres on inquiries into the value of encounters, their potential for facilitating social change, their politics and spatio-temporality, generating important insights into understanding urban life, the unfolding of prejudice and racialization and the ways in which people learn to ‘live with difference’ (Hall 1993).

Contemporary research thoroughly describes the often convivial ‘being together’ of multicultural strangers and diverse populations, processes and continuing landscapes of racism and racialisation and the interlocking of encounters with local-global relations (Nayak 2017; Askins 2015; Koefoed and Simonsen 2012). Despite this research continuing to de-
bate the potential of encounters to unsettle prejudice, discrimination and the racialisation of specific bodies and identities in Western societies (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014, 2012; Amin 2012). Wessendorf (2013: 410, original emphasis) suggests that while ‘encounters in public associational space do not necessarily enhance deeper cultural understanding, [...] the absence of such encounters can enhance prejudice’. This underscores the ongoing importance of researching everyday encounters and their politics, and the shifting and changing relations between people, places and urban encounters.

This thesis investigates the relational, embodied and emotional aspects of everyday encounters, drawing on grounded insights from informal spaces of encounter populated by diverse and different individuals and community groups in the North and West of Glasgow, Scotland. These encounters are not always simple and ‘easy’, and moments of multi-ethnic and multicultural encounter and relation-building can be fraught with tensions and difficulties. It is therefore important to reveal the complexities of encounter and the friction that often accompanies processes of (dis)identification and (non)belonging (Nayak 2017). This thesis argues that everyday encounters, of differing depth and duration, have the potential to nurture a sense of (national) belonging, social inclusion and hope within Scotland’s changing political landscape, and it contends that informal meeting spaces open up opportunities for new ways of living together with difference in more inclusive and hopeful worlds (Wright 2015; Wise 2005).

Taking a feminist approach, the thesis aims to foreground the trans-formative potential of seemingly ‘small’ and banal encounters in everyday spaces of proximity and contact. This approach involves thinking through the often multi-layeredness of identities, the clashes and frictions that position people differently in their world, and to-wards each other, and the ways in which the global links up with the local, the past with the present, shaping encounters and notions of identity and space on ‘decidedly unequal terms’ (Featherstone 2017: 169). Such an approach involves taking everyday encounters seriously. Massey (1994) contends that moments and spaces in everyday life bring together past histories and uneven geographies, orienting bodies in the present (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014) and shaping socio-spatial relations that seep through into future encounters (Wilson 2016a).

This thesis reveals everyday encounters as crucial moments of relation-building, full of tension, that shape identities, spaces and worlds. I explore how encounters unfold across various informal spaces as I participate in and hang out at public libraries, local cafes and community centres in the North and West of Glasgow used by people for a variety of reasons and in different ways. I uncover the relational, contextual and everyday ways in which people encounter others across ethnicity, gender, age, class and/or religion, and
lay open moments of transformation, tension and hope. As I explore the ways in which social inclusion, belonging and a sense of shared identity(ies) emerge in the messy ways that encounters are experienced, enacted and performed through everyday spaces of relation, I find that these encounters, and the everyday, are always also political. At this starting point, I give a clearer sense of the conceptual landscape that this thesis engages with, and is embedded in, to more thoroughly locate the contributions I make to these debates.

1.2 Urban diversity and encounter: key conceptual contributions
At the heart of this thesis lies a concern with the increasingly ‘fearful’ engagement with, and problematizing perception of issues around migration, (re)settlement, multiculture, nationhood, ‘home’ and belonging; processes that shape, in diverse ways and to differing extents, many, if not all lives, realities and societies in today’s world. Dominant approaches to ethnic diversity and cultural difference often problematize and associate cultural difference with conflict, threats to national identities, social disorder and strain, with the notion of ‘multiculturalism’ and ‘diversity’ in twenty-first century Europe frequently being associated with failure and crisis (e.g. Jones 2015). While these debates have arguably been shaping the political context in Scotland to a lesser degree (e.g. Williams and de Lima 2006), Scotland is not immune to the influence of such narratives.

Simultaneously, research and debates from a wide range of disciplines and corners of society have continuously been challenging these narratives, emphasising the ways in which diversity and multiculture often does get managed and navigated in more constructive ways (Back and Sinha 2016; Wessendorf 2014b; Noble 2013; Hall 2012; Wise and Vlayutham 2009; Vertovec 2007a; Gilroy 2006, 2004; Amin 2002). The starting point in many of these (counter) debates is what Noble (2009) terms an ‘unpanicked multiculture’ approach to everyday life and contemporary urban realities, where cultural difference is often experienced as ‘ordinary’ and ethnic diversity as ‘commonplace’ (Wessendorf 2014a). Taking inspiration from, and attempting to add to these debates, the research presented in this thesis foregrounds the significance of mundane and quotidian ways of living together in/with difference, and the ways in which multicultural relations and connections are often carefully, consciously and successfully managed in/through ‘placed’ encounters.

This contribution is paralleled by an understanding that ‘multiculture/ism’ is a widely debated term, the current widespread ‘backlash’ in public discourse and policy debates in the UK and across Europe against concepts of multiculturalism, diversity, difference, integration and cohesion (e.g. Malik 2015; Heath 2012; Helm et al 2011; BBC News 2010) highlighting that each is a ‘complex, multifaceted, multivocal phenomenon’ (Grillo 1998 in
Vertovec 2007b: 968), ‘capable of multiple interpretations, with changing associations of what is “good” or “bad” for society’ (Vertovec 2007b: 969). Accordingly, I use the term ‘multiculture’ to hold central the continuous process through which people arrive, live and settle in Glasgow, and through which participants, in negotiating diverse aspects of their intersecting identity(ies), shape local spaces and social relations in the city. This process involves actors with varying access to power, and is multiple and complex. Indeed, the empirical materials will show that processes and practices of exclusion exist alongside more positive aspects of multiculture, some of which can hinder especially minority groups to participate in different aspects of urban and local life in Glasgow. Similarly, I am aware of the power inherent in the terms ‘minority’ and ‘ethnic’, their use to differentiate and single out particularly non-white people from the wider population sitting uncomfortably with many (e.g. Parks and Askins 2015; Ware and Back 2002). Still, I employ these terms in an attempt to express that, while we all have ethnicity, some ‘ethnic groups’ constitute a minority that faces particular challenges in society that other groups do not. Sometimes I use the language of particular author/s or reports, e.g. referring to ‘ethnic minorities’ or ‘black and ethnic minority groups’, associated problems with the term ‘black’ being usefully explained elsewhere (e.g. Modood 1994).

At its core, then, living together represents an unfinished process of *becoming* in which minority and majority groups co-constitute and shape the other in dynamic and contingent ways; an understanding of human life that I use in this thesis to stress and recognise the ‘unfinished range of possibilities’ (Neal et al 2018: 5) present in encounters, and the processes in which identities, belonging and notions of ‘community’ get made in specific places and spaces. In this thesis, ‘community’ is employed to reflect ‘a form of social, and often spatial, organisation centred on common interests and/or locale’ (Castree et al 2013: 70-71), emphasising the fluidity of community(ies) and people’s agency (Herbert 2005). Importantly, this foregrounds the desire expressed by many participants in the empirical chapters of this thesis for forming and maintaining emotional attachments to places and people in and beyond the city.

In the UK, contemporary and older migration flows and (re)settlement practices have generated an increasingly heterogeneous and diverse society, and have also led to a heightened concern with issues of community, cohesion, integration and ‘parallel lives’ (e.g. Cantle and Kaufmann 2016; Neal et al 2013). Scotland’s geographies of diversity and division are distinct from the rest of the UK. Yet, while dominant debates around migration, national identity(ies) and belonging(s) arguably tend to steer away from ‘newer anxieties and contestations surrounding cultural difference’ (Neal et al 2018: 3), popular narratives of ‘Scottish exceptionalism’ (McBride and Liinpää 2018) in terms of being more welcoming and accepting of migrants (than England) cannot gloss over some more racialized notions
of nationhood, community and belonging. Ethnicity, constructions of ‘race’ and inequality thus remain intertwined in powerful ways, and exist alongside practices in which people engage in negotiated processes of living with difference in their daily environments.

Accordingly, this thesis supports the view that it is crucial to focus on the spaces and places where people enact ways of living with difference and develop unpanicked approaches to multiculture and urban diversity. Massey (2005, 2011) suggests conceiving places as socially made, fragmented and developing – a ‘collection of stories so far’ – which is a helpful reminder to think of places as multiple, with identities being shaped in relation to wider geographies (Featherstone 2017; Allen and Cochrane 2010), and ‘stretched by populations that are shifting, diverse and connected to other places’ (Neal et al 2018: 5). This critical engagement with spatialities reflects a recognition of the significance of the micro geographies of everyday encounter and interaction, and responds to Wise’s (2009: 42) call for research that focuses on the ‘who, where, how and when people get on [and] how diversity is lived on the ground’. It also follows Amin’s (2002: 959) emphasis on the significance of ‘sites of multiculture’ where ‘much of the negotiation of difference occurs at the very local level through everyday experiences and encounters’; thus, this approach holds on to multiculture, ‘difference’, and articulations of belonging and identity in a way that attends ‘to the ordinary social spaces within which people of different backgrounds encounter one another, and the mundane practices they construct and draw on to manage these encounters’ (Harris 2009: 188).

In this thesis, I work through a range of ‘ordinary social spaces’ to explore how diversity and multiculture is lived and negotiated in contemporary Glasgow. Taking a feminist lens to identity formation processes and belonging, I seek to move beyond simplistic understandings of encounter, to better understand how processes of negotiation, reflection, co-production and co-presence exist simultaneously within places. While recognising that the transformative potential of encounters continues to be debated, I foreground the politics of semi-formal and mixed space(s) to suggest that encounters, of differing depth and duration, are valuable in their own right, participants often highlighting the value and significance of both fleeting and more prolonged and repetitive encounters.

Simultaneously, encounters scaled through the national and the global, with micro connections existing alongside micro-aggressions and racialisations, a perspective that is implicit throughout the empirical chapters of this thesis. I use the concept of ‘micro connection’ to talk about the multiple and iterative points of connection that people form in informal settings, and their capacity to translate into wider notions of recognition, belonging, hospitality, comfort and multicultural exchange in society; in that way, the concept echoes aspects of Wise’s (2005: 177) notion of ‘micro hope’ which signals ‘some of the conditions
for forms of open, intercultural belonging’ to emerge in and beyond local spaces. As such, moments of micro connection can be understood in a similar framing, yet in tension with the concept of micro aggressions (Arshad et al 2017; Sue 2010).

Subsequently, the research presented in this thesis aims to destabilise binaries of ‘one or the other’, instead foregrounding and contributing to a feminist perspective that considers simultaneously ‘both/and’, to capture the politics of mundane spaces and seemingly banal encounters. These micro connections were often emotional and agentic, supporting significant work being done in feminist geographies that discusses the emotional as always both ‘everyday’ and political. Central here is that the everyday is political, an understanding which I use in this thesis to advance post-colonial thinking, emphasising past inequalities, geographies and relations of power continuing to weave through, and shaping, contemporary social relations and the im/mobilities and in/capacities of different bodies in Scottish society.

Furthermore, I take seriously the significance of speaking from a perspective of situated knowledge, an understanding advanced by feminist literature that informs the methodological approach of this thesis. I discuss the spatiality of racialisation in Scottish society through Glasgow as grounded and empirical, since the ‘realities of everyday life – the sum total of all our relations – is built on the ground, in daily activities and transactions’ (Burkitt 2004: 212) in which ‘abstractions (meaning here, imposed ideas of politics and nationhood) must eventually land’ (Gregg 2004: 365; also Jones and Merriman 2009). As Glasgow is relationally constituted with Scotland, taking a localised perspective enables me to foreground the particular ways in which ‘Scottishness’ is placed, and to ask questions about wider imagined communities of Scotland and what people say and feel about Scottishness. This underlines the relevance of empirical and grounded research (cf. Wise 2009); research which, I find, more fully allows an assessment of what is potentially moved/shifted in moments of encounter (Curtis 2016), and how identities and belonging get made in ‘places, and the spaces within them, in the everyday (at ease/uneasy) interactions, interdependencies, materialities and practices that are part of urban social worlds' (Neal et al 2018: 5).

In the next section, I introduce Scotland and Glasgow as appropriate places to investigate mundane spaces of encounter through the eyes of people from diverse and complex backgrounds and heritages. The remainder of the introduction presents the research questions and key arguments as well as the structure of the thesis.
1.3 Preliminary background(s): Scotland and Glasgow

Scotland offers a significant case through which to explore everyday spaces of multicultural encounter as its particular demographic profile and political and geographical context sets Scotland apart from the rest of the UK. Throughout this thesis, I argue that these differences make it necessary to develop a deeper understanding of how debates in/across England converge and diverge with wider UK issues regarding national identity and belonging, multi-ethnic relations and cultural diversity. First, with regards to dominant understandings of Scottish identities and national belonging, a substantial body of research suggests the apparent inclusive nature of ‘Scottishness’ with respect to minority groups and the considerable willingness among people in minority groups to identify as Scottish (e.g. Bonino 2015; Hopkins 2007, 2008; Virdee et al 2006), feeding into dominant imaginaries of Scotland as a somewhat more inclusive and ‘civic’ place for ethnic and cultural minorities than other parts of the UK (Hepburn and Rosie 2015; Rosie and Bond 2006).

The ‘cultural icon of an egalitarian nation’ (Arshad 2016: 5) is echoed by elite political actors and parties in Scotland who try to establish a persuasive version of the ‘nation’ that pursues integration and unity among Scotland’s diverse and multi-ethnic populations, and arguably places (ethnic) minorities at the centre of its nation-building projects (Meer 2015). While this ‘aspirational pluralism’ (ibid.) represents a welcoming and positive stance towards migration and Scotland’s multi-ethnic and multicultural past and present, recent studies of national identity among Scottish (ethnic) minority communities emphasise the boundaries frequently drawn around Scottishness and the limitations in minority claims-making and recognition on Scottish identities (Virdee 2016; Meer 2015). In this thesis, I develop a nuanced understanding of the processes and limitations on (national) identity and belonging that many people in Scotland adhere to and experience (Leith and Sim 2016), and challenge political and wider public celebrations of the inclusiveness of contemporary Scottish identities or Scottishness. Writing in late 2018, this is particularly relevant given Scotland’s changing political landscape, with the 2014 referendum debate and its aftermath, the Brexit vote in 2016 and the UK’s announced exit from the European Union in early 2019 (cf. Piacentini 2016).

Second, research exploring the Scottish perspective regarding issues of ethnic and cultural diversity and everyday negotiations of multiculture and ‘difference’, though growing, remains scarce compared to other areas of the UK. This might have to do with Scotland continuing to be envisioned as a ‘white’ enclave (Mycock 2012); a conception arguably supported by the notion that ethnic minority populations living in Scotland remain limited (4%) and are concentrated into specific urban areas such as Glasgow (12%) (McCrone 2017; 2011 Census). However, for the first time in some decades, the overall population in Scotland has increased with the largest contributor being inward migration (Pollard et al...
2008), more recently including refugee and asylum seekers who are predominantly settled in and around Glasgow (Wiseman 2017a; Netto 2011). Many of these migrants plan to stay (Leith and Sim 2016).

While these trends lend weight to claims such as ‘Scotland has become stronger and more culturally diverse’ (McCrone 2001: 174) made over 10 years ago, my position in this thesis is that such a quantified approach/narrative of Scottish minority identities and experiences risks ignoring Scotland’s multicultural and multi-ethnic past. Post-colonial literature emphasises that many people, particularly from India, Pakistan and the Caribbean, came to Scotland through colonial conquest and transatlantic slavery (Morris 2015; Devine 2012), the future generations and extended families of these forced migrants identifying as Scottish and calling Scotland their home ever since. Glasgow, in particular, has been, and continues to be, fundamentally shaped by these migrations (McCrone 2002; Audrey 2000). In this thesis, I therefore highlight the importance of increasing knowledge of the complexities of migrant experiences in, and claim-making to, Glasgow, articulating participants’ desire for belonging, home-making and identity in the context of sometimes limited and limiting social environments.

Third, while it is increasingly recognised that there is great differentiation within Scottish society, some research suggests that religious issues continue to be constructed as more relevant and important in the Scottish context than ‘race relations’ (Hopkins 2016). As lively debates over the form and scale of sectarianism in Scotland continue (Raab and Holli gan 2012), issues regarding multi-ethnic relations seem to ‘register low on the radar of policy makers and those who implement policy’ (Arshad 2016: 7). For some, this points to a ‘disengaged’ and ‘silencing’ political culture in Scotland where matters of ‘race’ are constructed as ‘less urgent, not as important and less worthy of attention compared to other matters’ (Hopkins 2016: 31). For others, this reflects a tendency in Scotland to assume ‘all is well’ (Arshad 2016: 5) that glosses over ‘Scotland continu[ing] to be uncomfortable with talking about racism or racial discrimination’. In this thesis, I connect these debates to relevant research on the racialisation of (public) space to challenge the dominant notion that racialisation has been less formative of Scottish identities and notions of (national) belonging than in other parts of the UK (Hopkins 2016). Building on recent research that articulates the various forms and shapes of discrimination and racialisation faced by particular ethnic, cultural and religious minority communities in Glasgow (e.g. Goodall et al 2015; Piacentini 2012), I foreground racialisation as an ongoing spatio-temporal process that has significance for particularly marginalised and more vulnerable groups and individuals in Glasgow and wider Scottish society.
1.4 Making the argument: research questions, aims and overview

In the previous sections, I have begun to explore some of the key conceptual issues that frame current complexities of ethnic and cultural diversity and multiculture, and the importance of place and shared spaces. I have also begun to introduce some of the key themes of this thesis, setting out my concern for the ways in which people negotiate urban diversity and build forms of living together through social practices and encounters 'on the ground'. While I recognise the tensions and ambiguities weaving through these processes, with racism and other forms of division remaining deeply structuring forces in the lives of many people, I hold that these realities reinforce the need to better understand some of the mundane ways in which people in (some) urban areas live with difference.

The overall aim of this thesis is thus to highlight the transformative potential of 'everyday' encounters taking place in mundane spaces in Glasgow. Following Nayak's (2017) call for research that emphasises the relational, emotional and embodied aspects of encounters, I explore how ordinary and 'quiet' encounters (Askins 2015) and embodied activities build up through time and space, how they stick in the body and add up. As such, I provide a critical analysis of how people negotiate, and connect through, their multi-layered and intersecting identities in particular spaces, some of which enable them to share and carve out self-defined identities and senses of belonging that react to and push against stereotypes and discourses in Scottish society. After all, if the claim of dominant political parties and elite politicians in Scotland is to nurture social inclusion and a more open sense of (national) identity and belonging in Scotland (Meer 2015; Mycock 2012), it is critical to locate the instances in which this is being attempted and/or achieved.

The following three research questions have driven this project.

1. What are the diverse contexts that enable encounters between people with varying degrees and mixities of ethnic, cultural, gender and religious backgrounds and heritages living in/across North and West Glasgow?

2. To what extent are these encounters sustainable across space and time?

3. What role do these encounters play in shaping constructions and understandings of (national) identity and belonging in contemporary Scotland?

Through engaging with these research questions, this thesis makes the following key arguments.
**Argument 1:** A range of informal meeting spaces exist in Glasgow that enables people to mix and mingle with others who live in the city. I argue that semi-formal and public spaces of proximity and contact are particularly critical to identify, since they cut across and function as ‘contact zones’ (cf. Wood and Landry 2008) between diverse populations and groups making up Glaswegian society. Forwarding an understanding of the everyday spaces that different individuals and groups use in Glasgow, and for what reasons, is crucial to grasp the precarious yet progressive and hopeful ways in which people negotiate the increasing ethnic, cultural and religious diversity of Glaswegian communities and populations, and manage to live together in specific areas in Glasgow.

**Argument 2:** The encounters people experience and/or engage in which others in such ‘meeting spaces’ need to be unpacked, to explore the differing depth and duration of these interactions and their ‘impact’ on people in and beyond these spaces. By doing so, I problematize debates on the ‘scalability’ and ‘measurability’ of encounters, instead foregrounding encounters as tempo-spatial moments of relation and connection-building that are simultaneously valuable in their own right.

**Argument 3:** I suggest that it is vital to embed such encounters within the wider geographical and political contexts of Scotland, to avoid viewing encounters as isolated moments and to dissect the role of encounters in processes of identity construction and claim making on place and nationhood in and beyond Glasgow. Resonating with Argument 2, here, I explore the ways in which notions of place, (national) identity and belonging are negotiated in moments of encounter ‘on the ground’ and ‘in the moment’, and how these encounters feed into wider imaginaries of belonging and ‘Scottishness’. I argue that this adds to an understanding of encounters as interrelated moments that connect through and work across different scales, from the local to the regional, through to the national and global, and back, and situates seemingly mundane and ‘everyday’ moments of interaction as crucial in shaping, challenging and potentially subverting, while simultaneously being shaped by, wider imaginaries of nationhood and belonging in Scottish society.

To these ends, the thesis is organised as following. The next two chapters provide an in-depth discussion of the theories guiding the thesis. **Chapter 2** begins by suggesting that the concept of encounter enables a more nuanced understanding of how people encounter others across ethnicity, gender, age, class and other identities in mundane spaces, emphasizing the importance of embedding encounters and identities within broader historical and geographical contexts. I argue that this adds a crucial perspective to current debates surrounding belonging and social inclusion, key concepts in current public and more formal political discourses and debates in Scotland. I then review relevant scholarship discussing geographies of racialisation, strangerhood and national belonging, and lay
down my understanding of the transformative potential of encounters. In doing so, I point
to the gaps in current scholarship and the ways in which my own research addresses
these. Moreover, I explore identity and belonging as relational, hybrid and context-specific
processes, foregrounding the often ‘small’ and ‘quiet’ politics of encounter and space (af-
ter Askins 2015), and people’s agency.

Chapter 3 builds on these debates, using theories of intersectionality, performativity and
emotionality to further complicate the complexities and pluralities of identity making and
belonging. Taking a spatialized view of intersectionality, I explore how intersecting identi-
ties are produced through local places and encounters, and argue for bringing together
literature on intersectionality and performativity, to theorise subjects as conscious and re-
flexive (intersectional) identities ‘on the ground’. Further unpacking the politics of bodies,
identities and differences, I then discuss contemporary research that relates to the politics
and spatiality of emotion(s), situating my contribution to this discussion. I conclude by ex-
amining literature specific to the Scottish context, and to Glasgow, to trouble and ‘place’
multi-ethnic Scottishness.

In Chapter 4, I outline a research methodology that is designed to dissect the diverse
ways people encounters others across a variety of spaces, and a research practice that
aims to highlight the embodied, emotional and relational side of many multi-ethnic and
multicultural encounters. My body becomes an ‘instrument of research’ (Longhurst et al
2008), revealing how bodies are always located, closely entwined with spaces and places,
and how people produce, perform and undermine dominant notions of others, space and
knowledge. This aligns with the feminist approach underlying the theoretical framework
of the thesis, helping to conceive the methods of this research as a ‘journey’ (Askins 2004)
that is fluid, changing and responsive to research encounters and experiences in the field.
This enables me to offer insights into what people from diverse backgrounds and heritag-
es say and feel about encounters with difference, and how identities and belonging are
(un)done, (re)made and negotiated in mundane spaces of encounter.

I subsequently move on to explore the findings of this research. The first empirical chap-
ter, Chapter 5, draws on the concept of intersectionality to explore the ways in which
people live and negotiate diversity on a daily basis in Glasgow. Taking a spatial focus, I
argue that informal meeting spaces enable people to ‘rub along’ with others in Glaswegian
society, particularly individuals and groups constructed as ‘different’, ‘strange’ or ‘out of
place’ (Ahmed 2000), and to navigate multiculturalism and diversity in ‘unpanicked’ ways
(Bennett et al 2016; Noble 2009a). I particularly discuss the value participants attached to
fleeting encounters. I then explore these spaces as opening up possibilities to express,
perform and ‘do’ different aspects of often multi-layered and complex identities together
with others, highlighting moments of intersectional tension and the ways in which participants negotiate uneasiness and disconnection. Emphasising the increased awareness and stress associated with certain and intersecting identities in Glasgow, I conclude that possibilities for connection, though contested, are evident in everyday ‘zones of encounter’ (Wood and Landry 2008) in Glasgow, and that an openness to and through intersectional encounters can chip away at feelings of fear, uncertainty and anxiety increasingly constructed around ‘difference’ in Scottish society.

In **Chapter 6**, I focus on the embodied, emotional and material dimensions of many multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters, reflecting in more depth on the ‘doing’ of identities, and their spatialities, through which participants create micro connections and shared identifications with others. I highlight the value of spaces that enable participants to perform identities around common activities and interests, contributing to their sense of belonging in Glasgow, and the role of gestures and embodied exchanges in getting around moments of tension, disconnection and misunderstanding. I then turn to the materialities of encounters with difference, discussing the importance of ‘everyday’ objects in facilitating people to realise and enact both differences and similarities with others. I conclude by underlining the importance of attending to emotions arising in moments between selves and others, framing encounters (with difference) and be-longing (Probyn 1996) as always ‘mooded’ (Merleau-Ponty 1962).

**Chapter 7** focuses more explicitly on processes and forms of racism, discrimination and micro aggression in Glasgow, and the ways in which landscapes of racialisation continue to weave through and shape encounters and moments of relation-building for specific people more than for others. Dissecting the ways in which public space in Glasgow continues to be (re)produced and secured as ‘white’, and linking back to debates on recognition, I detail participants’ strategies to negotiate racialized encounters and the agentic ways in which some of them challenge moments of racialisation and discrimination that attempt to construct them as ‘other’. In doing so, I draw attention to the mundane and daily practices of belonging (Askins 2015) and the ways in which notions of (national) identity and belonging are reworked and (re)negotiated through placed encounters in everyday spaces. I also foreground the vulnerability of these practices and position them in relation to wider contexts. This chapter concludes that the everyday is always political and suggests a transformative geopolitics of encounter (Askins 2008), with participants appealing to a civic belonging and their rights to the city, and nation, through encounters in everyday spaces.

In the final chapter of the thesis, **Chapter 8**, I summarise the findings and main contributions of this thesis, emphasizing the micro politics of multicultural encounters and connect...
tion-making, the need to spatialize intersectional analyses, and the importance of localising narratives of nationhood and belonging in specific contexts and localities in Glasgow and Scotland. I conclude by discussing the implications of the presented materials beyond academy, particularly in terms of nurturing community spaces in Glasgow, and the broader relevance of this thesis regarding research concerned with ethnic, ‘raced’, cultural and religious identities, and their intersections, emergent geographies of hope and care, and embodied methodological research approaches.

1.5 Conclusion
In this opening chapter, I have started to give a sense of the conceptual landscape that this thesis engages with, and is embedded in. At its centre, this thesis is concerned with the increasingly ‘fearful’ engagement with, and problematizing perception of debates around migration, (re)settlement, multiculture, nationhood, ‘home’ and belonging; processes that critically shape, in diverse ways and to differing extents, contemporary urban realities and everyday lives. By drawing on relevant literature that emphasises ‘unpanicked’ and commonplace approaches to multicultural living (Wessendorf 2014a, 2014b; Noble 2009a), the following chapters extend, and attempt to add to these debates, dissecting mundane and quotidian ways in which people who are differently situated in society, and towards each other, live together in/with difference across the North and West of Glasgow. Crucially, I foreground how multicultural relations and connections are often carefully, consciously and successfully managed in/through ‘placed’ encounters.

Moreover, I have suggested that it is vital to focus on the spaces and places where multicultural living is made possible, in precarious yet progressive ways, to contribute to an understanding of articulations, contestations and entanglements of ‘being together in difference’ as embodied, emotional, material and relational processes, that simultaneously work across and connect through multiple scales. The importance of speaking from a place of situated knowledge is a key theme picked up in the following chapters, as I detail the ways in which localising narratives and ‘practices’ of (national) identity, community, belonging and ‘home’ in specific spaces and localities in Glasgow enables me to illustrate how people speak and feel about ‘Scottishness’, that way exploring what is potentially shifted/moved in moments/spaces of multicultural encounter. By doing so, this thesis moves towards conceptualising everyday moments of being together as mundane and ‘quietly’ political acts/practices (cf. Askins 2015), framing the development of ‘connective interdependencies’ (Neal et al 2018: 152) as central to navigate the complexities and tensions of contemporary urban life.

In order to tell these stories, it is necessary to develop a framework capable of valuing and exploring encounters, and everyday spaces of multicultural encounter, in addition to
understanding how best to foster means of living with difference. The next two chapters develop a conceptual lens to explore mundane spaces of encounter, and examine the literature specific to encounter by gathering literature on processes of identity formation and belonging, spaces of racialisation, encounter and emotion, and their politics.
2 Spaces of encounter, difference and politics of belonging

"Contrary to current orthodoxies which read encounters off momentary bodily orientations, encounters with and across difference [...] must be contextualised within [...] personal pasts and the collective histories of the communities within which we are emplaced."

(Valentine and Sadgrove 2014: 1982-1992)

2.1 Introduction

Debates around how to understand processes through which social diversity, urban difference, and living with difference can be understood have centred on the role of the encounter. Much of this work is interested in documenting the ways in which people negotiate difference in their everyday lives, raising questions regarding the value of encounters, their potential to bring about change, their politics, and their spatio-temporality (e.g. Schuermans 2013; Matejskova and Leitner 2011; Wilson 2011; Valentine 2008). As such, this body of work is concerned with broader imaginaries and post-colonial theories, focusing on social difference and sites of ‘throwntogetherness’ (Massey 2005). More specifically, this literature approaches the city not as a backdrop where encounters occur, but conceptualises it as made from encounters (Amin and Thrift 2002; Darling and Wilson 2016). This perceives the urban as a site of ‘permanent disequilibrium’ (Wilson 2016: 453) and as the ‘juxtaposition of difference’ (Bennett et al 2016), holding the potential for both connection and understanding and tension and conflict.

Geographic inquiry, then, has shifted attention to the spatiality and relationality of these processes and of the encounter itself, as the opening quote attests. Feminist and post-colonial geographers, in particular, have been conceptualising encounters as a ‘distinctive event of relation’ (Wilson 2016: 452), folded into different temporalities and geographies that operate ‘elsewhere and in other times’ (Ahmed 2002: 562). Holding onto such work, this chapter discusses encounters as sites of different co-existing trajectories that come together in moments of ‘arbitrary closure’ (Massey 1994). This holds central how notions of difference, identity and belonging are negotiated, constructed and legitimised through encounters ‘on the ground’ and ‘in the moment’ (Nayak 2010), while remaining sensitive to how encounters shape space and are shaped by it. It also foregrounds a multi-scalar, temporal and spatial understanding of encounters, and their effects (cf. Koefoed and Simonsen 2012).

By embedding encounters in their broader historical and geographical contexts, it also becomes possible to unpack how wider geographies of racialisation continue to shape social relations and to impede the mobilities and abilities of particular bodies in society. This is
important given that racialisation is a plural and dynamic process caught up in wider issues of power, ownership over space, and claims to nationhood and national belonging. Studies of urban life and encounter have been dissecting the processes and mechanisms by which bodies are differentiated and identified as strange, abject and unfamiliar (Hopkins 2014; Haldrup et al 2006; Ahmed 2000). Literature on ‘the stranger’, in particular, links the naming and recognition of difference to specific bodies and identities being rendered ‘out of place’, operating across scales and stretching from encounters to discursive imaginaries of ‘the nation’ (Hopkins 2014; Koefoed and Simonsen 2012). This indicates the centrality of embodiment in processes of negotiating differences and similarities (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014), and marks encounters as also always political. By bringing these debates into dialogue with literature on wider geographies of fear and insecurity, I untangle the ways in which racializing discourses and practices of racism socially construct and exclude ‘the other’, and highlight over-racialisation as a form of embodied control (Virdee 2006; Hall 1988).

Foregrounding the relationality of encounters, work in feminist and post-colonial geography stresses identities and belonging as highly inter-connected, hybrid and context-specific phenomena (Noble and Tabar 2002; Bhabha 1994). By moving away from notions of ‘absolute’ difference and otherness, such work considers identities and identifications as more mobile and fluid (Butler 1993). Geographers have long been highlighting the importance of grounding accounts of identity and belonging in their specific localities and geographies, to grasp the diverse ways in which people construct and consolidate identities and senses of belonging in response to specific spaces and contexts (Anthias 2001). This chapter moves to consider these issues with regards to a ‘transformative politics of encounter’ (Askins 2008), discussing how everyday negotiations of identity and belonging hold the potential to disturb, unsettle and shift overarching and dominant notions of space in society. In tension with the racialisations previously discussed, I argue the need to recognise the place and potential of small, banal and ‘quiet’ practices of identity and belonging (after Askins 2015) to gradually transform society.

Within these debates, the scope of various inquiries has been to understand how notions of belonging encompass multiple scales, sites, practices and domains, from ‘the affective to the structural and everything in between’ (Wright 2015: 384). Belonging plays out across multiple scales (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012; Ho 2009) and relates to multi-layered structures of participation and membership across different political communities (Caluya 2011; Yuval-Davis 2011). Moreover, belonging encompasses a yearning for attachments to places and people (Probyn 1996), and emerges as having to do with becoming rather than be-ing. This chapter thus considers a political understanding of urban togetherness, suggesting how there is more at stake in moments of encounter than the ex-
perience of ‘being together in difference’ (Ang 2003), relating belonging to issues of recognition and the (re)making of (power) relations in society (Mee 2009; Noble 2009b; Wise 2005).

To explore these debates, this chapter begins with a discussion of the literature on spaces of encounter and belonging with the aim of assessing their transformative potential. I then turn to wider geographies of racialisation, particularly whiteness, as playing a central role in shaping dominant notions of space in society. After considering how hegemonic practices of strangerhood and national belonging are (un)done, I introduce identity production as hybrid and relational, to emphasise performances of identity and belonging as more mobile and fluid, and embedded within specific localities and moments of encounter. Finally, I turn to agency and the politics of encounter.

2.2 Spaces of encounter and belonging
Urban life has long been marked by (ethnic and cultural) diversity, ‘throwing together’ (Massey 2005) diverse groups and individuals who bring with them various histories, socio-economic, cultural, religious, and linguistic profiles (Vertovec 2007a) and different norms, values, ideas and lifestyles (Tasan-Kok et al 2013). This makes the city a place of ‘intensity and the juxtaposition of difference’ (Bennett et al 2016). The body of work investigating these issues is ever-growing, paying particular attention to negotiations of diversity and difference, constructions and representations of (national) identities, and processes of othering and belonging in the city. In response to more formal political debates increasingly problematizing issues around migration, (re)settlement and cohesion, much of this work attempts to contribute to ‘unpanicked’ and ‘everyday’ approaches to multiculture (Noble 2013), foregrounding quotidian experiences of ‘living with diversity’ (Neal et al 2013, original emphasis). This work also normatively adopts a post-colonial lens, deconstructing ‘whiteness’ and complicating notions of identity construction and belonging by exploring which groups and people are marginalized when and where, and power relations circulating in dominant imaginaries and discourses in contemporary societies. Critically, this conceptualises politics as a diverse set of questions, bringing power into relation with more formal institutions, and informal and mundane ways of negotiating everyday life.

Spatiality is crucial in these debates. Massey (1994: 120) suggests that space can be conceived as ‘the articulation of social relations’, with encounters emerging as the site of different co-existing trajectories becoming articulated in moments of ‘arbitrary closure’. This conceives of public space as an important contact zone of ‘situated’ encounter (Pratt 1991). Conceptualising space in this way assesses how and where notions of ‘difference’, identity and belonging are negotiated, constructed and legitimised through specific encounters (Haldrup et al 2006). This holds central the unpredictable ways in which similarity
and difference are negotiated in the moment of encounter (Hubbard and Lyon 2018), while remaining sensitive to how encounters shape space but are also shaped by it (Leitner 2012). Paying attention to specific spaces of encounter further embeds encounters within their specific localities. Importantly, this works through the uneven histories and geographies that shape urban life in different ways for different people (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014); also 2.3 and 2.5). It also helps to understand how ‘difference’, identities and belonging are (un)made, grasping how ‘species of all kinds, living or not, are consequent on a subject- and object-shaping dance of encounter’ (Haraway 2008: 4) as ‘they are formed, remade and given meaning through intra- and interaction’ (Wilson 2016a: 455).

Understanding public space as ‘mixed’ spaces that assemble performing bodies, things and sensory experiences (after Lobo 2013), this thesis foregrounds encounters taking place in semi-formal, parochial or ‘third’ spaces (Lofland 1989), urban spaces where the life worlds of diverse individuals and groups overlap (Wise and Velayutham 2009). Public libraries, community centres, local cafes, gyms, and schools, amongst others, are thus perceived as important sites of connection, or ‘micro publics’ (Amin 2002), where people can associate, ‘mix’ and mingle with others (Duyvendak and Wekker 2015). The multicultural intimacy and contact arising out of this ‘mixedness’, then, is what can transform these spaces into important sites of intercultural and interethnic encounter (Valentine 2008). Many of these spaces are also places of ‘enforced togetherness’ (Wise 2009), demanding a highly attendant awareness of others (Wilson 2011). As such, they almost always require some degree of negotiation, interdependence and habitual engagement (Amin 2002). Some scholars argue that precisely these processes transform ‘mixed’ spaces into crucial social platforms where conversations across difference become possible (Appiah 2007), and where notions of identity and belonging can change and shift (Peterson 2017; Wilson 2011).

Massey’s (2005) account of the ‘throwntogetherness’ of urban life further suggests that pluralism or the negotiation of diversity is not something ‘easy’. Indeed, she argues that these processes are full of political antagonism and contestation that are produced out of the engagements between unlike actors, refusing diversity as ‘simple plurality’, instead highlighting the need to understand the unequal relations that shape spaces of multicultural encounter. Spaces are never free of past histories, wider geographies and politics (Hall 2000). Approaching encounters as the site and articulation of co-existing trajectories makes it possible to trace the diverse histories and geographies shaping and determining the ‘decidedly unequal terms’ on which encounters are carried out (Featherstone 2017). Critically, notions of identity, belonging and power, while emergent and fluid (2.4), are thus perceived as simultaneously (re)produced and unsettled through racialized power relations and encounters firmly embedded in everyday spaces. Tracing ‘the routes by which
people have come to their present situation’ (Hall 2009: 29), then, becomes crucial in grasping ‘the histories and geographies, the “conjunctures”, through which encounters are experienced and constituted’ (Featherstone 2017: 166). Section 2.3 and 2.5, respectively, develop such thinking in terms of unsettling normative whiteness by which white majority narratives are constructed, and the politics weaving through informal spaces of encounter.

2.2.1 Contemplating the transformative potential of encounters

Much of the work on encounter draws on ‘contact theory’ (Allport 1954), which suggests that interpersonal contact between ‘different racial or cultural groups’ can increase positive attitudes towards each other and reduce prejudice (Matejskova and Leitner 2011: 719). Central to this argument is that contact or exposure to ‘the other’ enhances knowledge about strangers and may lessen anxiety and fear of ‘the unknown’ and ‘difference’ (Phillips et al 2013; Matejskova and Leitner 2011; Valentine 2008). Yet, opinions differ regarding the political and social effects of encounters. Conceptualized as a ‘distinctive event of relation’ (Wilson 2016b), most encounters are not without tension, conflict or opposition. Thus, there remains scepticism of fleeting encounters, arguing that ‘at best, such fleeting and chance encounters […] comply with the norms of social civility’ (Matejskova and Leitner 2011: 728) with only more structured and meaningful interactions holding the potential to unsettle prejudice and promote respect (Valentine 2013; Amin 2012). The argument is that the right conditions for transformative encounter, such as equal status of two groups in a given situation, is ‘hardly present in the everyday life’ (Matejskova and Leitner 2011: 720) as ‘real-life contact between members of different social groups is always structurally mediated and embedded in particular historical and geographical contexts of power relations between and within social groups’ (ibid: 721; also Leitner 2012; Ahmed 2000).

However, others suggest that everyday encounters need to be recognized as having transformative potential. Laurier and Philo (2006: 193), for example, argue that people who live alongside each other share a ‘low level sociability’ and ‘do togetherness’ on a daily basis. Others add that through furthering a sense of familiarity with ‘difference’ (Peterson 2017) and making diversity appear more ‘commonplace’ (Wessendorf 2013), various types of encounter can contribute to a change in attitude towards ‘otherness’ and serve as stepping stones towards building relationships across difference (Askins 2015; Blockland and Nast 2014; Wise 2005). And Thrift (2005: 147) agrees that small acts of kindness, compassion and ‘mundane friendliness’ have the potential to filter into the wider world. Importantly, these debates approach encounters as moments of opportunity and hope, offering the ‘possibility of disorienting firmly held habits, stereotypes and prejudice’ (Matejskova and Leitner 2011: 722) and providing people with the ‘opportunity to explore their own hybridity through experiencing a variety of different situations and people in the course of their everyday lives’ (Fincher and Iveson 2008: 153; also 2.4).
In this vein everyday spaces of encounter are conceived as holding the potential for simultaneous connection and understanding and conflict and tension (Askins 2015), combining ‘different elements of position, identity, and difference into new constellations and moments of engagement, attraction, and aversion’ (Wilson 2010: 646). The significance of these spaces thus lies in their potential to be sites of repeated encounter that may become part of the fabric of the city, potentially a ‘new norm’ (Askins and Pain 2011: 818). Such arguments resonate with debates about the ‘measurability’ and ‘scalability’ of encounters. In much of the relevant literature, ‘meaningful’ encounter tends to defined as encounter that has the potential to change values ‘beyond the specifics of the individual moment into a more general positive respect for – rather than the mere tolerance of – others’ (Valentine 2008: 325). A key question for this approach to encounter, then, revolves around the ‘scaling-up’ of respect beyond the moment. Yet, Curtis (2016) warns that the significance of the encounter itself should not be overlooked, with the scale of the embodied encounter being of equal value as other scales. Wilson (2010: 646) adds that it is in moments of everyday encounter where ‘differences are negotiated on the smallest of scales […] and subjectivities are continuously (re)formed’, with new modes of ‘living with difference’ being produced and projected into future encounters.

Taking inspiration from these debates, I focus on understanding the transformative possibilities of ‘doing togetherness' by thinking about ‘what is sparked [...] moved or created within and through moments of encounter’ (Curtis 2016: 52); crucially held in tension with an understanding of encounter as a multi-scalar, -temporal, and -spatial phenomenon. Hence, the rest of this chapter foregrounds the need to localise and ‘ground’ encounters, and emergent relations, constructions and makings of identity and belonging, in the histories, geographies and politics that weave through and shape specific places and spaces. This emphasises the ‘messiness' of social relations and encounters (cf. Askins 2015), constantly in the making, and considers space as also always a social product (after Lefebvre 1991). Such an approach works to localise debates around migration, multicultural and belonging in these ‘activity spaces’ (Massey 1995) – the day to day situations and interactions that occur in environments and spaces at local level – and considers the ways in which everyday encounters become cemented in bodies and are central in defining ‘who we are’.

Simultaneously, there is a critical need to consider the 'conjunctures' weaving through everyday spaces of encounter in more detail, emphasising the importance of avoiding any abstraction of the encounters described in this thesis from their broader historical, political and geographical contexts.
2.3 Geographies of racialisation, encounters and the politics of space

I now move to foreground the ways in which geographies of racialisation continue to shape encounters with difference, and the importance of understanding encounters and identities not as isolated moments but as part of broader geopolitical processes (Katz 2007). Reflecting on identity and belonging in relationship to nation, place and the local, Massey (1995: 191, original emphasis) argues that ‘recognising that what has come together, in this place, now, is a conjunction of many histories and many spaces’. The past is thus ‘always present in places and spaces in a variety of ways’, and places ‘are always already hybrid’ (ibid: 186). This conceives of encounters as both spatial and temporal, and focusses attention on how connections around (national) identity, geography and time are drawn and redrawn in moments of encounter.

In earlier work, Massey (1994: 120) argues that place can be theorised as ‘the articulation of social relations’. Place, then, is made up of ‘particular moments’ that are relationally constructed in ‘their interactions with other places rather than by counterposition to them’ (ibid: 121). As such, places are full of memories and histories of other places and past relations, and the interactions that occur in and across them. Rather than reproducing ‘a singular sense of the past, and its relation to the present’ (Massey 1995: 183-184), this approach to space focusses on ‘the long history of interconnectedness with elsewhere (the history of the global construction of the local)’ and that the identity of places is often ‘very much bound up with the histories which are told of them, how those histories are told, and which history turns out to be dominant’ (also Katz 2001). Such interconnectedness potentially closes places down as areas of contestation or debate. Description, definition and identification of a place, Massey (1995: 186) concludes, ‘is always an intervention not only into geography but also into the (re)telling of the historical constitution of the present’.

In this thesis, I find Massey’s (1994, 1995) arguments useful to think about the ways in which wider geographies of the ‘West’ change micro geographies of encounter, particularly the impact racialized readings and constructions of place and space have on notions of encounter, identity and belonging in the city. Massey’s work foregrounds the social construction of space as impacting on social interactions. Encounters thus emerge as the site of past and present interactions coming together, with ‘memories, associations, histories and experiences [of the past] contributing to [the orientation] of bodies in the present’ (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014: 1982). This approach to space and encounter shifts attention to the racialisation of space, identities and bodies, particularly the ongoing significance of ‘whiteness’ structuring social relations and the mobility of different bodies in society. Lobo (2013), for example, observes that (public) space acquires the ‘skin’ of the bodies – their past histories, geographies and power relations – that inhabit it, allowing
particular bodies to extend, ‘sink’ into and move through space more easily than others (also Ahmed 2007). Section 2.3.1 and 2.3.2 explore racialisation as a set of social relations articulated in ‘placed’ encounters.

Here, I argue that approaching space as the coming together of different co-existing trajectories helps to grasp how encounters become articulated across ‘a range of scales from the local to the regional and beyond […] in and across place’ (Katz 2001: 1230, original emphasis). Encounters, and notions of identity and belonging, are thus situated and ‘at the same time scale-jumping and geography-crossing’ (ibid: 1216). Wilson (2010: 640), for example, discusses multicultural encounters in public transport to highlight encounters not only being about ‘the maintenance of the immediate, physical relations’ but also about ‘a social-spatial imaginary’. Imagining encounters as a ‘movement of closeness’ between the ‘secure national self’ and the ‘arriving other’, Wilson (ibid: 641) argues that encounters simultaneously ‘work to shape subjectivities [and] reproduce wider discourses and processes of belonging and differentiation’.

Encounters, then, can also become moments of ‘moral drama’ (Katz 2002) reflecting wider discourses and systematic problems in society. This speaks to Virdee and McGeever’s (2018: 1803) observations of how discussions around Brexit reflect ‘corrosive legacies of colonialism and racism, past and present’ that continue to shape the lives of racialized minorities and migrants in British society, ‘internal others’ (cf. Koefoed and Simonsen 2012) against ‘whom the nation has often defined itself’ (Virdee and McGeever 2018: 1804). These debates highlight that wider discourses and structural contexts impact on how encounters are experienced and constituted ‘on the ground’, these encounters shaping political discourses and national contexts in turn (Featherstone 2017). As such, there is a critical need to unsettle normative ‘whiteness’ by which ‘white’ majority narratives are constructed, and consider how dominant notions of place, space and identity might shift in moments of encounter, to which I now turn.

2.3.1 (De)stabilizing geographies of racialisation and ‘whiteness’
The racialisation of space and identities continues to shape the everyday geographies of many individuals and groups in society, with research on race and ethnicity particularly emphasising the ongoing significance of ‘whiteness’ in the ‘West’ (McDowell 2008; Kobayashi and Peake 2000). Yet, multiple forms of racialized identities and multi-ethnic linkages become articulated in moments of encounter, shaping meanings and notions of space and (national) identity in society. Racialisation is a plural phenomenon, with constructions of ‘whiteness’, ‘blackness’ and ‘brownness’ co-existing and becoming defined through, and in relation to, each other. Moreover, it is critical to approach racialisation as a highly dynamic and context-dependent process. Hall (1980: 338-339) uses the term ‘articulation’ to understand how racialized formations can become co-constituted in particular spatio-
temporal contexts, turning ‘race’ and ethnicity into a ‘modality’ or ‘medium’ through which social relations are experienced and become articulated in and across specific contexts; that is, processes of racialisation are closely tied up with issues around the ownership of space, mobility, belonging and nationhood.

Approaching racialisation as an ongoing historical and geographical process, negotiated at local level, further suggests that articulations and constructions of ‘race’ shape life differently for different people. While it is important to bear in mind that race is ‘not a physical description but a term of social relation’ (Ignatiev 1995: 112), and far from ‘natural’, unchanging or unchallengeable (Dyer 1997), Ahmed (2007: 150), amongst others, argues that ‘it does not follow from such a critique that race does not exist’. Racial and historical dimensions of colonialism, Ahmed (ibid: 151) suggests, have rendered our world ‘inherently white’, putting ‘in place’ physical and mental objects – styles, capacities, aspirations, techniques and habits – more readily available and ‘reachable’ for certain kinds of bodies. These past historical and geographical relations become ‘cemented’ in bodies, stretching into the present and possible future, as bodies ‘remember such histories, even when we forget them’ (ibid: 153-154). Race should, then, be understood as ‘a social as well as bodily given’, ‘a question of what is within reach, what is available to perceive and do “things” with’ (ibid: 154).

The complexities of black geographies particularly highlight that histories of colonialism, transatlantic slavery, contemporary practices of racism and resistances to white supremacy continue to shape a specific sense of place and identity. McKittrick (2011), amongst others, argues that focusing on the interconnectedness of race, practices of racialisation and domination, and geography is crucial to understand how ‘blackness’ or race emerges in and helps to make sense of the present. Racial and geographical violence continue to impede the development of a ‘black’ sense of place, McKittrick (ibid: 954) suggests, describing and re-describing ‘spaces of otherness’, and people of colour who inhabit these spaces as ‘radically outside the boundaries of humanness, global citizenry […] disconnected from the land itself’. This condemns ‘black worlds’, communities and their geographies to death ‘over and over again’ (ibid: 954), and disregards alternative narratives and practices by black people that politicise notions of space, place and identity. Section 2.3.2 further discusses mechanisms underlying the ‘othering’ of non-white bodies and identities.

Here, I draw on such work to emphasise that black and brown geographies have been shaped, and continue to be shaped, in tension with wider geographies that (re)produce a ‘white’ sense of space and (national) identity. The politics of this are revealed by the ways in which white bodies move through space with more comfort than black and brown bodies, enabling them to ‘settle’ and inhabit space whereas non-white bodies are rendered
‘visible’ and ‘out of place’ (Ahmed 2000). These constructions are often accompanied by feelings of discomfort and exposure, implying the lines of inclusion and exclusion drawn and felt around dominant – read ‘white’ - constructions of nationhood and national belonging (Virdee 2016, 2014). In earlier work, Virdee (2014: 5) discusses the geographies of ‘the nation’, highlighting how each time the boundary of ‘the British nation’ was extended, ‘it was accompanied and legitimized through the further racialisation of nationalism that prevented another more recently arrived group from being included’.

The notion of the ‘racialized outsider’ is thus transferred beyond immediate encounters between different actors, to a social structure and history of racialisation and subjugation that renders ethnic minorities ‘other’ to the nation-state (Meer 2015; also 2.3.2). And, as historical processes of in/exclusion stretch into the present, a sense of ‘the nation’ and national identity is forged that builds upon the racialisation and strategizing of migrant, black and brown identities (also Ince et al 2014). Critically, this positions racism as a plural, complex, intersectional and contested set of experiences that is spatially-extensive and divisive; a ‘scavenger ideology’ (Meer and Nayak 2013: NP15) that ‘draws selectively upon the past, present and imagined future, distilling complex fears and anxieties’ and can therefore never be homogeneous (also Gilroy 1992, 1987). Chapter 3 further links this to intersectionality and the complexities of identity making.

These debates help to grasp the ways in which past trajectories continue to influence perceptions of different bodies, and their possibilities, in moments and spaces of encounter, where the ability to ‘do things’ (Ahmed 2007) might refer to different bodies being more/less able to claim identities and forge a sense of place and belonging in society. While encounters are ‘moments when realities of domination and oppression become embodied’ (Peake and Ray 2001: 184) and ‘banal nationalism’ is performed (Billig 2004), an ever growing body of research frames encounters also as moments where (emotional) connections and assumed linkages between whiteness, nationhood and belonging can break open. It then becomes central to simultaneously look at structural processes and habitual practices through which everyday spaces are ‘whitened’ and the experiences and practices of (racialized) identities that unsettle, challenge and ‘unseat’ whiteness from its ‘throne of privilege’ (Nayak 2010: 2372).

Kyriakides et al (2009), for example, detail how constructions of ‘the Muslim’ as an oppositional identity in the construction of English and Scottish codes of cultural belonging are continuously undermined in everyday life. While imagined racialized conceptions of nationhood echo referents of whiteness, these cannot be easily sustained at the level of the ‘multi-ethnic’ neighbourhood. Similarly, Nayak (2010: 2375) discusses how different ways of ‘doing’ race evoke a ‘global sense of place’ (cf. Massey 1996) that unsettles ‘familiar
emotional-laden landscapes of whiteness’. In earlier work, Nayak (2003: 319) undermines the imagined homogeneity of racialized identities, arguing that, as with other identities, whiteness too can take on ‘multiple and contingent’ meanings. Evidencing how whiteness intersects with class and masculinities, Nayak (ibid: 320) suggests that ‘whiteness is not simply constituted in relation to blackness […] but is also fashioned through and against other versions of whiteness’, turning it open to contestation and negotiation (also Meer 2015). Further detailing the experiences of people of Asian backgrounds in Scotland, Virdee (2003) suggests that the willingness of people of South Asian descent to identify themselves as part of Scottish nation, adopting hybrid identities such as Scottish Asian or Scottish Muslim despite structures and practices of racism and racialisation, evidences dominant and imagined geographies of race, place and nation constantly being re-negotiated in and across mundane contexts (also 2.5).

Much of this research rethinks encounters as moments of opportunity, holding the potential to disrupt ‘narratives of Otherness’ (Lobo 2010: 109), and conceives of encounters as an important part of everyday life, indeed, spatial-temporal moments which might make it easier ‘to question and reflect on the exclusionary effects […] [of encounters] that mark individuals as “cultural Other”’ (ibid: 109). Holding on to these thoughts, the next section discusses the figure of ‘the stranger’ to further unpick practices of boundary drawing around notions of national identity and belonging.

2.3.2 (De)constructing narratives of strangerhood and national belonging
As discussed above, geographies of racialisation structure everyday life in uneven ways. This positions and constructs specific bodies as ‘out of place’, ‘strange’ and ‘suspicious’, highlighting that processes of racialisation are closely entangled with issues of naming, narrating and recognising ‘difference’. The politics of naming are imbued within the figure of ‘the stranger’, somebody always already excluded from dominant readings of identity, belonging and space. The figure of ‘the stranger’ continues to be a key theme in social theory and urban studies (Amin 2012; Ahmed 2000; Bauman 1991; Simmel 1950). Ahmed (2000) argues that ‘the stranger’ (the other) is not someone unknown, but some-body already constructed as different. Rather than being truly unknown as in somebody going by unnoticed, someone recognised as unknown but different is always identified as a stranger. Ahmed stresses that such identifications are tied up with histories of previous encounters and experiences that are attached to the specific moment of recognition, i.e. embedded within wider socialised understandings of previous encounters between ‘our’ own group and the stranger’s. Ahmed continues to question the assumption that it is possible for anyone to be a stranger (unknown), arguing that strangers are presumed known via stereotypes. Strangers are therefore always already recognised as such, often accompanied by notions of threat. It is thus crucial not to accept the figure of the stranger as ‘natural’ as this would conceal
“the very relationships of social antagonism that produce the stranger as a figure in the first place [...] how the stranger comes into being through the marking out of inhabitable spaces, bodies and terrains of knowledge.” (Ahmed 2000: 79)

It follows that differences can be understood through

“thinking about the role of everyday encounters in the forming of social space [...] Such differences are not then to be found on the bodies of others, but are determined through encounters between others; they are impossible to grasp in the present.” (ibid: 9, original emphasis)

As such, the act of recognition cannot be based on the very present encounter alone but ties in with knowledges socialised over time as to who can be in a public space. It is therefore crucial to foreground the history of social relations embedded in notions of strangerhood to unsettle fixed ideas of identity and wider discourses of space and place in society. The stranger emerges as a highly relational and context-specific figure. Indeed, some less relational work on the stranger has been criticised for being ‘curiously disembodied’ (Hopkins 2014: 1575) and not paying enough attention to the spatiality of strangerhood (Noble 2013). These disembodied and non-spatial accounts have led some to caution that ‘it cuts “the stranger” off from histories of its determination’ (Ahmed 2000: 5), constructing the stranger as having a life of its own ‘without much regard for the role of others in shaping how, where, and why particular figures become categorised as “strangers”’ (Hopkins 2014: 1575).

Exploring young Sikh men’s experiences and responses to being positioned as strange in Scottish society, Hopkins (2014) emphasises precisely the relationality of strangerhood. Hopkins finds that the strange-ness of participants’ bodies and identities shifts and changes across different spaces, contexts and scales, suggesting participants’ agency (2.5) and notions of strangerhood being embedded within wider racialized geographies of ‘migrant belonging’ (Noble and Poynting 2008: 129). Koefoed and Simonsen (2011: 343) agree that the stranger is ‘a relational figure constituted in spatial ambivalence between proximity and distance’, closely linked to encounters within specific spaces constructing specific figures as strangers. In later work, Koefoed and Simonsen (2012) introduce the figure of the ‘internal stranger’, arguing that Pakistani-born Danes in Copenhagen are reproduced as internal others who are standing outside or ‘on the edge’ of the Danish imagined community. Their account highlights that strangerhood operates simultaneously across different scales, stretching from local encounters to discursive imaginaries of ‘the nation’, as well as how hegemonic discourses are challenged.
Here, I link these debates to Kristeva’s (1982, 1991) work on ‘the abject’ to further draw out the psychological dimensions underlying the making and unmaking of notions of national identity and belonging. This work unpacks the apparent need to defend boundaries constructed between self and other, and to safeguard the purity of the self against the impurities connected to ‘the other’. Abjection involves the expulsion of ‘the impure’: through ‘casting out and down’ specific bodies and identities into the condition of being abject (Tyler 2013: 41, original emphasis), these structural acts of inclusion/exclusion generate and secure ‘the borders of the individual and the social body’ (Tyler 2009: 80; original emphasis). Kristeva suggests that these boundaries are psychologically necessary to cope with ‘a frightening loss of distinction’ (Tyler 2009: 78) between the conscious ego, the ‘I’, and objects/others, and to settle the subject into a ‘socially justified illusion - a security blanket’ (Kristeva 1982: 136-137). However, Kristeva (1991) also contends that the threat of the abject can never be entirely removed, because to recognise ourselves we must recognise, and constantly try to separate ourselves from, the other. This makes the desire to expel/distance the self from the other an ‘implicit condition of existence’ (Askins 2004: 33).

The theory of abjection helps to understand how, in moments of encounter, naming and recognising ‘the stranger’ is about the need to separate ourselves from ‘the other’ at individual and community/social group level. This foregrounds encounters as sites of co-existing trajectories where particular histories are reopened ‘such that some are already read as more hateful than other(s)’ (Ahmed 2004: 33). These ‘strange’ bodies are excluded (expelled) from dominant (white) society, constantly attempting to distance itself from the ‘threat’ of cultural heterogeneity (cf. Askins 2004), where racializing discourses and practices of racism serve to socially exclude the ‘national other’, and the stranger becomes a figure of repulsion, impurity and rejection. Importantly, this underscores the need to think about the consequences of being abject within specific social and political locations (Tyler 2009), and to focus on how abjection is experienced and lived through encounters on the ground (Katz 2017).

While accounts of agency develop more complex understandings (2.5), research indicates that many people feel that they have little power to influence wider processes of spatial and social exclusion. Work concerned with issues of racism, experiences of being blocked or stopped in public, and misrecognition, emphasises the ongoing racialisation and securitisation of white spaces (Hopkins et al 2017; Bonino 2015; Caluya 2011) and ‘racial vibrations’ weaving through senses of belonging and home (May 2015). These often small, banal and ‘slow’ forms of violence are serious. They represent forms of control that ‘of course embody power’ (Kilomba 2013: 66) as geopolitical conflicts and the fear of terror become incorporated into everyday embodied encounters (Katz 2017). Being looked at,
questioned and stopped in public openly positions minorities ‘as solo in arrangement’ (strange and other), strategically isolating black and non-white people and reassuring ‘white dominance’ (Kilomba 2013: 109). Thinking through this in terms of ‘the stranger’, Koefoed and Simonsen (2012: 629) argue that the phenomenon of being stopped (re)produces racialisation and ‘internal racial organisation’ (cf. Haldrup et al 2008) as a natural form of life, resulting in us/them dichotomies that determine ‘which people are either incorporated into the community or not’ (also Haldrup et al 2006).

Accounts of strangerhood speak to debates around the politics of multiculturalism (Lentin 2012; Chan 2010) and the importance of researching encounters as sites of ‘social collision’ (Willis 2010) to grasp the influence of geopolitical events becoming articulated through ‘placed’ encounters. In recent years, this awareness has led to more attention being paid especially to the geographies of Muslim identities (Dunn and Hopkins 2016) which unfold in a ‘refashioned racial landscape’ (Puar 2007). Within this racialized and ethnized political climate, research suggests that Muslims are being constructed as the ‘ultimate Other’, and as ‘undesired, irredeemable, alien’ (Alexander 2002: 564). These identifications tie in with wider issues concerning inequalities and power where constructions of ‘the stranger’ function as a means of social control and ownership over territory and space, securing a dominant - white - sense of nationhood, belonging and home (Ahmed 2000). Nayak (2009: 139), for example, argues that the majority of the white population in Britain does not accept people of Asian and African descent as full legitimate members of ‘the nation’, evidencing how wider geographies of power use ‘over-racialisation’ (Hall cited in Hyder 2004: 114) to ‘effectively devalue other identities, capacities and accomplishments’ (Nayak 2009: 139) and senses of belonging, citizenship and home.

While stranger-making and institutionalised structures of racialisation continue (Fraser 2000), other research suggests that everyday negotiations of identity and belonging can disturb and potentially subvert overarching and dominant constructions and imaginaries of ‘the nation’ and national belonging. This chapter now thinks through identity making as a relational and hybrid process.

2.4 Hybridity, relationality and urban belonging(s)
So far, this chapter has stated that geographies of racialisation continue to construct fixed notions of place, space and identity. Yet, racialisation emerges as a deeply spatio-political phenomenon as past social relations and uneven geographies of power filter through to and become articulated in present encounters. Placed encounters, then, will play a central role in (re)producing and negotiating dominant senses of national belonging and identity, rife with conflict and tension, by the diverse users of everyday spaces of encounter in
Glasgow, Scotland. In this section, I advocate the necessity to conceptualise identities as *relational* and *hybrid* to foreground identity making as a highly emergent, localised and contextualised process (Clayton 2012). Doing so considers the complexities of identity making, their spatiality and unevenness, and holds on to the potential to unsettle and destabilise essentialist and static readings of space, belonging and identity, and the power positions needed to name and fix people as other.

Bhabha (1994) discusses hybridity not as the merging of two distinct entities, struggling with each other and the ‘resulting’ entity being made up of these two ‘original’ starting points, but as deeply ambivalent because any (ethnic) identity is inherently a ‘blend’ or mix that cannot be distinguished in time and space. That is, hybridity, and identity, has neither origin nor arrival. This idea resonates with the concept of ‘inbetweenness’ discussed in feminist literature (Katz 1992), stressing that any position is always a shifting identification simultaneously separate from, yet related to, other equally fluid identifications. This interpretation emphasizes a relational concept of identity ‘based on difference from others but not separation from others’ (Rose 1997: 314). Thinking about identity in such a way problematizes static and essentialist constructions of ‘white/non-white’ and ‘in place/out-of-place’: these binaries no longer hold if it not possible to identify a ‘stranger’, in Ahmed’s (2000) conception of the term, and potentially challenge racialized constructions of space and place.

However, Bhabha does not deny that a sense of differences existing is central in identity making. Rather, he conceptualises these differences as fluid to undermine the positions of power necessary to construct people as ‘strangers’ or ‘threat’. Similarly, Hall (1996) uses hybridity to search for roots and grounding without identity being tied to the ‘basis of origin’ (Anthias 2001: 625). His concept of ‘new ethnicities’ foregrounds experiences of racialisation and narratives of identity as ‘lived with and through, not despite, difference; by hybridity’ (Hall 1996: 220), which highlights identities as multiple, shifting and contextually negotiated. These ideas are part of a wider body of literature that discusses hybridity and plurality, rupturing notions of essential and fixed identities and working with and through notions of difference as central elements in processes of identity construction (e.g. Butler 1993). Some of this literature draws on Derrida (1972) who argues that difference is a model in which every ‘concept’, including identity, is

“inscribed in a chain or in a system within which it refers to the other, to other concepts [identities], by means of the systematic play of differences” (Derrida 1972 in Hall 2000: 216)
In such a framing, any system/society is prevented ‘from stabilizing itself as a fully sutured totality’ (Hall 2000: 216). Thinking through diasporic identities, Gilroy (1998: 23) adds that the concept of ‘in between’ terminates thinking of ‘effortless sameness’ or ‘absolute differentiation’, with identities being constantly made and remade through processes of ‘creolization, metissage, mestisaje and hybridity’ (Gilroy 1993: 2). Moreover, a sense of agency and resistance weaves through these debates. Bhabha sees hybridity as a potentially subversive tool, opening up a ‘third space’ that allows for the renegotiation of identities by sidestepping binary thinking. This dialogical conception of identity speaks to Lorde’s (1984) notion of the ‘self’ as always ‘collaged’, constantly made and remade of pieces and relations that change, disappear and re-emerge over time. I now consider the question as to how hybridity can help in rethinking relational identities as localised in place, affected by encounters, and affecting these encounters in turn.

2.4.1 Localising hybridity in moments of encounter

Many accounts of hybridity have been criticized for being too theory-driven and mentioning space only in an abstract way, thereby insufficiently dealing with the situated and structural specificities of articulations of identities and belonging. A notable exception are Noble and Tabar (2002: 144) who highlight the hybrid identities of young Lebanese-Australian men in Melbourne arising in response to particular encounters experienced in public spaces where the men feel that these identities give them ‘a manoeuvrability and a sense of agency needed [for] their social environment’. Their identities, the authors argue (ibid: 144), involve ‘a hybridity that rests on a “strategic essentialism” which stabilizes identity in the face of racism and marginalization’. This echoes Hall’s (1996) argument that identities are lived with and through, not despite, difference. It also suggests that identity making is a deeply spatial and agentic phenomenon, where individuals might enact and perform specific identities in particular places and spaces to subvert dominant constructions of space and (national) identity (2.5). Chapter 3 extends discussion on these issues through the lenses of intersectionality and performativity. Here, these accounts of the highly spatialized nature of identity performances are drawn out to show that hybridity, and identity construction, is always caught up in encounters, and involves a dual process of self-positioning and identification by others in particular spaces and configurations of social relations (Clayton 2012).

I suggest that holding on to the geographies of hybridity is crucial, because otherwise hybridity, meant to register the dynamics of identity formation, may function to gloss over existing cultural hierarchies and hegemonic practices (Anthias 2001). Power is central, becoming articulated through, and shaping, socio-spatial relations and imaginaries, all of which are felt through and on the body, and on specific bodies more than others (2.3). This implies that hybridity cannot address issues of exclusion and narrations of belonging and ‘otherness’ unless also located within other constructions of difference and identity,
such as gender and class (3.2). It is pivotal, then, to ground hybrid identities, and their making, in the historical and material conditions of specific geographies within which they arise (Mitchell 1997). This draws attention to identities being produced by, and simultaneously producing, particular spaces, paying critical attention to processes of racialisation interred in hybridity.

Discussing the complex denial and/or recognition of national identity and belonging among Danish Muslims, Koefoed and Simonsen (2012), for example, indicate that the hybrid identities of Pakistani-born Danes connect across, and are intertwined with social relations in multiple spaces and scales. The authors observe that taking ethnicity as an axis of difference is complicated in emergent and contestant ways across space and place: participants ‘jump scale’ to negotiate problematic encounters that cast them as strange and ‘out of place’, ‘downgrading national identity in favour of more habitable spaces on global, urban, local or bodily scales’ (ibid: 639). Positions in geography differ regarding the geopolitics of scale, some foregrounding their interrelations (e.g. Katz 2001) and others holding on to some scales such as ‘the local’ to think through dynamics in political discourses shaping places and spaces (e.g. Jones and Fowler 2007) and scales of identity and belonging (Caluya 2011). I perceive scales as always interwoven and connected through; yet, I do not reject scale completely since the local plays a significant role in some of the micro connections and relation-building processes described in this thesis.

Here, I focus on the importance of recognising that (past) social and spatial relations are involved in determining which aspects of hybrid identities are lived, and how they become articulated in particular places. Using the example of young people from black and ethnic minority communities in England, Clayton (2012: 1675) argues that diasporic identities are highly localised and contextualized as they unfold within a society ‘that has not eliminated its hegemonic racial grammar’. This underscores that social relations are always freighted with significant histories and geographies of contestation, with places and encounters becoming ‘key sites through which histories of encounter [and social relations] are staged, articulated and politicized’ (Featherstone 2017: 167).

A conceptual framing that emphasizes the spatializing of identity processes, the power inequalities affecting them, and retaining a hybrid and relational sense of identity, can thus expose how people construct and consolidate identities in response to specific spaces, enabling them to navigate and ease interactions within different spaces. Bonino (2015), for example, emphasises that Scottish-Muslims project and present ‘and’ identities suited to specific geographies and spaces. These hybrid or ‘and’ identities combine national, cultural, ethnic and religious aspects and are integrated ‘within a network system in which each identity aspects is not fixed and completely separate from the others but works in a
dialogical and contextual fashion' (ibid: 87; also Lorde 1984). Indeed, Bonino (2015: 88) observes that in ‘Muslim’ places such as mosques participants portray specific elements of their hybrid identities to navigate ‘the expected environmental sociocultural rules’ of these spaces. Such identities clearly highlight how place itself is central in such emergent and hybrid identity making, and how processes of hybrid and relational identities challenge dominant constructions of space and belonging in contemporary societies. Moreover, a strong sense of agency weaves through their identity making, indicating the politics of encounter and moments of micro connection and hybrid and relational identity making as resistance, to which I now turn.

2.5 Belonging, agency and politics of encounter
Up to this point, I have emphasised the role of social relations to shift to more mobile conceptualisations of identities and identifications. The hybridity and relationality of these processes challenges static thinking rooted in absolute notions of difference. Belonging emerges as a key theme throughout these debates, as people try to make sense of places, and their attachments to them. This section approaches belonging as a deeply emotional and political process. While emerging research increasingly focusses on the emotional dimension of experiences of (non)belonging (e.g. Wood and Waite 2011; also 3.4), I discuss another set of debates foregrounding a ‘transformative politics of encounter’ (Askins 2008) and a political understanding of ‘urban togetherness’ and belonging which suggests that there is more at stake in encounters than the experience of ‘being together in difference’ (Ang 2003). These debates state that agency and resistance form a crucial part of many intercultural and interethnic encounters, with particularly informal, mundane and ‘small’ encounters potentially shifting ‘how we see and feel about our others’ (Askins 2008: 4730). This section, then, considers the agentic and transgressive practices that might disrupt ways of ‘knowing’ difference and otherness.

With increasingly global movements of people, Gilroy (1993) suggests that an ever-growing number of people form diasporic identities that stretch across countries and continents. These multicultural and cosmopolitan attachments open up new ideas of belonging in and beyond the nation state, and simultaneously disrupt and heighten the desire for ‘locally-based’ belonging (Amin 2002). As more formal political debates increasingly focus on the relationship between community and society, particularly on issues of social cohesion, integration and cosmopolitanism, more attention is being paid to everyday spaces of routine heterogeneity and intercultural encounter. This growing interest in the spatialities of intercultural encounter at the local scale speaks back to issues of national belonging and nationhood, and the shifting and contested meanings of place (Mee and Wright 2009). Current literature on belonging, then, emphasises the multiple ways in which belonging emerges and works across multiple places and scales, and is always political
(Caluya 2011). Within these debates, key concerns include the intersectionality of belonging (Valentine 2007), i.e. the ways individuals negotiate multi-layered, contested or competing senses of belonging across different spatial scales, and how belonging 'works' as an emotional attachment (Wood and Waite 2011). Such concerns are unpacked in more depth in Chapter 3; however, it is necessary to briefly outline the latter, regarding emotions, in my discussion on politics.

Rather than positioning belonging as a natural occurrence, Probyn (1996) argues that belonging concerns people longing to be and yearning for attachments. Discussing belonging as a 'dynamic emotional attachment' (Wood and Waite 2011:1755) – (non)belonging being more complex than binary terms of belonging or not – conceives of belonging as becoming and a yearning for 'feeling part of a larger whole, through social, familial and emotional bonds with others and to place' (Askins 2015: 474). This resonates with identity as not having to do ‘with being but with becoming’ (Sarup 1996: 11). Indeed, it is the diverse and multiple possibilities for identification, implied by a fluid sense of identity, which renders necessary boundary making around the self, in processes of abjection discussed in 2.4. The same goes for the desire to belong. Moreover, past and present geographies and relations of power bear down on the desire to identity and belonging, with other desires to become/belong often having to be ignored and/or suppressed. Belonging is thus always about political struggle, tied up with issues of (political) recognition and claiming one's place in society (Noble 2009b; also 3.4).

It is critical, then, to stay mindful to the power entangled in processes of belonging. The power of belonging shifts attention to the ways in which people actively negotiate multiple claims to become/belong in society, articulated through everyday encounters. Agency forms a central part of (un)making belonging. Yet, it is not useful to think of agency solely as always and only resistance. Hesse (2000: 18) introduces the concept of ‘transruptions’ to capture the marginalised, resistant, alternative, incorporative and cultural practices of people that ‘recast, challenge and/or stretch’ dominant meanings and discourse. These practices ‘put in question, particularly in unexpected places and at unforeseen times, matters deemed in hegemonic discourses to be settled, buried and apparently beyond dispute’ (ibid: 18). In other words, emergent practices in mundane spaces of encounter can unsettle and present irrepressible challenges to dominant society. This approach enables a fluid and relational understanding of identities, and highlights the constant re-negotiation of (national) belonging. It also holds onto identities and belonging as always becoming.

To better understand the 'seemingly mundane acts of micropolitics', Staeheli et al (2012: 630) further suggest that more attention has to be paid to how 'small actions [...] can lead to varied forms of contact and engagement that hold the potential to nudge established
patterns of control and authority. This positions the everyday as always political, and focuses on the encounters and activities in ‘prosaic places in which people discover each other as multifaceted, complex and interdependent’ (Askins 2015: 476). A ‘quiet politics’ (Askins 2015) of encounter and belonging thus emphasises an explicit will to engagement that becomes expressed through these practices, potentially contributing to the process of ‘renegotiating Selves’ (Askins and Pain 2011: 18) and shifting wider socio-political contexts.

In similar ways, researching spatial ownership practices of asylum seekers and Aboriginal people in Australia, Lobo (2013) argues that the ‘white skin’ of public space is challenged through the diverse ways in which these people ‘live with difference’ across different spaces. Lobo (2013: 463) suggests that their practices transform public space into the ‘skin’ of the differentiated bodies inhabiting it, enabling a vision of ‘a future where the grip of “whiteness” can be loosened [and] racialized bodies can belong in the city’. In earlier research, Lobo (2010: 109) states that ‘everyday practices grounded in place’ function as ‘sources of empowerment’ that allow people marked as ‘excluded, disempowered, oppressed and passive’ in suburban Australia to foster a sense of national belonging and identity. Research by Hopkins (2014) and Bonino (2015), respectively, indicates a will to become/belong in Scottish society among young Sikh and Muslim men, who actively carve out alternative spaces and narratives of belonging. Chapter 3 discusses this research in light of performativity and intersectionality. Here, this body of research implies a level of agency that holds ‘the differences that matter’ (Ahmed 2007) central, keeping experiences of otherness and structural inequalities in tension with hybridity and movement that weaves through (un)making identities and belonging.

Regarding the impact of individuals’ agency on broader structural contexts and geographies of power, scholars warn that the subversive qualities of these practices is limited (e.g. Matejskova and Leitner 2011; Valentine 2008; also 2.2). However, I concur with Mahtani (2002: 436, emphasis added) who stresses that ‘what is at stake is the hope that [people’s] interventions, in some small way, will sometimes generate reverberations that do matter’. Despite the unpredictable outcomes and dissonances that people’s activities produce (cf. Sharp et al 2000), these activities can open up opportunities to shift attention to the power of the subject and to how individuals actively attempt to transrupt (racial) binaries of identity and belonging. Critically, this considers how ‘many of these strategies shake things up a little, unveiling new configurations of identity [and belonging]’ (Mahtani 2002: 437). I take inspiration from such arguments, foregrounding the ‘small’ and ‘quiet’ politics of encounter and belonging (Askins 2015), emergent in everyday spaces, that might produce more nuanced understandings of differences and similarities, as they ‘allow
for, and demand, shifts in perceptions of Self and Other’ and the anticipation of ‘new social relations’ (ibid: 476) that might gradually transform society.

2.6 Conclusion
This chapter started by exploring literature on spaces of encounter and belonging, assessing the transformative potential of seemingly banal and ‘everyday’ forms of contact and interaction. Shedding light on the diverse contexts that bring people of various backgrounds and trajectories together on a routine and everyday basis, I have suggested that the ‘mixedness’ and ‘ordinary-ness’ characterising many of these spaces is what transforms them into critical sites of multicultural and multi-ethnic encounter. Central here is that approaching public and semi-formal spaces in this way recognises and values social interactions and micro connections as integral in negotiations of diversity and difference, and processes of living together.

Discussing concerns regarding the romanticising of encounters and the ‘celebratory diversification drift’ (Neal et al. 2018) of conviviality, I have emphasised that focusing on micro spaces of encounter can help ‘place’ debates around migration, multiculture and belonging in specific environments and spaces, and simultaneously acknowledge structural forces and inequalities that also always drive social relations. To that end, I have considered the ‘conjunctures’ weaving through everyday spaces of encounter, arguing that it is crucial not abstracting encounters from their broader historical, political and geographical contexts. Importantly, this conceives of encounters not as isolated moments, but as sites of different co-existing trajectories that (continue to) know and value people and places.

Holding central encounters as sites of conjuncture, I have drawn out the possibilities of everyday geographies of encounter for dissecting wider geographies and discourses of racialisation, strangerhood and national belonging; these processes remain deeply structuring forces in the everyday lives of specifically black, non-white and Muslim people in Western societies, constructing and stigmatizing their bodies and identities as strange/impure/unfamiliar/other and ‘out of place’ in and beyond local contexts. To further foreground the politics of multiculturalism and belonging, I have explored theories of abjection and recognition, agreeing with the view that encounters can be sites of ‘social collision’ (Willis 2010) in which boarder (uneven) geopolitical relations and events accumulate and become accentuated, with ethnic and ‘racial vibrations’ (May 2015), in particular, continuing to weave through encounters with/across difference and senses of identity, belonging, and ‘home’ in society. This critically conceives of encounters as also always rife with conflict and tension, as they tie in with wider issues of inequalities and power.
Connecting above debates to the potential to unsettle and destabilise essentialist and static readings of space, belonging and identity, and the power positions needed to name and fix people as other, I have suggested that conceptualising identities as relational and hybrid is vital to conceive of identity construction as a highly emergent, localised and contextualised process. As such, I have elaborated on the need to embed hybridity in moments of encounter, to highlight the dynamics of identity formation, their spatiality and unevenness, and to hold central existing cultural hierarchies and hegemonic practices interred in hybridity. By emphasising the spatialities of identity processes, the power inequalities affecting them, and retaining a hybrid and relational sense of identity, I was able to examine the ways in which people construct and consolidate identities in response to specific spaces, exploring how people navigate and ease interactions with others in mixed and semi-formal public places.

In the final section, I have addressed the often ‘quiet’ politics of encounter (cf. Askins 2014) and micro connections as resistance (Chapter 7), conceptualizing multicultural encounters as moments of possibility in which agentic practices and performances of people may shift and disrupt dominant – read white – notions of space, identity and belonging. I have suggested that encounters hold the potential to negotiate, unsettle and transrupt (cf. Hesse 2000) narratives of otherness and difference, enabling people to question and reflect on processes and geographies of inclusion and exclusion, through developing more nuanced understandings of self and other, and identifying points of similarity and difference. As such, seemingly mundane practices and interactions may present irrepressible challenges to dominant society. This perspective also recognises people’s increasingly multicultural and cosmopolitan attachments in and beyond the nation state, and emphasises the multiple ways in which belonging emerges, works across and connects through multiple places and scales, and is always emotional and political. Highlighting the power of belonging, I have shown that people actively negotiate multiple claims to become/belong in society, articulated through everyday encounters.

As the debates in this chapter frequently underscore the ‘conjunctures’ weaving through mundane spaces of encounter, the following chapter expands on the often uneven geographies and relations of power, considering theories of intersectionality, performativity and emotionality to further investigate and complicate the pluralities and complexities of belonging(s) and identification processes.
3 Spaces of intersectionality, multi-ethnic encounter and politics of emotion

“Everyday intercultural encounters [...] that embody passion and action and harness imperceptible forces from a more than human world are moments of [...] a ‘quiet murmur’ (Shapiro 2009: 1) barely noticeable, a doing, an affective performative force that transforms bodies and public spaces in imperceptible ways.”

(Lobo 2013: 460-463)

3.1 Introduction

Holding on to spaces of encounter as sites of different co-existing trajectories (2.2), this chapter explores (uneven) relations and broader geographies of power weaving through encounters ‘on the ground’, to further unpack the complexities and pluralities of identity formation processes, and the ways in which hybrid identities are produced, shifted and transrupted through local places and encounters. To do so, this chapter brings into dialogue literature on spaces of encounter and intersectionality, further developing its feminist conceptual framework, to interrogate identities as emerging at the various intersections of ethnicity, class, gender and other identities, producing subject positions that firmly interlock with multiple and overlapping forms of power (Fernandes 2003; Crenshaw 1993). This shows identities as fluid, processual and momentary, highlighting the multifaceted and complex links of identities and bodies into themselves and to external worlds (Anderson and Tolia-Kelly 2004), the intersectionality of belonging (Wood and Waite 2011; Valentine 2007) and belonging encompassing a yearning for attachments to places and people (Probyn 1996), while remaining aware of the structures, histories and subjectivities that constrain and shape identities and encounters (Ahmed 2000). Within this thesis, the main empirical materials speak to ethnic and cultural intersectionalities, and related intersections of religion and gender (Chapter 5).

Focusing on the politics of bodies, identities and differences, this chapter establishes the significance of ‘placing’ intersectional analysis, to unpack the multiple and shifting ways in which versions of self and other are represented, (dis)identified and (un)done at particular moments and in specific contexts (Valentine 2007; McCall 2005). Such a spatialized perspective critically approaches identities as produced through specific encounters and contexts, remains sensitive to wider (uneven) relations and geographies of power at work in any given moment/situation, and the unpredictable and ‘messy’ ways in which both similarities and differences are negotiated (Hubbard and Lyon 2018; Hopkins and Noble 2009). As such, this approach can help to explore wider geographies of racialisation, belonging and nationhood (2.3), ‘placing’ intersectionality raising important questions about
the geopolitics at the micro scale of local identities and belonging(s) (Askins 2016; Koefoed and Simonsen 2012; Valentine and Waite 2012).

Moreover, I suggest that bringing intersectionality into conversation with (aspects of) performativity helps to explore how people consolidate and (un)settle identities and belongings in interactions and prosaic spaces; performativity theorises subjects as conscious and reflective (intersectional) identities ‘on the ground’ and ‘in the moment’ (Rose and Gregson 2000). As with intersectionality, spatializing performativity is crucial to thoroughly embed human subjectivities (Nelson 1999) and to understand bodies being positioned and shaped differently in the same general context (Hill-Collins and Bilge 2016). I also maintain that the tensions between both theories can more thoroughly capture the ways in which people are caught up in the unpredictable process of becoming (after Probyn 2005), opening up opportunities to think through performances as transformative of wider geographies of racialisation and power.

This chapter builds on these debates to further consider the emotional dimensions of identification processes, arguing that emotions, as space, are central in understanding experiences of everyday life and belonging (Horton and Kraftl 2009). My position is that paying attention to emotional relations in spaces and moments of encounter is vital to make sense of how bodies with complex histories and racialized geographies negotiate affective pressures in public spaces and ‘inhabit a world of becoming’ (Lobo 2010); emotions thus always being political (Smith et al 2009; Tolia-Kelly 2006). I hold that thinking through the spatialities and politics of emotion foregrounds what bodies of colour, in particular, can(not) do in encounters (Lobo 2014a, 2014b) and wider contexts (Ahmed 2007), as ideas of ‘nation’ and ‘home’ are experienced through ‘felt connections’ (Nayak 2017), that way also speaking to wider geographies of fear and insecurity (Pain 2009; also Pain and Staeheli 2014) and hate (Wilson 2010; Ahmed 2004).

In the final section, I give a sense of the Scottish context and dominant political discourses around issues of nationhood and belonging (Virdee et al 2018, 2016; Meer 2015, 2014), and discuss Scotland as a ‘refashioned racial landscape’ (Puar 2007) in which ‘black and brown Scots’ (Virdee 2016) continue to struggle to negotiate and consolidate their affiliations with the nation despite long-standing trends of self-identification on Scottish identities by (ethnic) minorities. Remaining sensitive to the significance of speaking from a place of situated knowledge (Rose 1997; also 4.2), I conclude that taking a spatialized perspective of Glasgow makes it possible to speak about ‘Scottishness’ in a way that remains aware of the histories and geographies of place, and to interrogate how different bodies relate to and can (re)make (national) identities and belongings through their interactions and practices in mundane spaces.
The chapter begins with a discussion of intersectionality and spaces of encounter to interrogate the complexities of identity formation, and the power relations shaping them. I then discuss the tensions of (intersectional) identity performances, followed by the argument that emotions weave through processes of (dis)identification and relate people to wider geographies and politics of (national) belonging. I conclude by relating the theories and concepts discussed to the Scottish context.

3.2 Unpacking spaces of intersectionality and multi-ethnic encounter
Intersectionality developed from feminist theory which claims, in different ways, that it is crucial to acknowledge the social positioning of people and to challenge the ‘god trick of seeing everything from nowhere’ (Haraway 1991: 189) as ‘a cover and a legitimisation of a hegemonic masculinist “positivistic” positioning’ (Yuval-Davis 2006: 369). Situated gazes, knowledges and imaginations construct differently the ways people see and experience the world (Stoetzler and Yuval-Davis 2002). Specifically, intersectionality can be attributed to critical race theorists who rejected the notion that race, gender, ethnicity, class and so on are separate and essentialist categories. Instead, intersectionality emphasises the interconnections and interdependence of race with other categories of identity (Crenshaw 1995). Crenshaw, a legal scholar, is most associated with developing the concept of intersectionality through theorising the intersection of race, gender and class for black women. Using the analogy of ‘road junctions’, Crenshaw (1993) describes that ‘violent accidents’ occur at these crossroads which often go unreported. Thinking through the ways in which the ‘differential situatedness’ (Yuval-Davis 2006) of different people links up with forms of oppression and violence, Fernandes (2003: 309) adds that

“intersectional analysis names and describes these hidden acts of multiple discrimination and how they obfuscate damaging power relations, and it also bring to the fore how they construct, while paradoxically obviating, identities of the self.”

Intersectionality thus recognises that differences are not located ‘in the spaces between identities but in the spaces within’ (Fuss 1989). Importantly, this undermines essentialist thinking, which problematically interprets identities as a set of separate and fixed differences that overlap and add on to each other, something which would ‘champion identity politics’ and the ranking of difference (McCall 2005). Instead, intersectionality attempts to understand how different categories interlock with ‘systems of oppression’ (West and Fenstermaker 1995: 9) and ‘how power is organised around intersecting relations of race, class and gender to frame social positions of individuals’. As such, intersectionality speaks to my understanding of identities as multiple, shifting and contextually negotiated, where the ‘self’ emerges as constantly (re)made of pieces and relations that change, dis-
appear and (re)emerge over time (2.4). Moreover, through its emphasis on power, I suggest that intersectionality adds to this fluid understanding of identity(ies) by emphasising ‘differences’ as a political practice, questioning ‘what we do’ with these differences (cf. Ahmed 2004); that way, intersectional analysis can help to unpick binaries of oppression and privilege, critically highlighting the multiple and overlapping relations of power at work in any given instance (Yuval-Davis 2011).

The history of the various debates on how to approach intersectionality is usefully explored elsewhere (e.g. Hill-Collins and Bilge 2016). Here, this last point brings me to consider the value of appreciating intersectionality as spatially constituted and experienced; an understanding I find critical to explore the (intimate) connections between the production of space and the systematic reproduction of power (2.3). However, despite its ‘obvious spatial connotations’ (ibid: 13), theorisations of intersectionality often pay ‘only scant attention to the significance of space in processes of identity formation’ (ibid: 14; also Hopkins 2017). Although intersectional theory emphasises differences as intermeshed and mutually constitutive, it has been criticised for not addressing the question of how to explore specific features of differences (Davis and Zarkov 2017), and failing to incorporate the specifics of social contexts and of local, regional, national and global geographies, which are crucial to provide more nuanced understandings of social inequalities and the consequences of uneven power hierarchies (Hill-Collins and Bilge 2016). Hopkins (2017: 4), amongst others, argues that keeping intersectional readings of people’s lives connected to their political situations and contexts is vital to avoid intersectionality ‘becoming depoliticised, flattened out and whitened’, particularly problematic where/when ethnic and ‘raced’ bodies and identities are concerned, and to ensure addressing ‘underlying structures that produce and sustain injustice’ (Bilge 2013: 408).

Geography, then, critically inserts the role of space into intersectional analysis. By being sensitive to the spatilities of intersectionality, I suggest that it becomes possible to assert the multiple and shifting ways in which versions of self and other are (mis)represented, (dis)identified and (un)done in specific contexts (McCall 2005). Valentine (2007) argues that the process by which particular identities become salient or foregrounded is highly contingent on the power-laden spaces in and through which experiences are lived, making it crucial to grasp how ‘particular identities are weighted or given importance by individuals at particular moments and in specific contexts’, and when some categories ‘might unsettle, undo or cancel out other categories’ (ibid: 15, added emphasis). While subject positions and identities are fluid and complex (2.4), they are thus always produced in power-laden spaces, rubbing up against and exposing dominant spatial and social orderings that define who is in/out of place and who does (not) belong. In terms of the politics of (not) belonging, I suggest that processes of racialisation are often intersectional as they
draw on, out and together particular aspects of identities that are subsequently (re)produced as ‘other’, such as intersecting identities of ethnicity, gender and religion in the case of Muslims (2.3.1).

Following Hopkins (2017: 6), I argue that research, taking seriously the wider socio-political geographies of intersectionalities, has an important contribution to make, as it attempts to highlight context and relationality in intersectionality, emphasising ‘matters of race, racism and racialisation’ in specific spaces of encounter.

3.2.1 ‘Placing’ intersectionality

Foregrounding intersectional identities as produced through encounters ‘on the ground’ and ‘in the moment’ must also attend to broader social structures and discourse, holding central the notion of identities as highly contingent and situated, and space and identities as co-implicated (Wilson 2016b). In 2.2, I explore how encounters are inherently also an embodied dimension of social distinctions, and the unpredictable ways in which relations and identities of similarity and/or difference are negotiated in the moment (Hubbard and Lyon 2018). As such, encounters are always approached through ‘the lens of our intersecting identities’ (Valentine and Waite 2012: 486), and I suggest that intercultural and multi-ethnic encounters and sites involve the ways in which people look for recognition and validation as ‘raced’, gendered, classed, aged, sexualised, politicised and/or emotional selves, and at their multiple intersections (Askins 2016). Bringing together literatures on spaces of encounter and intersectionality, then, allows for a more nuanced understanding of the contradictions, entanglements and momentary extensions of (intersectional) identities, and the power associated with different subject positions (Wilson 2016b); this integrative approach thus capturing ‘the messiness of layered subjectivities and multidimensional relations in particular localities’ (Hopkins and Noble 2009: 815).

Indeed, a growing body of geographical research builds on ideas of intersectionality which conceive differences not as fixed and unchanging but as emerging from encounters. Neal et al (2013), for example, use intersectionality to explore the competencies of informal practices in everyday living together, emphasising the role of (especially) local places in which people experience relationships through intersectional diversity (also Piekut et al 2012). Focusing on intersections of youth, religion and masculinities, Hopkins (2006) details how various markers of social difference intersect in multiple ways for young Muslim men, and how their identities are intertwined with specific locations in suburban Scotland. And, researching intersections of youth, gender and class, Nayak (2006) emphasises identities and performances arising within, and responding to, the specificities of the post-industrial English suburb where class continues to operate as a ‘structuring absence’. Critically, this work foregrounds an understanding of emergent intersectional identities as engendered through local spaces, and encounters, though not place-bound.
Related research uses intersectionality to explore wider geographies of racialisation, belonging and nationhood, raising questions about the micro politics of everyday encounters and identities (2.3 and 2.5). Interrogating notions of ‘the stranger’ and dominant discourse on ethnicity in Denmark, Koefoed and Simonsen (2012), for example, argue that Pakistani and Muslim identities intersect and collide with a ‘white’ sense of Danish-ness which constructs these intersections as ‘on the edge’ and ‘internally strange’ in Danish imagined society. Caluya (2011) also emphasises the role of national imaginaries in Australia, where notions of community, belonging and security are actively racialized, deflating scales of ‘home’ and ‘nation’, which causes Aboriginal and Asian-Australian identities, particularly if further intersecting with middle and working class identities, to be constructed as ‘migrant other’ and ‘suspicious’. And Valentine and Wai-te’s (2012) account of the complex ways in which young lesbian and gay people of faith negotiate their rights to belong in the city highlights intersectional identities, and performances, speaking to Frosh et al’s (2002: 174) argument that identities are often ‘full of tension and drama, and the pain of belonging and not belonging’.

Critically, this work indicates that a shared identity aspect, e.g. religion, does not necessarily indicate ‘sameness’, but only marks one of many different intersecting social identities shaping people’s experiences of (national) belonging (Yuval-Davis et al 2005). Here, the value of integrating intersectionality in spaces of encounter lies in being able to expose and confront uneven relations and geographies of power shaping (national) identities and belongings, and racialized, gendered and/or classed inclusions and exclusions. Shifting attention to what power imbalances are at play in place(s), and through space(s) (of encounter), and how different aspects of often multi-layered identities are read and excluded at different times, intersectionality can draw out ‘what consequences these intersections have for discourses and practices of domination, exclusion and marginalisation’ (Davis and Zarkov 2017: 316), interrogating people’s different belongings, mobilities and rights in society (also 2.3).

Moreover, intersectionality’s origin in critical race theory emphasises the ‘all-pervasive racialisation of society’ (Price 2011: 154) and the social construction of ‘race’ as a ‘presumably immutable condition’ (ibid: 166); critically speaking to wider geographies of racialisation that render specific persons or groups ‘outside’ of and impervious to imagined notions of (national) community and belonging. My position here, then, is that connecting literature on intersectionality and spaces of encounter allows to foreground ‘understandings of scale, appreciations of time-space relations, spatial belonging and identities’ (Hopkins 2017: 6) involved in the complex spatiality(ies) of the social construction of ‘race’ (Price 2011), that way ‘offer(ing) more nuanced readings of everyday life’ (Meer and Nayak
2015: NP3). Framing intersectionality in spaces of encounter demands a teasing out of articulations of Scottishness (3.6) and attending to bodies and emotion as caught up in complex hybridities (Tolia-Kelly 2006; also 3.5). It also suggests a closer examination of performativity and spaces of encounter as ‘performative arenas’, to which I turn next.

3.3 Spaces of (intersectional) identity performances and tension

This section discusses how people adapt to, create and manage (micro) spaces of co-existence through actively consolidating and performing diverse identities and belonging(s); that way thinking through issues of power, space, embodiment and performance. I suggest that bringing intersectionality in conversation with performativity is useful to more thoroughly examine how people practice or act out different aspects of their intersecting identities in different spaces, contexts and encounters. Performativity’s emphasis on understanding how people position themselves and are positioned due to gender, ‘race’, age and other identities, in particular, resonates with intersectionality’s focus on wider geographies of power structuring social relations, the im/mobilities and dis/abilities of different bodies in society. While in tension (see below), both theories, as I shall argue, are thus useful to lay open how power works in society, taking seriously issues of social construction, experience formation, difference and inequality (Prins 2006).

Capturing the ways in which gender and sexual identifications are continuously remade through repetition, Butler (1990: 25) frames subjectivities as produced through power-laden processes, where categories of differences are performative, that constitute identity ‘as it is purported to be’. Identity thus emerges as ‘the repeated stylisation of the body’ (ibid: 26) that congeal over time ‘to produce the appearance of substance, of a natural sort of being’; crucially conceiving of identities as developing, changing and processual (2.4), and of performances as enabling people to play with social roles and behaviour in imaginative and inconclusive ways (Dirksmeier and Helbrecht 2010). Yet, Butler (1990) does not conceptualise the body as a blank surface, but as always already invested with meanings and signifiers of its cultural inscription (Salih 2002); identities are thus constrained by the ‘compelled performance of dominant discourses’ (Nelson 1999: 331) as society’s regulatory framework seeks to maintain the illusion of stable, substantive, binary and naturally hierarchical identities. Although Butler’s overemphasis on discourse in Gender Trouble (1990) has been criticised (e.g. Nelson 1999; Benhabib et al 1995), Moss and Dyck (2003: 66-68) argue that it does critically address how ‘power operates diffusely, subtly and hegemonically’, and ‘the ways in which powerful discourses frame both subject positions and forms of resistance’.

Staying mindful to the power entangled in processes of identity formation, this thesis foregrounds the often small and quiet practices of people that might re-cast, challenge and/or
stretch dominant meanings and discourse. Focusing on how complex identity performances are put ‘in place’ by individuals and groups frequently marginalised and othered, potentially *transrupting* wider landscapes of power (Hesse 2000; also 2.5 and 3.3.1), then, shifts attention to the value of performativity in terms of exploring embodiment, and, in particular, racialized bodies. Thinking through the stories of ‘mixed-race’ women in the Canadian context, Mahtani (2002: 425) suggests that these women take advantage of dynamic and ambiguous racialized spaces to enact complicated racialized performances, ‘revealing their ability to intervene and disrupt racialized social scripts […] and racialized readings of their bodies’. This highlights the construction of complex and shifting (racialized) identities within wider geographies of racialisation, and echoes Gregson and Rose’s (2000: 442) argument that ‘it is not to say that certain performances elude power relations, but rather to suggest that power operates in a rather different, although less predictable manner’.

Moreover, Mahtani’s research implies that bodies of colour, and female ‘mixed-race’ bodies in particular, are pronounced as hyper visible and ‘out of place’ in public spaces (also Lobo 2013), as dominant frameworks of power enforce colour of skin as a visual marker of ‘difference’ (Lobo 2014b; 3.3.1 and 7.2). Yet, racialized performances ‘not just idly “take on” the gaze of others’ (Mahtani 2002: 432) – the ‘inscription of race on the skin’ (Hall 1996: 20) – but can reflect a controlled move away from stereotypes associated with the racialized categories of whiteness and blackness, the ‘tactic of visibility’ (Harris 2016: 369) redressing bodies of colour (Fleetwood 2011) and whiteness, like blackness, as a performative accomplishment (Alexander 2004; also 2.3.1). I take inspiration from these arguments, as they highlight the relationality of human existence and ‘the important element of interconnection which goes into the construction of any identity’ (Massey 1999: 12), and move towards a greater understanding of the relationship between performance, processes of racialisation and embodiment.

As such, I suggest that approaching spaces of encounter as ‘performative arenas’ (Lobo 2013) allows to rethink intersectional identity performances and belonging as multiple and fractured, and to consider the places and spaces where axes of power operate at multiple levels of individual and group experience (Lobo and Ghosh 2013; also 3.2). It also positions identity categories including ethnicity and gender as permanently contested concepts and ‘terms of cultural engagement’ that are produced performatively (Bhabha 1994: 2). Such a conception is critical to highlight the interconnectedness of identities with space(s), and to further draw out the intersections between ethnicity, gender and other identities and place. Performativity can thus be usefully integrated with intersectionality, as both theories insist that ethnicity, gender, class, age and other identities are co-
constructed and mutually constitutive (3.2). Indeed, Butler (1990: 3) stresses that identities are not different social structures but are experienced simultaneously, arguing that

“if one ‘is’ a women, that is surely not all one is […] Gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual and regional modalities of discursively constitutes identities. As a result, it becomes impossible to separate out ‘gender’ from the political and cultural intersections in which it is inevitably produced and maintained.”

Bringing such thinking into dialogue with intersectionality is worthwhile since it opens up possibilities to more thoroughly study and capture the processes through which social identities and experiences are (re)produced and shaped in specific contexts and situations, and to demonstrate how complex intersectional identities relate to experiences of everyday co-existence and living together. Valentine and Waite (2012: 489) detail how performances of lesbian and gay people of faith negotiate their rights to belong in the city through everyday encounters, suggesting that these ‘encounters are approached and refracted through (their) complex individual identities’. Similarly, Lobo (2012: 156) highlights how young women of Asian back-grounds, through performing ‘bodily experiences’ that reflect their multi-faceted identities, re-inhabit home and interrupt normative understandings that fix what vulnerable female bodies ‘can say, do, or are capable of in advance in any encounter’. ‘Placing’ intersectionality (3.2.1) can thus help to explain ‘how contact works in practice’ and how encounters in public space ‘are framed, approached and performed through our complex personal identities rather than group positions’ (ibid: 490). Other research finds that performative acts re-organise and re-align bodies in different socio-spatial settings (Mayblin et al 2015; Lobo and Ghosh 2013), foregrounding identities as ‘situated accomplishments’ (West and Fenstermaker 1995) that occur in interactions.

Some of this speaks to agency (2.6) and how specific intersecting identities are strategically performed across contexts. With strategies, in this context, I address the ‘strategic, tactical, mobile, multifaceted, blurred, awkward and ambivalent’ (Pile 1997: 27) adopting of situated identities which ‘debunk the constructedness of qualities associated with [certain identity] categories’ (Mahtani 2002: 433). Mahtani (2002: 425-426), for example, outlines situated practices through which some ‘mixed race’ women contest and produce their own racialized and gendered locations in the Canadian context, with ‘mixed race’ identity emerging as a ‘site for performances of potentially enabling political identities’. I suggest that people ‘doing difference’ and performing intersectional and hybrid identities can thus involve ‘new political uses of the personal’ (Bell and Valentine 1995: 154), and shift the balance of power ‘in the relations of culture…changing the dispositions and configurations of cultural power, [while] not getting out of it’ (Hall 1992: 330).
Simultaneously, intersectionality and performativity are in tension with one another as, to some degree, intersectionality conceives of identity construction as the crossing and merging of identities infused by oppression and privilege. I thus hold that conceiving of identity performances as moments of ‘intersectional tension’, and how different bodies are positioned and shaped differently in the same ‘general context’ (Hill-Collins and Bilge 2016), allows to develop an integrative approach to identities as a ‘doing’ and a ‘coming together’ of ‘continuities and discontinuities, clashes and neutralizations, in which positions, identities and differences are made and unmade, claimed and rejected’ (Valentine 2007: 14). I argue that this troubles rather than reinforces identity demarcations, focusing on how experiences of embodied intersectional subjectivities and hybridities are felt, lived and their meanings potentially changed, and captures how people are caught up in the unpredictable process of becoming (Valentine and Waite 2012). As with intersectionality, it is critical to spatialize and firmly ‘ground’ performativity to better understand how people enact and perform identities responsive to their life-worlds and the complexities of the everyday.

3.3.1 ‘Placing’ performed identities
The processual and relational approach to identities, and embodiment, has been embraced among geographers, work in feminist geographies being particularly inspired by Butler’s theorisation of performativity in Gender Trouble (1990). While Butler’s earlier work has been criticised for being highly theoretical and ‘disturbingly metaphysical’ (Rose 1995: 546), saying ‘very little […] about the space in which performances occur’ (Thrift and Desbury 2000: 414), Butler does engage with some of these criticisms in later work, particularly in Bodies that Matter (1993); however, the spatiality of performed identities, where and when performances take place, remains largely obscured (Nelson 1999) despite ‘the fabric of space’ (Thrift 2004: 2022) being constitutive ‘in the strongest possible sense and it is not a misuse of the term to call it performative’. Indeed, feminist geographies have long been arguing that place, power and performances intermingle in the co-production of social and spatial categories; Gregson and Rose (2000: 443), amongst others, suggesting that ‘spaces too need to be thought of as performative, and that ‘more needs to be made of the complexity and instability of performances and performed spaces’. Holding on to these arguments, this thesis contests abstract explorations of performativity, instead understanding performed identities as embedded in the specific spaces and encounters in which they occur, to better examine ‘the social relations of performances and the relationality of their spaces’ (ibid: 442).

Spatializing performativity is crucial, and, as I shall argue, approaching spaces of encounter as a ‘complex performative arena’ (Lobo 2013) avoids isolating (performed) identities from wider social and political geographies, both past and present, within which they are embedded (2.3). Hence, Nelson (1999: 351), amongst others, stresses understanding
“the historical and geographical embeddedness of human subjects who ‘perform’ a wide variety of identities in relation to various spaces over their life course [and] locating these performances in space and time, as well as theorizing how situated, knowing subjects do identity.”

Identities and performances are highly contextual and bring ‘spaces into being’ (Gregson and Rose 2000: 441; also 2.4), making it crucial to ground performativity in the spatial. This allows for a more nuanced use of Butler’s (1990) model of performativity, mapping out how subjects ‘do’ identity in ‘real time and space’, and the role of subjects in that process (Nelson 1999: 352). Critically, this conceives of space as the site of performances of interaction between self and other (Ahmed 2000), bringing forth situational identifications that respond to, and are shaped by, wider social, historical and geographical patterns and processes (Amin 2012; Cresswell 2011; Massey 2005). Spatializing performativity, then, entails revealing identity performances as inherent within specific encounters. Encounters are performative, containing specific gestures, postures, visual aspects, odours and gazes that give space meaning and position bodies in relation to each other (Laurier and Philo 2006). Simultaneously, power relations shape embodied performances and performances of interaction contained in encounters (Dirksmeier and Helbrecht 2010). Committing to the performed nature of encounters thus helps to recognise the multiple temporalities and ‘elsewheres’ that momentarily unfold in encounters (Massey 2005; Ahmed 2002), constituting daily life through ‘attachments and influences that are distanciated’ (Amin 2004: 39; also 2.2). For Wilson (2016: 464), this suggests encounters as ‘performed, fluid and momentary’, and retains a ‘critical eye on the structures, histories and subjectivities that constrain and shape them […] and allow encounters to live on’.

Moreover, approaching performativity through spaces of encounter makes it possible to de-naturalise social processes (Gregson and Rose 2000; Nelson 1999) and unpack wider geographies of racialisation (3.3). While processes of ‘race’ and space are largely absent in Butler’s (1990) earlier work, performativity is useful to theorise the relationship between (intersecting) identities of ethnicity, gender and so forth with place. Ahmed (2002), for example, uses performativity to argue that ‘race’, like gender, does not pre-exist encounter, but is a social construct performed and (re)produced as meaningful through the repetition of encounters. I extend this here to suggest that performativity helps to conceptualise the embodied (racialized) subject as a coming together and emergence of affective forces (cf. Grosz 2008; also 2.5) that can transform bodies and public space in imperceptible ways. Lobo (2013: 461), for example, suggests that performances by refugees and Aboriginals in Australia, enacted in moments of everyday encounters, emerge as modes of ‘inhabiting the world’ in a country where ‘whiteness possesses space’ and racializes non-white bod-
ies. Critically, this highlights the performative as interventions in the affective dimensions of place (Lobo 2013), and demonstrates how public space can transform into the ‘skin’ of differentiated bodies, effectively ‘loosening the grip of whiteness’ (Lobo 2013: 463) and enabling racialized bodies to speak back and belong in the city.

Crucially, this work positions performances as potentially disruptive of wider geographies of power, opening up possibilities to think through notions of agency that resist ‘fractionalisation of identity’ and denaturalise claims ‘to know (racial) genealogy and belonging’ (Mahtani 2002: 430; 3.3). Geographers have criticised Butler’s (1990) model of performativity for assuming an ‘abstracted subject’ (Salih 2002), leaving little leeway to theorise agency and processes of ‘doing’ identities (Valentine and Waite 2012). Yet, by considering the spatialities of performed identities, where and when performances take place, I argue that performativity can contribute to understanding subjects as critical and conscious identities ‘on the ground’. Mahtani’s (2002: 428) work, for example, suggests that racialized performances simultaneously work as ‘regulatory fictions’ and articulations of embodied practices that subtly displace and disrupt racial categories, encounters emerging as the site of articulations of bodily practice which create a self and space, and as moments to live with difference in light of competing and conflicting claims in the public sphere. Throughout work on space, intersectional identity performances, the emotional dimensions of encounter are increasingly being considered; this chapter now explores the geographies and politics of emotion in more depth.

3.4 Encounters and the politics of emotion
A growing body of literature discusses the importance of emotions and affect in geography, emphasising their centrality in understanding experiences of everyday life, belonging and identity. Davidson and Bondi (2004: 373) write

“Emotions are, without doubt, an intractable if intangible aspect of all our everyday lives. They are embodied and mindful phenomena that partially shape, and are shaped by our interactions with the people, places and politics that make up our unique, personal geographies. Clearly, our emotions matter.”

Horton and Kraftl (2013) suggest that emotions and affects are a fundamental part of human experience, including the experience of space, and should therefore be central in geographic inquiries. Many geographers agree that our emotional lives ‘matter’ (e.g. Anderson 2014; Pile 2010). Developing from a critique that emotions were silenced when discussing subjects and social relationships in Cartesian and Enlightenment ‘science’ and academy (Sharp 2009), feminist geographers make key contributions to this field, acknowledging emotions as socially shaped and deeply relational phenomena, recognizing
the ‘incoherences, permeabilities, opaquenesses and specificities’ (Pile 2010: 7) of human subjectivities. Emotions can thus be conceptualised as inner subjective experiences that are used to make sense of the ‘process of becoming’ alongside experiences of ‘exclusion, erasure, violent foreclosure and abjection’ (Butler 1993: 8; Tyler 2011; 2.5). That way, emotions play a central role in the ‘surfacing’ of individual and collective bodies as they ‘align individuals with collectives – or bodily space with social space – through the very intensity of their attachments’ (Ahmed 2004: 26).

Emotional geographers, then, suggest that emotions do things, as feelings are both felt through the self and through relationships with others, and the context of these interactions and connections (Bennett 2009). After Ahmed (2004), and others, I argue that place emerges as a key site of emotional relations, and plays a significant role in negotiating dominant norms that stigmatise and render specific (elements of) bodies as ‘excluded, disempowered, oppressed and passive’ (Lobo 2010: 109). Interrogating emotions, Lobo (2014: 723) argues, is therefore critical to make visible the power relations underlying social constructions, and to understand how the racialisation of different intersecting identities affects ‘how bodies occupy space and what they are capable of doing’ (also Ahmed 2007). Researching emotions and relationships can thus reveal how feelings are wrapped up in, and interconnect across the local, national and global, and the public and private space (Askins 2016; Pain and Staeheli 2014), and are central in understanding embodied (re)productions of space, (national) identity, belonging and ‘home’ (Brickell 2012; Caluya 2011; also 3.2).

However, emotional geographies have been criticised for simplifying the complexity of human experiences (Wetherell 2012) and concentrating too much on emotions in making sense of the world (Pile 2009). Many geographers therefore focus on affect rather than emotions and feelings. And while these terms are at times used interchangeably (Bondi 2005), geographers of affect argue that attending to human life ‘as it happens’ (Anderson 2014) is important to understand the ‘how’ of emotions (Thien 2005) and what exists ‘in-between’ people, objects and spaces (Anderson 2006). Anderson and Wilson (2018: 292), for example, attend to the ‘multiple senses of what the contemporary condition feels like to live in’, the ‘affective present’, to make sense of how political events such as Brexit shape everyday practice and public life in uneven ways. Different from emotions, then, affect(s) is argued not to be reducible to the individual, instead representing a ‘multitude of possibilities’ (Anderson 2006 in Wiseman 2017b: 43), and capturing human beings as always becoming (Thrift and Dewsbury 2000). In turn, emotional geographers have pointed out that many accounts of ‘affect’ are too abstract and removed, and are ‘ironically, disembodied’ (Bondi 2005: 438). Thien (2005) sees this as a continuation of ‘rational’ and masculinist thinking, moving away from emotional ‘feminised’ experiences, that re-creates bounda-
bies of the public and the personal, the emotional and reason, and reinforces rather than deconstructs binary thinking (also Wiseman 2017a).

With an understanding that affect is related to emotional geographies, I attempt to avoid the ‘twin pitfalls of equating emotions with individualized subjectivity and conceptualizing affect in ways that distance it from ordinary experience’ (Bondi 2005: 441), foregrounding instead what emotions can do in moments of encounter (Ahmed 2004) and how emotions affect people. In this thesis, emotional geographies thus have analytical utility to highlight the deeply emotional nature of relations, and to avoid discussion of emotion and affect becoming too abstract and pre-conscious or outside consciousness. Taking inspiration from Wiseman (2017b: 46), I suggest that social relations ‘reach “sideways” – in-between people and objects, as well as ‘forwards and backwards’ – including histories of people and places, previous experiences and affects’. This perception resonates with a common thread in emotional geographies regarding the relationality of feelings, and how what we experience can be connected to the feelings of others (Bennett et al 2015) as ‘we all carry the affective impress of our earliest patterns of relating into all of our subsequent relationships’ (Bondi 2005: 440). Although emotions are to some extent culturally constructed, Probyn (2005: 16) argues that human existence and social relations entail emotionality (being emotional/having emotions) that is always ‘the particular and the specific, the universal and the general’. Not meant to flatten out or deny difference, this conception moves beyond ‘only-difference’ (Askins 2016: 518) towards appreciating (intercultural) encounters as constructing ‘difference-and-similarity instead of oppositional and reductive dualisms’.

I further suggest that this approach reveals the spatiality of emotion, briefly mentioned above, where emotions work as a set of spatial relations that enable more open and inclusive senses of local community and belonging. Discussing a befriending scheme in a Northern English city, Askins (2014: 354), for example, argues that, as emotions come together in moments of engaging with others, ‘new social relations are built in/through everyday spaces, relationally connected across a range of geographies’. Wilson (2011) adds that (temporary) bonds can emerge out of sharing, and responding to, ‘affective atmospheres’ in public spaces, as meanings are attached to emotional experiences that (positively) influence wider notions of conviviality. That way, emotions can open up ‘new ways of being human’ (Wright 2015) as familiar bodies, and strange ones, recognise and respond to each other through emotion. While it is critical to acknowledge that belonging and identity is ‘never a given, but always a precarious achievement’ (Prins 2006: 288), and woven through with emotions and feelings that ‘are not always positive and easy, and not always shared’ (Askins 2014: 354), Wright (2015) suggests that emotions bring bodies into relationship with different places and times. As such, particularly marginalised bodies
can experience, perform and enact identities in moments of encounter that allow them to ‘fit into’ intersectional locations in the city (also 2.4).

Attending to emotions in moments of encounter, then, is central to unpack social constructions of identity, its multiplicity in different spaces and its intersection with other axes of identity. As outlined in 3.2, intersectionality draws attention to subjects being ‘constructed within specific discourses and always precariously and temporarily sutured at the intersection of those subject positions’ (Mouffe et al 1992: 10). By bringing the feelings in encounters ‘back to life’ (ibid: 722), it becomes possible to explore how bodies with complex histories and geographies of racialisation negotiate affective pressures and inhabit a ‘world of becoming’ (Lobo 2010: 102). As encounters reveal ‘histories that stick’, Ahmed (2004) suggests that difference is determined through already constructed bodies of others, with emotions building upon and generating these associations, but also enabling interconnectivity across difference and similarity in their ‘immediacy and ongoing embodied reflection’ (Askins 2016: 523). Holding on to emotion and embodiment as central in meaning-making (also 3.3), reflecting on emotions thus provides a better understanding of the diverse ways in which different subject positions are continuously produced through interactions with others; central in assessing processes of sense-making and experiences of identity and belonging that participants in this research reflect upon.

The last point brings me to consider the value of examining emotions in encounters as they produce and negotiate (an openness to) differences through emotional relations. Wise (2010) suggests that emotions emerge as affective moments in everyday life that can reconstitute and renegotiate the boundaries between self and other. As such, emotions are always already political; and encounters are socio-spatial events that know and value people and place (2.3), through which certain bodies become ‘more likely to be excluded, pathologised, victimised and racialized’ (Lobo 2014a: 721). I suggest that the associated experiences and/or feelings of this mark these bodies as a ‘site of stress’ (Ahmed 2004: 157) who feel exposed, visible and different rather than comfortable in public space (2.4). As emotional geography literature itself points out, power and historicity are important in the production of emotions (e.g. Smith et al 2009; Tolia-Kelly 2008). Encounters, then, emerge as ‘emotional collisions’ (Nayak 2010: 2388) through which historical ‘structures of feelings’ are not only geographically located but emotionally experienced. Lobo (2014: 722) adds that particularly ‘feelings of negation’ have outcomes for what bodies of colour can(not) do in encounters. For Ahmed (2007), this makes it crucial to consider what emotions ‘do’ within wider contexts and discourse, as emotions are not contained within bodies but work to bind, separate and stress certain bodies more than others (also Wilson 2013). Through the identification of feeling, Ahmed (2007: 39) continues, borders are established ‘in the event of encounters with others’ as they rehearse associations that
are ‘already in place’. Discussing how feelings of anger, shame and discomfort shape bus encounters in suburban Melbourne, Lobo (2010: 722), for example, highlights how ‘fear surfaces, envelops, differentiates, sticks to and crushes bodies […] preceded by colonial histories’ and how these histories ‘invade’ encounters in everyday spaces.

In this thesis, I use the above debates on encounter and emotion to think through wider geographies of fear and insecurity (Pain 2009) and ‘geopolitics of intimacy’ (Pain and Staeheli 2014). Taking inspiration from Pain and Staeheli (2014), I suggest that the bodies of participants in this research are connected to wider national and institutional realms, with intimacy and emotion being tightly wrapped up in national, global and geopolitical processes. Askins (2014: 354) further stresses that gaining a ‘fuller sense of intersecting intimacy’ reveals how people challenge discourses and geographies of violence, insecurity and fear in ‘quiet’ and local ways (2.5). In later work, Askins (2016: 517) adds that emotions open up the potential of/for making connections in everyday spaces, suggesting that emotions enable people to (re)make society at the local level and enact a ‘politics of engagement’. As such, emotions emerge not only as ‘part of the connective tissues of relations that stretch across and between communities, cities and states’ (Pain 2014: 352) but ‘foundational to them’. Literature on the organisation of fear and hate also evidences the importance of examining what emotions can ‘do’ in encounters, particularly how ‘seemingly small events work to unmake the world’ (Ahmed 2001: 360) of people who have been marked as ‘somewhat more hateful than others’ (Wilson 2010: 641; also 2.3). Exploring the ways in which multicultural intimacies and ‘visceral hatred’ coexist in a predominantly white English suburb, Nayak (2010: 2371), for example, emphasises that a ‘constellation of feelings, practices and imaginaries’ breathes life into the concept of race in moments of intercultural encounter. These debates proved critical to make sense of the agentic ways in which participants in this research reflect on, resist and shape wider power relations and discourses through interactions in everyday spaces.

Furthermore, as emotion is at once personal, societal and political, emerging ‘at the intersection of these trajectories, as multiple and complicated, mediated by relations of power as well as personal experiences and affiliations’ (Wright 2015: 400; also Tolia-Kelly 2006; Ahmed 2004), I suggest that linking debates on how emotions are caught up in encounters, belonging and recognition is ‘central in understanding how multiculturalism, difference and diversity is lived’ (Nayak 2017: 291). Paying serious attention to the centrality of emotions in the ‘quest for recognition’ (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012), in particular, is critical to (re)politicise everyday and interpersonal interactions, and the emotions caught up in them, as they weave through broader (state) politics and contexts (Askins 2016; also Neal et al 2013; Piekut et al 2012). Since belonging is always also about the desire to be recognised (Strang and Ager 2010), a politics of recognition calls for an understanding of
how emotions relate to encounters, enacted in everyday spaces, and may exceed domi-
nant discourses of (national) identity and belonging. Wright (2015), for example, discuss-
es belongings that come about through ‘feeling-in-common’, arguing that humans need
some sort of intersubjective recognition (after Honneth 1995) across political and emo-
tional spheres to build a sense of self and develop the feeling that they belong in encoun-
ters across and beyond local and national sites. In this research, I engage with the em-
bodyed and emotional in encounters to develop a more diverse and intersectional politics
of recognition that is context-specific (Askins 2016), and realise Noble’s (2009: 46, original
emphasis) call to distinguish ‘between recognition as (I am this, you are other) and reco-
gnition with’, the mutual, collective fashioning which comes out of shared practice’, to better
understand ‘complicated entanglements of togetherness-in-difference’ in moments of mul-
ticultural and multi-ethnic encounter. A dimension of materialities in moments of multici-
lultural encounter emerged in the empirical chapters of this thesis; this chapter now consid-
ers briefly the entanglements of emotion, bodies and things.

3.4.1 Emotion, bodies and materialities
The ways in which emotion and affect interlink and work through bodies and things in
moments of encounter emerged as central in this thesis to make sense of the value many
participants attached to embodied/performed practices and micro connections forged in
micro spaces of encounter (6.2). Objects, then, matter because they contribute texture to
counters and are also ‘sparky in their own right, hot-wiring social relations and intera-
tions’ (Bennett et al 2015: 13), and can prove critical in fostering or foreclosing interaction
(Askins and Pain 2014). Askins and Pain’s (2011: 815) discussion of the potential of con-
nection through tactile engagement with materials indicates that ‘the doing-with-stuff’ can
mediate points of similarity and difference between people of different backgrounds, and
suggests that the materialities of embodied performances can open up opportunities to
mediate power imbalances attached to imaginaries of self and other in positive and crea-
tive ways. Similarly, Bennett et al’s (2015) account illustrates the capacities of ‘things’ in
mediating emotions that surface in (research) encounters, as feelings such as shame and
anger are projected onto objects and subsequently enable participants to discuss emo-
tionally-laden topics.

Taking inspiration from the above debates, I suggest that it is crucial to foreground micro
spaces where the physical and embodied experiences of ‘doing and making stuff’ (Askins
and Pain 2011: 816) may prompt and/or enable new social relations and connections to
emerge between individuals who may otherwise be very differently situated in society. As
encounters are ‘both remembered reflectively (discursively) and reflexively (through the
body)’ (ibid: 817), I agree that attending to the physicalities caught up in processes of
identity construction, embodiment and emotional politics may help to further draw out how
connections and/or relations enacted through placed encounters may feed into wider so-
cial changes. Drawing on Hinchliffe’s (2007) suggestion that objects are both made of relations and make relations, I thus attempt to think through the role of ‘things’ in this research, and particularly their capacities in encounters; an understanding that also proved central to make better sense of the ways in which materials effected (research) encounters in embodied and affective ways (4.4.3 and 6.4).

Critically, the theories and concepts discussed up to this point have established identity formation and belonging as fluid processes that are constantly changing, negotiated and challenged, as people encounter each other as multifaceted and complex individuals, with alternative and sometimes competing senses of identity, community, belonging and ‘home’ in and beyond local contexts. Holding on to these debates, this chapter now turns to consider the diverse, multi-ethnic and complex articulations, constructions and contestations that shape Scottishness and senses of belonging in Glasgow.

3.5 Placing multi-ethnic Scottishness
So far, I have argued that researching spaces of encounter can offer important insights into how notions of identity, belonging and difference are negotiated on a daily basis (Wilson 2016b), and how spaces are interconnected in the sense that they flow into, across and out of each other, constituting the ‘throwntogetherness’ of everyday life (Hopkins et al 2017; Massey 2005). Regarding the Scottish context, I suggest that everyday spaces of encounter are crucial in shaping multi-ethnic communities and their sense of belonging in Glasgow, and Scotland, and in (un)making dominant notions of ‘Scottishness’ and place. Speaking from a perspective of localised places is thus critical to firmly embed (intersectional) encounters and identities into the specific contexts within which they occur (2.2), and to make sense of the ways in which participants in this research articulate their relationship with the (Scottish) nation through mundane places in their day-to-day life worlds (Jones and Fowler 2004). I further argue that such a spatialized perspective remains sensitive to the geographies and histories of place (2.3), and unpacks notions of ‘nation’ and ‘nationhood’ as political, cultural and emotional processes that are constantly (re)produced through interactions in local places where ‘connections with the local, regional, international and global’ (Jones and Fowler 2004: 338) become salient (also Zimmerman 2003).

In this final section, then, I consider how contextualising everyday encounters and identity making within Scotland’s wider political landscape helps to make sense of the ways in which notions of ‘Scottishness’ and national belonging are (un)done through interactions in everyday spaces, and to better understand how dominant discourses shape the lives of different individuals in and across specific spatial and temporal settings in Glasgow. While Glasgow does not stand in for Scotland, I hold that focusing on Glasgow as a specific
context makes it possible to speak about Scottishness, and the processes shaping broader geographical concepts of ‘place’ and ‘nation’ in Scotland (Jones and Fowler 2004). In terms of thinking about (Scottish) national identity, it is important to recognise that ‘nation’, like ‘race’, is a social and political construct, and therefore a changing and shifting concept (after Jackson and Penrose 1993). This does not mean that ‘nation’ is a meaningless concept; instead, it can help to focus on processes associated with the formation of national identities and senses of belonging (Penrose 1995). Approaching identity as narration (2.4), this thesis thus aims to foreground the diverse, multi-ethnic and complex narratives that shape Scottish identity(ies) and belonging(s) carved out, negotiated and challenged in moments of encounter across everyday spaces in Glasgow.

3.5.1 ‘Scottishness’ as a shifting and complex set of identities and belongings
In this section, I problematize popular assumptions that frame ‘Scottishness’ as a somewhat more inclusive and civic national identity, particularly when compared to its English counterpart, and racism as not a ‘Scottish problem’ (Hopkins 2007). Instead, I draw on literature that suggests tropes of ethnicity and ancestry weaving through Scottishness alongside more ‘civic’ elements of nationhood and belonging (Meer 2015; McCrone and Bechhofer 2010). Earlier research implies that questions of national and ethnic identity in Scotland have long not been properly connected (McCrone 2002), and that dominant discourse reflects continuing assumptions being made regarding the relatively small size of black and (ethnic) minority groups in Scotland, relations of place, identity and belonging therefore being regarded as more heavily ‘raced’ in the English political context (Goursnyanni 2012; Hopkins 2004; Arshad 2003; Kelly 2002). Miles and Dunlop (1987: 199) suggest that this led to the absence of a ‘racialisation of the political process in the period since 1945, rather than the absence of racism per se’, political preoccupation with religious divides between Catholic and Protestant Christians also having displaced the racisms at the centre of English political affairs from Scottish affairs (Hopkins and Smith 2008). Others suggest that Scotland’s (continuing) struggle with outwards migration and an overall declining population has led to a more positive and welcoming stance towards immigration and integration (than the English), statements from Scotland’s political elites thus downplaying birth as a marker of Scottish identity and highlighting issues of belonging based on residence and a commitment to Scotland (Bechhofer and McCrone 2009; Kiely et al 2005, 2001).

However, assuming that Scottishness is predominantly based on belonging rather than birth would be premature, Kiely et al (2005: 170) warn, given that, while ‘birth-place often “trumps” birth-blood’, the idea that being committed to Scotland and ‘living an identity’ – choosing to belong – is often not enough to claim Scottishness (also McCrone and Bechhofer 2012, 2010). More recently, research has pointed out that while the inclusive multicultural nationalism put forth by dominant political parties in Scotland during, for example,
the independence referendum in 2014, is effective in making some people from ‘different’ backgrounds feel secure in the nation state, everyday violence of racism trouble such efforts towards inclusion and multiculturalism (Botterill et al 2016). This echoes Hussain and Miller’s (2006: 49) earlier argument that the ‘genuinely inclusive ‘civic’ nationalism of the Scottish political elite may not apply ‘on the street’, and that Scottishness is not a simple matter of ‘civic’ versus ‘ethnic’ but rather an ‘ambiguous’ and ‘discordant’ process. Moreover, other research suggests that Scotland is not immune against broader global discourses of insecurity and threat (cf. Pain 2009), ‘new terrorism’ (Choudhury and Fenwick 2011) and the securitization of certain ‘suspect communities’ (Mythen et al 2012).

Turning to current geopolitical conjunctures in Scotland, Davidson and Virdee (2018) argue that recent developments, such as the rise of the SNP and the independence referendum in 2014, have further entrenched the myth that Scotland has ‘no problem’ with racism and that Scottish politics are more egalitarian, collectivist and welcoming regarding issues of belonging and nationalism (than the English). This sense of ‘Scottish exceptionalism’ (McBride and Liinpää 2018: 214) seems to continue in the post-Brexit context ‘which appears to shape much of the political, media and public consciousness’, conferring an authority ‘extremely difficult to shift or revise’ (Hall 2007: 90). Meer (2015: 1477) observes that this ‘aspirational pluralism’ - a particular cluster of options and beliefs that values pluralism and multiculturalism - and ‘impeccably civic outlook’ (ibid: 1480) of Scottish elite discourse seems to ‘nest comfortably’ alongside formal political debates which make particularly non-white people and Muslims feel that ‘race’ continues to matter in Scotland. For Meer (2014: 1), this reflects a somewhat paradoxical political landscape in which

"prevailing hierarchies in Scottish nationhood sit at odds with how minority Scots (who overwhelmingly self-identify as Scottish) can claim – and therefore remake – Scottish nationhood."

Ethno-centric tropes of Scottishness thus continue to remain relevant (Leith and Soule 2012; Penrose and Howard 2008), and can restrict/deny building senses of belonging to those (bodies) who do not possess these (ethnic/visible) markers of (national) identity. Davidson and Virdee (2018) link the ongoing significance of ethno-centric elements to an apparent ‘dishonesty and unwillingness’ of Scottish elite politics to confront the ‘underside of Scottish history’ – the role Scotland played in colonial conquest and transatlantic slavery by which families of today’s ‘black and brown Scots’ (Virdee 2016) have made their way into Scotland – that results in ‘race-blind’ narratives of Scottishness. Such narratives, Davidson and Virdee (2018) warn, continue to weave through contemporary political rhetoric by political parties such as the SNP, silencing ‘matters of race’ when discussing Scot-
tish nationhood and belonging. Similarly, Liinpää (2018a: 24) suggests that the routine framing of Scottishness as an open and all-encompassing identity in political discourse and the SNP’s so-called ‘civic’ imagining of the nation draws on ‘a very specific history’ in which ‘some more sinister chapters are forgotten’ (also Morris 2015). And although the SNP often steer away from identity politics to extend ‘the boundaries of the nation’ (ibid: 30), ethnicity continues to enter through ‘the backdoor’ (Kearton 2005: 39).

The 2014 Scottish independence referendum provides a ‘hyper-nationalist’ context (Liinpää 2018b: 263) in which the inclusions and exclusions of Scottish ‘civic’ nationalism are laid open. Political elites certainly steered Scottish nationhood in more inclusive directions before the referendum, policy language referring not to ‘Scottish people’ but to ‘all the people of Scotland’ (Leith 2010: 292) and the Scottish government’s White Paper Scotland’s Future (2013: 271) insisting that ‘a commitment to multicultural Scotland will be the cornerstone of the nation on independence’. A pluralistic discourse with low threshold for inclusion (Meer 2015) seemed to emerge as a shared political aspiration, constructing Scottishness as a ‘big tent’ national identity where ‘everyone living in the country has a claim’ (McCrone and Bechhofer 2010: 926; also Keating 2009). The SNP, official leader of the ‘Yes Scotland’ campaign, strongly adopted such rhetoric, emphasising possible political futures as a result of Scottish independence built on continuing cross border networks of family and friendship and diverse bonds and affiliations to the nation (Bond 2015). It should be noted that Scottish nationalism should not be equated with/through the SNP, since the independence campaign received strong support from, amongst others, the Scottish Greens and multiple grassroots groups (Liinpää 2018b). The extension of voting rights to young people and to migrants from the EU and Commonwealth countries during the referendum was thus widely perceived as opening up questions regarding national belonging and citizenship in Scotland.

While the referendum certainly emphasised ‘hopeful multicultural and democratic futures for the people of Scotland’, Botterill et al (2016: 126) caution that the dominant discourse of inclusion is also one of exclusion, since ‘demarcating a space of belonging involved putting borders up to exclude those outside’. Thus, although ethnic minorities voices were at the forefront on both sides of the case for independence (Arshad et al 2014), many people resident in Scotland, such as ‘new migrants’ (those living in Scotland for under 5 years), asylum seekers and refugees, were excluded from voting in the referendum. Issues of migration and race equality were also predominantly framed in terms of demographic change and economic challenges (Liinpää 2018b; also Dekavalla 2016), migrants’ labour identity being ‘privileged over all other forms of identity with little acknowledgement of their personal, social and cultural background’ (De Lima and Wright 2009: 394; Phipps and Fassetta 2015). Moreover, given that experiences of racism and racialisation continue
to exist alongside Scottish elite politics and rhetoric around ‘race’, ethnicity and multiculturalism (Botterill et al 2016), Peace and Meer (2015: 26) criticise that relations of race, inclusion and independence were not dealt with in nuanced ways before/during the referendum, since ‘BME and constitutional issues appear to continue to “fire past each other” (McCrone 2002: 304)’. Mooney and Scott (2016) add that the SNP’s emphasis on ‘shared national values’ are constructed as inherent to Scottishness via history, limiting some (ethnic) minorities’ subjective confidence and willingness to claim Scottishness, and/or the acknowledgment of such claims by the dominant - white - population (also Meer 2015). For Featherstone (2015), such politics and rhetoric indicates the exclusionary effects around the independence referendum, in which demands and grievances became rendered political, and highlights its uneven, racialized, gendered and classed spatialities.

Drawing on above debates and recent political events, I argue that the relationship between ‘race’ and ‘nation’ in Scotland (continues to) need careful re-examination if the diverse histories and geographies by which peoples who identify as black, brown and non-white came/come to Scotland are to be understood, and the lived reality of racialized minorities ‘whose lives remain deeply distorted by everyday racism’ (Davidson and Virdee 2018: 10) to be taken seriously (also Virdee 2016). Morris (2015), for example, analyses the interplay of Scotland and slavery in the Caribbean, drawing out the long obscured social, economic and political relations of Caribbean people with contemporary Scotland, and Hopkins’ collection (2017b) discusses the geographies and politics of Muslim identities in Scotland. These works are notable, and much needed, exceptions that speak to the longstanding trends of self-identification, agency and claim-making on Scottish identities by ethnic minorities (Bonino 2015; Hopkins 2014; Meer 2014). Taking an encounter lens, I am contributing to this work by foregrounding the diverse ways in which participants negotiate, shift and form identities through ‘placed’ encounters (2.2), offering new and original insights into how inter-personal and local articulations of Scottishness interlink with the national, and vice versa (Katz 2017). Holding on to encounters as spatial-temporal moments in which ‘histories that stick’ (Ahmed 2000) are brought to the surface, connecting (bodies from) the past and present, and extending into future encounters (2.2 and 2.3), I now consider what such a spatialized perspective can do/add in terms of dissecting national identity construction and belonging in the Scottish context.

3.5.2 Approaching articulations of ‘Scottishness’ through ‘placed’ encounters
In the encounter literature, above debates have been linked to how imagined racialized conceptions of Scottishness are (de)stabilised through multi-cultural encounters at neighbourhood and everyday level (Virdee et al 2006), and how many ethnic minorities positively identify with the nation, adopt hyphenated identities of various forms and see themselves as Scottish ‘in many ways’ (Hopkins 2008a: 120, 2007; Virdee 2003; Kiely et al 2001). More recent research details the everyday geographies of particularly ‘black and
brown Scots’ (Virdee 2016: 61) that unfold in the ‘refashioned racial landscape’ (Puar 2007: 180) of wider Scotland, highlighting how stereotypes around ‘race’, ethnicity and national belonging interweave with histories and geographies of Scottish colonialism and temporary political discourse around community cohesion, interethnic contact and the challenges and complexities of living together and sharing public space. Botterill et al (2015: 131), for example, argue that young people of ethnic and religious minority backgrounds experience concealed and tangential forms of racism in everyday spaces across Glasgow, making these young people feel visibly out-of-place, apprehensive and insecure as their black and brown skin is constructed as ‘other’ in encounters where ‘multicultural tensions were palpable’. Similarly, Hopkins et al (2017: 6) highlight experiences of misrecognition among young Sikh people in Glasgow, arguing that, regardless of level and nature, ‘commonsense, everyday, harmless encounters […] all involve racist and exclusionary readings of the “other”’, suggesting that a ‘white’ sense of Scottishness can be actively securitized and firmly embedded in everyday spaces that challenges these young people’s sense of national identity and belonging (also Bonino 2015: 7.2).

While indicating the complexities of belonging established by ethnic minorities in Scotland and the relative fluidity of Scottishness, this body of research emphasizes that everyday racialized practices continue to take ownership of the ‘Scottish’ nation, keep ‘white’ spaces intact and stress bodies of particular colour with different histories and geographies more than others (e.g. Nayak 2017; Virdee 2016; Meer 2015). It also highlights that micro and interpersonal interactions and emergent relations are folded into specific spaces, localities and wider landscapes of racialisation and political discourse, while holding on to encounters as simultaneously shaping dominant notions of identity and place. Taking inspiration from these debates, I hold that focusing on the spatialities of encounter makes it possible to consider what is done with differences (cf. Ahmed 2007), and to rethink politics as ‘variously configured spatial relations, interactions and practices in particular spaces’ (Pain and Staeheli 2012: 346) that are ‘contextual, historical, processual and felt’ (Botterill et al 2015: 132). As such, considering encounters helps to better understand how multiculturalism, belonging and identity are lived and constantly negotiated across everyday spaces in Glasgow.

An encounter lens holds on the local and the national as interwoven and connected through (2.4.1), critical to unpack intersections between ethnicity, gender, age, other identities, place and time that come together in spaces of encounter (3.2), and the ways in which people may (re)create, shift, challenge and transrupt (dominant) notions of identity, belonging and place in Glasgow (2.5). It is critical to think through micro spaces of association and encounters ‘on the ground’, this perspective highlighting the diverse, multi-ethnic and complex narratives that exist alongside, challenge, and flow in and out of artic-
ulations of ‘Scottishness’ (cf. Hussain and Miller 2006), through/across local and national scales. Moreover, I argue that this approach can engage with debates around the Scottish political context that moves away from framing the ‘national project’ in binary terms of civic/ethnic nationalism, instead interrogating the fluidity of Scottishness (Hopkins 2008a, 2008b; Virdee et al 2006) and foregrounding the diverse experiences and relationalities of belonging that exist alongside geographies of racialisation, racism and discrimination in and beyond Glasgow. My position is thus that interrogating spaces of encounter is critical to not let the ‘knotty matter of inequalities’ (Valentine 2008) slip out of debates concerned with prosaic forms of ‘living together’ in Glasgow, and central ‘to the visions of what Scottish society is, and what it could become’ (Mooney and Scott 2016: 239).

3.6 Conclusion
This chapter set out to examine the uncertain and uneven flows of power that weave through everyday spaces of encounter, considering theories of intersectionality, performativity and emotionality to further unpack the ways in which categories of the self interlock with multiple and overlapping relations of power. I have argued that intersectionality speaks to my understanding of identities as multiple, shifting and contextually negotiated (Chapter 2). Critically, by emphasising ‘differences’ as a political practice, intersectionality questions ‘what is done’ (cf. Ahmed 2000) with these differences; in that way, intersectionality interrogates what consequences intersections of identity(ies) may have for discourses and practices of domination, exclusion and marginalisation, and how ‘race’, racism and racialisation structure and (re)scale belonging(s), mobilities and rights of different bodies in society.

Discussing relevant criticisms of intersectionality, I have supported the position that it is crucial for intersectional readings of people’s lives to stay connected to their political situations and contexts, ensuring that underlying structures of power and injustices are addressed; this is particularly the case when/where ethnic and ‘raced’ bodies and identities are concerned. As such, I have argued that spatializing intersectionality, and bringing it together with literature on spaces of encounter, can help to more thoroughly expose and confront (uneven) relations of power that shape and racialize inclusions and exclusions, identities and senses of belonging in society. Importantly, it also conceives of (intersecting) identities as produced through local places and encounters, though not place-bound, drawing attention to the centrality of micro spaces of encounter and connection in the entanglements, contradictions and momentary tensions of (intersectional) identities, and the power associated with different subject positions in any given instance (Blige 2013).

Moreover, bringing intersectionality into dialogue with (some aspects of) performativity, I have suggested that such an integrative approach conceptualises spaces of encounter as
‘performative arenas’ (Lobo 2013), foregrounding bodies and embodied (intersectional) identity performances as caught up in complex spatialities and ‘webs of power’ that position and shape different bodies differently in the same general context (cf. Hill Collins and Bilge 2016), and intersectional identities occurring in interactions. I have also shown that performativity can serve to theorise subjects as conscious and reflective (intersectional) identities ‘on the ground’, vital to make sense of the diverse forms of agency and resistance discussed by participants (Chapter 7).

I then turned to the emotionality of social relations and politics to further teases out the geopolitics and micro politics of everyday encounters, identifications and connections, illustrating how narratives of ‘nation’, ‘home’ and locality are lived, experienced and potentially shifted through ‘placed’ encounters in mundane spaces. I have argued that such an understanding responds to calls for the relational, embodied and emotional aspects of encounter (Hopkins 2017; Nayak 2017), and conceptualises encounters and micro connections as vital moments of relation- and meaning-making, in which different (intersecting) subject positions are continuously produced through interactions with others. I have also stated that some of these encounters and micro connections connect through and across different scales, with emotions feeding into wider discourses around racialization, belonging, and identity, and their intersections (Chapter 7), and people-place relations and attachments in society (Chapter 5).

Holding on to the significance of spatializing processes of (dis)identification, (dis)connection and (non)belonging, I concluded that taking the localised perspective of Glasgow makes it possible to assess what people say and feel about Scottishness in a way that remains sensitive to the histories and geographies of place. As such, I have suggested that the conceptual approach presented in this thesis opens up possibilities to interrogate how different people, often quite differently positioned within society and towards each other, may relate to, (re)make and shift notions of national identity and belonging through (intersectional) encounters with/across difference and embodied practices in mundane spaces of encounter in Glasgow.

Moving forward, the next chapter discusses the methodological approach of this thesis, and the subsequent chapters present the empirical findings, exploring how, through performing (intersectional) identities and belonging(s) across semi-formal spaces, bodies are connected to places, and bodies to other bodies, that way collectively (re)defining and (re)producing senses of community, identity and belonging in Glasgow, simultaneously marked by connection and tension and similarity and difference.
4 Methodology: Researching everyday spaces of encounter

“Context and positionality are always shifting beneath our feet as research develops, relationships grow and recede and the lives of those we work with move on around us.”

(Darling 2014: 211)

4.1 Introduction

This chapter details the development of the qualitative methodological approach, and the fieldwork from September 2016 to August 2017 that underpins the research presented in this thesis, used to grasp the messy and complex articulations and constructions of identity, community and belonging emerging in a range of informal spaces of encounter in Glasgow. Based on a mix of qualitative methods, this approach captures what individuals say about encounters, spaces and identity making, simultaneously revealing how individuals do these processes. So far, I have argued that it is critical to understand how these processes happen ‘on the ground’, approaching encounters as the site of different co-existing trajectories embedded within specific constellations of temporal-spatial relations. And I shall illustrate that, when exploring encounters, taking into account the relational, embodied and emotional is crucial to allow individuals and groups whose identities are othered, estranged and marginalised in society to speak back (Chapters 5-7). As such, the methodological approach of this research is framed by wider feminist debates, suggesting that the themes explored in this thesis demand qualitative methods to explore more expansively notions of self and other and processes of social inclusion and exclusion.

A key methodological concern, then, relates to the importance of holding central the spatiality of identity making and belonging. I argue that this entails drawing on ‘grounded’ insights from specific localities and contexts within which research is embedded. It also entails simultaneously appreciating the multi-scalarity of encounters (e.g. Koefoed and Simonsen 2012), and embedding encounters within wider local, regional and national geographies (Hill Collins and Bilge 2016). I suggest that this raises key methodological questions regarding how the encounters described in this research relate to, and are constitutive of, broader relational contexts and particular spatio-temporal dynamics in Scottish society. Recent research suggests that Brexit and the independence referendum are vital contexts to consider when discussing encounters with difference in Glasgow, and Scotland (e.g. Botterill et al 2016; Featherstone et al 2016; Meer 2015). While the empirical chapters show that these formal political debates emerged as less central concerns for participants, I use this chapter to further cement the importance of ‘placing’ encounters and ‘grounding’ research within specific spaces and localities in Glasgow.
Moreover, the conceptual framework of this research involves taking seriously the centrality of bodies in research and the significance of embodied knowledge(s) in making sense of articulations of place, identity and belonging (e.g. Gray and Porter 2014). Feminist geographers have long been emphasising bodies as integral parts of (feminist) geographic practice, a critique taken up by a continuously growing body of research interested in embodied geographies and what it means for research to be ‘embodied’ (e.g. Chiswell and Wheeler 2016; Diprose et al 2013; Elmhirst 2012, Heller et al 2010; Kobayashi 1994). However, some geographic research continues to be disembodied (Hopkins 2014), ignoring the impressions left on and felt through bodies that extend beyond the visual or observation (Duffy et al 2011; Ahmed 2004). In this chapter, I therefore think through bodies as a central ‘instrument of research’ (Longhurst et al 2008: 209), conceptualising the body as a primary frame of reference through which people experience, do and feel encounters with others. I draw on these debates to consider the emotionality of (doing) research, approaching research as ‘emotional work’ that involves researchers and participants, and their bodies (cf. Askins 2009), and to position my embodied engagement as part of the research process.

Further, the theories informing this thesis entail approaching research as a changing, shifting and messy process that is responsive to encounters in and beyond ‘the field’; a problematic term in itself (cf. Massey 2003). The metaphor of being on a ‘journey’ (after Askins 2004) more thoroughly resonates with the approach to methodology taken in this research, underpinning that methodological practices and social realities are always co-constructed and therefore uncontrollable, messy and unpredictable (Law 2004). As participants are involved in research, and I myself form part of the encounters described in this thesis, I suggest that there exists an interflow between participants and me, in which ideas, practice, politics and empirical ‘findings’ pass back and forth, and communicate with each other. This chapter, then, conceives of the conclusions drawn from (qualitative) research as always tentative and emergent (Askins and Pain 2011) and as an attempt to make sense of the materials gathered, and the gaps encountered, that way foregrounding who is involved in the knowledge(s) produced in (this) research.

To explore the methodologies underlying the research, this chapter begins with a discussion of the challenges and questions thrown up by researching the themes of this thesis with the aim of highlighting the embodied and emotional nature of (qualitative) research. I then turn to the importance of ‘grounding’ research, detailing the specific contexts and localities in Glasgow that this research is embedded in. After discussing research as a changing and shifting ‘journey’, and who is involved in knowledge production, I describe the selected methods and conclude with reflections of issues of consent, rapport and leaving the field.
4.2 Researching racialized identities, multiculture and spaces of encounter

This thesis set out to explore how prosaic negotiations of encounters with difference shape, and are shaped by, informal spaces in the city. Complex histories and geographies underlie these spaces, weaving through everyday (racialized) practices that take ownership of the nation, keep ‘white’ spaces intact and stress particular bodies more than others. Simultaneously, self-identification, agency and claim-making on Scottish identities by (ethnic) minorities feed into wider notions of community and belonging. I have suggested that it is critical to understand that all of these processes become articulated in and co-produced through encounters ‘on the ground’. Researching these themes has had its challenges. Yet, as it remains crucial to investigate the ways in which mundane practices and social relations shape notions of space, identity and belonging in society, this also informs the ways that research is designed and carried out.

As discussed in Chapters 2 and 3, geographers highlight that research must pay closer attention to the centrality of the body and emotions. This calls for a methodological approach that demonstrates ‘the visceral and bodily dimensions of racism in the everyday lives of marginalised and racialized individuals and groups in society’ (Nayak 2017: 290) and the ways notions of identity, space and belonging are sustained through ‘feelings, affects and emotional dispositions, often with stark geo-political consequences’ (ibid: 292; also Pain 2009). When it comes to exploring encounters, this entails focusing on the relational, embodied and emotional to allow those constitutes of the population whose identities and bodies are marginalised, estranged and othered to speak back (Hopkins 2014). I agree that this type of research enables us to advance our understanding of the ‘social interactions in public space as well as the meanings and interpretations of such encounters’ (Hopkins 2014: 1583).

In terms of methodology, this approach recognizes the centrality of bodies in research and the significance of embodied knowledge in helping to make sense of articulations of place, identity and belonging. Despite feminist geographers having long drawn attention to bodies as integral part of (feminist) geographic practice, Crang (2003: 494), amongst others, notes the ‘ghostly absence’ of bodies in geographic research and how methodologies ‘have in fact been rather limited in touching and feeling’. Similarly, Longhurst et al (2008: 208) suggest that ‘often smells, tastes, gestures, reactions, clothing, glances and touches slip away unnoticed and/or undocumented’. Yet, considering the ‘porosity of our bodies’ (Duffy et al 2011: 18) is central when thinking about (bodily) encounters with places and other bodies, some of which extend beyond the visual or observation. Longhurst et al (2008: 209), for example, use their bodies as ‘an instrument of research’ in relation to knowledge production, with bodies emerging as primary frames of reference through which all interactions and emotions filter.
Here, I use these debates to think through the emotionality of (doing) research. If acknowledging our bodies as central ‘agents that […] negotiate the world’ (Dewsbury and Naylor 2002: 257), this conceives of bodies as always lived and experienced through emotion(s), and as ‘our most immediate and intimately felt geography’ (Davidson and Milligan 2004: 524). I have argued that holding on to the emotionality of human existence (after Probyn 2005) is central to ‘reflect on what makes us different and the same’ (Davidson and Milligan 2004: xiv), emotions emerging as contextual, embodied and socially-constructed and ‘the spatiality and temporality of emotions coalesce around and within certain spaces’ (Davidson et al 2007: 3; also 3.4). Taking seriously the role of embodied and emotional ‘dis/connective responses’ (Duffy et al 2011: 20) in shaping co-constructions of self and space (Paterson 2005; Thrift 2004), I suggest that research is deeply ‘emotional work’ that involves researchers and participants, and their bodies, as emotions, gestures and bodily affects emerge, grow and recede throughout research (cf. Askins 2009). Regarding research practice, this involves critically assessing how we negotiate research encounters in and beyond the field (4.4).

These debates are also useful to think through the ways in which bodies ‘matter’ in researching encounters with difference, taking seriously the materialities of (doing) research. Bodies are always also material as they possess ‘boundaries’ that are felt and experienced in different ways by different people. These boundaries are power-laden as bodily markers of ‘difference’ – e.g. age, gender and/or ethnicity – become invested with diverse meanings and values, highlighting the ‘messy materiality’ (Longhurst and Johnston 2014: 273) of different bodies. Holding central the uneven geographies of diverse materialities, I concur with Longhurst and Johnston (ibid: 274) who criticize accounts of the ‘unmarked body’, eliding ‘the materiality and specificity of bodily difference [as] particular bodies – white, male, able-bodied, materially well off, Western bodies – come to be assumed and privileged over other bodies’ (also Ahmed 2004). Instead, this thesis attempts to explore ‘real’, material bodies that occupy ‘real’ spaces and places (ibid: 270), allowing our bodies to become places which ‘field difference’ as the field is ‘every body’ (Nast 1998: 94, original emphasis).

This epistemological approach also conceives of methods as a central part of research. As bodies and emotions are bound up with wider structures and processes (Bondi 2005; Ahmed 2004), I support the position that considering the embodied and ‘emotional processes of doing research and of being researchers’ (Longhurst et al 2008: 210, original emphasis) helps to better understand how ‘lives are lived and societies made’ (Anderson and Smith 2001: 7). To do so, this research employs a qualitative research methodology to access the dynamic, complex and messy ways that notions of identity, belonging and community are negotiated, contested and shaped through encounters in mundane spaces.
in Glasgow. I argue that the value of the selected qualitative methods lies in their ability to explore constructions of self, other and processes of inclusion/exclusion more extensively and intensively (4.4). Before elaborating these arguments, this chapter discusses the significance of ‘grounding’ research in particular contexts and localities in Glasgow.

4.3 Placing the study
This research explores everyday spaces of encounter and processes of identity (making) and belonging in Glasgow, Scotland. To pay attention to the spatiality of identity making and belonging, I suggest that greater emphasis needs to be on the specifics of local, regional and national geography (Hill Collins and Bilge 2016) and the multi-scalarity of encounters (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012). To do so, this research draws on ‘grounded’ insights from informal spaces of encounter, including public libraries, community-centres and local cafes, populated by diverse and different individuals and community groups in the West and North of Glasgow. Sections 4.3.1 and 4.3.2 expand on the specific characteristics of the research sites. Here, I raise key methodological questions about how these encounters are related to, and constitutive of, broader ‘relational contexts’ and particular spatial-temporal dynamics of wider conjunctures in Scottish society. The context of Brexit and the Scottish independence referendum, in particular, prompted a surge of renewed engagement with the lines of inclusion and exclusion drawn by ‘Scottishness’, scales of belonging in contemporary Scotland, and the sense of ownership over Scotland and claim-making on Scottish identities by ethnic minorities (Botterill et al 2016; Featherstone and Karaliotas 2016; Meer 2015).

It is vital to place the encounters described in this research within these processes, to embed the research in specific spaces in particular neighbourhoods of Glasgow.

Glasgow is interesting for several reasons. First, Scotland has both a smaller number of people identifying as members of ethnic minorities and a different composition of ethnic minority groups than other parts of the UK (Hopkins 2008a). However, Glasgow has been significantly shaped by diverse multi-ethnic migration flows since the 1950s (e.g. Raje and Mahn 2018). Second, these demographics have been significantly changing in recent years. In the 2001 Census, 2% of respondents living in Scotland identified as ‘non-white’, which increased to 4% in 2011. This was even more distinct in Glasgow. Here, the ‘non-white’ population comprised 5.1% in 2001, compared to 11.6% in 2011 (Census 2011a).

Third, Scotland has often been constructed as more welcoming towards immigrants than

---

1 As the empirical chapters show, however, these formal political debates emerged as less central concerns for participants, with few articulating their sense of belonging and place in Glasgow explicitly in such terms or norms.
England (Penrose and Howard 2008, see 3.5). While this is debated, research does suggest that it provides a less hostile environment for immigrants (Hepburn and Rosie 2014; McCollum et al 2014). Research often focuses on Glasgow’s south side as considerable numbers of non-white migrants (>30%) live in these areas (Census 2011b). The West and North of Glasgow have received less attention, despite roughly 9% of people living in these parts identifying as ‘non-white’. For some, this contributes to less being known about ‘suburbs, large towns and small cities with little or no histories of multiculture and/or ethnic tensions’ (Neal et al 2014: n.p.) and multicultural encounters in predominantly ‘white’ preserves (Nayak 2017). This research contributes to this smaller body of research by exploring encounters in semi-formal spaces located in the neighbourhoods of Partick, Maryhill, and Woodlands.

Figure 1 (see below) gives a rough sense of the official ward numbers that correspond with the areas of Partick (11), Woodlands (12) and Maryhill (lower half of 15) in which this research took place, locating these neighbourhoods in the West and North of Glasgow (LGBC Scotland 2017). People identifying as ‘non-white’ comprise roughly 18% of the overall population in Partick (particularly Chinese and African, Caribbean or Black), 19% in Maryhill (again Chinese and African, Caribbean or Black) and 23% in Woodlands (particularly Chinese and Pakistani) (Census 2011c). In the following sections, I shall give an overview of these areas and the locations of the ‘meeting spaces’ which I studied in this thesis. Before doing so, it is worthwhile having a brief look at Scotland’s changing and highly uneven political conjunctures over the last two decades, to better understand how years of welfare cuts, austerity, neoliberal politics and political and economic crises at both national and local levels have shaped what Glasgow is today.

4.3.1 A brief overview of Glasgow and its shifting political conjunctures
Urban policy in the 1930s to late 1970s was characterised by a strong centralised control of Glasgow City Council over the city (Boyle and Hughes 1994), and a time of extensive urban planning projects (Fyfe 1996; Pacione 1995). While the welfare state saw a short expansion and consolidation in the 1960s, the unstable political climate of the late 1970s and 1980s made the UK government ‘roll out neoliberalism’ (Nolan 2015: 57; Featherstone et al 2012), asserting ‘individualised opportunity rights over social entitlements’ (Cochrane 1993: 11). Glasgow was hit hard during these times, since the level of grants paid to local authorities was significantly reduced and ‘local government became the target of a whole series of attacks (or reforms) from above’ (ibid: 28). In the 1980s, UK government returned to place greater emphasis on community consultation and participation in the delivery of welfare (Boyle et al 2008), and cities, including Glasgow, adopted diverse strategies of place-marketing that stretched into the 1990s. Today, authors are critical of these efforts, arguing that they have exacerbated the fiscal crises that led to the closure of local facilities in Glasgow (e.g. Gray 2010); however, some suggest that they
have brought promotion of and funding for local arts and community projects as well (e.g. Nolan 2015). The 1990s saw a return to strong national state disciplinary regimes that entailed considerable reduced budgets for local authorities, resulting in the closure of community services across Glasgow and a political climate of ‘cuts, uncertainty and competition [...] that set communities against each other’ (Nolan 2015: 62).

Today, the process of reducing welfare services is happening again. A politics of ‘aggressive roll-back neoliberalism’ (Featherstone et al 2012) and austerity emerged as a response to the global economic crisis of 2008 (Kitson et al 2011), comprising of welfare reforms and public sector cutbacks that ‘dramatically curtail government spending’ (Featherstone et al 2012: 177). Under these huge fiscal pressures unleashed by the Glasgow City Council, the delivery of community services increasingly shifts to, and is doubtfully celebrated as a sign of, ‘responsible’ and ‘resilient’ citizens who have been left to compete for state resources in the city (MacKinnon and Derickson 2013; Painter et al 2011; Purcell 2006). This ‘austerity localism’ (Nolan 2015) has resulted in a shift of working with whole communities in the 1960s and 1970s towards meeting the needs of specific ‘at risk’ groups in contemporary Glasgow. Yet, this type of localism does speak to the crucial role the third sector plays in society, as ‘voluntary organisations often identify needs, provide services and offer support to groups outside the public sector framework’ (Nolan 2015: 66) - the voluntary sector being significant in Glasgow. Nevertheless, others have pointed out that the local state remains the body instigating this process (Blanco et al 2014). In this research, the social impact of changing state responsibilities and the unstable nature of urban policy funding in Glasgow was critical to make sense of the ways in which participants articulated micro politics of public spaces and moments of encounter and micro connection (5.4 and 7.4.1).
Figure 1: Location of research sites in Glasgow, source: LGBC Scotland 2017
4.3.2 The neighbourhoods of Partick, Maryhill and Woodlands

Partick is commonly represented as a predominantly working class residential district, with a history shaped by sectarian tensions and orangeism (Davies 2013; MacRaild 1999), and a strong tradition of Labour support (Hughes 2005). Partick has also long been home to diverse ethnic and cultural communities, with earlier Irish migrations (Kelly 2012) being complemented by South Asian and Caribbean migrations since the 1950s (Raje and Mahn 2018), more recent Polish migrations (Pacione 2009), and arriving asylum seekers and refugees into Glasgow more widely (Wiseman 2017b). The recent influx of Chinese students, in particular, has been accompanied by the City Council and the nearby University of Glasgow making funds available to renovate and build housing stock, and regenerate Partick more widely; some of these regenerations being heavily criticised for representing a move towards sharper urban planning strategies that ‘deliberately displace poor people to make way for “higher end land uses” rather than supporting progressive planning policy and public housing construction’ (Gray and Porter 2014: 18; also Christophers 2010). As such, Partick’s social structure is changing, as new inequalities, inclusions and exclusions are arising due to differences in economic, social and financial abilities of residents to consume provided services in the area (Paton 2010).

Similarly, Maryhill is a historical working class neighbourhood, albeit with higher income deprivation and poorer housing conditions (Shipton and Whyte 2011), that has been dominated by rigorous urban regeneration agendas (Gray and Porter 2014) and ‘revanchist’ punitive political responses (MacLeod 2002). Large housing estates run by housing associations have dominated the area since the late 1960s/early 1970s, which have contributed to Maryhill being territorially stigmatised, similar to other parts of Glasgow (Gray and Mooney 2011). Negative tropes around place and dominant representations, such as the branding of Maryhill as ‘Glasgow’s new slum’ (Pacione 2004), continue to reconstruct Maryhill as an image of Glasgow’s tough and hard city life (Wright et al 2017) and to arguably qualify its spot among the most deprived wards of Glasgow, and Scotland (Mirza 2012).

Like the rest of Glasgow, Maryhill has been shaped by diverse migration stories (e.g. Raje and Mahn 2018), with earlier South Asian migrations having been complemented by migrations from the Middle East, Eastern European and Central and East-African countries over the last decades (Pacione 2008) and, more recently, by Syrian and other refugees and asylum seeking individuals and groups (Wiseman 2017a). Different articulations of ‘whiteness’ have also significantly shaped Maryhill (Davies 2016; Blaikie 2011; Wilkinson 1993). In this context, different voluntary organisations, institutions and groups have structurally organised themselves around the needs of different communities, some short-term and others long-term, whether it is in terms of language, sports, trauma support, befriend-
Woodlands is commonly constructed as an historic area of tenement housing that is not a distinctively working class area nor an area of concentrated deprivation; however, Woodlands does contain pockets of deprivation and has been subject to housing action plans since the mid-1970s (Paton 2009). These strategies revolved around ‘renewal through conservation’, involving local residents and community-led groups alongside city and state actors, to tackle derelict land and housing (Gillick 2017). In terms of ethnic and cultural composition, Woodlands has been among the dominant areas of ‘minority settlement’ in Glasgow since the 1950s, with migrants from India, Pakistan and China moving into Woodlands alongside smaller Afro-Caribbean migration flows (Bowes et al 1990). Various religious groups including Muslim and Sikh communities are also visible in the area (McGarrigle 2010). Research suggests that these groups mainly live in owner-occupied housing, yet, are experiencing higher rates of unemployment and are less mobile than ‘white’ populations in the area (Binns 2002).

Woodlands has also always been a destination for students since its proximity to the university (e.g. Kelly 2012), which has led to increasing gentrification in the form of newly developing cafes and shops opening that specifically cater towards students and ‘young professionals’. Yet, ethnically diverse cultural shops and goods continue to be a strong presence (Paton 2009), alongside various voluntary organisations, institutions and groups that are active running projects and activities around, for example, befriending and gardening, arguably indicating a strong sense of ‘community’ being fostered and lived among more permanent residents.

4.3.3 Places of study
Local cafes, public libraries and community centres were selected places of study to represent a cross-section of mundane spaces of encounter that exist in Glasgow. In some ways, this reflects a case study approach, strategically selecting spaces that reflect ‘informal spaces of encounter’ and therefore represent relevant sites for studying processes of identity making and belonging in Glasgow. An extensive body of literature discusses both advantages and disadvantages, and the appropriateness, of using case studies to investigate spaces of encounter (Curtis 2016; Darling 2011). In the context of this research, this literature suggests that case studies enable more in-depth explorations (Flyvbjerg 2001), can elicit ‘thick’ descriptions of events, places and people, and the researcher’s immersion in the minutiae of the practices of the case (Curtis 2016), that way unpacking ‘how broader processes work through specific constellations of space’ (Gregory et al 2009: 72). Moreover, as with other methods, selecting a research site is also al-
ways a conscious and deliberate choice. Yet, I suggest that the researcher has to find a balance between the ‘relevance’ of a site for the investigation of the research topic and practical considerations such as time constraints and availability of ‘suitable’ sites, making some sites more convenient than others (Denscombe 2014). I now turn to the key characteristics of the selected research sites, highlighting why they represent important informal spaces of encounter.

In encounter literature, geographers have pointed out that, despite often having commercial aims, cafes can be an important informal space of encounter as people experience each other’s presence without direct interactions (Peterson 2017; Tjora and Scambler 2013). This enables many people to familiarise with diversity (Blokland and Nast 2014), making it appear more commonplace (Wessendorf 2013). Two cafes in Woodlands were selected as research sites, café A being a small cafe run by a local Glaswegian, white, male in his early/mid 30s together with his mother. It is a corner cafe with large windows, a few tables downstairs and sofas and lounge chairs upstairs. Café A feels quirky and personal due to a range of furniture and decorations, seems to attract a mix of regulars and passers-by and, while being quieter during the week, is often busy on weekends. Café B is part of a Glaswegian chain, with mostly young staff of different ethnic and cultural heritages. It feels modern yet more generic than the other cafe, with a large window front, sofas and tables spread throughout, private booths screened off by low walls, computer tables on one wall and few decorations. Café B seems to attract many students, potentially because of free Wi-Fi, and my sense from fieldwork is that people of Pakistani and/or Indian heritage and Muslim women are also regular users. Cafe B is often busy and customers seem to hang out late into the evening due to its longer opening hours.

The feminist framing of this research demands critically thinking through the terminology, and its shortcomings, used to describe research settings and participants. Here, I am aware that my descriptions of the café settings are potentially problematic since they make (wrong) assumptions regarding people’s ethnic, religious and cultural heritages. The descriptors used in interviews and focus groups are more precise since I was able to ask people how they wished their identities to be described. While being aware of the shortcomings of participant observation (also 4.4.1), the terminology used here is meant to give a sense of the different café settings and provide a sketch of who is generally there. These descriptions rely entirely on my field notes, which is also problematic since other groups who were not participating in the settings when I did are potentially obscured from this research (4.4). Discussed here in terms of the café settings, these issues surely exist across all sites described in this research.
Regarding public libraries, research often suggests that they can function as an important ‘entry point’ into local and communal life, allowing particularly newcomers and people with smaller social networks to connect with others (Peterson 2017), and provide possibilities for ‘silent companionship’ and ‘doing the same things’ through which people can identify with others (Iveson and Fincher 2008). Traditionally being funded through council and local government, public libraries also represent a crucial institutional space of encounter, providing particularly poorer and marginalised segments of society, such as homeless and unemployed people, a safer space to dwell. I initially selected two public libraries, however, I ended up observing and participating in community groups more extensively in the livelier and more heavily used of the two (cf. Denscombe 2014).

Located in Partick, the selected library is a large space, subdivided into different sections by wooden walls with windows and connected by swing doors. The library is light and clean, giving it an airy, friendly and inviting atmosphere. There is a community board in the hall, advertising activities and groups taking place in the library, the neighbourhood and wider Glasgow. One area has computers and a silent study which is often busy with people of different ages, professions and ethnic and cultural heritages reading, working and studying. Another area holds most of the books with large bookshelves lining the walls, some chairs and the reception. People often read in here and browse the selection. Staff mostly keeps to this part, chatting among themselves and with library users. The last area holds the children’s playground, four large tables with chairs and some bookshelves. A range of community groups meet at this library, including the knitting group I attended, a book club, a breastfeeding support group, English learning and computer classes and a creative writing group.

There is an extensive body of literature which explores community centres as sites of encounter, with geographers drawing attention to the value, and politics, of interpersonal relationships developing in, and stretching beyond, community centres (e.g. Peterson forthcoming; Wiseman 2017a; Askins 2016; Darling 2014). As community centres often focus on community cohesion and integration, next to providing access to key social services and information, sociality is one of the main drivers of this type of space. This speaks to Amin’s (2002) notion of ‘micro publics’, with community centres providing people with opportunities to encounter others through shared activities in a safer space of interaction. Despite their apparent importance and value, community centres are often charity-run and depend on volunteers alongside staff and funds from council and government bodies.

Both community centres selected for this research are located in Maryhill. Community centre A is housed in an old school building next to a main road, alongside other organisations, and consists of one large and bright front room and two smaller offices in the back.
The front room has a kitchenette, a long table with chairs, lounge chairs and colourful decorations, photos, posters and information leaflets on the walls. This room is busy throughout the week and weekend, with members of different community groups holding their meetings and hanging out, of which I attended the weekly multicultural women’s group and spoke with members of the multicultural men’s group and gardening club. Users of this community centre live close-by and travel from further away, including the East End and South side of Glasgow. Community centre B is a converted school building and slightly hidden from sight, located in the midst of a development scheme. Low brick walls fence in the building, a community garden and a playground. Inside, a long corridor stretches to both sides, with the reception to the right and different sized rooms to the left, including a kitchen, a large hall with podium and café, and a gym. Most users of this community centre seem to live in the surrounding area and attend community groups that meet here during the week, of which I attended the cooking club. Aside from community group meetings and the gym, the community centre often seemed quiet and empty, with only a few people using the cafe.

4.4 Research as a messy, changing and shifting ‘journey’

The methodological approach of this thesis entails thinking through research process as a ‘journey’ (after Askins 2004) that is constantly shifting and changing, and responsive to encounters experienced in the field. This concept suggests that methodological practices and social realities are always co-constructed, and in that uncontrollable, messy and unpredictable (Law 2004). This particularly applies to research processes that involve participants. It also suggests that I myself form part of the complex and unforeseeable encounters that I describe in this thesis, and, drawing on Askins and Pain (2011: 809), I agree that while researchers ‘try to read some order through the mess’ of (doing) research, conclusions drawn from (qualitative) research are always ‘tentative and emergent’ and request us to be humble regarding knowledge claims.

This last point brings me to consider who is involved in the knowledge(s) produced in this research. Building on my field notes, and aware of their shortcomings as a means of ‘recording’ participant observation (4.4.1), I support the significance of building towards situated and embodied knowledge(s), and ‘against various forms of unlocatable, and so irresponsible, knowledge claims’ (Haraway 1988: 583). Central here is to approach knowledge(s) as a ‘situated conversation at every level of its articulation’ (ibid: 594), ‘partial views and halting voices’ (ibid: 593) that together produce, and challenge, the construction of meanings and bodies in society. Fieldwork lasted from September 2016 to August 2017, during which I was involved with two community groups in particular, a multicultural women’s group meeting at community centre A and a knitting group meeting at a local library (4.3.2). I argue that their experiences, stories and knowledge(s) are ‘views
from somewhere’ (ibid: 590, emphasis added), and therefore crucial to explore how notions of identity, belonging and community are (re)produced through everyday spaces of encounter in Glasgow.

The multicultural women’s group meets for three hours every week, although many women arrive earlier/leave later than that, and brings together 12-25 women of whom 12-15 attend weekly. There are often newcomers. Many bring along their children who are taken care of in an adjoining day-care facility. Based on informal conversations, I gathered that most women have migrated to Glasgow from various parts in the world, including countries in the Middle East and Northern Africa (Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Egypt and Libya), South-Eastern Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia and Sudan) and East Asia (India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka). Others were born and/or raised in Glasgow, and Scotland, and have a ‘mixed’ (ethnic and cultural) heritage/background. Volunteers I have met come from Scotland, Eurasia and East Asia. Women have diverse religious orientations – Muslim, Hindu, Christian and Atheist – and their ages range from the late 20s through to some women in their late 60s. So does their time of residency: while some are living in Glasgow just under a year, others have been living in the city for 10 and some over 30 years. This reflects the diverse migration stories through which most of these women arrived in Glasgow, including accounts of voluntary migration, for example to follow/join families/partners/parents and work opportunities, through to forced migration such as fleeing war/conflict zones and seeking/applying for refugee and asylum status in the UK.

The group often holds activities and themed discussions. During my time with the group, there was a project on belonging and identity, a mapping of public space and free activities in and around Glasgow, a discussion about the role and value of the community centre and the group in the women’s personal lives, a screening as part of a Glasgow-wide film festival, and festivities with Christmas, Diwali (Hindu festival of lights) and Ramadan. Women often talked among themselves in and around these events/activities, discussing family issues, their daily lives and happenings through to sharing information about affordable (kids) activities and groups in Glasgow. With me, women talked about their reasons to attend the group, the value of the group, their migration paths and experiences in Glasgow and Scotland, what ‘home’ means to them and where it is, and imaginaries and stereotypes about Scotland.

The knitting group meets for two hours per week, bringing together five to nine women of whom five attend regularly. Newcomers often join, approaching the group on the spot or hearing about it through the library’s flyers/notice board/website. While the group is not advertised as a women-only group, members suggest that knitting continues to be perceived as a female activity and therefore mainly attracts women (also 5.3.1). Members
come predominantly from the UK (Scotland and England), while others come from Australia, China and India. Occasionally, women with mental health issues attend the group, with regular members emphasising the social support role of the group. During meetings, most women knit or crochet while others leaf through magazines and drink tea/coffee. Conversations focus on everyday activities, recent local/regional/global news, travel plans and family issues. With me, women discussed the importance of the library for local/communal life in Glasgow, the value of the group and their ability to ‘do something together’ (6.2), what types of relationships develop(ed) out of attending the group, and reasons they enjoy knitting and spending time together.

I also attended a cookery class at community centre B that ran for 10 weeks, once in late 2016 and again in early 2017. Classes were organised by the charity North Glasgow Healthy Living Community, together with Glasgow City Council and the NHS and changing local partners, in this case community centre B, a nursery and a supermarket in Maryhill. Classes were free of charge, lasted about 3-4 hours, and were advertised in the form of a ‘homework cooking club’ aimed at parents whose children attend the surrounding schools of community centre B. About 10-12 parents attended the classes regularly, most of them stay-at-home mothers in their 30s to early 40s. Fathers/Partners sometimes accompanied their partner to community centre B and left, others stayed for the duration of the class. There was a group of 3 Chinese couples who knew each other beforehand, 3 white-Scottish women who were born/raised in Glasgow, 3 women from South/West African countries, and 2 women with Middle-Eastern backgrounds who also attended above multicultural women’s group at community centre A. While participants cooked in an adjoining room, volunteers from the nursery and the community centre helped children with their homework and organised games. The class would end with everyone sharing the prepared meal.

Occasionally, I attended the weekly meetings of the gardening club at community centre A, bringing together between 7-16 people depending on the week. There was an about equal ratio of women and men. Attendees came from around the world, including countries in East Africa (Eritrea, Ethiopia), Northern Africa (Morocco and Tunisia), the Middle East (Jordan), Eastern Europe (Poland), and East Asia (India, Pakistan, Sri Lanka). In terms of age, the majority was presumably in their late 30s to early 50s, some were in their early 30s and a few in their early 60s. Many were refugees and asylum seekers, and, in case of many women, stay-at-home mothers. Some of the women also attended above mentioned multicultural women’s group. Volunteers were from Scotland, England and Iran. Activities included working in the community centre’s garden, harvesting, cooking and eating together, and drinking tea and coffee. During my time with the group, they also organised a day trip to Loch Lomond and a walk in Glasgow’s Pollokk Country Park.
Finally, I was involved with a writing and book club meeting monthly at Partick library, attended regularly by 5-6 people, all white, the majority being Scottish, one woman being English and another woman having migrated from Bulgaria over 20 years ago. Most were presumably in their 50s to early 60s. The gender ratio was changing when I left the group in April 2017, with two newcomers, two men, white, one Scottish, the other English, in their late 60s/early 70s, joining the group. Activities included discussing preselected books, reading out loud self-written pieces of writing, drinking tea and coffee, and writing exercises.

4.4.1 Participant observation through ‘hanging out’ and becoming involved

In geography, ethnographic methodologies present opportunities to explore the ways in which people create and experience their worlds through processes such as place-making, inhabiting social spaces, forging local and transnational networks, and representing and disrupting spatial imaginaries. Critically, ethnography emphasises local knowledges, and approaches ‘people as knowledgeable, situated agents from whom researchers can learn a great deal about how the world is seen, lived and works in “real” places’ (Cloke et al 2004: 169). Participation and an embodied experience of ‘being in the field’ are central features in most ethnographic projects, meant to allow the researcher to better understand and become involved in the diverse practices that constitute everyday life (Herbert 2000). Through its emphasis on locality(ies) and situatedness, ethnographic research can make more explicit processes and power relations that are involved in knowledge creations (DeLyser et al 2010). I agree that this can disrupt binaries of researcher/researched, and contribute to a feminist perspective of research constituting a ‘process of articulating differences and sameness, an act of bounding “here” and “there”’ (Watson and Till 2010: 121; also Hyndman 2001).

While resting on a series of encounters and methods, participant observation is often central in ethnographic projects. Participant observation does not alone constitute ethnography, but can be critical to allow the researcher to observe people in, and perform, the social practices of a group. As such, participant observation is about the ‘doing’ rather than the procurement of ‘facts’ (Watson and Till 2010), the involvement in the everyday life of people and the ‘spontaneity of everyday interactions’ (Kearns 2005: 195). Critically, this recognises members of communities as ‘experts’ in their lifeworlds, and can open up possibilities for collaboration and working with as well as negotiating access to places and people (DeLyser et al 2010).

From September 2016 to August 2017, I adopted the (ethnographic) method of participant observation through ‘hanging out’, to gain insight into how people negotiate multicultural encounters and ways of being together in everyday spaces across Glasgow. Jupp (2008:
335) argues that hanging out foregrounds the ‘micro levels of feelings and interactions’ that other forms of participant observation might overlook. In order words, it is the informality and mundaneness of this type of participant observation that makes it valuable, as the researcher can observe how encounters unfold in informal spaces of ‘enforced togetherness’ (Wood and Waite 2011). Hanging out has also been emphasised as a relevant and ethically desirable research method outside of encounter literature. In the field of forced migration studies, for example, Rodgers (2004: 48) concludes that the value of ‘modest and small-scale qualitative approaches’ lies in the informal and interpersonal interactions that develop between researchers and forced migrants, bringing attention to informal interactions and processes. Horton and Kraftl (2009) add that hanging out allows the researcher to capture emotional and embodied dimensions of encounters, capturing small acts of kindness, words and gestures that weave through encounters.

Elsewhere in encounter research, there are examples of participant observation through hanging out that explore multicultural encounters, everyday negotiations of diversity and accounts of living together. Wise (2010) explores interethnic living in Australian suburbs through hanging out in local shopping malls, participants’ homes and on the streets as well as participating in ordinary activities with participants such as shopping and socialising. And Lobo’s (2014) research with Aboriginal people and asylum seekers in public spaces in Darwin, Australia, researches the ways that racially differentiated bodies live with difference and belong in the city. Lobo (2014: 715) conducted participant observation through hanging out at ‘beaches, bus transit centres, open-air markets and shopping malls’ because spending time in these public spaces is indeed ordinary and ‘everyday’.

For this research, I hung out in local cafes, public libraries and community centres in the West and North of Glasgow; spaces selected to represent the range of spaces of encounter that exist in the city, including commercial, institutional and third sector/charity spaces. While having diverse functions and aims, all of these spaces provide platforms for people to ‘mix’ and mingle with others who live in the city. These spaces were therefore assumed to attract different individuals and groups, allowing me to observe and interact with a cross-section of Glaswegian society (4.3).

Another way participant observation was adopted in this research was through becoming involved in different community groups meeting at the selected research sites (4.3.2). I took part in a weekly knitting group and a monthly book club at a public library, a weekly multicultural women’s group and gardening club meeting at community centre A and a 10-week cookery class at community centre B. This approach highlights participant observation as an embodied practice, where the researcher can gain insights into unfolding and real life experiences of people involved in particular communities and settings (Cloke et al 2004). Participant observation opens up opportunities for the researcher to informally in-
teract with participants in a relaxed and friendly manner by ‘doing the same things’ (after Fincher and Iveson 2008). This is critical when researching multicultural encounters, and their effects, as friendships and other relationships and connections can grow out of being actively involved with others. In terms of positionality, this can also unsettle conventional understandings of ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ (cf. Williams 2012; also 4.4.6). I have used participation as a means of experiencing, doing and feeling (multicultural) encounters on and through my body (4.4), and using my own experiences as prompts for discussion during interviews and focus groups.

Staying mindful to different forms of power/knowledge shaping daily contexts/situations involves taking seriously that participant observation can reiterate and recreate wider stereotyping and racializing discourses and imaginaries. I am aware that my perspective of ‘difference’ might have been problematic during fieldwork, with field notes occasionally (re)constructing visual signifiers such as darker colour of skin and the headscarf as noteworthy elements about people’s bodies and identities. For example, Figure 2 details an instance where I have (unintentionally) reproduced problematic accounts of whiteness, Scottishness and Asian-ness, and their intersections (7.3).
Figure 2: Field notes taken from diary, September 2016
Thinking through some of my descriptions of people reflecting and reproducing wider dominant (racializing) discourses made me realise that ‘visual difference as otherness’ is somewhat of a shorthand, a dominant way of thinking (about others), that is a normative and overriding social construction, to different extents, in the minds of many people in society, including me; yet, cannot verify how somebody identifies themselves. *Talking to people* is thus critical to challenge and negotiate ways of viewing/looking that assume and ‘fix’ others as different, and I have tried applying elements of life history interviewing to let people identify themselves in their own words (Jackson and Russel 2010; also 4.4.2 and 4.4.3). Simultaneously, I suggest that (my own) reproductions of otherness and difference might reflect how some people in mundane spaces such as cafes and libraries *make sense* of others, highlighting ‘how bodies interact, meld, and constitute social spaces, and thereby create inclusions and exclusions’ (Watson and Till 2010: 122). I hold that the participant observations I have made remain valid and important, and I often used them to open up encounters and conversations to more critically reflect on processes of ‘othering’. Moreover, observing and trying to make sense of people is also a way to understand emotional worlds, behaviour in public and mundane spaces allowing feelings of (dis)location, attachment and belonging to surface (3.4). I give a detailed self-reflection in 4.5, and further discuss issues of informed consent and building rapport in 4.4.5.

4.4.2 Individual interviews with diverse users of everyday spaces of encounter

Interviews can enable insight into people’s experiences and ‘the meanings with which attributes, attitudes and behaviour are endowed’ (Cloke et al 2004: 127). As with other qualitative methods, the aim is ‘to explore and understand actions within specific settings, to examine human relationships and to discover as much as possible about why people feel or act in the ways they do’ (McDowell 2010: 156). Interviews, as a method, echo a feminist approach to research, highlighting that ‘people’s knowledge, views, understandings, interpretations, experiences and interactions are meaningful properties of the social reality’ (Mason 1996: 39). As such, interviews show respect for participants and attribute value to the data they provide. And, when structured around open-ended questions, interviews invite participants to share their opinions and can empower their voices (Dunn 2005).

Interviews can be a powerful tool for exploring the ways encounters shape people’s ideas and understandings of (national) identity and belonging. Geographers interested in spaces of encounter, in particular, have used interviews with people from diverse heritages and backgrounds to unpack multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters and their impact on people’s sense of places (Lobo 2010, 2014; Wise 2010). Askins (2014), for example, sees interviews as important to explore and explain the relationships formed between participants of a multicultural befriending scheme in the UK, particularly non-quantifiable matters such as beliefs and feelings that weave through their encounters, as well as participants’ opinions regarding the ‘impact’ of these encounters and emergent relations on their sense
of belonging in the city. Hopkins’ (2014) research implies that interviews are invaluable when trying to better understand embodied and emotional aspects of ‘encounters with difference’ that construct Sikh young men as ‘strangers’ across daily contexts in Scotland. And Noble and Tabar (2002) employed interviews with young Lebanese-Australian men to understand their spatial strategies to confront and subvert dominant discourses around public space in Australia.

These examples suggest that interviews are an appropriate method for exploring spaces of encounter and belonging. Simultaneously, ‘rather than being a transparent, straightforward exchange of information’ interviews are always also ‘a complex and contested social encounter riven with power relations’ (McDowell 2010: 161). While it is critical to remain sensitive to interviews as an (uneven) site of power (Tanggaard 2007) that can stretch beyond the immediate moment of the interview (Chase 2003), I suggest that both interviewer and interviewee are involved in the production of knowledge(s), and that relations of power can shift and change in interview situations. The researcher has a power position in terms of, for example, determining place and topic, initiating the interview, posing the questions, critically following up the answers and closing the conversation; yet, it has been suggested that the interviewer does not exclusively hold power, as interviewees can withhold information, talk about something other than what was asked for, may question the interviewer and oppose their interpretations (Kvale and Brinkmann 2009; Ilkonen and Ojala 2007).

Feminist perspectives have further emphasised that diverse identities and social attributes, including age, sexuality, gender, ethnicity, social status, and the power positions these entail, can enter the interview situation to varying degrees and change its flow and content (Broom et al 2009; Ramanzanoglu and Holland 2002). Interviews are thus not always a space of understanding and connection, and differences and similarities between interviewer and interviewee, and their connected power, can both be fruitful and limiting (Enosh and Ben-Ari 2010). Central here is not to minimise these differences, but to think through how both parties may/can decide to (re)produce, present and unsettle them during interviews (Vähäsantanen and Saarinen 2012; Pratt et al 2007). Section 4.5 further discusses power in the analysis of interviewing data.

In this research, people who were interviewed were frequently using, hanging out and/or attending community groups at one or more of the selected research sites. Most participants I got to know through becoming involved in the different community groups, my personal contact allowing me to invite them for interviews. Some members of community groups also approached me, asking to be interviewed, because they had heard about the research through staff and members of community groups. I approached other partici-
pants ‘on the spot’, while a few participants contacted me via email through the posters I had put up in the research locations to make transparent this research taking place (Appendix C).

While language differences did not hinder conversations during interviews and focus groups, critical here is to acknowledge that there is no neutral position from which to translate, and that language is power particularly ‘if you cannot give voice to your needs [and] you become dependent on those who can speak the relevant language to speak for you’ (Temple and Young 2004: 164). This speaks to post-colonial and feminist perspectives dissecting language as rhetoric, logic and silence (Spivak 1992) and power geometries tied to meaning construction (Simon 1996; Barrett 1992; Foucault 1989; Derrida 1978; also 2.3).

The use of the above mentioned social categories is paralleled by an understanding that using any social categories can be limiting and potentially harmful, naturalising and ‘fixing’ social constructions of identities and maintaining relations of domination (e.g. Kobayashi and Peake 1994). While holding on to identity(ies) as relational, hybrid and always contextually-fashioned (2.4), the inclusion of specific biographical data was helpful to foreground participants’ experiences and perspectives of encounters with others, also beyond certain social categories. Moreover, some people decided to self-define/’label’ their migratory background/history, subsequently using these categories or ‘labels' to reflect on their experiences in Glasgow and wider dominant discourse(s) on migrant identities in society. Categories given included that of ‘second generation citizen’ (born in the UK/Scotland with immigrant parents, or having come to the UK/Scotland during early childhood and attending school), ‘new migrant’ (living in the UK/Scotland for less than 3 years), ‘permanent resident’ (living in the UK/Scotland for more than 5 years and intending to stay) ‘return migrant’ (in/voluntary return of migrants to their country of citizenship), ‘refugee’ and ‘asylum seeker’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Ethnicity(ies)</th>
<th>Place of birth</th>
<th>Migratory histories</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>Origin</td>
<td>Migration Status</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Stay-at-home mother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>Return migrant</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Not working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Older</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>East-Asian</td>
<td>Sri Lanka</td>
<td>Second generation citizen</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Looking for work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Refugee</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Asylum seeker</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>East-Asian</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Stay-at-home mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Middle-Eastern</td>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Stay-at-home mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>East-Asian</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Central-Asian/German</td>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Second generation citizen</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td></td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Middle-aged</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Dubai</td>
<td>Return migrant</td>
<td>Stay-at-home mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Permanent resident</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>East-Asian/White</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>Second generation citizen</td>
<td>Working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>New migrant</td>
<td>Stay-at-home mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1**: Characteristics of interview and/or focus group participants

4.4.3 Focus groups with people frequently ‘othered’ by discourses and media

Following the interviews, focus groups were held to further reflect on everyday negotiations of multiculturalism, community and belonging in Glasgow. I used focus groups to encourage interactions and the exchange of experiences among participants, hoping to gain insights into their motivations, feelings and dynamics around the discussed topics (Morgan 1997). Literature suggests that the researcher can assume the role of moderator to focus discussion on their questions (Pratt 2001), and to ensure that discussions are conversational and informal in tone. I support that lightly moderating discussions can allow people to respond using their own words (Clifford et al 2016), and to create a more relaxed setting which potentially encourages shy participants to speak up (Cloke et al 2004).

In the context of this research, I found that focus groups enabled me to invite participants who wanted to continue to be involved and to encourage those reluctant to be interviewed one-on-one to explore the themes of this research together with others.

Focus groups thus proved to be a successful and *sensitive* method, providing insights into the experiences, feelings and opinions of people whose bodies and identities were frequently othered by formal political debates and popular media. Focus groups are themselves encounters, taking place in spaces caught up in histories and geographies, with former experiences, discourses, meanings and debates all weaving through and shaping focus group discussions and relations. Participants with different, multi-layered, marginalised and othered identities come together in the specific space and moment of the focus group. As participants are asked to openly discuss and share their experiences, most of whom barely know each other in this research except in focus group 3 (see below), this can transform focus groups into a daunting encounter: feelings of fear and anxiety, hope and understanding interlink with wider geopolitical discourses and debates, collectively bearing down, and shaping, the specific context of the focus group. Similar to spaces of encounter, then, the focus group is a space of potential and vulnerability, opening up and
closening down opportunities for different and multiple notions and meanings of (national) identity, nationhood and community to be created, challenged and negotiated, in uneven ways for different people (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014).

To some extent, the ethical issues arising in focus groups are the same as those in one-on-one interviews, although the group context exacerbates power dynamics at play within interaction. There are concerns, for example, that group participants can collaborate or collude to intimidate and/or silence a particular member or create a silence around a particular topic or issue (Wilkinson 1998). And that focus groups, due to their interactive form and social nature, might lead to a loss of (sensitive) data, as some people are less willing to share their stories, and can make people conform to majority opinions or express 'socially acceptable' ideas (Stewart and Shamdasani 2015). While focus groups, as a method, are somewhat about understanding and revealing (uneven) power dynamics, some suggest that it is important to balance the relinquishing of power/control against goals of supporting individuals, broadening out discussion or exploring taboos (Wilkinson 1998).

Table 2 details the three focus groups conducted. Trying to make all focus groups feel safer and comfortable, participants were informed that identities would be anonymised, that they could withdraw at any point and asked if they were happy for discussions to be tape recorded. With regards to focus group 3, participants already knew each other through community centre A, and their differing levels of English proficiency did not hamper discussion as other focus group participants translated the opinions and experiences of those less able/confident/willing to express themselves in English (cf. Esposito 2001).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus group</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>1,5 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6, 15 and 21</td>
<td>All formerly interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Public library</td>
<td>2 hours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3, 18 and 19</td>
<td>All female and one participant formerly interviewed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Community centre A</td>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 13</td>
<td>Contacted me through staff, Knew each other beforehand, Different abilities to speak English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Specifics of focus groups
During focus groups, I encouraged participants to use a range of materials including maps, labels and pens (see Figure 3 below). These materials structured discussion, allowing participants a moment of reflection to formulate, write down and/or draw their thoughts before sharing them with the group. That way, I hoped to enable participants to be ‘hands-on’, collectively building a communal picture of their experiences and thinking, and balance inputs from over-assertive and shy participants. Many participants confirmed that the materials helped to explore multiple aspects of emergent questions and themes. Visual methods have been receiving growing attention in geography and the social sciences (e.g. Rose 2016; Askins and Pain 2011; Pink 2007), specifically their potential to ‘create a space for embodied, multilingual, marginalised experiences to be expressed in visual form’ (Tolia-Kelly 2007: 133) and to ‘capture alternative vocabularies and visual grammars that are not always encountered or expressible in oral interviews’ (ibid: 135). This illustrates that material objects can affect encounters and social relations in embodied and affective ways (6.4), and speaks to what embodied senses can add to understanding relationships between people and places (Longhurst et al 2008; 4.2). However, engaging with materials was not a ‘must’: focus group 3 decided not to use the materials, arguing that they were getting in the way of communication, instead discussing questions and themes verbally. This shows that these ‘things’ are tools, a support that may (not) be needed or wanted.
Figure 3: Photographs of room where focus groups were held and materials used, source: author
4.4.4 Negotiating issues around informed consent and building rapport

The recruitment process of this research underscores that participants are active agents who take an interest in and have the power to shape their own lives (4.4.2), resonating with feminist and post-colonial writing that acknowledges the position and impact of self-subject relations in research (e.g. Longhurst et al 2008). As such, the methodological approach here challenges the belief that participants are passive or inert bodies from whom information is extracted or passed to, instead highlighting their everyday agency throughout the research process and the encounters described in this research (7.4). This, alongside my growing immersion in the field, also challenged the ways in which I thought about, and sought to gain informed consent from those I interacted with.

The issue of ‘informed consent’ is often treated in bureaucratic terms. I had to complete the University of Glasgow ethnics process, which included providing information sheets (Appendix A), and consent forms (Appendix B); the latter being limited to asking for and giving consent. However, consent is a more complex process. Issues of gate-keeping, access, re-access and participation can shift throughout the research (Miller and Bell 2012), meaning that consent is not a given but may have to be renegotiated, an ongoing interaction between researcher and researched. However, this can also turn it into a laborious and irritating process as multiple forms need to be signed and collected, that way potentially disturbing the flow of the research. I negotiated these issues by verbally asking for permission to attend and observe community groups as a ‘researcher’ and having formal consent forms and information sheets read and signed prior to interviews and focus groups. In both instances, I would outline the aims of my research (Appendix D) and how the materials produced would be used. I also highlighted that I wanted to actively participate in the different community groups, letting members know that I would assume any duties that came with such a status in order to observe the different social spaces. In addition, I put up posters in the different research sites, hoping to further establish assurance and transparency of the research taking place (4.5).

This process made me consider the issue of ‘building rapport’. As this research relied on the willingness of people to participate, I attempted to critically assess the motivations underlying my behaviour and interactions with (potential) participants. Feminist and post-colonial writing has always scrutinised researchers’ behaviour in the field, particularly if that behaviour may ‘(inadvertently) expose sensitive practices of subaltern people to those who (might) use this knowledge to oppress them’ (Katz 1994: 71). Research with refugee and asylum seeking groups, for example, highlights the need to develop relationships of trust to ensure vulnerable individuals not being coerced into participation (Darling 2014). This involves researchers considering if they use methods ‘designed to develop sufficient trust for participants to yield sensitive information’ (Cloke et al 2004: 192), risking
to betray this trust by publicly writing what may 'upset (or perhaps even disadvantage) them' (Ekinsmyth 2002). For ethnographic practice, particularly participant observation, this may involve deception and impression management (Kawulich 2005) and in terms of interviews, the ethics of ‘faking friendship’ (Duncombe and Jessop 2002: 111) which speaks to the somewhat skewed view that interviewing is a benign practice ‘leading the interviewee to valuable personal insights and enabling the researcher to contribute to a wider understanding of individuals’ lives and problems’. Far from being clear cut, though, boundaries around rapport, friendship and intimacy are also always inherently blurry (Duncombe and Jessop 2002) as emotional engagement is the practice of doing research (Elmhirst 2012).

To negotiate the issue of rapport, I tried to engage with the different social settings as both researcher and participant. However, becoming a trusted group member as well as researcher took time and commitment and meant that I needed to adopt an ‘attitude of reciprocity’ (Darling 2014: 204). When asked, I opened up around questions concerning my personal life, family, history, background and how the research was progressing. I believe that this ‘reciprocal exchange of views and experiences’ (ibid: 204) was crucial to build trusting relationships and connections with people throughout the research: it was through these informal and banal conversations that friendships developed. Indeed, this research has shown me that it sometimes does not suffice to be an ‘attentive listener’ but requires reciprocity to show the value placed in the relationships being developed (cf. Smith 2012). Section 4.4.6 reflects on my emotions and embodied reactions to others in greater detail.

4.4.5 Leaving the field
To officially end the data gathering process, an informal closing event was held at a local library to which all participants were invited and six participants attended. The event was meant to discuss together with participants the initial findings and themes emerging from the research and to enable participants to comment on these findings, share their experiences of having been involved in the research and voice final questions/comments. To facilitate discussion, an information leaflet that summarised research objectives, questions, initial outcomes and my contact details was handed out (Appendix F). To involve everybody in the feedback process, I emailed this information leaflet to participants and also gave it to staff at the community centres to reach participants for whom I had no contact information. By doing so, I hoped to enable everyone to feedback to me in a way that felt comfortable, even after the official end of the research. This was also meant to make the research process - how information was gathered, analysed and written up - as transparent as possible.

In qualitative methods literature, feminists have highlighted the potential ‘tyranny of participation’ (Cooke and Kothari 2001), arguing that the assumption that involving ‘those re-
searched' in different stages of research does not necessarily make for morally or ethically superior research nor the research experience more enabling for participants (also Holland et al 2010). Instead, researchers should critically assess the stages in which participation may matter the most (Nind 2011). In this research, certain participants seemed enthused to discuss the research outcomes during the closing event, and via email, as questions were raised and answered and new lines of inquiry emerged. Therefore, I agree with Holland et al (2008: 1) who argue that participation at different stages of research can make a central contribution, ‘providing an ethical, epistemological and political framework and in the potential for rich findings’. For me, this clearly highlights the messiness of doing (qualitative) research, with different stages of the research bleeding into, and informing, each other.

The closing event was intended to negotiate my leaving the field in a careful and respectful way, making sure that the disengagement of my ‘researcher self’ was openly and clearly communicated to participants. In theory, ‘leaving the field’ is often conceptualised as an introspective process, with the researcher transitioning from their ‘insider’ role back to being a community member (Labaree 2002). This conception is problematic because it implies that the perception of social reality of both ‘researcher’ and ‘researched’ is not transformed through the research. However, as new knowledge has been acquired during the study, social reality shifts and changes. Massey (2003: 76) adds that the spatio-temporal imaginary of ‘the field’ gives the false idea that the field is a bounded place (or places) ‘out there’, and that the researcher ‘back here’ (away from the world) can unproblematically step in and out of it. Thinking through positionality reveals the problems with such a conception, as participants often ‘continue to hold residual definitions of the “researcher” not just as a friend, colleague or peer group member but also as an investigator’ (Labaree 2002: 115). Instead, ‘the field’ is open, porous and always shifting with the ‘world’ continuing to talk back and reshape the research (Askins 2004).

Leaving the field, then, might be an impossible task. For me, the relations built during the research stretched beyond the research, informing analysis and writing up as well as my personal life, as I continue to use most of the research sites and attend some of the community groups. This highlights that fieldwork produces more than just data, narratives or notes to be analysed and represented, instead producing ‘sensibilities and dispositions’ that alter individuals and ‘orientate them differently towards others’ (Darling 2014: 211).

4.4.6 Shifting positionality(ies)

The contentious nature of ethnographic methodologies, including fieldwork and participant observation, and (individual/group) interviewing raises critical issues regarding positionality(ies), representation and power (Madison 2005; Jankie 2004; Naples and Sachs 2000). In geography, the work of feminist and other critical geographers has been crucial in re-
fecting upon the multiple positionalities of the researcher (Kobayashi 2003; Mohammad 2001; Skelton 2001), and the ways in which various identities may influence and shape research encounters, processes and outcomes (e.g. Hopkins 2007; Valentine 2002). I agree with Madison (2005: 7) that ‘positionality is vital because it forces us to acknowledge our own power, privilege, and biases just as we are denouncing the power structures that surround our subjects’. Although difficult to achieve (Rose 1997), consciously breaking down the relationships of power between researcher and researched and acknowledging the ‘conscious subjectivity’ of research (Arendell 1997; Cotterill and Letherby 1993) plays a key role in research process (Hopkins 2009). To recognise ‘our own positionality’ (Jackson 1993: 211), the ‘politics of position’ (Smith 1993: 305) and to examine this reflexively (Rose 1997), I describe my approach to acknowledge the choices I made as researcher that impacted the conduct of the research and this thesis.

I position myself as having been born and raised in Northern Germany, by a German mother and a Turkish father who migrated to Germany in the 1970s, and therefore as a Turkish/German female whose mother tongue is German, with only limited knowledge of Turkish, but who has become fluent in Dutch and English through her school life and migrations, moving to the Netherlands for study and more recently to Scotland in pursuit of a PhD. I often identify as ‘mixed-race’ to set myself apart from wider discourses that might read/construct me as ‘white’ or ‘passing as white’ in different contexts (cf. Ahmed 2004), to draw attention to my surroundings as to how I might experience situations differently due to my (intersecting) identities. Through this, I have become more reflexive about the complexity embedded in the term ‘intersectionality’; this has become even more pronounced throughout the journey of this thesis. Conducting ethnographic research ‘away from home’ is also critical, as my own immersion into everyday life in Glasgow has been unfolding alongside fieldwork and gaining access to the communities I wanted to study. Simultaneously, I have been doing research ‘at home’, since I looked into neighbourhoods and communities that form part of my everyday life, knowing most places of study beforehand; yet, becoming involved with communities and groups involved an active effort on my side.

This effort made me more aware of my shifting positionalities and identities of researcher, local resident, recent immigrant, ‘mixed-race’ and young woman. Before commencing the research, I had not considered all of these identities as points of connection and difference, and other positionalities and identities that were revealed, negotiated and managed in research encounters that became crucial in ‘alliance formation’ (Harvey 1996: 360). Yet, I was able to establish rapport with many people by drawing on shared experiences and attributes, and people often referred to points of (assumed) similarity and difference to discuss their experiences and opinions. Some of these un/intended positionings felt
awkward, and I often felt that I was negotiating positions of ‘betweenness’ (Nast 1994: 57), being (thought of as) both insider and outsider, that could feel emotionally challenging and draining (Nowicka and Ryan 2015). Coffey (1999: 40), amongst others, suggests that ethnographic investigation often requires ‘a level of rapport and sharing’, a framework of reciprocity, that is often emotional. Leitner (2012) adds that discussing encounters with difference and the specific forms in which ‘othering’ takes place is often imbued with strong emotions, individuals’ negotiating narratives through their positionality. This draws attention to the embodied and emotional nature of ‘othering’ and racialisation (Ahmed 2000, 2004; 3.4 and 6.3), and the un/conscious yet ‘fuzzy’ shifts between multiple positions of power and positionality (Tarrant 2014).

Positionality(ies) in terms of negotiating access and research relations are discussed elsewhere (e.g. Hopkins 2009); here, I focus on my own emotions and embodied reactions regarding others. Looking back at field notes, I realise that I, too, have often positioned people as ‘others’, that way participating in reproducing rather than unsettling stabilised orders that specifically construct non-white bodies and identities as ‘different’ (4.4.1). While done so unintentionally, my embodied responses of misrecognition and misperception can take away from the freedom of those bodies to ‘oscillate between different subject positions’ (Lobo 2014a: 724; also Hopkins et al 2017); yet, such oscillation between different identity positions is crucial to develop alternatives to racist relations (Hage 2012; kennedy-macfoy and Nielsen 2012). In the context of this thesis, such misrecognition might be productive to think through ‘stressful’ bodies and the surfacing of anger, shame and discomfort discussed by participants who identifying as black, non-white and/or Muslim (7.2), and my own fieldwork encounters as providing insight into how ‘cultural othering’ unfolds in everyday spaces and events through unintentional embodied acts (Lobo 2010).

4.5 Analysing the materials
Approaching research as a ‘journey’ (Askins 2004) entails appreciating that research ‘begins before materials are generated and continues through the contemplation of these materials’ (ibid: 97), including making sense of the materials generated and ‘gaps encountered’. As such, ordering materials involves power, as data remain part of ‘the field’ and ‘the world’ ‘continues to talk back and reshape materials’ (ibid: 98). For example, during fieldwork, the emerging, multiple and complex interactions between participants fed back into the re-shaping of research questions and alterations/additions to methodology. Yet, analysis inevitably places power into the hands of the researcher, as I dissected and ‘categorised’ opinions, stories and experiences discussed during interviews and focus groups (Appendix E), and lay out and captured initial findings and reflections in ways that made sense to me during the closing event (Appendix F). It is impossible to distance myself from this power, and I agree that it is critical to acknowledge it and ‘work on its nature and
distribution and [...] recognise the inequalities which will almost inevitably remain' (Massey 2003: 87).

Thinking through the silences in research, Haraway’s (1991) notion of partial and situated knowledges serves as a reminder that there is no one truth out there, as all knowledge remains partial and linked to the contexts in which it is created (also Moss 2002, 1995; Rose 1997; Gibson-Graham 1995). Positionality and power critically influence knowledge production processes (4.4.6). In this section, I therefore discuss how the empirical material was handled to avoid rendering me as the embodied, situated and subjective researcher invisible (Mauthner and Doucet 2003), and to grasp some of the politics of research beyond the borders of any temporally and spatially bound ‘fieldwork’. I used vignettes, interviews and focus groups to position the encounters described in this thesis in relation to broader spatial contexts and geopolitical articulations. I also used my body as an ‘instrument of research’ (Longhurst et al 2008) to make sense of what participants said and felt about an encounter; critically interrogating what different knowledges are produced through each, and to generate interpretations that challenge the notion of supremacy of any one kind of knowledge (Nightingale 2003).

Each method generated an extensive amount of field notes which I noted down in diaries, examples of which can be found in Figure 2 (4.4.1). It was crucial not to censor myself and record occurrences, conversations, feelings and reflections as they happened (Cook 2005), to make transparent my thought processes, challenges faced, the emotionality of experiences and considerations made to improve future research encounters. To negotiate and confront the biases/assumptions inherent in some of my field notes (4.4.1), I compared my observations and interpretations with the ways in which media covered issues around multiculturalism, difference and otherness in Glasgow, and wider Scotland, including newspapers and social media. Considering how these themes were constructed within and represented wider geographies of power was critical to contextualise the generated materials. I also used extracts from field notes in interviews and focus groups, to further ‘test’, compare and validate their significance with those of participants.

Interviewing and focus groups data were collected in the form of recordings and transcripts, all of which I did myself. I transcribed everything verbatim, also noting pauses, disturbances and people’s gestures if I could remember these; an example of a coded transcript can be found in Appendix E. While verbatim quotations might not always be in the interest of interviewees (Corden and Sainsbury 2006), I decided to give priority to reproducing people’s ‘voices’ as much as I could, putting words and interpretations that I have added in brackets to make changes more visible. I coded by hand in an open-ended style, using codes such as ‘home’, ‘diversity’ and ‘friends’ alongside more detailed phrases (Ap-
pendix z), and revisited some of this with people throughout and after fieldwork to follow-up on interpretations. To pull out articulations of Scottishness, I encouraged people to describe their identities as geographically and relationally constituted, for example, discussing people’s networks, their biographies and their identities not as static in Glasgow but in relation with other parts of the world.

In the context of this thesis, giving verbatim representations of ‘how’ something is being said was central to illustrate pertinent points and issues raised by participants, to establish reliability and validity (Spencer et al 2003), and to give more depth to codes and themes. However, the selection of quotes always entails issues regarding whose voices are being heard and whose may be silenced. While writing up, I attempted to strike a balance between the themes and topics most talked about by participants – reflecting the issues deemed significant by people – and minority experiences regarding opinions and issues that might have felt more uncomfortable to talk about, including experiences of racism and racialization (7.2), yet are central in understanding how everyday life unfolds differently for different people in Glasgow. As such, quoting is also about the authority of the academic voice, and I agree with McDowell (1997: 393) who suggests that, while it is critical to remain close to people’s voices, researchers have to take into account their ‘own voice and reactions’ and ‘recognising what is on the tapes as a single story, albeit interpreted within wider contexts’.

During the writing up process, I stayed close to the data to avoid abstractions (Ritchie et al 2003), and triangulated across the different methods to generate firmer interpretations. Triangulating or drawing on these different perspectives or sources in the course of my work was crucial to ‘try and maximise [my] understanding of a research question’ (Valentine 2005: 112) and to examine power relations and social processes inherent in the geographical patterns I wished to study (Longhurst 2016), such as some of the biases/assumptions in my field notes (4.4.1). As I progressed slowly from largely descriptive versions, in which I mainly relied on people’s ‘voices’ to more analytically and theoretically informed chapters, these earlier triangulations and drafts were a critical basis to test the validity of the final context of the current chapters.

4.6 Conclusion
The methodological approach of this research was designed to explore the diverse ways in which people encounter others in a variety of everyday spaces in Glasgow, highlighting the emotional, embodied and relational side of many multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters. When researching encounters with/across difference, I have supported the position that it is critical to recognize the centrality of bodies in research and the significance of embodied knowledge, to make sense of articulations of place, identity and belonging.
Central here, I have suggested, is that such an approach conceptualizes research as deeply ‘emotional work’, that involves researchers and participants, and their bodies, as emotions, gestures and bodily affects emerge, grow and recede throughout research. I have shown that it also shifts attention to the materialities of (doing) research, and foregrounds the centrality of research that explores ‘real’, material bodies that occupy ‘real’ spaces and places (cf. Longhurst and Johnston 2014).

Accordingly, I have argued that it is crucial to align the concept work and methodological approach of this thesis to research and understand spaces of encounter as central in the production of knowledge(s). The selected qualitative methods included hanging out and participating in various community groups, individual interviews, focus groups and a closing event. Importantly, I have stated that this mix of methods enabled participants whose identities are othered and constructed as strange and ‘out of place’, and sometimes as ‘dangerous’ and ‘threatening’, to speak back and become involved in this research, in various forms and at different stages, if they wished to. I have also further drawn out the significance of ‘grounding’ research in particular contexts and localities in Glasgow, suggesting that holding central the specific local, regional and national geographies of the informal spaces of encounter under study enabled me to explore constructions of self, other and processes of inclusion and exclusion more extensively and intensively. Critically, I have emphasised the experiences, stories and knowledge(s) shared and/or produced at the various community groups I attended as ‘views from somewhere’ (after Haraway 1988), crucial to explore how notions of identity, belonging and community are (re)produced through these specific informal spaces of encounter.

Moreover, taking seriously the different ways in which histories and geographies combine and shape everyday life in different ways for different people, I have attempted to carefully think through issues of power endemic in this research. I have suggested that accepting methodological practices and social realties as always co-constructed, and in that uncontrollable and unpredictable, entails viewing research more as a ‘journey’ (after Askins 2004) that is often messy, changing and fluid, responding to encounters and experiences in the field. As such, I have reflected on my changing and shifting positionalities and identities, and those of participants, with our bodies emerging as crucial sites of encounter, power and knowledge production. This is an important theme that links into the empirical work discussed in the following three chapters, unpicking the various ways in which (dominant) notions of power are (re)produced, challenged and subverted through spaces of encounter, processes of identity formation and belonging in Glasgow.
Women from diverse backgrounds are sitting dispersed throughout a room. They are talking, drinking tea and exchanging gossip. The atmosphere is relaxed and sociable with loud talking and laughter echoing off the walls. There is constant movement with women getting up, preparing cups of tea and food and walking around in smaller groups. To me, their interactions feel chaotic, lively, and full of sympathy. The easy and relaxed atmosphere changes as I notice a man, white, maybe in his late 30s, standing by the door. He appears to be a delivery man and hesitant to enter the room. I observe one of the volunteers, a white woman in her mid-20s, walking over to greet him. After exchanging a few words, she turns around, re-enters the room and announces in a loud and clear voice ‘Ladies, listen! A man is entering the room for a moment now!’ Around me, conversations stop, silence falls, and after the volunteer’s words have been interpreted into Arab, Farsi and other languages, most women quickly cover their hair with scarves, those already wearing one tuck it tight around their faces, and many avert their gaze and speak in hushed voices. Upon a wave by the volunteer, the delivery man quickly enters, delivers the parcel and leaves the room again. The moment we hear the door fall shut, the women loosen their headscarves and resume their activities. I wonder at this seamless and quick transition in atmosphere and behaviour. As if somebody has pressed a reset-button, hushed and subdued a moment ago, it reverts back to the cheerful mood from before.

[Extract field notes, October 2016]

5.1 Introduction

This chapter opens with an ethnographic moment as a reminder to position the encounters discussed in this thesis to wider relational contexts and particular dynamics of broader conjunctures that shape the terms on which these encounters are experienced and articulated (Featherstone 2017). One relevant context is that the vote for Brexit in 2016 and the Scottish referendum debate since 2014 prompted a renewed engagement with the lines of inclusion and exclusion drawn by ‘Scottishness’, scales of belonging in contemporary Scotland, and the sense of ownership over Scotland and claim-making on Scottish identities by ethnic minorities (Botterill et al 2016; Featherstone et al 2016; Meer 2015). As I show throughout this thesis, however, these formal political debates emerged as less central concerns for participants, with few articulating their sense of belonging and place in Glasgow explicitly in such terms or norms. In this chapter, I suggest that engaging with work on everyday geographies of encounter does draw attention to how politics and histories both shape everyday spaces where people mix, mingle and ‘rub along’ with others in
Glasgow, and wider Scottish society, and how these processes are negotiated, produced and contested through such ‘placed’ encounters.

This moment is also one of many research encounters which speak to intersectionality, and prompt thinking about the ways people live together and negotiate diversity on a daily basis in Glasgow. The opening vignette indicates some of these dynamics, suggesting that, while the women’s group seems to enable the women to negotiate their differing ethnic, cultural, religious and age intersections in an easy/at ease and progressive manner, intersections between gender and ethnicity and interrelated issues of religion, tradition and ideology come to the fore as the delivery man arrives, this encounter temporarily disrupting the women’s connections. This is an important realization, intersectionality in the above situation signalling that the women are positioned differently in the same general context (cf. Hill Collins and Bilge 2016) with regards to the delivery man, and the volunteer, and not experiencing social situations/activities in the same way (also 5.2.1).

Intersectionality thus emerged as a central concept in this research, since it ‘recognizes the multiple axes of social structural difference [...] and the ways in which these differences combine to advantage or disadvantage individuals and groups in different situations’ (Falconer Al-Hindi 2016: 3827). I suggest that intersectionality’s focus on the diverse ways in which social context and injustice combine and work together to disadvantage and render particular people and identities more vulnerable than others is critical since it ‘sheds light on the differences within groups such as women’ (ibid.: 3828) and clearly highlights ‘how crucial it is to ground intersectional analyses in histories and geographies’. Space and place matter as diverse elements and trajectories ‘come together to foster a particular “here and now”’ (Anderson 2008: 232; also 3.2). As such, ‘grounding’ intersectionality in particular spaces and places can be a powerful analytical lens when examining processes and practices of encounter, the contested making and re-making of identities, and how people traverse different spaces and places of the everyday.

By discussing encounters experienced in a range of semi-formal spaces including public libraries, local cafes and community centres in the North and West of Glasgow, this chapter examines the multiple ways in which people encounter others across ethnicity, age, gender, religion, and class. The first section links these intersectional encounters to a desire for inclusive meeting spaces, and I suggest that emerging forms of mundane micro connection indicate everyday spaces being critical sites both for the ‘being together’ and ‘the bringing together’ (Neal et al 2015) of diverse individuals and groups in Glasgow. I then discuss how these interconnections allow people to carve out an individual sense of comfort and belonging in the city that strongly relates to the intersection of ethnicity and gender, and these encounters being simultaneously marked by moments of tension, un-
easiness and misunderstanding, with language of particular attention. In the final section, I show that, despite these tensions, connections and relations are built, as being involved with others feeds into feelings of belonging and community; the embodied and political dimensions of which are more thoroughly discussed in Chapters 6 and 7.

5.2 Mixed space and moments of intersectional micro connection

Everyday encounters with/across difference and the physical proximities of people of diverse social, cultural and ethnic backgrounds embody contemporary city life. Exploring progressive potentials of city life and urban interactions thus becomes a vital task, particularly given that wider public and more formal political representations increasingly depict ‘urban socialities as disintegrating and disintegrative’ (Matejskova and Leitner 2011: 721) and cities as sites of conflict, incivility, isolation and estrangement. In this section, I analyse moments of intersectional encounter in everyday spaces of ‘throwntogetherness’ (Massey 2005) and relationality, foregrounding their potential for social affinities and ‘connective interdependencies’ (Neal et al 2018: 152) to develop between differently situated individuals and groups in Glasgow, and wider Scottish society. The opening vignette gives a sense of the dynamics of emergent connections, relationships and identifications at a multicultural women’s group in Maryhill, emphasising space(s) as ‘an open and ongoing production’ (Massey 2005: 90), always dynamic, porous and continually under construction (2.2). It also indicates the micro politics of intersectional encounters and connection making, particularly how they relate to city life across the rest of Glasgow; this is an important theme picked up throughout this thesis, and more thoroughly discussed in 5.4 in this chapter.

Turning to specific moments of multicultural encounter, and the significance of informal meeting spaces in Glasgow, then, the majority of participants agreed that public spaces which they considered ‘multicultural’, ‘mixed’ and ‘shared’ are critical social settings that facilitate connections and relationships, of differing depth and duration, to emerge between individuals. Tracing these micro connections, I show the value many participants attributed to both fleeting and repetitive encounters in mundane spaces, these encounters being experienced as valuable in their own right, and I highlight the ‘quiet’ politics of intersectional micro connections, participants discussing their potential to develop/entrench a sense of belonging and embeddedness that stretches beyond the immediate localities of mundane (physical) places (5.4). In this research, the majority of participants agreed that fleeting and superficial encounters are a positive thing, participants from non-Scottish backgrounds and those relatively new to Glasgow attributing value to fleeting encounters in particular:
"[The barista] barista knows my name but we are not friends or anything…I have met most of the staff [of cafe B] at some point [Laughs]…but yeah, I like that [the barista] recognises me, it’s nice [Smiles] […] When I enter [cafe B], [the staff] will smile at me, I will say ‘good morning’ to them, or I might speak to people waiting in the queue…it feels natural to do that, to have these small interactions. I love it actually [because] it reminds me of home. When I am in Egypt, I have those small interactions with people, so having them [in cafe B] makes me feel more at home in Glasgow.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student)

This quote goes to the ‘quiet’ politics of fleeting encounters and micro connections (5.4); here, it serves to illustrate that participants frequently valued fleeting and superficial encounters including smiling, small chats and the exchange of greetings, as valuable and meaningful in their own right, contributing to a sense of conviviality and peaceful living together in public spaces (Peterson 2017). Other participants echo that the value of fleeting encounters lies precisely in their temporary and passing nature, one participant suggesting that “it’s nice to smile at other people, and them smiling at you [because] positive energy comes to you naturally” (Young woman, East-Asian/German, born in Turkmenistan, new migrant, working), and another participant remarking that “although [interactions at the library] are transient, like, you don’t develop lasting friendships […] in that moment, it’s still nice to have those interactions” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working). ‘Niceness’ and ‘positivity’, in these quotes, may speak to the affective dimension of everyday life where encounters contribute to a low-level sociability that produces inclusive public spaces (Lobo 2013) and navigates multiculturalism and diversity in ‘unpanicked’ ways (Noble 2009a). Indeed, the value of ‘the fleeting’ is the focus of a growing body of research that argues direct interaction as not necessarily a premise to feel connected to others (Blokland and Nast 2014), but enabling some sense of comfort with the increasing diversity that marks much of modern urban life (Peterson 2017), processes of recognition and their political dimensions being revisited in Chapter 7.

While the value of fleeting encounters was emphasised across the research, participants from non-white and/or non-Scottish heritages, in particular, indicated their wider socio-political effects/implications:

“…all kinds of different people come together [at the library]. Men and women, people of different colours, cultures, you know? […] I don’t really talk to other people when I am here [but] sometimes I look at somebody, I smile or nod [my head]. I like that; it’s nice, friendly. And everybody does it. So, yeah, [this diversity and these interactions] make me feel less conscious about myself. I don’t worry about
This participant emphasises the value of ‘mixed’ space, and that the close proximity to others in mixed spaces, without explicit interaction, can be enough to spark processes of identification and connection-building. For this participant, it seems that superficial recurring encounters and the ethnic and cultural diversity of the library enable her to identify with other library users in transient ways (Fincher and Iveson 2008), that way feeling ‘in-place’, relaxed and comfortable at the library. Critically, I suggest, micro identifications made in local spaces can also feed into a sense of comfort and ease at wider city level, and foster belonging that connects through and across different scales (Wood and Waite 2011; see below). This quote also indicates the politics of mixed space (7.4.1) in which multiculture and ethnic, cultural and religious diversity are ‘commonplace’ (Wessendorf 2014a), allowing many of the intersectional micro connections described in this thesis to emerge in the first place.

The potential of fleeting encounters to spark processes of micro identification and recognition, that way fostering a sense of belonging in Glaswegian communities and wider Scottish society (5.4), was also discussed regarding informal interactions at local cafes:

“although [people at café B] don't ask ‘What are you doing tonight?’ or ‘How are you?’, people will often smile at me or look me in the eyes […] these small and superficial interactions are important to me; they mean something in my day and in my life. […] [These interactions] mean that people see me, like, they see me sitting there, in this cafe, but they also see me as a person […] [who] maybe lives in [Woodlands]. So they want to be friendly. […] A moment like that can be really important to feel that [Glasgow] is your ‘home’ [and that] other people think so, too.”

(Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student)

This quote suggests that fleeting encounters experienced at cafe B evoke in this participant a sense of ‘being seen’, resonating Noble’s (2009) conception of the term ‘recognition as’, a process in which the act of looking can construct and recognise individuals as legitimate and competent actors in a specific situation, context or event (also 7.2). In the above situation, for example, the fleeting encounters at cafe B seem to make this participant feel that she is considered to have a legitimate presence in the café. It also suggests that she is recognised as part of the culturally and ethnically-diverse populations and student communities living in Woodlands. Similarly, another participant argued that the owner of a local cafe in Maryhill recognises her by name which “makes me feel that I am part of the place […] that people know me and that I have a kind of connection with them”
(Young woman, black, born in Eritrea, asylum seeker), supporting that everyday forms of recognition in the form of, for example, referring to somebody by name contribute to a sense of belonging in wider Maryhill, and the neighbourhood's changing cultural and ethnic make-up – Maryhill being among the main dispersal areas of newly arriving refugees and asylum seekers in Glasgow (Wiseman 2017a: 4.3.2).

What is at stake here is that the small acts of recognition described by both participants seem to more thoroughly capture the ‘fullness of their humanity’ (Noble 2009: 888, original emphasis), in so far as both women may be recognised for their competencies, accomplishments as well as their social identities. As such, their sense of being recognised/known/seen in both cafes speaks to the politics of acknowledgement (cf. Markell 2003), situated belonging and comfort, which this thesis finds to often bleed out beyond the immediate moment/situation of encounter and locality of, for example, the cafe (5.4). It also indicates that the possibility of contact with difference and the ‘light touch rubbing along’ (Wise and Velayutham 2009) in the semi-formal spaces described in this thesis is vital for micro connections to emerge that make ‘us possible to exist in and move across complex societies’ (Noble 2009: 888).

Furthermore, groups which specifically focus on age, ethnicity or gender emerged as critical settings that enable people easily identify something that they share with and can connect through to others. Examples included (multicultural) men and women groups, a Syrian group, and a Pakistani women’s group. Many participants emphasised that encounters experienced at groups meeting at public libraries and community centres were more repetitive and structured, allowing more prolonged and deeper relations to emerge between group members:

“I know a lot of the woman [attending the multicultural women’s group] very well [because] they come every week. […] We will have a chat and drink tea or coffee, just socialise. […] step by step, I started to like these women [and] we became friends.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer)

This participant went on to discuss the regularity of contact and encounters experienced around the activities at the women’s group set out in the opening vignette of this chapter, where informal practices of talking, drinking tea and socialising, and their shared identity of ‘being woman’, enables the women to explore their similarities and differences. While differences continue to exist and shape individual experiences of living in Glasgow, I suggest that these women simultaneously form new and shared identities around common interests and passions, and successfully build relationships across difference. Similarly, participants who were relatively new to Glasgow and/or had limited social networks found
groups that clearly focus on ethnicity and gender helpful in connecting to particular groups in Glaswegian society integral to their social lives:

“In the beginning, it was important for me to get into contact with the Arab community [in Glasgow] because [...] people from my country or other Arab countries will have the same culture [and] language as me. So, I started coming to the women’s group because my [Arab] friend told me about it.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Jordan, new migrant, stay-at-home mother)

This participant explains that attending the above multicultural women’s group helped her to connect with other women of Arab heritage living in Glasgow. As such, emergent intersectional micro connections relate to an individual sense of belonging and comfort in the city, something frequently linked to spaces that allow specific identities ‘more in line’ with how participants thought about themselves to become accentuated (also 5.3). This research evidences that spaces specifically enabling women who are otherwise very differently situated – the women’s group set out in the opening of this chapter, for example, attracts women of different ages, ethnic and cultural backgrounds and social classes – to come together, was found to allow many to relax and open up (5.2.1); such micro spaces of association being found to be particularly relevant for non-white Muslim women to alleviate and mediate some of the stress experienced and associated around their intersecting identities (7.2).

Central here is that in group situations which are clearly structured around ethnicity, gender, or religion, people still seem to find connections to move beyond these identities. In the women’s group, for example, members experience encounters around ‘being a woman’ which, in turn, open up possibilities to identify other commonalities, and differences, such as “being a friend, a girlfriend, a mother [and] a sister” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer). These identifications might more adequately capture how people think about themselves, the ontological condition of one’s being, and represent ‘forms of selfhood’ (Noble 2009: 889) that, while embedded within specific places and temporalities, may (re)configure social interactions, identities and relations beyond the group setting of, for example, the multicultural women’s group (Nayak 2003; also 5.4). Participants who frequently felt ‘othered’ by Western media and public discourse attributed particular importance to (establishing) these identifications:

“In the men’s group, […] I remember we talked about ‘strong men’. The question was ‘Who is your motivation in life?’ like, which men are you looking up to. […] [It was] really interesting to hear what everybody had to say.” (Middle-aged man, black, born in Eritrea, refugee, volunteer)
While ‘being a man’ acts as an initial point of relation, this participant suggests that members realise new points of commonality, and difference, such as personal histories and life experiences. For many, discovering and sharing identities around passions, opinions, lifestyles and experiences, e.g. knitting, gardening, playing golf and going to the gym, were the more important and ‘human’ characteristics of people, which speaks to belonging (5.4) and politics (7.4). Similar to the fleeting encounters discussed earlier, this participant indicates that more prolonged and structured encounters, emerging in informal group spaces, are thus quietly political (after Askins 2015): people configure identities and relations beyond ethnicity, gender or ‘race’ and bond over diverse aspects of their complex and intersectional identities; some of these micro connections and relationships being taken beyond the group space (5.4). Indeed, across the research, participants othered by dominant media and public discourse agreed that being involved with others helped them to feel connected to and embedded within local Glaswegian communities (6.4).

5.2.1 Negotiating intersections of gender

As indicated above, this research argues that gender often plays a central role in structuring moments of intercultural and interethnic encounter. Female participants agreed that groups organised around ‘traditional’ gender identities facilitate a greater variety of connections and relations to emerge between individuals, often linking this to the intersection of gender and feelings of intimacy and safety:

“Possibly [the knitting group] feels safer [without men because] you can talk about more personal issues. […] If men are around, conversations are more superficial. […] Perhaps you joke with them but nothing really…when I was alone with the women of my family, then we would talk about stuff. […] That’s the way I was brought up. […] Men don’t sit around and talk.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working)

This quote speaks to histories, experiences and identities being lived through and played out on the body, placing it ‘in situation’ with ‘memories, associations, histories and experiences [from the past] contributing to [the orientation] of bodies in the present’ (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014: 1982). As such, patriarchal discourses constructed throughout Western history continue to shape women’s behaviour and, for this participant, are accompanied by feelings of unease and uncertainty. I suggest that such discourses are normative, limiting women’s agency in mixed spaces (Ahmed 2007). Although this potentially reinforces assumptions regarding gender performances and behaviour in Western society (Valentine et al 2014), it does highlight how historically constructed stereotypes continue to shape spaces of relation (Featherstone 2017); something particularly felt by women. In this research, this was experienced even more so by women of non-white and/or non-
Western heritage who reflected in greater detail on societal norms that structure women’s behaviour and limit agency in other, non-Western societies:

“I think it makes a difference that [the women’s group] is women only. [...] In our culture at least, you can laugh, you can take off your scarf, you can do whatever you want. If men are around, you have to sit quietly. [...] But at the café [where I volunteer] this doesn’t matter! We are all kinds of different people there, so I don’t care.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer)

This participant links feelings of safety and comfort to the intersection of gender, religion, and culture while discussing behaviours and identity ‘roles’ that are produced through such intersecting identities and spaces as evidenced in the shifting atmosphere and behaviour of the women’s group in Maryhill at the beginning of this chapter. As such, gender and ethnicity further intersect with religion, tradition and ideology, rendering these women more vulnerable and/or disadvantaged than others in mixed spaces. Keeping these intersections central is crucial to ‘shed light on the differences within groups such as women’ (Falconer Al-Hindi 2016: 3828). Research observing intersections between gender and ethnicity and interrelated issues of religion, tradition or ideology highlight the importance of this finding, warning that ignoring these intersections would assume that all people experience social activities the same way (Winiarska et al 2016); something which is clearly not the case in the quote above. Interestingly, this participant also touches upon spaces that are not organized along traditional gender lines – the community café where she volunteers in Glasgow’ city centre – but which are arguably dominated by (cultural and ethnic) diversity, something which might play a role in softening cultural differences and interrelated behavioural expectations for women in particular spaces of the everyday.

So far, I have suggested that both fleeting and more prolonged encounters are valued by participants in their own right, and that informal spaces where multiculture and diversity are perceived to be ‘commonplace’ (Wessendorf 2014a) alongside groups specifically structured around ethnicity, gender and/or religion enable people to forge micro connections and relations across their often complex and intersectional identities. Yet, while possibilities for connection are evident in everyday ‘zones of encounter’ (cf. Wood and Landry 2008) in Scottish society, it is critical to approach these spaces as also always full of tension.

5.3. Performing identities and moments of intersectional tension
This research argues that spaces of encounter are often ‘messy, disorderly, and noisy’ (Askins and Pain 2011) which open up possibilities to express different aspects of often multi-layered and complex identities (Peterson forthcoming). Such potential for micro con-
nection building (5.2) is in tension with the finding that, for participants, many of these encounters were also marked by moments of tension, uneasiness and misunderstanding. When discussing everyday encounters with difference, participants emphasised particular (intersecting) identities being experienced as more stressful than others, with particularly non-white, non-Scottish, and/or Muslim women experiencing their identities, and intersections, as burdensome across informal spaces in Glasgow:

“I stand out all the time! When I was wearing the headscarf, wherever I went [in Glasgow] people looked at me! For example, I was the only girl in my research group [and] whenever I went to meetings of other research groups, [...] everyone looked at me. [...] and of course you don’t feel comfortable being looked at all the time. You’re like under pressure.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student)

While this participant talks about moments that resulted in her decision to take off the headscarf, she emphasises the increase of unease, doubt, and irritation around her wearing the headscarf as an indication of her Muslim faith to others since having moved to Glasgow, a city which she perceived as a Northern European and ‘Western’ place where “the headscarf has no history” (ibid.) – referring to the hijab as a point of Islamic significance (Siraj 2011) that distinguishes it from more commonplace veils in Scottish history (e.g. those worn by working-class women). As this participant later explains, her constructed otherness around her intersecting identities of a non-white, educated and Muslim woman becomes particularly pronounced and reproduced in her predominantly white and male working environment, and on the streets of Glasgow’s West End, which is generally quite a white Scottish space, albeit a middle class one. Importantly, this draws attention to many public and work spaces in Glasgow being/remaining heavily gendered, classed and/or ‘raced’. Other non-white Muslim women in this research echo that ‘Muslimness’, and its intersection with ethnicity and gender, is often constructed and experienced as different and ‘out-of-place’ in Glasgow, moments of tension and uneasiness often shaping their interactions with others in public spaces. Many of these women linked this in implicit ways to specific aspects of their identities become accentuated, and suppressed, in different everyday settings:

“At the café [where I volunteer] […] was the first time [in Glasgow] that I felt like ‘Nobody cares that I am Egyptian! Nobody cares if I don't speak [English] properly! Nobody cares if I am Muslim!’ […] Everybody is different! The only common thing between us is that we are all lonely and looking for friends. […] It is really me there [who] […] people interact with [and] she is really funny and crazy!” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer)
This participant gives a sense of the formal political context in Glasgow doing and undoing particular identities to her (also 5.4), simultaneously sensing their effects lessening in the context of the community café, located in the city centre of Glasgow. This space allows her to shed the stress associated with particular identities, and their intersections, constructed as ethnic and culturally ‘different’ by broader political conjunctures, instead relaxing and enacting a sense of being herself. Indeed, the above quote highlights how identities are rooted in specific historical, temporal and spatial contexts, and their power over specific bodies in Glasgow, with mixed spaces allowing the same individuals to enact a sense of identity that is a ‘doing rather than a being’ (Butler 1990; also 6.2). The quote also implies that individuals are actively involved in producing their own lives, seeking out particular spaces that allow specific identities to be 'performed', through/with agency (Chapter 7). Similarly, participants who identified as black experienced heightened levels of stress accompanying the intersection of their skin colour and Scottishness in everyday situations:

“I was on holiday and one of my friends had an accident [and] this [white] English guy asked ‘Where are you from?’ [...] We said ‘Scotland’ – my friend is black Scottish, too – [and] the guy was like ‘What happened to your friend?’ and we said ‘He had a jet-ski accident’ [...] and he said ‘Look at them black Scottish and on jet-skis!’ [...] It was a joke […] [but] why did he have to say that?” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This goes to dominant constructions of ‘Scottishness’ and Scotland as ‘white’ (7.3) and emphasises that the intersection of black and Scottish can be reacted to through feelings of disbelief, irritation, imitation, insecurity, and humour. These feelings clearly sit at odds with how this participant thinks about himself, considering himself ‘British’ and offering to describe his identity as ‘Afro-Scot’ and ‘Eri-Scot’ to include the emotional connections he feels to both Scotland and Eritrea, emotions being central to developing belonging (Chapter 6). The quote further draws attention to the stress experienced at having certain intersecting identities challenged and humoured that, to this participant, feel natural and integral in the Scottish context.

While the research evidences intersectional tensions shaping many multicultural encounters in Glasgow, there also seemed to be a tendency among participants to describe each other using essentialist and categorizing language. This language was often formulated in terms of perceived differences and similarities in ethnic, national, cultural, and religious backgrounds and heritages, including phrases such as ‘being white/black/mixed’, ‘being Arab/Scottish/Australian’, ‘being Middle-Eastern/European/Asian’, and ‘being Muslim’. 
Paradoxically, while adhering to such language, particularly non-white and/or non-Scottish participants voiced their irritation and anger at such essentialist thinking:

P18: “I grew up in Australia but because I don’t look ‘white’, people would ask me where I am from. I say ‘from Melbourne’ but they will say ‘But before that?’ […] People will push and push until you give away your ethnic or cultural background.”

P19 [Addressing P18]: “I think people ask you where your parents are from because they want to know if their story is similar to yours. […] [Addresses the group] But why does it matter?”

(Focus group 2)

This group discussed encounters experienced in various informal settings in Glasgow’s West End and city centre, including the library in Partick, work environments, supermarkets and local cafes, that made them feel othered and estranged from wider Scottish society. Their exchange highlights intersecting identities not always being done or experienced in untroubled ways (cf. Valentine 2007) and that established identifications are not stable but open to disruption. The arrival of the delivery man at the multicultural women’s group in the opening vignette highlights this, with the women’s shared identities being temporarily broken but resumed and re-created after his departure. Tensions and disconnections thus also accompany encounters with/across difference, as shared and newly found identifications shift and change, and are disrupted. Importantly, this emphasises the fragile and dynamic nature of identity(ies) and space(s). It also underscores Pratt’s (1991) observation that everyday spaces are messy ‘contact zones’, holding the potential for connection and understanding as well as for tension and misunderstanding. This is particularly relevant to encounters of language diversity, discussed in the following section.

Moreover, I argue that Koefoed and Simonsen’s (2012: 630) figure of the ‘internal stranger’ helps to make sense of the exclusionary effects and the ‘slow’ violence (cf. Nixon 2011) of routine ways of talking touched upon by participant 18: individuals who are constructed as ‘strangers’ often get asked ‘where are you from?’, and are ‘expected to give an answer than can explain what is “suspicious” about them’. I suggest that this can effectively limit their possibilities for identification with, and recognition of their (intersecting) ethnic and cultural identities as part of wider national imaginaries of Scottish community and nationhood (7.2). Central here is that ‘common’ language exchanges such as the ones implied by participant 18 may thus evidence a banal orientalization and habitual internal racialisation (cf. Haldrup et al 2008; Said 1995) within wider Scottish society that is reproduced and constructed as ‘normal’ through informal encounters in Glasgow, where
‘small, unnoticed words naturally appearing in ordinary speech’ (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012: 630) force people to think in us/them dichotomies, and can work to exclude and identify individuals with specific ethnic and cultural (intersecting) identities as an outsider ‘who does not know the codes and stands outside the (Scottish) imagined community’.

5.3.1 Negotiating intersections of language

In groups that were described as ‘mixed’ or ‘diverse’ by participants, language differences were sometimes expressed as barring or complicating encounters:

“Language was sometimes a problem. I was cooking together with this woman, she was Asian, [and] she didn't understand that I couldn't have the fish. [...] I was pushing the fish away but she kept pushing it towards me; I just kept saying ‘No!’ and waving my hands at her [and] shaking my head. [...] she finally got the idea [Laughs] I felt a bit awkward but we were both laughing [...] in the end, we still got things done.” (Young woman, white, born in Scotland, stay-at-home mother)

This participant illustrates how language differences complicated an encounter of cooking together at community centre B in Maryhill, and implies the role of materials (6.4) and gestures (6.2) in mediating multicultural encounters. In this research, particularly differences in English fluency created moments of stress, insecurity, and misunderstanding, with some participants whose first language was not English remarking “When I first came to Scotland, I could speak English but I didn't have the confidence to speak [...] that made me feel really scared.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer). However, moments of uneasiness and misunderstanding were also often bridged and overcome in multiple ways. Here, I pay attention to the pro-cess of (re)interpreting, while embodied ‘doings’ of language are discussed in 6.2:

“We will often talk like this, in a third party [Laughs]. I speak to Y in our language and he will translate to W in his language and then it comes back via Y to me and I can say it in English!” [Everybody laughs after this was interpreted back and forth]

(Comment made in focus group 3)

This focus group discussed different activities they attend at a local community centre and their strategies for communicating with each other. The group agreed that English was their chosen language of communication and acted as a linguistic ‘common ground’. The quote further highlights linguistic encounters across difference often being marked by spontaneity and improvisation, with people manoeuvring and taking advantage of diverse languages to identify a common level of communication. The situation at the multicultural women’s group set out in the opening of this chapter illustrates this, with the volunteers’
words content being related in multiple languages to other group members. The research also evidences that many encounters with language diversity were often eased with laughter and joking, something alluded to in the quote regarding a cooking encounter at community centre B (6.2.1). Other research supports this finding such as Bennett et al’s (2016) analysis of humour featuring in negotiating highly diverse college settings and Wiseman’s (2017a) account of young refugees’ use of banter and jokes to establish connections with each other. Drawing on this work, I suggest that the intersecting of multiple languages and differing degrees of English fluency might mitigate some of the stress and anxiety expressed by participants around their ability to speak ‘proper’ English in an English-speaking nation. That way, participants’ innovative and creative use of language(s) might also feed into notions of community and belonging across different sites and scales.

Moving on, I emphasise ‘community’ and belonging emerging at the multi-scaling of relations, with the micro connections and relations previously described often bleeding out beyond the immediate moment and specific site of encounter.

5.4 Intersecting identities, belonging and ‘community’
I have so far argued that possibilities for connection, though contested, are evident in everyday ‘zones of encounter’ (cf. Wood and Landry 2008) in Scottish society. In this section, I highlight performed and embodied senses of belonging to discuss the transformative potential of encounters experienced in informal spaces of association and relation-building, where people can tap into an ‘open sense of belonging’ (Diprose 2008) that is centred around building community and connectedness with others in Glasgow. The notion of embodied encounters is extended in the following chapters. Here, I suggest that, since encounters are always inter-scaled and relationally constituted (2.2), micro connections and relationships forged through ‘placed’ encounters can feed into a multi-scalar and inter-scaled sense of belonging in local neighbourhoods, Glasgow at city level, and wider Scottish society.

The quiet politics of such micro connections and relations (after Askins 2015) particularly surfaced regarding the ways in which many participants understood and articulated notions of community. ‘Community’ emerged in this research as the “being able to bump into people [and] witnessing those interactions” (Young man, white, born in Scotland, working). This quote underscores ‘community’ as an inter-scaled and relational set of practices and experiences where ‘repeated fluid encounters’ and ‘durable engagements’ (Blokland 2017: 66) create a sense of ‘public familiarity’ (Blokland and Nast 2014) with people as ‘others’ in public spaces and local neighbourhoods in Glasgow (also Botterill 2018). I contend that, particularly, brief and recurring encounters are vital for enabling people to ‘socially place others’, to recognise them, to ‘form narratives of place’ and to ‘induce a sense
of community’ (Blokland 2017: 126-132), that way (re)creating a sense of belonging in wider Glasgow, and experiencing community in local places.

I suggest that this complicates arguments in encounter literature disputing the transformative potential of banal and temporary encounters to shift wider societal attitudes, behaviours and stereotypes (e.g. Valentine and Sadgrove 2014; Amin 2012). If taking seriously that politics, in their broader sense, are the making of relationships between people (Askins 2015), then many of the fleeting encounters discussed in this thesis may very well have wider societal impacts, since they often shift ‘how we see and how we feel about our others’ (Askins 2015: 473; see below); the ‘transformative politics of encounter’ (Askins 2008) thus precisely lying in their small-ness and local nature, as transient micro connections and relations of similarity and difference can build up, affect socially constructed difference and remake society at local level in Glasgow.

The micro connections and relations made in community groups structured around (intersecting) identities of ethnicity, gender and/or religion (5.3) also often bled out beyond the immediate moment and/or situation of encounter. Many of the women attending the multicultural women’s group set out in opening vignette, for example, started seeing each other outside of the group, with members explaining “we sometimes walk to the centre or go to the park” and “I will call them or see them at their house”. Both quotes suggest that the women embody their sense of security, intimacy and belonging (5.3.1), incorporate this sense into daily routines and activities, and expand it across the neighbourhood and city. Central here is that their encounters seem to accumulate in and be felt through and on the bodies of these women (also 6.4), their embodied experiences being taken beyond the group space. I suggest that this enables many non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim women to inhabit the city (Lobo 2013; also 7.4), and shows how belonging is always political (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012; Caluya 2011). Regarding connections and relations found through community groups, one member of the gardening club at community centre A noted that “I am now friends with a woman [who] lives on my street; we now say ‘hello’ in the supermarket and […] one time I had tea at her house” (Focus group 3; P9). ‘Friendship’ here may work as recognition of communal belonging (Bowlby 2011), enacted through/in informal spatial practices at the gardening club, as this participant’s embodied experience of place and ‘co-presence’ extends beyond community centre A into wider Maryhill; this sense potentially challenging wider discourses of difference and exclusion in Glasgow (cf. Askins 2015).

Moreover, this research evidences that, while participants from non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim backgrounds frequently experienced particular intersections of these identities as more stressful than others (5.3 and 7.2), some participants opposed such views,
arguing that everyday situations which feel discriminatory might be related to differences in cultural behaviour rather than their identity of, for example, 'being Muslim':

“…My friends and I were blocking the pavement, we were talking loudly […] and this Scottish lady crossed through us […] in an aggressive way. […] My friends were saying 'Look, that's because we are wearing headscarves, because we are not Scottish!' […] I think it was more about differences in behaviour and culture […] [than us] being Muslim.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer)

This participant draws attention to the increased awareness and stress associated with certain (intersecting) identities in Glasgow, and everyday encounters with ethnic, cultural and religious diversity being firmly embedded within the wider political landscape of Scotland. Arguably, given another political climate and context, the tensions and misunderstandings drawn out by this participant might not be related to the overlapping of these specific identities. This participant also gives a sense of choice/agency being involved in processes of cultural and ethnic othering (7.4), and seems to foreground that tensions are inevitably part of conviviality and multicultural living. This might be illustrated by the way in which this participant attempts to negotiate some of the vulnerabilities of her and her friends’ intersecting identities in this multicultural street encounter in Maryhill – an area shaped by diverse past and present migrations (4.3.2) – drawing attention to the unpredictable responses of others that characterise the messiness of many everyday encounters (Markell 2003). This research also finds that participants emphasised micro connections and relations of similarity and difference with ‘others’ as critically allowing them to ‘become a person’:

“When you share an activity or an interest [with somebody] […] they become a person with a name, [somebody] who you have a common interest with, a relationship of sorts [which] is important to have with someone who you perceive as different.” (Young man, white, born in Australia, permanent resident, working)

This relates to what Wright (2015: 402) calls new ways of ‘being human’, with ‘belonging as emergent becoming’ enabling familiar bodies and strange ones to recognise and respond to each other through emotion (6.4). Spaces that facilitate everyday encounters with difference, in that light, are deeply political as they mark informal moments of being together in diversity as steely and decisive acts. The politics of ‘becoming a person’ also speak to the plurality of forms of recognition and the practical orientation in social space they allow (Noble 2009; Markell 2003), this quote indicating how interpersonal micro connections can be central to allow other forms of self-definition to emerge, that way poten-
tially *transrupting* dominant perceptions of difference and feeding into wider social shifts and transformative change (cf. Hesse 2000). Chapter 7 further discusses the everyday as political. Here, this finding links to other participants suggesting that micro forms of connection, identification and relation can help to contextualise identities, furthering their sense of belonging in the city:

“...you can't pinpoint and tag people with labels and say 'if all these ticks apply, that is the kind of person you are'. [...] In our [knitting] group, [...] there is no age barrier, no racial barrier...people with all kinds of backgrounds can come if they want to [...] When you get to places like the library that is an important thing to realise, to feel that it is okay to be here.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working)

This participant implies that through encounters that she experiences as positive with others in specific contexts such as the library in Partick, identities are 'grounded' and individuals and groups frequently portrayed as 'other' in Scottish society can regain their humanity; they can relax, open up and form attachments with spaces and people in Glasgow. As such, I suggest that people create their own belonging in diverse and active ways, with identities being co-constructed and re-made through ‘doing the same things’ (6.2). The participant's emphasis on realising that ‘it is okay to be here’ further implies that forming shared identities with others around passions, lifestyles, and experiences potentially empowers people as 'others' to lay claims to Glasgow, and Scotland, as their 'home'. Chapter 7 further thinks through the transformation of ‘becoming a person’ as a political process. When reflecting on the transformative potential of encounters, participants often became aware of the ways in which encounters speak back to, and are embedded within, wider discourses on belonging and nationhood in society; the next section therefore considers the quiet politics of being able to publicly discuss such conjunctures in informal meeting spaces.

5.4.1 Discussing (tensions of) community and belonging in public spaces

Up to this point, this section has focused on the micro politics of encounters and mundane spaces. Here, I shall briefly discuss a set of findings that suggests informal spaces being crucial for people to experience, observe, discuss, articulate, feel and/or make sense of community and belonging in local spaces in Glasgow, against the backdrop of broader national discourses around multicultural, belonging and in/exclusion, and micro tensions and aggressions that can accompany multicultural living (Chapter 7). This research finds that, when discussing Scotland’s current political climate, participants frequently highlighted popular media and discourse increasing feelings of uncertainty and fear (cf. Pain 2009) around issues of migration, multiculturalism, nationhood and community cohesion – understood by participants as ‘living together peacefully’. Interestingly, participants mostly
discussed these formal political trends in broad and abstract terms, most explicitly relating these conjunctures to an increased desire or longing (cf. Probyn 1996) for inclusive and informal meeting spaces where they could mix and mingle with others who live in Glasgow. Participants of non-white and/or non-Scottish heritage mentioned that the Brexit vote in 2016 heightened their sense of being othered, and that issues of (national) identity and belonging are more talked about in public since the independence debate and referendum in 2014 (e.g. Kenny and Pearce 2018, 2017; Littauer 2016).

While politics were mostly discussed in abstract terms during interviews and focus groups, this research evidences that informal spaces of encounter can give people critical opportunities to, however vaguely, address recent developments in Scottish politics and society, such as the following situation I observed at the library:

“I am at the local library in Partick. As I am walking out into the corridor, I overhear two women, presumably white-Scottish and in their 60s, discussing the recent Brexit vote and the possibility of another independence referendum in Scotland:

Woman 1 (shaking her head): ‘I don’t think the English are part of Scotland, and look what has happened with this Brexit thing…’

Woman 2: ‘But what about our shared history? No, no, I don’t think you could ever separate that from what Scotland is today…’

They pause and watch a couple walk by, both in their late 20s, early 30s, she is white and he has darker skin.

Woman 2 continues: ‘I don’t agree with Scotland not being part of Europe anymore but another referendum? I don’t think that would help!’

Woman 1: ‘I think it might…Scotland has different needs…with migration, I mean, I am not sure if we need more immigrants but they are saying Scotland needs more people…to work…if we could make our own decisions…’

As woman 1 trails off, women 2 starts talking about other topics.”

(Extract field notes, July 2016)

This extract goes to articulations of Scottishness, national belonging and processes of othering (7.3), and serves as a reminder as to how changing political conjunctures are ex-
experienced and felt in local places and spaces in Glasgow (4.3.1 and 6.4), and how such conjunctures can be made sense of through casual encounters and informal conversations in public. Critical here is that above rather abstract discussion of recent political events, changing migration trends in Scotland, and their tensions, is taking place in the local library in Partick; an urban area in which both women are likely to observe and experience some these changes in intersecting ethnic, cultural, religious, aged, gendered and classed compositions of local populations and communities. As such, I argue that having access to informal and ‘mixed’ meeting spaces such as above library can allow people to speak about and articulate specific aspects of broader political conjunctures, and the dynamic ways in which local Glaswegian communities and notions of belonging in wider society are changing.

The potential to (vaguely) discuss politics in public is significant, since ‘everyday talk’ can give people opportunities to ‘reflect, sustain, build and challenge who people are’ (Tracey and Robles 2013: 5), negotiate how ‘we live with difference and how the mundane is experienced’ (Wise and Velayutham 2009: 2, original emphasis), and may function to develop relational identities (Wise and Velayutham 2014). Public spaces that make people feel comfortable (enough) to engage in informal political talk, then, may point to the ‘qualities of spaces which enable the successful participation of residents in the collective lives of the neighbourhood’ (Jupp 2008: 336). Similarly, Young (2000) argues for the recognition of ‘small talk’ as crucial to politics, although everyday speech may appear peripheral to official structures of political debate and interaction. Moreover, given that participants identifying as non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim implied that feelings of insecurity and fear are diminished and replaced by a sense of relaxation and comfort through the ‘mixity’ of informal meeting spaces (6.4), I suggest that places of conviviality and multicultural ‘co-presence’ in which tensions and opportunities around ethnic and cultural diversity and ‘difference’ can be observed and/or discussed are vital to enable marginalised and more vulnerable bodies to settle in Glasgow. Chapter 7 further discusses the politics of mixed spaces and everyday negotiations of multiculture and diversity.

5.5 Conclusion
In this chapter, I have explored the relationship between concepts of intersectionality and spaces of encounter as a way of understanding how people live and negotiate diversity and difference on a daily basis in contemporary Glasgow. This research finds that informal meeting spaces which participants considered ‘multicultural’, ‘mixed’ and ‘shared’ are critical social settings that facilitate connections and relationships, of differing depth and duration, to emerge between individuals. Tracing these micro connections, I have shown the value many participants attributed to both fleeting and superficial and more repetitive and structured encounters in mundane spaces, these encounters being experienced as valua-
ble in their own right. Informal and fleeting encounters across ethnicity, gender, age and cultural and religious differences in public spaces, specifically in local cafes and public libraries, were experienced by many participants as meaningful and positive, contributing to a sense of conviviality and peaceful living together in local places, and wider Glasgow. Participants from non-Scottish backgrounds and those relatively new to the city, in particular, emphasised the affective dimensions of such fleeting encounters, their ‘niceness’ and ‘positivity’ being considered to foster a low level sociability that produces inclusive public spaces and navigates multiculturalism and diversity in more ‘unpanicked’ ways (Noble 2009a).

Similarly, community groups that specifically focus on ethnicity, age or gender emerged as key social sites that easily enable people to share with and/or can connect through to others. Encounters here were often more repetitive and structured, their value being attributed to more prolonged and deeper relations to emerge between group members. The significance of such informal group spaces was frequently highlighted by non-white Muslim women who suggested that intersections of gender and feelings of intimacy and safety enable many of them to relax and open up, and identities ‘more in line’ with how some of these women thought about themselves to become accentuated. Critically, intersectionality captures how gender and ethnicity further intersect with religion, tradition or ideology, this research suggesting that these women, and their agency and behaviour, are rendered more vulnerable and/or disadvantaged than others in mixed spaces. Chapter 7 revisits the importance of informal spaces of encounter for people, specifically women, to mediate and alleviate some of the stress associated with and constructed around their intersecting identities.

Simultaneously, tensions and moments of disconnection, uneasiness and misunderstanding are also always present in ‘zones of encounter’ (cf. Wood and Landry 2008), as people encounter each other as ‘raced’, gendered, aged and classed bodies that are situated within wider formal political contexts; intersectional tensions around gender and language coming to the fore in this research. Intersectional tensions especially shaped many multicultural and ‘everyday’ encounters for non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim women and participants who identified as black, who experienced their intersecting identities as more burdensome than others in Glasgow, with encounters in local cafes, supermarkets, work environments and other mundane places making many of them feel ‘out of place’ and othered. Chapter 7 relates this to dominant constructions of Scottishness and Scotland as white.

Critically, I have suggested that the possibility for connection, though contested, evident in everyday spaces highlights their messiness and chaotic and disorderly nature (cf. Askins
and Pain 2011). Linking the messiness of social spaces to the transformative potential of many of the encounters discussed by participants, I have foregrounded that moments of intersectional micro connection and relation building frequently bleed out beyond the immediate moment and specific site of encounter. The quiet politics (after Askins 2015) of fleeting encounters and micro connection specifically emerged regarding the ways in which the majority of participants articulated notions of community and belonging. ‘Community’ was frequently understood as an interscaled and relational set of practices and experiences where fleeting encounters and fluid engagements between people create a sense of familiarity and comfort with people as ‘others’ in public spaces and local neighbourhoods in Glasgow. Challenging arguments made in relevant encounter literature, I have argued that such brief and superficial encounters in public can spark processes of micro identification and recognition (also Chapter 7) that connect through and across scales of belonging, affecting socially constructed difference and remaking society at local level.

Moreover, I have evidenced that groups meeting at public spaces, particularly community centres and public libraries, offer opportunities to find connections beyond initial points of relation around (intersecting) identities of ethnicity, gender or ‘race’: as people bond over diverse aspects of their complex identities, new points of commonality, and difference, being to emerge, including personal histories, life experiences, opinions and lifestyles. There was general consensus across this research that these are the more vital characteristics of people; identifications, I have emphasised, that can allow people as others to ‘become a person’, a deeply political process that may speak to what Wright (2015) calls ‘new ways of being human’ (also Chapter 7). Critically, I have argued that micro connections, relations and identifications made/found through encounters at community groups often feed into an embodied and performed sense of ‘co-presence’ and belonging at wider neighbourhood and city level, these informal spatial practices potentially transrupting (cf. Hesse 2000) wider discourses of difference and exclusion in Glasgow.

As encounters always work across and connect through multiple scales (Chapter 2), and are caught up through a range of politics, I contend that spaces which enable diverse encounters with/across difference, and micro connections and relationships to emerge between individuals, are vital to foster more inclusive and progressive means of living together; such spaces critically open up opportunities for tensions and disconnections that often accompany multicultural living to be negotiated, and to articulate alternative senses of belonging in and beyond local contexts in Glasgow. If politics, in their broadest sense, are the making of relationships between people (after Askins 2015), it is crucial to better understand where and how people create identities and belongings ‘on the ground’ and ‘in the moment’ that may allow them to regain their humanity and to develop/entrench a
sense of belonging and embeddedness in and beyond local communities; this being particularly the case for people who are constructed as other and different by dominant narratives around nationhood and belonging in wider society. In the following chapter, I pick up the significance of identities being co-constructed and re-made through embodied activities and encounters, and the intertwining of emotion and politics, before discussing the politics of agency and mundane belonging(s) that push back against formal political debates in Chapter 7.
6 Embodied geographies and the materialities of multicultural encounters

I am at the knitting and crocheting group meeting weekly at a local library in Glasgow. Besides me, two other women are present, both white and in their early 60s, one was born in Australia and migrated to Scotland many years ago, the other was born and raised in Glasgow. A girl, probably of Pakistani, Indian or Arab heritage in her early teens, stands at a short distance. Noticing her, one of the knitting women asks the girl ‘Do you know how to knit?’ The girl smiles and says ‘No, but I can crochet.’ She then approaches, leans on the table, touches the wool of the woman and observes her. The woman inquires if the girl wants to crochet something herself and, upon her nodding, hands the girl some wool and offers tips to her, passing wool and crochet hook back and forth between them. I notice another woman, possibly same heritage as the girl, maybe in her 40s, wearing a headscarf – I read this as an indication of her Muslim faith – slowly walking over. She addresses the girl, saying ‘What are you doing there? Don’t disturb the women.’ I reckon she might be the girl’s mother. Quickly, the knitting women reply ‘No, no. It’s fine. We don’t mind.’ The girl resumes crocheting. Her mother hesitates, then strides over and asks ‘Is it okay if…?’ pointing to a chair, upon which the woman not instructing the girl replies ‘Yes, yes, please sit down.’ All hesitance and uneasiness seems to fall off the mother, who confidently starts a conversation by exclaiming ‘I never learnt how to knit!’ laughing heartily, yet pointing out that ‘But I can sew.’ The knitting woman picks up this opening, replying ‘Oh yes? I can sew, too. What do you sew?’ Both then share stories about their skills and garments they have made. The atmosphere is relaxed and sociable, chattier than at other meetings. There is more laughter, louder laughing, and more jokes being told.

(Extract from field notes, October 2016)

6.1 Introduction
This chapter opens with an extract that highlights a chance encounter at a local library creating an opening for the involved women to share something personal around their lives and thoughts, with knitting critically acting as a first point of contact, and materials subsequently shaping their encounter. In the previous chapters, I have conceptualised encounters as context-bound and site-specific interactions, located in time and place, with this situation being meant as an example that more widely responds to demands for research that focuses on the embodied, relational and emotional aspects of encounters (Hopkins 2014). As such, this chapter focuses on the ways in which bodies are critical in identity formation processes, enacted through placed encounters in mundane spaces of association in Glasgow, and quotidian (re)negotiations of self and other(s) in wider society. Focusing on the embodied and encounters, how identities are ‘done’, is critical as ‘too often the body […] is ignored, erased and written out of geographical research’ (Nayak
2017: 291), which is surprising given that the embodied ‘is central in understanding how multiculturalism, difference and diversity is lived’.

Critically, feminist work foregrounds the unequal physicalities of bodies, and these differences always shaping (multicultural) encounters and wider socio-spatial relations (e.g. Longhurst 2005; Butler 1993; hooks 1981). Post-colonial perspectives add that these corporeal histories of exclusion continue to position bodies ‘in situation’ (Valentine and Sadgrove 2014; Ahmed 2004), as they ‘are seared into the flesh […] and the memories of minorities’ (Nayak 2017: 296); the (unpredictable) unfolding of multicultural and multi-ethnic relations in mundane spaces meaning that multiculturalism and conviviality are also always precarious and contingent achievements (also 5.3). In this chapter, I consider the ways in which participants’ bodies are placed in multicultural encounters in local spaces in Glasgow, suggesting that the doing of identities together with others in everyday spaces of association opens up possibilities for specific micro connections and relations to emerge between people who are differently positioned in society. Doing so, I hold that some of these (unequal) social relations might be opened up, re-worked and renegotiated through embodied encounters, which are also always political (further drawn out in Chapter 7).

Taking seriously that bodies are central ‘objects’ in assessing how encounters register on the body and how ‘differences’ are (re)made (Ahmed 2000), I discuss the materialities of bodies and encounters regarding the ways in which mundane and ‘everyday’ objects often played a critical role in allowing people to negotiate diverse barriers to (non)verbal communication and reactions/feelings experienced as negative aspects of some encounters. I suggest that ‘doing the same things’ as ‘performative force’ in which activities and practices that involve (and evolve around) embodied encounters enable people to connect to and identify with local communities in Glasgow, and to negotiate diversity and multiculture in ‘unpanicked’ ways. Moreover, since emotional geographies conceptually set up bodies as material and more than material, emphasising how ‘everyday meetings with others fleshy and sensuous bodies affect us’ (Haldrup et al 2006: 178), I consider the ways in which emotions, of differing depth and duration, form ‘an integrated part of everyday meetings with “other” and/or “different” bodies’ (ibid: 178) in local places and spaces in Glasgow, and weave through many of the corporeal performances and practices that allow people to establish micro connections and identifications with others (cf. Wise 2010; also 5.2). As such, I support the position that emotions ‘reside in both bodies and places’ (Davidson et al 2007: 3) and are central in understanding processes of belonging and intercultural relations in Glasgow.
Moreover, given that ‘feeling is alive in nationalism, civic belonging and community cohesion’ (Nayak 2011: 292), I map out how emotions and actions are often folded into (embodied) encounters in Glasgow, some with stark geo-political consequences (Pain 2009; also 7.3). Discussing the ways in which participants from non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim backgrounds and those new to Glasgow attributed significant value to emotive gestures and emotions that enable them to feel closer to both people and places in the city, I suggest that feelings of connection, attachment and belonging mark many of the encounters described in this thesis. I thus underscore emotions as positive force of multicultural encounters making it possible for many people as ‘others’ to embody belonging and immerse in Scottish society (cf. Lobo 2014b), ‘small acts of caring’ being particularly relevant for marginalised and ‘burdensome’ female bodies to ‘become the skin of the city’ (Lobo 2013: 463) and more permeable to change.

Drawing out diverse (multicultural) encounters experienced in a range of mundane spaces in Glasgow, the first section discusses the potential of such spaces to perform identities around common activities and interests together with others. Enabling many to approach and get to know strangers and people as ‘other’, these performances are ripe with gestures and embodied practices that are central in negotiating tensions and disconnections around multicultural encounters. The second section explores diverse emotions weaving through encounters and moments of micro connection and relation-making, feeding into wider notions of belonging and homeliness in Glasgow. And in the final section, I discuss the materialities of encounters, ‘everyday’ material objects and things shaping and mediating many encounters across difference.

6.2 Relating to others through ‘doing’ identities

Mixed and mundane spaces emerged as critical settings for many participants to come together and engage with others through ‘doing’ identities; examples included singing, gardening, knitting, sports and language groups. Many participants emphasised the focus on common interests and activities as enabling them to build and perform shared identities with people as ‘others’ in a comfortable and ‘easy’ way:

“Sports give you that common point [...] to strike up a conversation. It is not threatening because you don’t approach the person directly [...] but through your shared interest. [...] I think a basic need, interest or activity [works well] for people from all kinds of cultures and background to relate to.” (Young woman, British/East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, raised in Scotland, second generation citizen, working)
This participant attended weekly running and yoga groups that meet at a local community centre, highlighting how the ‘doing’ of (sport-related) identities can help to mediate encounters between people who are differently situated. This quote suggests that participating in shared activities and performing specific identities around, for example, ‘being a runner’ and ‘being a yogi’ can make it possible to find openings – striking up a conversation – to relate through to others. Shared activities as desirable and non-threatening first forms of encounter – ‘conversation openers’ – were emphasised across this research, another participant explaining how performing identities together with others during golf allows him “to bond over something that you enjoy [and] talk to somebody who you don’t know or would never meet otherwise” (Young man, white, born in Australia, permanent resident, working). I therefore suggest that the involvement and engagement of different bodies is critical in enabling people to build shared identities and identifications with others. Bodies as central in negotiations of multicultural encounter is also evident in the opening situation of this chapter, the knitting and crocheting forming central activities around which the women enact their identities and find new points of commonality and difference with the girl and the mother.

Moreover, this research finds that spaces which enable people to do something together, collectively fashioning meanings and identities, facilitates many to move beyond these identifications; the potential to share other aspects of their lives specifically being emphasised by participants who attend ‘multicultural’ and highly ‘mixed’ or ‘diverse’ groups:

“[At the gardening group] I also meet women and some other people. [...] Everyone can come to the group [but] people are coming out of interest, you know? We bond over something else than just [gardening] [...] we can chat, we can discuss things…also things that have not to do with gardening [...] we talk about our countries, our families, what we do [in Glasgow]…everything!”[Laughs] (Focus group 3, P10)

This focus group discussed their reasons for attending the gardening club that meets weekly at community centre A in Maryhill, this participant emphasising the potential of groups that bring together diverse individuals around a common interest or passion, and indicating the value of physically doing something together with others. This quote suggests that, by being at work together, group members can find openings to share and exchange opinions, stories and life events. Research interested in practices that bring people into relation with each other finds that social exchanges can enable processes of ‘recognition with’ others (Noble 2009b: 62) through which complex mutual forms of acknowledgement, worth and competences are created. Embodied practices are clearly central in these processes, as ‘the mutual, collective fashioning which comes out of
shared practice, out of doing something together’ (ibid: 63) helps to better understand ‘complicated entanglements of togetherness-in-difference’.

The potential for moments of recognition with others, and their outcomes or effects, was frequently discussed regarding activities offered at community centres and, to a lesser extent, at public libraries since these spaces allow hybrid identities to become articulated and performed:

“I have met some really nice ladies [at the gym at my local community centre] from very different backgrounds. They are living a very different life to my own. […] That one lady, I would have never thought that I would make friends with her! She is 70 years old but really cool. […] And that other one […] has like 6 Catholic children [but] she is so funny! We talk about all kinds of stuff.” (Young woman, British/East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, raised in Scotland, second generation citizen, working)

Community centres, and occasionally public libraries, emerged as critical semi-formal and mundane spaces that bring together, and into relation, ‘different’ and ‘diverse’ bodies, as many activities offered here are of low or no cost, resulting in these spaces being experienced as highly accessible (5.2). Through dynamic and situated encounters at a community centre on Glasgow’s south side, this participant seems to challenge the otherness she constructs around ‘being Catholic’ and (old) age, simultaneously signalling the importance of religion and some stereotypes around Catholicism, as she identifies new points of relation and forms of mutuality and recognition. Here, recognition relates to a sense of recognising each other as competent human beings and ‘seeing each other to be legitimate participants in a specific situation or event’ (Noble 2009b: 882) as embodied activities, and emotions (6.3), seem to allow this participant to relate to and befriend ‘different’ women. As such, I suggest that ‘recognition is the beginning of something, not its end, and the end is never a given’ (Noble 2009a: 62), spaces of embodied activity(ies) holding the potential for shaping (more inclusive) notions of identity and belonging in wider society. The opening vignette of this chapter also details how embodied practices and encounters like knitting are critically mundane moments in which both/and aspects of the women’s hybrid and intersecting identities become pronounced and embodied, e.g. their ethnicity and gender. Their knitting also carries intergenerational elements, the micro politics of which intersectional analyses are just starting to explore (8.3).

With regards to local cafes, participants emphasised that being able to satisfy similar or basic bodily needs/functions together with others opens up opportunities to gain insight into other people’s lives, establishing ‘lighter’ forms of connection and identification that
were frequently conceptualised in terms of *being able to observe* who else lives in Glasgow:

“At the café, people are normal. They are regular people [...] People always have a role to play when they are in school or at work. But at the café, we put that role down a little and maybe play other roles...like being a friend, a girlfriend or a son [...] I like to observe these other roles. [...] I also like to see how people treat others, what they are interested in, how they behave, how they dress...So I come [to the café] because I can see what other people do.” [Laughs] (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student)

This participant emphasises the ‘light touch’ sociality of cafes enabling people to break out of fixed social categories, and to develop new social relations and identifications through doing, and observing, other people’s identities (cf. Fincher and Iveson 2008). Neal et al (2018: 81) suggest that spaces which ‘people are using in multiple ways to work, escape, restore, eat, catch up, be alone, and pass time’ can be spaces of hopeful encounter (Wise 2011), since they form of part of people’s daily rhythms, routines and repetitions, and serve as ‘enactments of belonging’ (Hall 2012: 60). This quote also implies that cafes hold the potential for social exchange and ‘practices of being public’ (Neal et al 2018: 88) as they are critically non-challenging and ‘known’ gathering places where there ‘is nothing to fear or avoid in being seen and being seen seeing’ (Goffman 1963a: 84). While the potential of urban encounters to penetrate private or interior worlds continues to be debated (2.3.1), cafes can thus be spaces in which culturally different populations ‘live together’ not without tensions but within a ‘creative and intuitive capacity’ to negotiate them (Gilroy 2006: 6).

Participants from non-white and/or non-Scottish backgrounds frequently linked a sense of ‘normality’ to the ability to observe and ‘do’ what other, arguably, ‘normal’ bodies do in Glasgow, and foster their sense of belonging and forming part of local communities:

“When I first moved to Scotland, I knew zero people and I went to that café close to my flat very often. It was always very busy and although I didn’t know anyone there, I felt comfortable just sitting there by myself and drinking coffee or reading a book. I liked having people around me even though I didn’t know them. [...] Essentially, we were all doing the same things [which makes] me feel normal!” [Laughs] (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Australia, permanent resident, working)

Behaving ‘like a café user’ seems to give this participant a sense of ‘fitting in’ and normality in the café, her localised sense of ‘being-in-place’ arguably transcending the café and
tapping into an ‘open sense of belonging’ (Diprose 2008), centred around building (a fleeting sense of) community and connectedness with others at the café, and wider Glasgow. This goes to the embodied and emotional nature of many everyday encounters and experiences around identity-making and belonging. Here, the sense of normality touched upon by both participants speaks to Ahmed’s work (2000) on no-body simply being a stranger, but specific bodies (actively) being (re)produced as strange and other in societies (2.3), and processes of in/exclusion and proximity/distance (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012). The ‘unfocused conviviality’ (Neal et al 2018) of the cafes discussed, in which both participants are ‘together and alone at once’ (ibid: 89), then, might indicate how the possibility of ‘civil inattention’ at cafes, where an awareness of visual and verbal ‘difference’ exists alongside unfocused attention, can allow bodies and identities as ‘other’ and ‘strange’ to ‘sink’ into place and public life. Public behaviour is significant, since it relates to how and where social life is experienced and managed, and the ‘patterning of ordinary social contact’ (Goffman 1963b: 4) taking shape. In such spaces of encounter, tactile engagements with things is central (6.4) to emotional dimensions of belonging (6.3).

While some embodied geographies are enabling, the embodied encounters described in this research were found to also always be gendered, ‘raced’, classed and/or aged: while people make connections, ‘differences’ do not cease to exist (cf. Ahmed 2000), and are crucial in shaping many multicultural encounters. Critical here is that embodied encounters produce different micro connections, since the discussed practices and activities that participants engage in with others are specific ones. Intersectionality helps to consider the gendered and classed dynamics of some of the activities mentioned in this chapter; drawing attention to the micro connections emerging at the knitting at the library in Patrick clearly being gendered, and the micro relations created during golfing, as mentioned earlier by participant 23, certainly being dominated by the middle-class, white and male dynamics of the game, while still also being racialized. Crucially, considering these dynamics foregrounds what participants may make of these differences, as embodied encounters can impact on histories and geographies that ‘stick’ and are written on different bodies in society.

Most of the empirical data discussed up to this point have hinted at different identities being (un)written on and (un)done to bodies of participants, particularly women (5.2.1); yet, while continuing, participants often also disrupted (some of) the (constructed) differences in age, ethnic and cultural heritage, social class and religion, as encounters enabled new connections and relations. The opening situation of this chapter, for example, suggests constructions of otherness and ‘different’ bodies being unsettled through embodied engagements, women of different trajectories (temporally) relating to each other through knitting, and transforming intercultural relations into interpersonal ones (Wise 2005; 6.3).
That way, embodied encounters speak to the post-colonial, and I argue that a focus on embodiment can acknowledge processes of micro connection-building and relation-making without losing differences that matter (Valluvan 2016; Ahmed 2000; 5.2) and the quiet politics of ‘doing the same things’ (Askins and Pain 2011) together with others (7.4).

Clearly, wider issues of power shape ‘raced’, gendered, aged and classed geographies within which the embodied activities described in this research are embedded. As many, not all, participants tended to discuss issues of power and politics in abstract ways (5.4.1), the next section foregrounds the ways in which participants often managed to get around moments of embodied tension(s).

6.2.1 Laughter and negotiating moments of embodied tension(s)
Participants often reflected on moments of tension, disconnection and misunderstanding when discussing the embodied and multicultural encounters. While everyday meetings with other bodies ‘should not be mistaken for harmony’ (Haldrup et al 2006: 178), and attention must be paid to ‘differences [that exist] among bodies and power relations involved in intercorporeal meetings’, participants frequently discussed social practices and exchanges which get over and around such disconnections, possibly negotiating inequalities in power and positionality, to produce a sense of co-existence in local spaces (Noble 2009b; Wise 2005). In this research, different types of facial and hand gestures were frequently critical in negotiating multicultural and multi-lingual encounters to create a level of understanding beyond the verbal, such as earlier discussed regarding a multicultural cookery class (5.3.1). Participants who were members of the multicultural men and women groups and the gardening club at community centre A in Maryhill frequently suggested using their bodies and gestures, including waving hands, signalling and miming, in moments of multicultural encounter to express their emotions and create understandings with others (Wiseman 2017b). While gestures and articulations are always socially and culturally constructed and limited, they ‘do things’ to bodies (Lobo 2015), participants in this research perceiving gestures as bodily practices that bring people together and ‘get things done’ in multicultural everyday spaces (Noble 2009b; also 5.3.1).

Moreover, laughter emerged as an embodied practice frequently used to alleviate tensions, and articulate the senses and embodied encounters. Laughter, beyond humour, can have transformative qualities as bodies that might have been tense and uncomfortable, relax and open up when laughter is heard: quotes throughout the thesis suggest that people’s bodies are seemingly united rather than separated in the ‘event of laughter’ in ways that ‘can interrupt the actual and assumed/imagined power geometries in a given situation/encounter’ (Emmerson 2017: 2094). The opening situation of this chapter, for example, highlights laughter as a form of corporeal engagement that, due to its transpersonal potential, can generate affective intra/inter-actions within and between ‘different’
bodies, allowing the women ‘to enact multiple trajectories that produce different affective responses and relational experiences’ (ibid: 2095).

Thinking through laughter as an embodied practice within wider political geographies of the Caribbean, Noxolo (forthcoming) calls for laughter to be taken seriously, since understanding the transformative ‘event of laughter’ allows for a more critical engagement with the ways in which community(ies) can be built. In addition, I suggest that attending to gestures (of laughter) allows for more generous conceptions of what constitutes ‘good’ or ‘bad’ encounters (Emmerson 2017; Darling 2010), attuning to an ontology of the in-between (2.4), while holding on to the bodily, and thus spatial, differences that matter. Last, I suggest that laughter can also be thought of as a choice, imbued with agency, making it possible to consider the ‘many different bodies who may be witnessing the laughter also’ (Emmerson 2017: 2095). As such, laughter can hold the potential to create/shift atmospheres that affect bodies, and position them (differently) towards each other and in society (cf. Ahmed 2007; 7.4).

6.3 Emotion and everyday negotiations of embodied belongings
Affect and emotions of differing depth and duration were found to weave through and shape many of the multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters described in this thesis, with small acts of sharing, care and support, and their consequences, contributing to a sense of what Wright (2015) calls ‘new ways of being human’ emerging among participants. This research finds that emotive elements, many of them ‘small’ and ‘quiet’, weave through often banal and superficial encounters, something often highlighted by participants new to Glasgow:

“Cafes don’t offer me the chance to get to know people [but] you are with other people and that is a kind of socialisation as well. Especially people-watching! [...] and maybe you will smile at them and they will smile back. That is good enough for me already. That makes me feel less lonely.” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student)

This participant suggests that small emotive gestures experienced at cafes such as smiling (6.2.1) can represent meaningful elements in everyday life, as they build up over the course of a day, and can help people to satisfy a yearning for emotional reactions from other human beings. The value of short-lived, banal or superficial moments of relation and encounter was underscored across this research (5.2), and showcases how small and quiet emotional gestures and social exchanges can produce a critical ‘flow-on effect’ (Wise 2005: 183) on wider notions of recognition, hospitality, and belonging in society. I suggest that this emphasises the embodied aspect of multicultural living and the emotion-
al in processes of belonging and homeliness (Askins 2015), emotions also being central to relationships with the nation-state, broader political discourses and processes of othering, which the following chapter discusses in more depth.

Similarly, participants who attended groups meeting at community centres and public libraries implied that embodied activities, and carving out shared identifications with others, enabled them to share the emotionality (having emotions/being emotional) of experiences:

“We can get to know each other [at the gardening group] [...] but, for me, the most important thing is that I can share ideas, I can share interests with other people. [...] Yes, we are busy in the garden [but] we also talk about our countries and our families. [...] It is good to know these things about other people [...] it makes me feel closer to them.” [Smiles, other participants nod their heads in agreement] (Focus group 3, P10; emphasis added)

Discussing the impact of specific placed encounters around ‘being a gardener’ at community centre A in Maryhill, this participant emphasised these as giving him the chance to satisfy a ‘longing’ for sharing ideas and interests with others, something that subsequently seems to foster feelings of closeness and connection to other group members. This speaks to intersectionality (5.3) and the relationality of emotions (cf. Haldrup et al 2006). The notion of sharing experiences, ideas and interests with others, with the effect of feeling closer and connected to them, might suggest how manifestations of connection, belonging and attachment are ‘expressions of conscious and unconscious feelings that arise in the real and imagined movements between “selves” and “others”’ (Davidson et al 2007: 7). This draws attention to how important it is to attend to feelings, e.g. fear, anger, love, compassion and hatred, when thinking through processes of (national) belongings. Chapter 7 further extends this discussion to the politics of emotion; here, this quote suggests understanding emotions as simultaneously interiorised subjective, embodied and mental states, and as socio-spatial mediations and articulations that shape processes of identification and relation-building (Davidson et al 2007). There is also an aspect of recognising encounters as temporal relations, representing an ‘assemblage of event, performance, and affect’ (Nayak 2010: 2388) which is always ‘mooded’ (after Merleau-Ponty 1962).

‘Feeling closer’ and connected to people and places, and emotions as positive force/aspect of multicultural encounters, leading to connection and tension (Chapter 5), was emphasised by participants frequently from non-white, non-Scottish backgrounds and those new to Glasgow:
“It’s good to be around others […] [because] even if you don’t get to know people, you recognize their faces, like ‘I have seen you before in the Zumba class’. […] It’s that group activity…it’s just that feeling of being part of something, of feeling connected…if you didn’t have that, you would just become lonely and disconnected.”

(Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Jordan, new migrant)

This participant foregrounds her ability to fight feelings of isolation and disconnectedness through being engaged with others in a Zumba class in Maryhill, actively working towards establishing feelings of belonging and connectedness; echoing Probyn’s (1996) concept of ‘belonging’ encapsulating not only a being but a yearning or longing for attachments (3.4). In this quote, dancing seems to incorporate an emotional dimension that is meaningful, and stretches beyond the immediate space of the dance group, arguably enabling this participant to feel part of the group and local (multicultural) communities in Maryhill (also 5.4). Likewise, another participant remarked that “I don’t have a huge social background or group of different people [in Glasgow] […] but [at the knitting group], if something interesting happens in my life, then I will have people to share it with.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working). Here, geographies of ‘home’ and belonging in Partick emerge as embodied performative acts, intertwined with emotions, something critical in many migrants’ lives (Christou 2011), that make it possible to embody belonging and ‘immerse in the world’ (Lobo 2014b, 2013).

Participants across the research talked about escaping feelings of loneliness, isolation and depression by coming together in mixed spaces, valuing the possibilities to (re)establish relationships with others. Especially participants who were new to the city or had experienced the process of (re)settling in Glasgow talked about their experiences of leaving their social networks of family and friends behind and the struggles involved in starting a new life in Glasgow:

“[When I first came to Glasgow] being somewhere around other people […] was really important […] having that contact with other human beings, even if that was just talking to the person over the counter [at the library] to take out a book.” (Focus group 2, P19)

The need and wish to experience emotions as positive force featured strongly in narratives of ‘coping’ with these decisive moments in participants’ lives, this participant, for example, suggesting how emotional encounters at the local library seem to have helped her to feel (re)connected with local communities and neighbourhood life in Partick, and possibly wider Glasgow. Similarly, another participant remarked that “when I felt like people started to welcome me, being friendly and talking to me, I felt so much better [and] I start-
ed to like being in Glasgow” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer). These ‘small acts of care’ this participant experienced at the multicultural women’s group at community centre A in Maryhill thus highlight the embodied and emotional as interrelated, and central in practices of belonging and home-making in local places and neighbourhoods, and wider Glasgow.

Central here, I suggest, is that many of these often small emotional practices matter because they ‘contribute to a convivial atmosphere in the shared space and […] lead to a sense of connection and understanding’ (Wiseman 2017a; also Darling 2010). Indeed, participants often linked the importance of sharing life experiences and making connections (5.2) to counteracting feelings of stress, anxiety and uncertainty increasingly felt around issues of immigration, multiculturalism, and (national) identity in Scotland:

“It can be about life itself [that you connect]. I don’t have kids and there are women my age [at the knitting group] who have grandchildren! […] I still want to hear [and] […] share these experiences that I did not have in my life.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working)

The possibility to share personal experiences with others was experienced as (re)instilling feelings of, for example, self-worth and comfort as “when you connect with other people […] you feel cared for [and] feel less stress in that space [and] with the people around you” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student). I hold that emotions are thus central features in understanding processes of belonging and intercultural relations, agreeing with Askins (2016: 525) who states that

“it is precisely in considering the emotions of intercultural encounter […] that attention is drawn to how diverse residents can discover each other as multifaceted and interdependent; as individuals with simultaneously different and potentially shared positions, practices and desires.”

As such, I suggest that an openness to and through emotions in intersectional and embodied encounters, and the particular spaces where such encounters are made possible, can help to chip away at feelings of fear, uncertainty and anxiety increasingly constructed around ‘difference’ in society. By contextualizing these feelings and giving people the chance to get to know each other as individuals, the impact of emotions as negative force might be lessened as people develop more ‘unpanicked’ ways of living together in difference. Materials played an important part in facilitating many of the above encounters and connections, to which this chapter now turns.
6.4 The materialities of multicultural encounters
This section concentrates on the physical nature of encounters (cf. Askins and Pain 2011), as materials were often central in shaping multicultural encounters and emotional and embodied practices described in this research. Participants generally agreed that objects can act as ‘icebreakers’, making it easier to approach others in public spaces:

“I knit everywhere, on buses and trains, and that gets people talking sometimes. […] It is hard to talk to somebody just like that because you don’t know anything about them. […] Whereas if they see you knitting, it is automatically something they can talk to me about. […] It breaks the ice to get into a conversation and then that conversation can move on and you can find out things that you have in common.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in Scotland, working)

This participant indicates how the materials of knitting – the wool, the needles – gives others a pretext for interacting with her, acting as a conversation opener that subsequently moves away from these objects. The library situation set out in the opening vignette also highlights the wool and crocheting hook acting as a first point of contact between the girl and the knitting woman, and other objects – the chair – playing a central role in the mother’s first encounter with the group. Fostering social interaction through material engagements was echoed by other participants, one participant arguing that material objects can “give you an excuse to go over [and] chat with somebody” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, volunteer). Some further linked this to the desire for social contact (5.2) and the busyness of contemporary life in Glasgow, arguing that “with people being so much busier nowadays […] those snatched minutes [of social interaction] are, for some, the only interactions they will be having that day” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the Middle-East, return migrant, stay-at-home mother). This last quote further speaks to the role of materials in enabling people to experience different kinds of sociality in everyday spaces, engaging with people through materials arguably making it easier to ‘legitimize’ one dwelling in the close proximity of others. The objects participants mobilised around in this research were often quite ‘everyday’ and mundane, yet shaped encounters with people as ‘others’ in substantial ways. Participants specifically from non-white and/or non-Scottish backgrounds discussed the potential of materials within the context of activities and groups held at local community centres:

“In the gardening group, we do physical activities. In the garden, we plant things […] we also cook [and] eat the things [that we have grown] together. Other times, we go outdoors, sometimes we walk…that is important, interesting…doing different things.” (Middle-aged man, black, born in Eritrea, refugee, volunteer)
This participant hints at materials as crucial elements involved in performing/doing identities at community centre A in Maryhill, as it is through the engagements with the materials or ‘stuff’ in gardening – tools, plants, earth, pots and pans – that fragile relationships, identifications, and connections seem to emerge between group members. Askins and Pain (2011: 814) argue that people can enact ‘relationships of difference and similarity [...] through the mediation of material objects’ in which they are ‘doing the same things’; everyday materials and objects thus being able to give people the chance/possibility to realise and enact differences and similarities (also Mayblin et al 2016). Material engagements in multicultural encounters are thus also always political, since the entanglement of ‘fleshy bodies, sensory impulses and material objects’ (Lobo 2013: 459) can interrupt white spaces and belonging, and make bodies, particularly female bodies, ‘permeable to change’ (ibid: 460). As such, I suggest that activities that involve (and evolve around) material objects can be a ‘performative force’ (ibid: 460) that may feed into gradual social change in Glasgow.

Participants who were new to Glasgow and/or frequently felt portrayed as ‘other’ by media and political discourses (7.3) linked embodied encounters around materials to being able to connect to and identify with local communities in Glasgow:

P21: “Does it make a difference for you, coming to the [knitting] group?”

L: “Yes! I mean, I am coming every week and I am a knitter now! […] When I first came to the library, I saw the [knitting] group - the library is a big open space - so [one day] I walked around [and] observed them. After some time, I walked over and talked to them about the knitting. [...] They gave me some wool and needles...we had tea. [P21] showed me how to knit.” [Smiles at P21]

P21: “Yes, I remember that…” [Smiles]

L: “Sometimes I see [mentions names of two other group members] at the supermarket or on the street...we will talk. I like that [...] it makes me feel at home [in Partick].”

(Exchange recorded after interview with P21; L: young woman, East-Asian, born in China, new migrant, stay-at-home mother)

L is a member of the knitting group who had arrived for the group’s weekly meeting while participant 21 and I were finishing an interview, was new to Glasgow (living in Patrick approximately one year) and alludes to the public and open sense of the library and the knit-
tering materials allowing her to approach and become involved in the knitting group. I suggest that this exchange might indicate how (spontaneous) encounters around materials can open up processes of ‘renegotiating Selves’ (Askins and Pain 2011), where one’s sense of self in relation to others and local communities can shift and change through engaging with others around everyday objects. Enacting identities around knitting, in this case, seemed to help L to realise that she can have a place in the local community, and possibly wider Glasgow. Feminist work emphasises the physicalities of the body always being embedded within wider (unequal) social relations (Longhurst 2005, Butler 1993); some of which, I suggest, might be opened up, re-worked and re-negotiated through embodied encounters, and their materialities, which are always also political (further drawn out in Chapter 7). Such exchanges resonate with Latour’s (2004 in Askins and Pain 2011: 841) argument that, when objects start to appear ‘everyday’, it is their ‘very mundaneness [that] engenders specific social relations, directing us in ways we barely notice’.

Indeed, this research finds that objects and materials were often used to negotiate moments of tension and uneasiness (also 5.3). In 6.2.1, a participant indicated the movements of a plate of fish becoming critical in negotiating and communicating with a woman of East-Asian heritage, and regarding objects used while doing sports, one participant remarked that “if things get awkward [while golfing], you can always return to the golf cart!” (Young man, white, born in Australia, permanent resident, working). While activities are always gendered, aged, ‘raced’ and/or classed (6.2) – the golf cart, for example, highlighting the white, male and middle-class intersecting aspects of the game – I suggest that the ways in which participants talked about and used everyday objects such as plates, pens, paper or mobile phones in this research indicates the complex ways in which materials are often central in negotiating diverse barriers to (non)verbal communication and feelings/reactions as negative aspects of some multicultural encounters, and actively working towards establishing co-presence in mixed spaces and making diversity and multiculture appear more ‘commonplace’ (Wessendorf 2014a, 2014b), which the following chapter links to agency.

6.5 Conclusion
In response to demands for research that focuses on the embodied, relation and emotional aspects of different forms of encounter (Nayak 2017; Hopkins 2014), this chapter has explored the ways in which embodied activities and social practices in mundane spaces of encounter are central in nurturing more inclusive ways of living together in Glasgow. I have foregrounded that spaces which allow hybrid and intersectional identities to become articulated, performed and embodied are critical to collectively fashion meanings and identities with people as ‘others’. This was particularly the case for embodied encounters experienced at community centres, and to a lesser degree at public libraries,
where a focus on common interests and activities enabled many participants to build and perform shared identities in a comfortable and non-threatening way, and find new points of commonality and difference. Non-white and/or non-Scottish participants, in particular, emphasised that being *physically involved and engaged with others* enabled them to share other aspects of their lives, including opinions, stories and life events. Critically, I have suggested that these social exchanges and practices feed into wider processes of recognition, creating complex mutual forms of acknowledgment, worth and competence that may unsettle constructions of otherness and ‘different’ bodies in Scottish society.

Similarly, I have argued that the light touch socality of local cafes can enable people to break out of fixed social categories and develop new social relations and identifications through doing, and particularly observing, other people’s identities. I have shown that local cafes in Glasgow often act as hopeful sites of encounter in which embodied activities and routine practices of being together in public can nurture people’s ‘creative and intuitive capacity’ (Gilroy 2006) to negotiate complicated entanglements of ‘togetherness-in-difference’ (Noble 2009b). Since non-white and/or non-Scottish participants emphasised the significance of being able to do what other arguably ‘normal’ bodies do in public, I hold that cafes are key spaces for people frequently othered by dominant discourses to enact a sense of ‘fitting in’ and ‘sinking into space’ in Glasgow, and tapping into a ‘more open sense of belonging’ (Diprose 2008) in Scottish society.

Using theories of intersectionality (Chapter 5), I have further drawn out that embodied encounters are always been gendered, ‘raced’, classed and/or aged and, while people make connections, that such differences do not cease to exist yet shape multicultural encounters, and their outcomes, in substantial ways. However, when reflecting on moments of embodied tension(s), participants readily highlighted social practices and exchanges which get over and around disconnections, negotiating wider inequalities in power and positionality, to produce a sense of co-existence in local spaces: participants often used their bodies and gestures, including waving hands, signalling and miming, in moments of multicultural encounter to express their emotions and create understandings with others. I have emphasised that such gestures and articulations do things to bodies (Lobo 2015), bringing people together and ‘getting things done’ in often constructive and unpanicked ways. Laughter emerged as an embodied practice to alleviate tensions and to articulate the senses and embodied encounters. As such, I support claims that laughter can have transformative qualities (Noxolo forthcoming; Emmerson 2017), this research finding that the bodies of non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim women and participants who identified as black, in particular, opened up and relaxed as laughter generated affective intra/inter-actions within and between ‘different’ bodies during (research) encounters.
Crucially, small acts of sharing, care and support were shown to weave through and shape many multicultural encounters, and their tensions; and I have suggested that emotive elements, many of them small and quiet, represent meaningful elements in the everyday lives of the majority of participants. Emphasising the value of the fleeting (Chapter 5), I have foregrounded that seemingly banal emotional gestures and social exchanges can have a critical flow on effect (Wise 2005) that may feed into wider forms of recognition and hospitality in society. Similarly, embodied encounters at community centres and community groups were shown to have the effect of participants feeling closer to people and places in the city, emotions as positive force/aspect of encounters leading to connection and tension (Chapter 5) that makes it possible to embody belonging and homeliness in Glasgow. As such, I hold that an openness to and through emotions in intersectional and embodied encounters, and the particular spaces where such encounters are made possible, is critical to chip away at feelings of fear, uncertainty and anxiety increasingly constructed around ‘difference’ in society. Chapter 7 picks up on emotions as essential to relationships with the nation-state, and broader political discourse and processes of othering.

In the final section, I have dissected the materialities of encounters, evidencing that objects and materials, many of them appearing ‘everyday’ and mundane, often shape encounters with people as others in substantial ways, as participants mobilised around and engaged with materials in diverse ways to perform (shared) identities. As such, I support that things can give people the opportunity to realise and enact differences and similarities (Askins and Pain 2011). I also agree that material engagements are always political (Lobo 2013), since many of the embodied encounters described in this thesis involving/evolving around materials shifted how many participants thought about themselves in relation to others, and local communities and belonging in Glasgow. Chapter 7 further extends on the unequal physicalities of bodies, discussing how wider uneven social relations and geographies of power might be opened up, (re)worked and (re)negotiated through embodied and material encounters.

My position, then, is that it is critical to acknowledge mundane spaces of embodied, emotional and relational encounter and micro connection that foreground concrete social interactions and wider, if fragile and precarious, social affinities amongst differentiated urban populations. Since issues of power and politics are also always intertwined with embodied aspects of multicultural living, the following chapter considers the ways in which more formal political debates and the everyday intersect, connect through and are always interscaled, highlighting the diverse ways in which some participants attempt to push back against broader discourses and uneven geographies of power by establishing diverse forms of belonging(s) and homeliness in Glasgow.
Everyday spaces of racialisation and resistance and their politics

“I was sitting in my neighbour’s living room and his partner comes in – they’re both white Scottish – and they were talking about this other girl and suddenly she said ‘That fucking black bastard!’ [Pauses] I went like [stiffens in his chair, tightly grabs armrests and widens eyes] but they just continued! I thought ‘Am I just another black bastard to them?’ I mean, he was racist when I was right there! [Laughs] Suddenly, they both went like ‘Oh no, sorry mate, we didn’t mean it like that!’ and I said ‘Don’t worry. It’s fine.’ …I was just thinking about getting out of there! The girl then said ‘It’s not like that, the girl is white.’ I went like ‘What?’ […] So I asked ‘Why are you saying black bastard then?’ They said ‘Because she is dirty.’ […] I said ‘Why don’t you call her a white bastard then?’ He was just like ‘Oh, you know, because black is dirty!’ I mean, are you for real? [Throws up hands in the air, raises voice] You can get all kinds of dirt: green, white, red! […] I didn’t know if I could feel comfortable again. […] And then in Scotland they’re always like ‘Ah we respect everyone! We are so tolerant!’ [Says this in a high-pitched voice] and then this is going on!”

(Interview extract January 2017; young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

7.1 Introduction

This chapter departs from previous opening vignettes, starting instead with an interview extract in which this participant reflects on mundane and everyday forms of racialisation and racism that were found to weave through many multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters in Glasgow that participants described. This quote also indicates the emotional effects of seemingly banal and ‘ordinary’ forms of racialisation being felt through and on the body of this participant, as feelings of anger, disbelief and frustration erupt and congeal in his attempt to resist and disrupt his (intersecting) identities arguably being positioned as ‘other’ and ‘out of place’. His emotional response further seems to address, and highlight, notions of ‘whiteness’ continuing to weave through past and present political discourse on (national) identities and belonging in Glasgow, as Scottishness is equated with whiteness. This interview extract serves as a reminder to carefully think through what is written on different bodies in spaces of encounter, speaking to the post-colonial perspectives informing the conceptual framework of this research, and issues of power at work in/through place that inculcate exclusion rather than sweep them aside.

Critically, post-colonial perspectives foreground the pervasive nature of (everyday) racism as remaining a deeply structuring force in the everyday lives of peoples of colour in Western societies (Virdee 2016). The banal and ‘everyday’ forms and geographies of such racisms and racialisations highlight how racist discourses and forms of oppression continue
to be inscribed in institutional structures and everyday spaces, including in Scotland (Davidson et al, 2018; Virdee, 2016; Meer, 2015). By situating the encounters described in this thesis within wider political contexts and discourses in Scottish society, specifically around migration, nationhood and belonging, I foreground continuing and complex forms and geographies of racism and racialisation that participants who identify as black, brown and non-white frequently experience in moments of (multicultural) encounter in Glasgow; moments which I suggest can play a critical role in (un)settling feelings of belonging, ‘home’ and comfort in the city (5.4), and feed into complex forms of agency that resist being positioned as ‘other’, ‘different’ and ‘out of place’ (2.5). As such, I speak to the politics of ‘slow’ violence of racisms and racialisations, and draw out the ‘quiet’ politics and political acts that may transrupt wider dominant paradigms and discourses (Askins, 2014, 2015), foregrounding the often mundane and daily practices of belonging and home-making.

Central here is that the everyday is political, with mundane spaces of ‘enforced togetherness’ (Lobo, 2013) and prosaic ‘contact zones’ (Wood and Landry, 2008) representing critical political platforms where racism can pull at ‘the cover of conviviality’ (Nayak, 2017). Chapter 2 discussed that there is more at stake in moments of multicultural encounter than the immediate experience of being ‘together in difference’ (Ang, 2003). In this chapter, I think through the everyday politics of racisms and racialisations to accentuate (national) identities and belongings being (un)settled and (un)done in a relational fashion, in moments of ‘placed’ encounter, and to challenge dominant attitudes and discourses that seemingly uphold the myth of Scotland having ‘no problem’ with racism (Virdee et al, 2018). I refer to post-colonial and feminist literature to suggest that the inequalities (of different bodies and identities) must be held in tension with a way of thinking/looking that avoids reiterating the power imbalances that enable these inequalities (Valentine, 2008; Ahmed, 2000). I therefore attempt to unpack the racisms and racialisations involved in the (re)production of a dominant – read ‘white’ – sense of Glasgow and ‘Scottishness’ to interrogate how such racisms can be, and are, disrupted in mundane spaces of encounter. Doing so, I hold on to a relational and processual understanding of identities ‘as a way of configuring the lines of force that compose the social, lines of force that are by their very nature deeply material and historical’ (Probyn, 1996: 12, original emphasis).

Drawing out the diverse ways in which participants attempt to unsettle ‘fixed’ identity constructions in moments of everyday encounter, the first section discusses non-white, non-Scottish and Muslim identities and bodies being subject to diverse forms of racism and violence in different places and at different times in Glasgow, foregrounding the ‘slow’ violence of ‘ordinary’ racism. I then dissect the mundane ways in which a white sense of community and belonging is frequently reproduced and attempted to be stabilised across informal situations/contexts in Glasgow, exploring how the emotional ties up with issues of
7.2 Racisms, racialisations and (re)productions of difference in Glasgow

When discussing discrimination, participants who identified as black, brown, non-white, non-Scottish and/or Muslim emphasised that everyday encounters are often woven through with overt and hidden forms of racism, visible signifiers such as darker skin colour and the headscarf being used as cues of ‘otherness’, that limit their sense of mobility, belonging and home in Glasgow. Tracing these experiences, I show that participants’ bodies and identities are thus always already constructed as different and a possible threat (cf. Ahmed 2000; also Askins 2004; 2.3.2), and that such a recognition of someone as ‘visibly different’ cannot be based on the very encounter alone but speaks to a knowledge socialised over time as to who can (not) be in public spaces. In this research, participants with darker skin experienced more often than others that they are stopped or feel rejected and excluded from public spaces, with participants who identified as black explicitly reflecting on experiences of being blocked or stopped in public:

“I was in a bar with my friend – he is black, too – and we were going up to the smoking area and the bouncer came up to us and said ‘You can’t take your drinks outside’ […] but I see everybody outside with their glasses! But I think ‘Okay’, you know, and turn to the bar where a couple of people are sitting […] and one of them says ‘Oh, just take your glass, you black bastard’ [Widens eyes]…I mean, I didn’t even retaliate to that. It’s just people’s mentality sometimes; I don’t know how to describe it. I just leave it at that.” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This participant experiences becoming ‘the other’ in the movement he makes when he and his friend try to enter a place. When rejected, he is made strange by his bodily appearance and becomes a ‘body suspect’ which Ahmed (2000: 21) characterises as techniques of reading the bodies of others and telling the differences between the familiar and the strange. I suggest that the experience of being stopped shifts attention back to the body and visible signifiers of ‘difference’ written onto it: The very visibility of the non-white body in a (racialized) space focuses attention on ethnic difference, and acts as a signifier of otherness that is used to control/manage/border ethnicity and the ethnic identity of spaces (2.3). Building on the research findings of moments of tension discussed in 5.3, this section extends on the uneven distribution of access to places, drawing on Koefoed and Simonsen (2012: 629, original emphasis) point that ‘when stopped, the stranger is produced and appears as the figure out of place’. Ahmed (2000) further suggests that ex-
experiences of restriction, uncertainty and blockage can scale ‘up’ to the city and nation, since the (young) black male body continues to be constructed as the ‘ultimate stranger’ in Western societies against whom physical (violent) measures are legitimised since they serve to protect and ‘guard’ the (white) ‘homeland’. One participant explicitly mentioned his darker skin colour provoking violent reactions from (white) others in public areas of Glasgow:

“It was in the city centre...There was a lot of space. No cars. It was a wide road. [...] This guy, he went in a big circle and bumped into me and said ‘Watch where you are going, you darkie’ and that was...he came towards me! He bumped me in the shoulder!...I couldn’t forget it for a long time.” (Middle-aged man, black, born in Eritrea, refugee)

This street encounter speaks to how public space can be actively bordered in Glasgow, in which black bodies experience violent blockage, and how ‘race’ is felt on and through the body. Post-colonial literature emphasises that the historicity of encounters between white and non-white bodies in Western societies (continues to) normalise the power inequalities set up by the (white) majority and (re)produces racialisation as a constructed natural form of life for minorities (2.2). While foregrounding accounts of agency that push back against dominant discourses and processes of racialisation (7.4), both quotes above strongly suggest that identifications based on visible signifiers continue to control and construct black bodies and identities as ‘out of place’ in Glasgow, arguably securing a dominant (white) sense of nationhood, belonging and home (7.3).

Verbal aggressions further reveal the ‘racial vibrations’ (May 2015) that weave through everyday encounters and senses of (national) belonging and home in Glasgow. Participants who experienced (racial) discrimination in public spaces often mentioned the use of racist language, as exemplified in the following quote:

“I was in town, walking down the street and this fella – he was white and had a Glaswegian accent – on the other side of the street yelled at me ‘Go home to where you come from, you chinky cow!’...I was so surprised, I just kept on walking. [...] That was nasty [...] but it doesn’t change the way I feel about Glasgow [...] as my home.” (Focus group 2, P19)

This participant’s experience highlights racist language both verbally and visually naming and recognising a body as different and other in a street encounter, this verbal act arguably serving to ‘cast down and out’ her body in the condition of abjection at individual and community/social group level (Tyler 2013; also 2.3.2). As such, language can (re)draw
(racialized) lines of inclusion and exclusion around identity, belonging and citizenship (cf. Noble 2005). Moreover, I suggest that racist language reveals geographies and histories of hate (Ahmed 2004: 33) where, in moments of encounter, ‘some bodies are already read as more hateful than others’. This quote indicates that hate-full language continues to shape some multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters in Glasgow, a disturbing and corrosive experience that ‘delimits one’s capacity to operate comfortably in a range of social spaces’ (Noble 2009b: 884). The politics of emotion are further discussed in 7.3.1 and agency in 7.4. Here, I want to explore the act of looking as another form of everyday racialisation that continues to construct intersecting positions of ethnicity, gender and religion as ‘out of place’ in Glasgow, an experience frequently discussed by non-white Muslim female participants:

“…sometimes when I walk [on the streets in Glasgow] people look at me because I am wearing the headscarf. They look [and] I put this street face on. Like a serious face, not smiling or looking at them. And then I just walk [on].” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Jordan, new migrant, stay-at-home mother)

The act of looking illustrates how visibility and exclusion are closely intertwined, as visibility is privileged as a signifier of difference that reproduces an ontology of the stranger based on singular visual difference (Ahmed 2000). Female ‘Muslimness’ as otherness was found to be reproduced through encounters in everyday spaces, one participant explaining how “…on the bus, someone [verbally] attacked me and my friend because we were wearing the headscarves” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, stay-at-home mother), and another participant emphasising how “one of my office-mates said he found my cultural background rude because I don’t hug guys […] [which] he might experience as a bad moment but I find that discriminating” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student). These experiences suggest an ‘intersectionality of oppression’ (Kohli and Solorzano 2012: 445) at the intersection of ethnicity, gender and religion (5.3), constructing these women’s bodies and identities as racially other, and potentially more marginalised than others, within wider Scottish society; something particularly felt in more (semi) public spaces such as public transport and on the streets.

This research also finds that broader power relations in Glasgow, and Scottish society produce degrees of ‘difference’ and visibility. Drawing on Song (2014), I agree that most white bodies have not been the victims of systemic structures of power and domination historically (the Irish in Scotland are a notable exception), and while there is analytical coherence, central is that the exclusions and aggressive racialized interactions that black bodies experience in some areas of Glasgow have to be treated on a different level than
those ‘otherings’ reflected upon by participants who were not from Scotland and/or ‘passed for white’ in moments of multicultural encounter. The forms of exclusion and discrimination discussed by ‘white’ participants often intersected with gendered and other aspects of their identities, as exemplified in the following quote:

“This man talked to me […] [and] I don’t think he was expecting my accent because he stopped, looked at me and asked ‘Where are you from?’ I said ‘I am from the States’ and he just shook his head, said ‘I can’t talk to you. You are my enemy’, and walked away. I didn’t know what to say… I mean, I am from the States but that doesn’t mean that I believe in the politics… that I represent all the bad stuff of my country, right?” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in the USA, permanent resident, working)

This participant ‘lasts longer’ before being identified as other, her accent arguably ‘outing’ her otherness, and subsequently fixed, objectified and charged with feelings of fear and suspicion. This quote is certainly about the privileges with regard to whiteness and space that the possibility to go unnoticed in public spaces entails (Schlossberg 2001); yet Ahmed (1999: 89, original emphasis) argues that relations of power and social hierarchies can paradoxically be secured ‘through this very process of destabilization’, since ‘ambiguous bodies that do not fit existing criteria for identification’ can keep in place ‘or are even the condition of possibility for, the desire to tell bodies apart from each other through the accumulation of knowledge’ (ibid: 92). Experiences of ‘lasting longer’ may thus indicate a constant urge to categorise, compartmentalise and label people, and ‘if failing to do so on visible criteria, other methods of differentiating between people need to be drawn upon’ (Liinpää 2018b: 208) such as accent or behaviour.

Such experiences also speak to Hall’s (cited in Hyder 2004: 114) ‘burden of representation’ – the assumption that people represent their ethnic, religious or national heritage – and how this burden is experienced in everyday life as ‘over-racialisation’ (Nayak 2003: 139). This quote indicates identities, and attached geopolitical discourses and imaginaries, being (un)done to this participant as she is compelled to represent intersecting identities of ‘North-American/white/Republican’, arguably experienced as a reduction or ‘mythinterpellation’ (Noble 2009b: 884) that ‘effectively devalues other identities, capacities and accomplishments’. As such, ‘forms of excessive attention do not valorise identity as cultural different […] but maintain its extraordinary status, as something unusual here’ (ibid: 883). This quote also suggests how readings of identity based on aural signifiers interlink with issues of belonging and becoming-ness (after Probyn 2005): This participant is in-between (2.3), her identities ‘dislocating the relation between self and other’ (Ahmed 1999: 88), which allows her to go undetected; yet, her identities ultimately unfold in a ra-
cialised, classed and gendered landscape that writes socio-spatial relations and political imaginaries onto her body.

Having discussed diverse forms of (racial) discrimination faced by participants with different trajectories in Glasgow, I now consider the politics of slow violence and the constructed sense of ordinariness of many of these racialising and discriminating experiences.

7.2.1 The politics of ‘slow’ violence
So far, I have suggested that diverse forms of racialisation and racisms continue to shape the everyday lives of participants frequently from non-white, non-Scottish and Muslim backgrounds in Glasgow. Here, I foreground the finding that the same participants often minimized and made light of racialisations and discriminations experienced in public and semi-formal spaces, with sentences “It was only minor” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, refugee, looking for work), “It only happened to me once” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Australia, permanent resident, working) and “It’s not like it happens all the time” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student) being frequently used. These statements might be indicative of the tendency Meer (2016: 11) observes among black and minority ethnic people’s ‘perceptions of both low-level and more obvious experiences of racial discrimination in Scotland going under-reported’, a finding Meer (2016: 12) further juxtaposes with ‘Scotland having the lowest level of self-reported prejudice in the UK outside of London’ (also 7.3). Yet, these ‘slow’ forms of violence have to be taken seriously, since they embody forms of power that openly position minorities as ‘strange’ and ‘other’, that way reassuring white dominance (Kilomba 2013), and can determine ‘which people are either incorporated into the community or not’ (Koefoed and Simonsen 2012: 629).

Nevertheless, participants commonly disregarded micro aggressions and more hidden forms of racialisation as ‘proper’ racism, the latter being predominantly understood as involving an element of physical violence and/or harm or the potential for an encounter to turn violent, as illustrated in the quote below. This perception resonates with Nixon’s (2011: 2) suggestion that when everyday acts of racism ‘occur gradually and out of sight […] they are typically not viewed as violence at all’. However, some participants did stress micro aggressions and ‘small’ forms of racialisation representing forms of ‘proper’ racism:

“I think racism in [Glasgow] would be towards black people if anything but, as I said, some small remarks but not proper racism. Like it turning violent. I think it’s always meant as a wee joke…Having said that, these small moments can lead up towards something bigger. It can become violent like people thinking ‘This is a person from a different religion’ and then ‘They have to get out of here’…in the end, it is bottom-line racism.” (Young man, white, born in Scotland, working)
While maintaining the idea that physical violence marks ‘proper’ racism, this participant also emphasises the accumulation of ‘small’ acts of violence and less obvious forms of racial harassment. The quote, then, suggests that the harm or violence of everyday forms of racism is rooted in its very ordinary-ness (cf. Nixon 2011), racial discriminations and racialisations often being long-term, repeated, offering limited prospects of escape, and building up over time (Pain 2018). Simultaneously, the quote gives a sense of how humour and mockery are used to defend racist speech and social commentary. This mirrors the opening quote of this chapter, suggesting that humour is used to ease the racist connotations laid between ‘black’ and ‘dirty’. As such, processes of estrangement work through subtle forms of racism (cf. Koefoed and Simonsen 2012; Ahmed 2000): the feelings of non-white groups and individuals in Scottish society can be ridiculed since a sense of Glasgow, and wider Scottish society, as ‘white’ prevails, within the normative discourse that Scotland has ‘no problem with [everyday] racism’ (Hopkins 2008a; 3.5). Section 7.3 further thinks this through in terms of the lines of inclusion and exclusion drawn around ‘Scottishness’ and notions of national belonging in Scottish society.

While recognising that Scotland has been supporting anti-racist movements and making clear political statements against racism and racialisation, these findings suggest that it remains critical to discuss small and ‘quiet’ forms of racism and racial discrimination, and their geographies. Meer’s (2016) recent survey highlights that nearly half (45%) of participants with a black African Caribbean heritage had experienced discrimination in Scotland within the last five years, compared with 29% of Asian heritage and 23% of mixed heritage participants, the main reasons given for discrimination being participants’ real or perceived ethnicity and religion. This and similar research emphasises subtle forms of racism continuing to cut across the everyday experiences and lives of many (ethnic) minority groups in Scottish society. Silencing ‘slow violence’ can therefore work to keep black and minority ethnic people in their place (Kilomba 2013) and ‘deny the Scottish population the right to engage with – and challenge – matters of racial inequality’ (Hopkins 2016: 30).

It is critical, then, to further unpack the tension between the lived realities of multiculturalism and dominant Scottish discourses on national belonging, identity and community, to better understand how both formal and everyday politics intersect in spaces of encounter.

7.3 ‘Scottishness’ and (national) belongings in a racialized society
This research finds that the broader spatial context of Glasgow, and Scotland, continues to be reproduced as ‘white’ with (national) belonging and identities being framed in these terms. When asking about ‘Scottishness’, ethnicity emerged as a critical signifier of national identity among many participants who identified as non-white:
"I don’t think I fit in the picture [of Scottishness] because obviously there are not a lot of black Scottish people." (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This participant suggests that blackness is (partly) incompatible with dominant notions of Scottishness, as Scottishness is equated with whiteness. While acknowledging research that positions whiteness as an (increasingly) unstable signifier of Scottishness (e.g. Goldie 2018; 3.5), I suggest that this quote emphasises the salience of ‘race’ as a marker of social difference, and that racialized nationalism is still felt on and through the bodies of ‘those we refer to as black and brown Scots’ (Virdee 2016). There was general consent among participants of non-white heritages that whiteness continues as a signifier of Scottishness, with statements including “I don’t think people would ever think that I’m Scottish. I mean, look at me! I am clearly not white.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student) being common. This speaks to the post-colonial critique that there is only little or partial acknowledgement of Scotland’s multi-ethnic and multicultural past and present (Morris 2015; Bechhofer and McCrone 2010; Penrose and Howard 2008), and might indicate that Glasgow is still reproduced as a ‘white preserve’ (Nayak 2017). Moreover, East-Asian ethnicity was highlighted as oppositional to dominant ideas of ‘Scottishness’, as exemplified in the following quote:

“I feel Scottish, I was raised here […] I went to a Scottish school, a lot of my friends have always been [white] Scottish, […] my parents’ house is in Scotland […] but not a lot of people think of Asian-looking people when they hear ‘Scottish’”. (Young woman, East-Asian/English, born in Hong Kong, raised in Scotland, second generation citizen, working)

This participant emphasises the significance of place of residence and spaces of socialisation in which she was ‘raised’, arguably alluding to being familiar and having internalised ‘Scottish’ norms and values. Although place of residence, length of residence, upbringing and education and commitment to place seem to be relevant markers of (contemporary) Scottishness (e.g. Hopkins 2004; Kiely et al 2001), this quote implies that notions of ancestry and territory continue to weave through dominant imaginaries of nationhood and belonging (McCrone and Bechhofer 2010). I suggest that this indicates a disjuncture between elite discourse on migration and belonging and the lived realities of racialized minorities in Scotland (Davidson and Virdee 2018; Virdee and McGeever 2018). When talking about Scotland’s political culture, participants frequently from non-white and/or non-Scottish backgrounds attempted to describe this disjuncture:
“I’ve lived in England and in Scotland, right? In England, people have been racist to me [...] but also in Scotland! At the same time, Scotland is really open, like, it’s mixed; it is open and tolerant to other cultures. But then, how is it that I have been racially attacked in Scotland?” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This participant alludes to dominant imaginaries and discourses of Scotland as an inclusive and ‘civic’ rather than ethnic nation, where a diverse and ‘mixed’ society accommodates people of different heritages and backgrounds (3.5). Research indicates that the Scottish situation is distinctive as ‘many black and ethnic minorities identify positively with the nation [...] and see themselves as Scottish in many ways’ (Hopkins 2008a: 120), which has prompted scholars to confirm ‘the brand of Scottishness’ (Sharp et al 2014: 40) promoted by the Scottish government as ‘forward looking, multi-ethnic and multi-cultural’.

However, this participant also emphasises living another reality, marked by everyday racism and discrimination (7.2), which exists alongside more inclusive experiences of Scottish society. There thus seem to be issues between state-given citizenship and belonging in wider society and local communities. Alluding to tensions between citizenship and belonging, participants of non-white and/or non-Scottish backgrounds strongly suggested that formal political debates and discourses stigmatise and racialize migrant belongings in wider society:

“[Politicians] are alluding to [...] black and brown people as immigrants [and] also people who are from the Middle-East. The media is often generalizing immigrants and, well, I am an immigrant and I don’t think that’s fair, to put all people into the same box and label it in a certain way.” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Australia, permanent resident, working)

While this participant was not clear about whether she identified as the ‘type’ of immigrant othered by dominant media and politics, this quote does point to power relationships within racialized minorities (e.g. Yuval-Davis 2006). Regarding the generalising trends discussed by this participant, research suggests that there is a growing trend in politics and media to de-value, de-humanise and problematize immigrants in society (e.g. Neal et al 2018). Some suggest that Scottish government has, in the form of past and current campaigns around nationhood, diversity and Scotland’s history (e.g. One Scotland, Many Cultures and the Fresh Talent Initiative), shown its ‘desire to establish a history of diversity’ (Penrose and Howard 2008: 106), arguably putting past, present and future generations of migrants central in nation-building processes. Yet, as above quote and other participants suggest, unease, uncertainty and doubt are felt around issues of difference and multiculturalism in Scotland, one participant explaining how “the media often talk about
certain people [...] as different somehow [and while] you are not against somebody [constructed as] different [...] you might still be worried...and won’t like that person so much” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student). As such, ethno-national and religious boundaries to Scottishness can construct otherness and ‘difference’ as negative, hindering a ‘future with ethnic and racial minorities that are included’ (Meer 2015: 1477).

Formal political events and contexts were generally discussed in vague terms; however, participants emphasised the ways in which both formal and everyday politics intersect in everyday spaces. Using Brexit and the independence referendum as abstract backdrops, some participants from non-white and/or non-Scottish backgrounds suggested that Scottishness as whiteness was often accepted as the norm, ‘casually’ reproduced in moments of mundane encounter:

“I think that people in Scotland see themselves as white. [...] whenever I talk to Scottish people, they always ask ‘Do you study here?’ or ‘Where are you from?’ They see me as a passer-by, thinking that I will leave again...maybe because I look different, Asian [...] but there is actually quite a big Chinese community in Glasgow [...] so there is a possibility that I could be born here. [...] Scottish people recognise that there are people from other countries and that they have a place [in Glasgow] but those moments also imply that they don’t see me as part of ‘us’, the Scottish.” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student)

I suggest that encounters as implied in this quote highlight the often banal and mundane ways in which a white sense of community and belonging can be reproduced and stabilised across everyday contexts in Glasgow, and how such moments form often ‘casual’ parts of everyday conversations, ‘banter’ and interactions, also illustrated in the opening quote of this chapter. This participant clearly points to the histories and geographies of past and present migrant populations in shaping contemporary Glasgow, and wider Scottish society, juxtaposing those with her experience of being regarded as an outsider or ‘passer-by’ by others rather than choosing to be different herself. While this quote clearly troubles dominant discourses that frame Scottishness as ‘impeccably civic’ (Meer 2014: n.p.; 3.5), here, I suggest that this powerful narrative of exclusion highlights the ongoing significance of ethnicity and whiteness weaving through dominant senses of imagined nationhood and community in Glasgow, obscuring alternative belonging(s) (7.4). However, some participants also gave a sense of norms changing, one participant remarking “[my daughter’s friends] will eat what we serve them, whereas the parents go like ‘Oh, my kids don’t eat African food!’” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second
generation citizen, working), alluding to a generational gap between narratives and ideas of Scottishness shifting with a younger and more multi-cultural and mixed generation.

The empirical materials above are inherently interwoven with emotion, and so I now develop discussion regarding in/exclusion and national belonging(s) through the lens of emotional geographies.

7.3.1 National belonging(s) and emotion
Since nations are imagined political communities (Anderson 1991), constantly (re)made through interactions and encounters in everyday contexts, the embodied and the emotional always shape everyday politics. In this research, different participants highlighted the emotions as woven through formal political debates around migration and (national) belonging, these emotional entanglements weaving through and being ‘felt’ on the streets of Glasgow:

“This whole Brexit thing might have flushed out [the extent of] racism in Scotland but I think it has always been there. Maybe it’s getting more talked about. […] In Glasgow, you always see people from so many places, religions and colours […] but when you get a bit deeper, you hear jokes being made, wee bits of racism coming out of people […] that sometimes makes me uncomfortable [when I walk down] the streets [in Glasgow].” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in Scotland, working)

Using Brexit as a vague political backdrop, this quote suggests formal and everyday politics intersecting, and ‘racial vibrations’ (May 2015) shaping everyday geographies of encounter. This participant juxtaposes a sense of the multicultural and multi-ethnic histories and geographies of Glasgow with subtle yet seemingly entrenched discourses around nationhood and belonging that ‘surface’ in the form of everyday racialisations and racisms (also 3.5 and 7.2). Nayak (2017: 290) connects these imaginaries and encounters with deeper social feelings related to whiteness and national belonging, arguing that “these felt intensities slide over the political grammar of legislation on citizenship, equality and human rights, inscribing their own felt interpretations of whiteness into the national landscape and the bodies that lie therein.”

As such, emotions can relate to normatively constructed understandings of who really has a right to belong in Glasgow, weaving through encounters ‘on the ground’, and produce ‘a fictive community’ that stabilises ‘the nation’ as white (ibid: 291; also 7.3). Køefoed and Simonsen (2012: 632) further suggest that experiences of not being recognised as a full member of an imagined community can ‘create ambivalent feelings and a double identification with the nation’, as particularly people who identify as black and brown experience
doubt, uncertainty and disorientation, and struggle for recognition (after Honneth 1995). Some participants tried to make sense of this process of double identification between in/exclusion and proximity/distance that Koefoed and Simonsen (2012) describe, arguing that:

"People are afraid of something or somebody they don’t know. Its difference, so, it’s a bit scary, right? […] It is wrong, but that’s what you feel like when meet someone or something different.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student)

This quote goes to the politics of normalising discourses and geographies of fear and insecurity (Pain 2009), and resonates with Taguieff’s (2001) argument that the most dominant form of racism today is a relentless fear of mixing fused with a racialized nationalism. Here, I argue that normalising of emotions that negatively impact/construct the unknown, difference and otherness can serve to draw boundaries and ‘harden the edges around politics, and the acceptance of practices that deny liberties to some people’ (Staeheli et al 2012: 637), where the ‘fear-mongering’ (ibid.: 636) about some people more than others in society can lead to differences rather than similarities being highlighted, and divisions rather than what connects people. The quote also speaks to the spatialities and politics of emotion(s), as affective relationships intertwine with subjectivities of citizenship, nationhood and belonging and the places in which these are lived (Askins 2015; Pain and Staeheli 2014; Staeheli et al 2012; also 2.5 and 3.4).

7.4 Agency and the everyday politics of resistance
Throughout this research, the everyday emerges as always political, with formal and everyday politics intersecting and becoming articulated in mundane spaces of encounter. This section draws attention to participants’ agency in challenging, transrupting and potentially subverting processes of exclusion that construct them as strange, different and other in wider society (cf. Hesse 2000). A substantive and growing body of research emphasises that black and minority ethnic groups in Scotland have firmly established themselves in Scottish society, feel a strong attachment to it and display a long history of claim-making on national identities and belonging in Scottish society (e.g. Botterill et al 2016; Bonino 2015; Hopkins 2014; Meer 2014; Kyriakides et al 2009). In this research, actions taken ranged from stepping in and confronting racializing and stereotyping behaviour and speech, to more quiet forms of resistance that can gradually shift established patterns of authority and control (Staeheli et al 2012) and dominant notions of nationhood and belonging. In more overt forms of resistance, some participants actively challenged discriminating and racializing behaviour that ‘others’ (ethnic) minorities in Glasgow:
“I saw a Polish couple [who live in my neighbourhood] at the bus stop and these boys [...] were harassing them, kicking their bags and calling them names. [...] I went over and said ‘What do you think you’re doing?’ One boy turns around, pulling the lady’s bag, and says ‘Fuck off, you…’ – he used a derogative word – and I went to the other boy [whose parents I knew from community-centre B] [...] and said ‘You got 10 seconds to apologise and take yourself and your friends away from here before I tell your dad that you were racially assaulting this couple’. He said ‘No, it’s not like that! We were just having a joke’. But, at end of the day, they were calling them names and said ‘Go back to your country’ and stuff like that.” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This participant’s decision to confront the boys’ racist behaviour echoes his decision to resist the normalising of racializing speech in the opening quote of this chapter. Instead of enacting ‘strategies of invisibilisation’ (Hopkins 2011) when faced with racism, marginalisation or discrimination, this participant openly challenges stereotyping geographies and racialisation that construct the Polish couple, and himself, as other and ‘out of place’ in Glasgow. This quote also highlights racist speech being constructed as harmless, and Scottishness as whiteness ‘casually’ being reproduced in everyday situations (7.2). Such normalising of racism was extensively problematized by Muslim participants, with one criticising how “this famous TV show on Netflix [...] used the Muslim call for prayer as a joke [...] which is not funny to people who believe in Islam!” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, stay-at-home mother). This goes to popular media adopting and (re)producing dominant narratives of nationhood and belonging in Western societies, and Muslim identities increasingly being constructed as ‘the ultimate other’ (Alexander 2002; 2.3.2). Furthermore, some participants enacted more everyday and quiet forms of resistance, indicating how micro connections and relations forged in mundane spaces may have the potential shift wider public attitudes towards otherness and belonging in Glasgow:

“I don’t think Muslims are famous for doing the activities I do. So, when I went to the [painting] classes, people look at me. When I go to a musical concert or opera, people look at me. [...] I always thought ‘Okay, I will give people the chance to get another opinion about Muslims’, making them understand that people with headscarves are normal people like them who enjoy doing all the things that they do.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student)

This participant actively performs/does her own versions of gender and religion counter to dominant constructions within society, attempting to transrupt dominant discourse and im-
aginaries of Muslim identities and (national) belonging in Scottish society (cf. Hesse 2000). Her actions might reflect what Askins (2015: 475) terms a ‘quiet politics of belonging’, with everyday activities in quotidian spaces representing ‘implicit activisms’ (Horton and Kraftl 2009) that form part of a broader continuum of movements for social change. This participant also seems to remain hopeful that encounters ‘hold the potential to nudge established patterns of control and authority and anticipate new political acts’ (Staeheli et al 2012: 630; 2.5), alluding to the geopolitics of hope and incremental change (Askins 2008, Smith and Pain 2008; Wright 2008). Other research shows that, instead of withdrawing from Scottish society, Muslims and those ‘mistaken’ for Muslims, including people who identify as Sikh, Hindu and South-Asian as well as peoples with Afro-Caribbean heritages (Hopkins et al 2017), use a range of strategies to ‘minimise a sense of difference and disjuncture from Scottish society’ (Hopkins 2014: 1581). Quotidian forms of agency and resistance enacted through micro connections thus indicate a ‘desire to force others to consider the limits of, [...] and blur socially constructed racial boundaries of racialized identities’ (Mahtani 2002: 429-31; also Nayak 2017), potentially deconstructing dominant binaries of whiteness/non-whiteness and racialized (national) belongings in society.

Participants in this research also linked agency with macro and micro politics, suggesting how coming together and forging micro connections and relations with others in mixed spaces can be a decidedly political act that opens up processes of ‘renegotiating Selves’ (Askins and Pain 2011). This is despite tensions, disconnections and uneasiness surrounding many encounters (5.3). The majority of participants foregrounded multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters as beneficial and mind-opening, regarding how participants think about themselves in relation to ‘others’, as well as prompting questions and reflections about the wider communal and societal fabric of Glaswegian society. A central theme that emerged in this research, then, relates to how many participants expressing a willingness to be ‘changed’, actively seeking out spaces that allow their thinking to be challenged and confronted by the tensions and uneasiness surrounding some encounters with ‘difference’:

“I have no control over who I’m gonna meet at [the gym] [...] [which] stretches you and your horizons: No longer am I surrounded by people that I chose to surround myself with, and they might not have the same opinions as I do. A lot of the time people don’t like their opinions to be challenged and that’s why they don’t surround themselves with people who are different from them, or go to places where that might happen. I like to hear how the other women [in my gym class] are doing and how they are coping with life. [...] It opened my eyes about life on the south side of Glasgow! I used to go running through the south Side without really seeing it. Be-
fore, I was living very isolated in this small pocket of Glasgow.” (Young woman, East-Asian/British, born in Hong Kong, second generation citizen, working)

This participant talks about the women of different ages, social classes, lifestyles and ethnicities she has met at her local gym, referring to the value of intersectional and mixed space in creating points of commonality and micro connection (5.4) and the ability of ‘doing identities together’ (6.2). Here, this quote serves to highlight this participant’s understanding of ‘the other’ changing and also her view of herself because of these encounters, and of the south side of Glasgow – with areas like Govanhill and the Gorbals, similar to Maryhill, housing significant numbers of ethnic and cultural minorities that continue to be stigmatised in terms of unemployment, violence and negative tropes around place (4.3.2). I suggest that the possibility to encounter others can initiate the process of ‘renegotiating Selves’ (Askins and Pain 2011), another participant agreeing that meeting others is “about how you see and think about people differently [and] about getting a chance to think about myself as well.” (Young woman, Central-Asian/German, born in Turkmenistan, raised in Germany, new migrant, working). Being (willingly) forced to reflect about one’s stereotypes and assumptions can thus help to critically assess wider discourses around nationhood and belonging.

Women, in particular, discussed their sense of themselves shifting through encounters with people as ‘others’, explicitly linking the value of mixed and everyday spaces with the ability to enact alternative belonging(s):

“Nowadays, there is a lot of confirmation of bias. Everything that you read, online or in the papers, it’s all very similar, they all tell you the same. I value the chance to [meet new people because] I get to know what’s happening outside of my bubble. […] Those opportunities are rare… I can do it here, at the cafe, and in the class [at the community-centre] but besides that… Still, it is so important to hear about others’ experiences […] because, otherwise, I only have my own experiences of the world and they might be very limited.” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Hong Kong, new migrant, student)

This participant points out the politics of mixed spaces (2.2 and 5.2), and highlights people’s willingness to be ‘changed’. I argue that this participant’s emphasis on the possibility of encounters to hear other people’s ‘experiences of the world’ suggests an agency that can ‘quietly’ push back against dominant discourses and narratives in politics and media, allowing people with different trajectories to carve out alternative belonging(s) in Glasgow. As such, this quote strongly resonates with feminist and post-colonial writing that frame social realities as being lived and experienced differently for different people. In this re-
search, participants from non-white and non-Scottish backgrounds frequently linked this to the realization that "integration doesn't just happen to you" (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, student), underscoring that the (successful) negotiation of difference is always precarious and involves continuous effort in communicating and creating understanding (Neal and Vincent 2013). ‘Integration’ thus emerged as unfolding in everyday spaces, and having to do with enacting senses of belonging and feelings of being ‘in place’ and ‘at home’ in Glasgow, achieved through actively seeking out social meeting spaces in the city.

This research also finds that participants who have been experiencing racism and racialisation aired their frustration at stereotypes in Scottish society only slowly changing. While foregrounding that it is critical to continue to mobilise against everyday forms of racism and racialisation, many accentuating how notoriously difficult stereotyping opinions and racializing discourses are to challenge:

“I’ve tried to explain to people that [immigrants] just do their jobs and that they are the same as them, but it goes from here through to there [Points to his right ear and moves his finger to his left ear]…So, sometimes I wonder ‘What’s the point?’”

(Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This quote speaks to the emotional effort needed to resist wider socio-political discourses; across this research this threw up questions regarding participants’ ability to shift how (ethnic and religious) minority and migrant identities and bodies, in particular, are constructed and perceived within Western societies. Another participant, for example, remarked how “Islam is being associated with terrorism. So, Islam is worrying for a lot of people in [Western] society. It is a fact now.” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Jordan, new migrant, stay-at-home mother), implying struggles of cultural and religious hegemony continuing to exist in Western societies, with Muslim identities and cultures increasingly being marked as inferior, other and threatening (Hopkins 2004). It is important to understand that ‘overcoming such “racialized boundaries”’ (Anthias and Yuval-Davis 1992; Miles 1993) can be a very tiresome, wearing and at times for some a deeply offensive and threatening feature of daily life in Scotland’ (McIntosh et al 2004: n.p.). Similarly, another participant commented that “the way out of which a lot of people approach minorities nowadays, also in Scotland, is not because they want to, but because people feel that they have to.” (Young woman, Central-Asian/German, born in Turkmenistan, raised in Germany, new migrant, working), indicating dominant discourses arguably constructing multiculture, diversity and migration as ‘burdens’ for Scottish society.
Yet, instead of feeling defeated by this sense of frustration, non-white and non-Scottish participants often argued that feeling othered can also be a conscious decision:

“I have been racially harassed in Glasgow [...] but that doesn’t stop me from feeling at home, it doesn’t stop me from doing the things I want to do. I still got a job, I have friends. In a way, that overcomes all the other barriers. If I didn’t have job here and was brown, it might be a lot harder to feel integrated and get around those moments.” (Young woman, East-Asian, born in Australia, permanent resident, working)

This participant seems to build a sense of belonging around work and social networks, replacing ethno-centric notions of belonging and nationhood. She foregrounds the intersecting of different trajectories influencing people’s ability to build alternative belongings, conceiving of employment as a decisive factor in her ability to ‘cope’ and navigate racist encounters and wider geographies of racialisation in Glasgow. Resistance and resilience are thus always caught up with an ‘intersectionality of oppression’ (Kohli and Solorzano 2012), making it vital to hold on to ‘the knotty issue of inequalities’ (Valentine 2008) when exploring everyday encounters (3.2 and 3.3). Similarly, another participant emphasised how “I have been racially discriminated [in Glasgow but] I think it would be too easy to say I feel excluded and want to go back to Egypt because of that. It’s deeper than that. It’s a choice you make” (Young woman, Middle-Eastern, born in Egypt, new migrant, stay-at-home mother). ‘Choice’ here speaks to Noble and Tabar’s (2002: 144) observation of people constructing identities in response to ‘the experience of structural and attitudinal discrimination within the everyday settings in which they operate’, containing and carving out belonging(s), ‘a manoeuvrability and a sense of agency needed for their social environment’. As worrying shifts around immigration, multiculturalism and integration continue on a broader political level (7.3), I suggest that participants in this research appeal to a civic belonging and their rights to the city, and the nation, indicative of what Askins (2008: 243) calls a ‘transformative geopolitics of encounter’ (Askins 2008: 243) where ‘conviviality is not a given, but the consequence of a hard won, slow-burn multiculturalism’ (Nayak 2017: 299), and marked by countless everyday acts of resistance and resilience.

7.4.1 The politics of semi-formal and mixed spaces
This chapter has evidenced how agency can be enacted through coming together and being involved with each other, more formal and everyday politics intersecting in mundane and informal meeting spaces in Glasgow. As such, I have suggested that these spaces are critical political platforms, allowing people to come together and to push back, individually and collectively, against wider structural issues that limit more inclusive senses of integration, social cohesion and multiculturalism. This ability to gather, mix and mingle is critical, especially given the finding that many participants emphasised the (increasing)
rarity of informal meeting spaces in Glasgow. Participants who use and/or work for community centres and public libraries discussed the ongoing struggles for securing public funds:

“The centre would not be able to operate without volunteers. There is only enough money for 1 or 2 paid members of staff. That might change in the future because they will get funding again. […] But we’ve been through a bit of a crisis where they weren’t able to apply for funding, so they had to rely on everyone giving up their time. I volunteer one night a week now. […] It has been really tough; we’ve got through it I hope.” (Middle-aged woman, white, born in Scotland, working)

This participant highlights the uncertainty of receiving, and qualifying for, decreasing funds as well as having to rely on unpaid work and support to keep community centres up and running in Glasgow. Other participants echo this, adding that community centres “have to make money whereas other places like the libraries obviously get funding from the Council and Glasgow Life” (Older woman, white, born in Australia, permanent resident, retired) and that “the council just doesn’t have the funding [and] there’re a lot of political things that you need to go through […] [which] makes the community think we’re holding back” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working). A sense of a mismatch prevails between the funding being allocated and the expectations/hopes of local communities what can/should be offered at community centres and other public spaces.

This ambivalence around community centres speaks to a sense of neighbourhoods being subject to change rather than the driver of change (Massey 1995), the neighbourhoods of Maryhill and Partick in which the community centres and library are located being subject to local and national changing political conjunctures (4.3.1). In this context, this research focusses on people still managing to come together in micro spaces of association in Glasgow, ‘getting together’ and micro connections as critical forms of resistance (7.4); finding that, despite these pressures, existing (publicly funded) spaces continue to prove their ‘worth’ and avoid closure:

“The libraries get funding [from Glasgow Life but] they have to fight for survival…they have to show that they are not only there for books. So, they record our attendance [at the knitting group] every week to show like ‘We got 7 knitters here every week’…it helps them to give figures to the council. […] My mother worked in a Paisley library and a lot of them were closed down because they weren’t busy enough. So, the library here is very keen […] to have people using the building and
This participant suggests that libraries continue to be meaningful public spaces as they facilitate community cohesion and social life in the neighbourhood alongside providing access to information and educational services. As neo-liberal policies have firmed inequalities between rich and poor in cities, creating uneven urban geographies in Glasgow (4.3.1), I suggest that public libraries continue to provide a critical space for redistribution, recognition and encounter (Peterson 2017; Fincher and Iveson 2012, 2008; also 7.3). However, while research suggests that political recognition of the value of public libraries seems to be growing on a UK-wide level, including Scotland (Myers and Heddon 2017, Scottish Library and Information Council 2015; Goulding 2006), emerging research positioning libraries as central in providing social well-being and integration for those most disadvantaged and vulnerable in Scottish society (e.g. Martzoukou and Burnett 2018), libraries continue to be under pressure (Heseltine 2018).

Similarly, participants using community centres emphasised the ongoing need of community spaces across Glasgow, one participant highlighting that community centres were often “the most social place in the whole area” and “if you took that away from the community, there would be nothing left” (Young man, white, born in Scotland, volunteer). However, many sketched a contrast between popular perceptions and the wider social potential of community centres. One participant warned that viewing these places as “for those in need of help only” hinders people from “realising these places to their full potential” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working), devaluing existing and increasingly sparse communal spaces particular in more deprived areas of Glasgow. A look at Scotland’s shifting political conjunctures over the last two decades indicates how ‘contradictory, uneven and incomplete’ state politics (Nolan 2015: 56) have had drastic ’material effects in the everyday lives of people (Dikec 2007: 21), impacting how many relate to still existing community services in Glasgow (4.3.1).

Some participants further believed that a politics of profit prevails in terms of providing and maintaining public services and spaces, and expressed their frustration at uneven geographies of investing and funding in more low-income areas of Glasgow including Maryhill:

“A lot of people around [Maryhill] are used to seeing quick changes happening, like, stuff opening up and then being closed down again. For instance, if this [community centre] stopped, [the community] wouldn’t weep about it. […] They would love to keep the centre open; they would fight for it, but if they lost, it
wouldn’t make a big difference [...] People have no illusions here.” (Young man, black, born in Eritrea, raised in England, second generation citizen, working)

This quote speaks to the more formal politics of mixed and mundane spaces, particularly their role in allowing people to meet others in casual ways and enabling encounters that ‘quietly’ chip away at wider stereotypes, racism and prejudices in society. This research foregrounds the multiple forms of association and identification happening despite these pressures, however, quotes as the one above also seem to indicate mundane spaces of association and encounter in Glasgow being in need of (continuing) support by local institutions and government, who, I suggest, have a certain responsibility to ‘preserve and acknowledge the importance of such facilities [particularly] in low-income areas’ (Tersteeg et al 2014: 7) and support ‘free, non-consumerist, spaces for [different types of social] networks, kinships and social reproduction to function’ (Davidson et al 2010: 220).

7.5 Conclusion
In this chapter, I have suggested that diverse forms of racialisation, racism and discrimination continue to shape the daily geographies of participants who identified as black, non-white and/or Muslim, and specifically non-white Muslim women, in Glasgow. Post-colonial perspectives discussed in Chapter 2 enabled me here to address the persistent and often ‘slow’ violence of these racisms and racialisations as gradual, often invisible and repetitive forms of power that continue to position some (ethnic) minority identities and bodies as ‘other’ and ‘out of place’, reassuring ‘white dominance’ (Kilomba 2013) over some public spaces in Glasgow. Critically, I have argued that these accounts seem to imply that in/exclusions and visibility remain intertwined in Glasgow, as an ontology of ‘otherness’ and strangerhood based on singular visual difference can frame, largely undisturbed, processes of nationhood, belonging and ‘home’ in those terms. As such, I have suggested that the findings discussed in this chapter challenge some of the literature presented in Chapter 3, regarding racial discrimination not being present in Scotland, instead emphasizing that ethno-centric tropes remain part of contemporary articulations of Scottishness, sometimes actively reproduced, and bordered, in moments of intercultural encounter in Glasgow. I have also argued that the apparent equation of Scottishness as ‘whiteness’ might indicate the only partial, though growing, acknowledgement of Scotland’s multicultural past and present, with Glasgow arguably continuing to be constructed as a ‘white preserve’ (Nayak 2017).

However, as in Chapter 5, I have suggested that ‘quiet’ political encounters and moments of micro connection can build up through time and space, stick in the body, and bleed out beyond the moment and specific site of encounter. Thinking through the politics of mixed and mundane spaces, I have sought to take seriously - both seeing and recognising - the
‘force of the informal’ (Neal at al 2018: 148) and the impact of the everyday, as people ‘get by in the rub, in the everyday […] where the abstract is subsumed’ (Keith 2008: 197), emphasising encounters with/across difference and micro connections as resistance. Despite wider contexts of Brexit, the Scottish independence referendum and scholarly and formal political concern, participants also tellingly appeared to conceive these conjunctures as ‘vague’ political backdrops. This implies a sense of agency and mundane belonging not driven by formal political debates – other concerns come to the fore.

Critically, through forging micro connections and relations with others in mundane spaces of proximity and association, I have emphasised that people as others identify, carve out and may lay claims to spaces and moments of belonging and ‘being in place’ in Glasgow. Central here is that I have shown how such embodied encounters, practices and micro connections may unsettle and shift wider stereotypes and racializing discourses in Scottish society. While many of them remain notoriously difficult to challenge, I have argued that these connections, relations and identifications can particularly empower people whose bodies are frequently racialized, ethnized and othered to ‘quietly’ inhabit and attempt to transform the ‘skin’ of public spaces in Glasgow.
8 Conclusion: Precarious yet hopeful encounters

“What kinds of interventions, practices and politics (at whatever scale) might imbue a sense of hopeful affect and reinvest hope, trust and commitment to the urban commons, and [...] does ‘difference in the minor key’ have the cement to keep it together in the face of calamitous discourse?”

(Wise 2013: 45)

8.1 Introduction

This thesis set out to explore multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters in mundane spaces across the North and West of Glasgow, and has highlighted their capacity to nurture precarious yet progressive forms of living together, taking to heart some of the concerns asserted in the quote above. By bringing together literatures on spaces of encounter, geographies of racialisation and cultural ‘othering’, and processes of (national) identity formation and belonging, I have emphasized that people from diverse and intersecting ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds and heritages routinely and confidently manage complex social relationships through ‘placed’ encounters, enacting various forms of belonging, comfort and ‘in-placeness’ in the city. While exclusionary discourses and xenophobic attitudes continue to shape everyday life for people who identify as black, non-white and/or Muslim, I have shown that people often accommodate these tensions, and identify mutual commonalities and differences together with others in micro spaces of association and relation-making.

Within the Scottish context, it remains crucial to interrogate how notions of place, nationhood, identities, ‘home’ and belonging are relationally constructed, disrupted and transrupted (cf. Hesse 2000), through multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters in quotidian spaces. Given that ‘Scottishness’ continues to be predominantly equated with and reproduced as ‘white-ness’ – although contested as this thesis and other work has shown – there is a real (on-going) need for spaces that provide engagement opportunities with people from diverse ethnic, cultural, age, gender, sexual and other backgrounds and heritages (Davidson et al 2018; Virdee 2016). Spaces that appear ‘everyday’, including local cafes, public libraries and community centres thus have a critical role to play in allowing people to identify differences and similarities, developing affective bonds/ties (Blokdand 2003) of belonging to each other, and notions of ‘community’ that stress social connection and interdependence in and beyond Glasgow.

This thesis has argued that exploring quotidian settings of multicultural and multi-ethnic encounter are critical to understand how multiculture and the complex nature of ethnic and cultural diversity are lived ‘on the ground’. The ‘ordinary’ matters, and this research
set out to focus on routine and ‘shared’ spaces of interaction and relation-building to investigate how people are able to both develop ‘connective interdependencies’ (Neal et al 2018: 152) and invoke ‘differences that matter’ (Ahmed 2004). While it was my main concern to foreground more hopeful ways in which to engage with issues around migration, (re)settlement, multiculture, nationhood, ‘home’ and belongings in Western societies, moving away from increasingly fearful and problematizing perceptions and attitudes of these processes, I do not discount spaces of encounter holding the potential for both connection and conflict. In earlier chapters, I have detailed some of the conflict and strain that multicultural encounters can entail, and shown how people often incorporate these as part of wider reflexive processes.

In this thesis, these debates have led to an understanding of encounters as spatio-temporal sites of ‘conjuncture’ (Featherstone 2017) and space ‘as an open and ongoing production’ (Massey 2005: 55), in which places are constantly being defined through the juxtaposing of communities, groups and individuals who are linked out into wider networks, and are ‘actively engaged in the co-construction of in neighbourhoods, cities and regions’ (Neal et al 2018: 129). Throughout this thesis, people’s everyday negotiations of multicultural encounters and increasingly diversifying (urban) environments have been explored to show how mundane and ordinary spaces can become a ‘milieu of experimentation’ (Ong 2011: 23) in which people build social relations and interdependence, and articulate (newly found) differences and similarities and capacities to live with difference. I thus conclude this thesis by outlining the key contributions of the presented work, before discussing the broader relevance of the thesis in and beyond the academy.

8.2 Key contributions
Exploring micro geographies of multicultural encounter and belonging in Glasgow, this thesis was driven by the following key arguments: (1) semi-formal and public spaces including local cafes, public libraries and community centres are key social sites that enable people, differently situated in society, to negotiate the increasing ethnic, cultural and religious diversity of Glaswegian communities, and to identify precarious yet often hopeful ways of living together; (2) encounters, of differing depth and duration, facilitate micro connections and relationships to emerge between people that often bleed out beyond the immediate moment and specific locality of encounter; meaning that (3) notions of place, (national) identity and belonging are negotiated in moments of encounter, situating ‘everyday’ and mundane moments of interaction as crucial in shaping, challenging and potentially subverting, while simultaneously being shaped by, wider imaginaries of nationhood and belonging in Scottish society. As such, this thesis contributes to debates on encounter, intersectionality and the Scottish context in three following ways.
8.2.1 Spaces of encounter and the impact of micro connections

This thesis thinks through the micro politics of multicultural encounter and processes of identity making and belonging in Glasgow, without abstracting such encounters from wider contexts or from past social relations and historical and spatial connections (Argument 1). Critically, this approach moves away from trends in recent literature that stage encounters as rather ‘anodyne occurrences’ (Featherstone 2017: 165), instead foregrounding encounters as sites ‘freighted with significant histories and geographies of contestation’. This thesis has detailed the diverse ways in which micro connections, relations and identifications emerge between differently situated people in specific semi-formal and mundane spaces in Glasgow, and their potential impact beyond the immediate moment and specific site of encounter, as people enact (new) relationships of similarity and difference, build and embody more inclusive senses of belonging in local communities and wider Glasgow, and relate to, and potentially transrupt (cf. Hesse 2000), broader national discourses and imaginaries around difference, place and nationhood in Scottish society. These micro connections are central, and I argue that the mundane spaces of proximity and association in this thesis are also key for such processes of identification and relation-making. This is an important realization, and contributes to relevant debates in encounter literature, since focusing on the specific sites in which people come together, mix and mingle with others enabled me to bring to the fore some of the (continuing) uneven geographies and unequal social relations that become articulated through encounters, and in particular places (Massey 2005) in Glasgow, and the ways in which people may contest current and emerging multi-ethnic politics and wider landscapes of power (Neal et al 2018) in local places.

Moreover, in terms of Argument 2, this thesis engages with debates in encounter literature that construct some encounters as more meaningful than others by assessing their ‘scalability’ and ‘measurability’; contributing to these debates by taking a feminist perspective of viewing/looking at the ‘both/and’, foregrounding the value and significance participants in this research attached to both fleeting and more prolonged and repetitive encounters, and all encounters always being inter-scaled and connected through the local, national and global, and vice versa. It is both important to explore how some encounters appear to invoke learning processes that ‘scale-up’ to new notions of citizenship which respect difference (Valentine 2008), and understand how encounters are often experienced, enacted and performed in messy ways, and with unpredictable and uncontrollable results (Wilson 2016a; Askins and Pain 2011; also Hubbard and Lyon 2018). By emphasising how micro connections exist alongside micro aggressions and racialisation, I have attempted to contribute to this body of work and way of seeing/looking.
A central concern underlying the above debates is the question when and how specific encounters become politicised and what is politically meaningful in the ‘here and now’; i.e. whether everyday social practices – movement, mixing and exchange – can ‘effectively contaminate’ political practice (Hall 2015). The main argument of this thesis is that both fleeting and casual encounters matter and can become politicised (Argument 3), contributing to conviviality and creating ‘everyday multiculturalisms’ (Studdert and Walkerdine 2016) and alternative ‘migrant urbanisms’ (Hall 2015), as well as the ways in which people (inter)act in more meaningful ways in what is more broadly recognised as ‘political’. This thesis has taken seriously that politics, at its roots, refers to the making of relations between people (cf. Askins 2015), arguing that all encounters can potentially reconfigure social relations, identities and senses of belonging and home, and specifically foregrounding the potential of ‘quiet’ and ‘small’ encounters to enter/shift the realm of more formal ‘Politics’. In so doing, I have attempted to move forward these debates and our understanding of how people’s everyday encounters with/across difference may (re)make urban space and thus (urban) politics.

Critically, the mutuality of micro connections and aggressions in moments of (multicultural) encounter also foregrounds the micro politics of mundane and mixed spaces (Argument 3). In this thesis, I have taken inspiration from post-colonial literature to remain sensitive to (past) colonial discourses, often marked by highly unequal relations of power (Domosh 2010), continuing to shape global politics, geographical imaginations and bodily encounters (Haldrup et al 2006; Gregory 2004), and sites of ‘throwntogetherness’ (Massey 2005). In previous chapters, I have thus detailed how colonial and border imaginaries of social, cultural and ethnic ‘difference’ and wider geographies of racialisation and racism continue to be felt by people who identify as black, non-white and/or Muslim, and particularly women with these (intersecting) identities, in public spaces across Glasgow; in this way contributing to the significance of taking post-colonial theories seriously in social geography, and in exploring everyday geographies of encounter. As the micro connections described in this thesis were also emotional and agentic, I contribute here to feminist and critical debates in geography that attempt to take discussions regarding the meaning of encounters in new directions by emphasising the multiple ways that encounters are affective, sensuous and emotive, and the spatio-political consequences of emotions (e.g. Wilson 2016a; Wright 2015; Ahmed 2014).

8.2.2 Locating intersectionality
In this thesis, I have brought together theories of intersectionality and thinking on/about space and the local, to underscore the significance of embedding processes of (intersectional) identity making and everyday negotiations of multicultural and ethnic and cultural diversity within specific encounters, places and spaces, and wider geographies. I agree that geographers have a significant role to play in emphasising social context and rela-
tionality in intersectionality (Hopkins 2017), and I have suggested that this can be done by exploring how intersecting identities, and their attached positions of power, become articulated, enacted and contested through ‘placed’ encounters, in relational and co-constructed ways. Moreover, I have suggested that locating intersectionality can further politicise debates around encounters, social interactions and emergent micro connections in quotidian settings (cf. Neal et al 2018). As such, this thesis contributes to work being done in feminist and other critical geographies, interrogating how identity categories of ethnicity, gender, age, sexuality, social class, and their intersections, may speak to wider political issues and to inequalities.

Foregrounding perspectives in post-colonial literature, I have suggested that embedding negotiations of intersectional identities in specific places and spaces, and encounters, allows examining the ways in which past relations and geographies of racialisation and cultural othering continue to construct specific bodies and intersecting identities as ‘other’ in contemporary Western societies. It has been suggested that more research is needed that emphasizes intersectionality’s origins in critical race theory and its focus on racialisation processes, to avoid intersectionality becoming ‘depoliticised, flattened out and whitened’ (Hopkins 2017: 4; also Bilge 2013). This thesis has tried to do some of this work by highlighting how a focus on encounter and micro spaces of relation and connection, in particular, can dissect some of the ways in which intersectional identities intertwine with wider relations and geographies of power, both past and present, in Glasgow. Being attentive to the differences in power that come with these (intersecting) positions, I have also sought to explore some of the ways in which people as ‘others’ may strategically use their identities to resist and transrupt wider processes and discourses of racialisation and cultural othering; adding to feminist work on embodiment, performativity and racialisation (e.g. Lobo 2014a, 2014b; Mahtani 2002).

8.2.3 Placing Glasgow and Scotland
This thesis has explored how people from diverse ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds and heritages relate to, speak and feel about wider imaginaries of ‘Scottishness’ and belonging in and beyond Glasgow, foregrounding racialisation as an ongoing spatio-temporal process that has significant impacts on some people’s sense of ‘home’, belonging and comfort in the city. I have found that visual difference, including ‘signifiers’ of darker colour of skin and the headscarf, continues to be constructed as ‘otherness’ in some public spaces and neighbourhoods in Glasgow, and that people frequently identifying as black, non-white and/or Muslim were often hesitant to claim ‘Scottishness’. I thus agree that there is an ongoing need for research that critically examines current and emerging political discourses and debates relating to ethnicity, multiculture and questions of nationhood and national belonging in the Scottish context (Davidson et al 2018; Virdee
this thesis attempts to move these debates forward by highlighting some of the manifold ways in which racism persists in Scotland.

Since much of this work is situated within the social sciences, I contend that geographers have more to contribute regarding the role of space in above debates. Taking an encounter lens, in particular, highlights the significance of speaking from a *localised perspective* about broader issues of imagined communities, nationhood and national belonging in Scottish society. This thesis clearly illustrates that focusing on everyday geographies of encounter can reveal how people *place* articulations of ‘Scottishness’ in local spaces to make sense of broader national discourses and political events, and how articulations of national identities and belonging(s) may be moved and shifted in moments of encounter (*Argument 3*). This thesis sets up some of the interrelationships between different neighbourhoods in the North and West of Glasgow and wider Scotland/articulations of Scottishness. As Glasgow is relationally constituted with wider Scotland, my position is that investigating the everyday (at ease/uneasy) interactions in routine and shared spaces is central to better understand how people make sense and shape urban social worlds, and are simultaneously shaped by them (Young 2000).

8.3 Broader relevance of the thesis
This section offers some suggestions for the broader relevance of this thesis. Intersectionality has been receiving growing attention within, and beyond, geography. In this thesis, I have used an encounter framework to emphasise how critical it is to avoid abstracting intersectional analyses from broader historical and geographical contexts, to better understand how bodies come together in moments of encounter and negotiate often multiple and intersecting identities. I agree that placing greater emphasis on the specifics of social context and ‘local, regional and national geography’ (Hill Collins and Bilge 2016: 199) is key to provide ‘a more nuanced discussion of global processes’. A critical engagement with social context and relationality could thus further work out how people do *togetherness*, might ‘mess up’ (Curtis 2016: 337) dichotomist discourses of us/them and insider/outsider, and avoid displacing matters of race, racism and racialisation (Hopkins 2017). Social and feminist geographers have critical contributions to make to these debates, as they can further contribute to understandings of scale, place or time-space relations, spatial belongings and identities; that way advancing ‘how intersectionality is theorized, applied in research and used in practice’ (Hopkins 2017: 6).

Another important contribution to the geographical literature that could be further developed is thinking through intersectionality in terms of embodiment and belonging. Yuval-Davis (2011: 13), amongst others, argues that intersectionality is about much more than multiple identities, as ‘different locations along social and economic axes are often
marked by different embodied signifiers, such as colour of skin, accent, clothing and modes of behaviour’. Considering these ‘embodied signifiers’ (Hopkins 2017: 8) may suggest also focusing upon issues of ethnicity, class, gender and sexuality, and their intersections, alongside ‘matters of embodiment such as those associated with disposition, habit, recognition and style’ (also Lobo 2014a, 2013; Noble 2009a). This thesis has shown that a re-focus on matters of ‘race’, ethnicity, gender and religion, and their intersections, is justified; more could be done here in terms of exploring sexuality, age, class and other degrees of difference, and intergenerational ties in ethnic and cultural intersectionalities (6.x). As such, considering the politics of encounter and belonging can open up possibilities to further study how intersecting identities are lived ‘on the ground’, critical also to appreciate the agentic ways in which individuals and groups may ‘compose their own intersectional subjectivities’ (Tse 2014: 211).

Beyond this, the thesis points to the significance of studying experiences of care-ing and hope-ful encounters (cf. Curtis 2016) alongside wider issues of injustice and inequality. An exploration of ‘kind words’ and ‘small gestures’ (Horton and Kraftl 2009), and their effects, is surely becoming even more critical within wider political landscapes that are framed by crisis talk around issues of migration, integration and the securitisation of communities and nations against ‘others’ imbued with feelings of fear and hate (Neal et al 2018; Pain and Staeheli 2012; Pain 2009; Ahmed 2004). I support the view that thinking about the varied and unexpected ways in which hopeful encounters exist may make a difference in the lives of people trying to ‘re-create a new social world’ (Westoby 2009: 2; also Wright 2015). This is not meant to discount the injustices, inequalities, prejudices and racisms that continue to exist and shape communities and societies; however, I agree that researchers also have significant contributions to make by emphasising hopeful stories of togetherness and living with others that may feed into gradual social change (Lobo 2014b; Askins 2015). Feminist geographic research is already doing significant work here, thinking through the spatial and political implications of emotion (e.g. Wise and Velayutham 2017; Askins 2016; Lobo 2015).

In light of the detailed engagement with contexts across the North and West of Glasgow, I agree that it remains critical to provide in-depth analyses of the experiences of particular social groups, highlighting the ‘overlap, continuities and discontinuities in terms of how racism affects different groups’ (McBride and Liinpää 2018: 214) in Scottish society. While elite political discourses foreground and attempt to put into place an ‘aspirational pluralism’ (Meer 2015) and a ‘civic’ nationalism in the form of, for example, equality and diversity paradigms (cf. Meer 2016a), Davidson et al (2018) suggest that these actions should not obscure the continuing need of considering the different modalities of racism and the ways in which ‘new’ or ‘cultural’ racism (Taguieff 1990) such as Islamophobia have be-
come central features in much political and media discourses. Here, research could further explore how multicultural encounters in Scotland are impacted by wider discourses around migration, citizenship, belonging and nationhood, and recent political decision-making such as Brexit.

Emerging research further stresses the significance of exploring more widely processes of misrecognition in Scotland. Exploring experiences of misrecognition among young Sikhs, Hindus and other South Asian young people as well as black and Caribbean youth across Scotland, Hopkins et al (2017: 937), for example, imply that experiences of (mis)recognition have to be taken more seriously, since (mis)recognition is a process that is ‘co-constituted, situational, relational and imbued with power’. As such, being misrecognised and misread in different spaces can have ‘significant consequences for people’s ability to live together and share everyday places comfortably’ (ibid: 938; also Taylor 1994), and shape ‘present and future cross-cultural relations’ (Martineau 2012: 162). I agree that exploring the complex ways in which different (intersecting) identities are misread and misrecognised in different spaces and encounters, and the varying consequences this might have for those who experiences this, could provide a deeper understanding of everyday socio-spatial relations in (Scottish) society. That way, exploring experiences of encountering misrecognition can also emphasise the fluid and changing nature of discrimination, affecting not only one group (e.g. Islamophobia affecting Muslims) but having a range of effects on different social groups.

In terms of future research practice, this thesis has shown that adopting an embodied methodological approach can open up possibilities to explore in more depth the often embodied nature of multicultural and multi-ethnic encounters. Critically, approaching my body as an ‘instrument of research’ (Longhurst et al 2008) has allowed me to experience, feel and become more thoroughly immersed in the life worlds, everyday spaces, embodied practices and activities of the people that I wished to study/understand. At times, this also meant adopting a performative approach, as I was invited to take part in the knitting, cooking, eating, crafting, writing, walking and dancing at various groups meeting at the library and community centres. My involvement in many of these performed practices and activities emerged as the research unfolded; yet, this ‘coming to my senses’ (Curtis 2016: 325, original emphasis; also Lobo 2013) proved crucial to make sense of the diverse aspects of multicultural encounters and moments of micro connection and relation-building that people discussed during interviews and focus groups. Embodied and creative methodologies are increasingly emerging in geography, and I argue that more can be done with exploring research practice that enables researchers to engage in encounters with ‘fleshy bodies, sensory impulses and material objects’ (Lobo 2013: 460) and to develop ‘an
openness [...] and ethical questioning that destabilises the relationship between power and knowledge’ (Lobo 2010: 104) not possible with disembodied approaches.

In order to highlight the wider implications of research that takes seriously the role of quotidian settings for exploring social relations of everyday multiculture and (ethnic and cultural) diversity, I now turn to some tentative policy implications.

8.4 The ‘micro’ matters: beyond the academy
Public, political and policy discourses that have emerged throughout this thesis remain uncertain, since people discussed these mostly in vague and abstract terms. Yet, as crisis talk in Western societies is increasingly expressed in the form of multicultural failure, segregation, parallel lives, securitization, border controls and a rise in (violent) extremisms (Neal et al 2013; Lentin and Titley 2011), I suggest that the findings discussed in this thesis have relevance for the real world, due to its focus on micro social worlds. Indeed, the ‘policy world’ has been recognising and engaging with the significance of the informal; however policy interventions aimed at everyday life often seem to search for possibilities of ‘bridging’ or identifying commonalities rather than understanding different social worlds and the unfolding of everyday lives (Bloch et al 2013; Nagel and Hopkins 2010; Grillo 2007). Given this context, some have suggested that ‘current policies can be improved by understanding the everyday contexts in which multiculturalism unfolds’ (Nagel and Hopkins 2010: 9-10), with a more nuanced attentiveness to place (Clayton 2012), particularly the urban (Wilson 2015) and the suburban (Watson and Saha 2013), that opens up significant possibilities for fostering senses of belonging (Neal et al 2018). As I have detailed some of the capabilities, sites and processes of everyday interaction across difference in the North and West of Glasgow throughout this thesis, I now consider some of the implications that policy taking further notice of, and working with situated everyday worlds might have, particularly in terms of providing ways of effectively fostering and maintaining convivial public space(s) (Fincher et al 2014; Fincher and Iveson 2008).

In Scotland, elite political discourse and wider public attitudes towards migration, multiculture and integration are often constructed to be somewhat more welcoming and ‘civic’ (than in England) (e.g. McBride and Liinpää 2018; the Scottish Government 2013). However, Scotland is not immune to the negative rhetoric emerging from the UK government in terms of migration, the power of ‘intimacy geopolitics’ (Pain and Staeheli 2014) and the structuring forces of wider neo-liberal policies. Moreover, recent research is highlighting the much-needed engagement with Scotland’s arguably remaining complacency regarding racism and its structuring power both within academia and local and central government (McBride and Liinpää 2018). While the Scottish government has recently shown its formal commitment to tackling racism and racial inequality (Meer 2016b), publishing its
Central here is that matters of ‘race’ and inequality, and attitudes towards immigration and national belonging seem to remain powerfully intertwined in Scottish society, and apparently even more so in the post-Brexit context (Virdee and McGeever 2018; also Meer 2016c). I therefore agree that it would be a mistake to ignore some of the ways in which people live together in (urban) places, since living together is ‘not only being an active process but a shared one’ (Neal et al 2018: 131) that is rife with possibilities for social relationships, connections and identities to emerge that can recognise, value and manage (ethnic and cultural) difference. If it is necessary to continue to challenge institutional, structural and direct racism in Scotland (Haria 2018), and develop strategies capable of confronting inequality (Young 2018), then it is critical to recognise how some of this might be done in modest, small and ‘quiet’ ways from below, in the micro processes of daily life, alongside more formal actions and campaigning for equality and diversity.

I take inspiration from Wise and Velayutham’s (2014: 425) argument that it is the ‘dispositions and practices of everyday recognition and accommodation, mediated by spatial and other factors, [that] produce a sense of “more than”’, the atmosphere of ‘more than’ conceiving of policy as a process that is ‘multiple, emergent and simultaneously bottom up and top down’ (Neal et al 2018: 130; also Bloch et al 2013) in which informal capacities and resources of residents can influence and might sometimes be used by local policy networks and actors. Wise and Velayutham (2014: 415) also note that this should be accompanied by focusing on different actors that ‘knit together connections’ and places that shape local possibilities in significant ways, such as community groups, schools, libraries and community centres; Nagel and Hopkins (2010:5) agreeing that policy would benefit from moving towards a more ‘encompassing sense’ of ‘community’ actors. Indeed, some participants recognized implicitly and explicitly some of the issues raised in above discussions, Chapter 5 and 7 detailing some of their opinions regarding the importance of fostering and maintaining convivial public spaces to enable precarious yet often hopeful ways of living together.

8.4.1 Nurturing community spaces in Glasgow
This thesis contends that it is vital to pay attention to the ways in which specific spaces and surroundings may significantly influence the ways in which people interact and develop (new) social and local attachments and more nuanced understandings of their similari-
ties and differences. If recognising, identifying and supporting accessible spaces that welcome people and encourage interactions ‘are surely the tasks of planners’ (Fincher 2003: 58), what advice, then, does this thesis have to offer the city of Glasgow? I am reminded of Massey (2005: 11) who argues that ‘space matters’ because it ‘inflects how we engage, understand and approach the world’. Anderson (2008: 228) adds that ‘conceptualizing space should, therefore, be a pressing need for us – it should cause us problems, make us think, and interest us’. Given contemporary political pressures like Brexit and increasing crisis talk surrounding issues of migration, citizenship, belonging and nationhood, I suggest that Glasgow, at policy and city level, has to carefully (re) consider why and how the formation of multicultural spaces and mixed spaces of proximity and association might matter, in order to facilitate and nurture more hopeful ways of living together in the city.

First, in terms of community centres, Glasgow is increasingly reconceptualising these spaces as multi-purpose units or ‘hubs’ meant to bring together local businesses, government services and communities living in specific areas such as Maryhill HUB in the North of Glasgow. While this rhetoric of community and exhortations towards ‘empowerment’ and agency of local communities is welcome, critics point out that neoliberal orientations of urban policy in Glasgow entail that such spaces increasingly ‘disappear, struggle to survive, or at least feel the pressure’ (Nolan 2015: 181; Gray 2015). They also entail that hubs are frequently managed in top-down consultative ways, arguably representing forms of local state intervention that can be ‘highly damaging’ (Nolan 2015: 182) to local relations and potentially constrain communities’ ability to work through and move forward local issues. In current times of austerity, however, this thesis has shown that spaces like community centres are important sites of encounter in urban life, and thus require core funding from the state as a gesture of commitment to ‘publicness’ (Newman and Clarke 2014). Moreover, I support the view that Glasgow needs to more carefully consider how community spaces are already being used by local groups, and in what ways, and to (re)assess the needs of communities that hubs are meant to cater to/be for. This might address some of the issues raised by participants regarding the claimed under-use of community centres and their apparent public perception as spaces for ‘those in need of support or help only’ (7.4.1), alongside recognizing, (re)valueing and growing respect for the practices of already existing local networks, organizations and grassroots groups in a given area.

Second, this thesis has shown that libraries fulfil a range of key social functions in Glasgow, critically enabling people of diverse backgrounds and heritages to build connections and relations across/with difference, and find more inclusive and hopeful ways of living together in local communities and wider Scottish society. Despite this potential for fostering social connectivity, cohesion and integration (also Norcup 2017; Peterson 2017), li-
Libraries are among the key public spaces under pressure and cut as Scottish society is rapidly moving through and on from a time of ‘aggressive roll-back neoliberalism’ (Featherstone et al 2012: 177-180) in which ‘civic’ institutional spaces such as libraries have to withstand ‘dramatically curtail(ed) government spending’. Similar to community centres, I maintain that more funding needs to be made available for local libraries and library-like spaces across Glasgow because libraries are vital nurturing grounds for making ‘civil’ society, and represent a key social interface between people’s daily lives and the state, increasingly sparse within today’s society.

To secure and ‘legitimise’ such (extra) funds, and to counteract libraries being constructed as archaic and obsolete spaces (Jenkins 2016; Doherty 2014; Silka and Rumery 2013), Glasgow could support and implement urban policies, initiatives and projects that reimagine and revalue libraries as ‘everyday’ and quotidian spaces of hope and care, and community and refuge, particularly relevant in current times of growing political stress, anxiety and disaffection (Smith 2016; Staeheli et al 2012; Fincher and Iveson 2012). Inspiration could come from cutting edge Scandinavian city planning and policy environments that develop ‘library as place’ as a key concept, theorising and approaching public libraries as central social platforms that can enable people to reimagine place-people relations and attachments in society, in that way impacting/evoking alternative socio-political imaginations (Varheim 2014; Svendsen 2013; Hapel 2012; Johnston 2012; Hillenbrand 2005).

Third, regarding local cafes, this thesis evidences their role in providing a space for the diverse range of people who live and use Glasgow to come together and facilitate interaction and encounter between them. This recognizes and values some cafes as places of accessibility and welcome in many inner cities today that may represent ‘urban hubs’ of practiced conviviality and ‘light touch’ community (Valluvan 2016; Tjora and Scambler 2013; Warner et al 2012). Yet, since there are costs involved, the relationship between the commercial and the convivial is a critical one in the context of cafes. As such, it could be helpful for Glasgow, as a city, to think through ways in which to further support and nurture alternative cafe spaces that blur the lines between the private sector and the city’s or state’s domain, and responsibility; this could include ‘neighbourhood houses’ (Fincher 2003) or community cafes, as discussed by one participant in this thesis (5.3), which receive a little bit of funding from the state or local government to have a small staff of coordinators or tutors that welcomes people and manages the space.

Clearly, as with other public community spaces, one has to accept that conviviality in cafes may be sought through ‘coming together of like-minded persons, without a welcome for the unlike’ (Fincher 2003). Nevertheless, I wonder if bringing together more formal and voluntary organisations and initiatives working around issues of (multicultural) social con-
text, integration and cohesion in different areas of Glasgow could allow for collectively exploring the benefits and tensions of encouraging community groups to meet within cafe settings, and how to go about planning, financing and potentially campaigning for this. There already exist some cafes in Glasgow that put this into action; local cafe *For Fikas Sake* in Partick, for example, provides space for different community groups, including two music and art groups, one parents group and three language groups, to meet at the cafe alongside their other clientele at no or little cost throughout the week - at the point of writing this thesis, management of the cafe is changing and it remains unclear if these activities will continue. While such ideas surely entail tensions and limitations regarding a group’s size and activities and a cafe’s ability to accommodate community groups, and the exact usage of spaces and the outcome of proximity never being a predetermined given, I maintain that it remains crucial to explore and facilitate (alternative) opportunities for ‘rubbing along’ others in public places in Glasgow, to develop community that may be more commonly a social planning aim.

### 8.5 Conclusion – Hopeful futures

In the introduction, I stated that at the heart of this thesis lies a concern with an increasingly fearful and problematizing engagement with issues around migration, multiculture, nationhood, ‘home’ and belonging(s) in contemporary Western societies. This concern partly stems from my own positionalities of being a ‘mixed-race’ young woman who is, and hopes to continue to be a migrant, living and making a home in different countries and societies. As researcher, this concern entails attempting to develop a critical yet hopeful research agenda that takes these political developments seriously.

In this thesis, I have attempted to do so by taking an encounter framework to work through quotidian settings ‘on the ground’ as a means to explore social relations of everyday multicultural and complex negotiations of ethnic and cultural diversity in Glasgow, Scotland. Following the narratives of diverse and different people, a picture began to emerge that showed people often moving towards one another in routine and shared spaces despite tensions, uneasiness and persisting stereotypes and racializing attitudes. The ambivalence that defined the (thrown)togetherness of many of these spaces resonates with Young’s (1990: 22) attempts to move towards a politics of difference, in which ‘city life’ enables people ‘to live with difference in liveable ways’ (Neal et al 2018: 152). I hold that it is these spaces that may bring about more hopeful futures, as people develop ‘connective interdependencies’ (Neal et al 2018: 152) that are central for navigating the complexities and tensions of contemporary urban life.
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Appendix A: Participation Information sheet

Participant Information sheet

Meeting Spaces: Coming together in Glasgow

Research Project

My name is Meline Peterson. I work at the University of Glasgow and I am doing some research to explore the ways people interact in social spaces of the city, how these interactions influence the way people view themselves and others, and how interacting and living with people from diverse backgrounds shapes social life in Glasgow.

I am interested in hearing your opinion on the following questions:

- Where do you meet others in Glasgow?
- What are your experiences and memories of interacting with others in these places?
- How do these meetings shape the way you view yourself and others?

This research project wants to talk to people from diverse backgrounds who have been born, raised and/or settled down in Glasgow. It does not matter what background you have. I welcome all opinions.

1. What will taking part in the research involve?

Informal interviews: You will be invited to have a one-to-one conversation with me, to talk in detail about the issues you think are important. This will last no longer than one hour and can be arranged at a time and place suitable to you.

To be able to analyse all the information, I will record the things you say in various ways. Where possible—and only with your agreement and I will use a tape recorder so that I can remember what has been said more accurately. Otherwise, I will make
written notes during conversations. All recordings and notes made during the interview will be kept in a password protected computer/locked room.

2. Do I have to take part?
Please ask any questions you might have about this research before deciding whether or not to take part. You are free to choose whether you would like to participate. If you agree, and then later change your mind, you may withdraw yourself and your data from the study without any questions asked at any time. If you are happy to take part in this study, you will be asked to sign a consent form.

3. What happens to the research data provided?
The raw research data—recordings of interviews, conversations and so on—will be typed up into Word Documents on computer. This information will then be analysed to produce a PhD dissertation as well as a report, which will be circulated to participants of this project and relevant organisations in Glasgow, and across Scotland where appropriate.

The copy of this report offered to you will be a paper copy, and it will also be freely available via the University of Glasgow website.

I will make sure that all the information is kept anonymised. This means that I will not use your real name, or other details about you that could identify you—unless you expressly tell me that you want your own name to be used.

4. Who has reviewed this project?
This project has been reviewed by, and received ethics clearance through, the University of Glasgow Research Ethics Committee. This project has also been reviewed by Dr. Kye Askins, the project supervisor.

5. Contact details
Melike Peterson, PhD student, School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow
h.peterson.1@research.gla.ac.uk
0141 330 4506

Dr. Kye Askins, Project Supervisor, University of Glasgow
Kye.Askins@glasgow.ac.uk
0141 330 2289

We are both happy to answer any questions about the project!
Appendix B: Consent form

Consent Form

Meeting Spaces: Coming together in Glasgow

Research Project

☐ I have read and understood the information sheet.
☐ I would like to take part in the research project described on the information sheet.
☐ All information I disclose may be used in the research unless otherwise stated.
☐ I understand that I can withdraw from the research, without penalty, at any time.
☐ I give permission for a recorder to be used, knowing that all recordings will be kept safe, secure and confidential.
☐ I understand that my data will not be identified with my personal details during analysis and reporting of findings.

Signed: _____________________________________________

Print Name: __________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________

Contact email/telephone: _______________________________

Any questions? Contact me at:

h.peterson.1@research.gla.ac.uk
0141 330 4505
Melike Peterson, PhD student, School of Geographical and Earth Sciences, University of Glasgow
Appendix C: Poster used to advertise research in selected places of study

Meeting Spaces: Coming together in Glasgow
Research Project

This project explores how people interact in social spaces of the city, how these interactions influence the way people view themselves and others, and how interacting and living with people from diverse backgrounds shapes social life in Glasgow.

Would you like to share your story?

Contact Me

If you would like to take part or have any questions, please contact Melike Peterson
Email: h.peterson.1@research.gla.ac.uk
Appendix D: Script used during discussion groups

Script discussion group

How should we behave towards each other in this discussion?
- Don’t interrupt
- Assume best intentions
- Keep what is said during the group confidential

Introduction
Today, we will
- Discuss different kinds of meeting spaces where we meet new people in Glasgow
- Impacts of those meetings on our feelings of belonging in Scotland & how we think about others in Scottish society.

Key things mentioned so far in interviews:
- Range and variety meeting spaces important... people need different spaces where they feel comfortable going and hanging out
  - Feeling that fewer indoor public spaces available to do this
- Superficial and short interactions in our daily lives important
  - Show that you participate in social life, want to be social
  - Interactions often not carried beyond that moment
- Groups organized around activity, a purpose, help to get to know new & other people, more in depth
  - Also true for small moments of contact
- Varied & very diverse ideas about what it means to be Scottish, Scottishness seems like an inclusive identity?
  - Stereotypes ‘Scottishness’ remain as well as experiences of everyday racism and discrimination
  - Broader context: Political environment in Scotland (wider UK) felt by some as becoming more hostile (towards immigrants & people of colour)
  - Divided opinions about the role meeting other people in shared spaces can or should have in overcoming this & developing more inclusive views of Scottishness.

Put together 3 questions. We will explore them by using mind map tool (introduce KETSO)

Q1 Enabling/hindering spaces
- Signs: Enabling spaces Hindering spaces Diversity Shared spaces
  - What are comfortable spaces to meet new people?
  - Shared spaces more comfortable?
  - Really diverse space, more or less comfortable?
  - Different people vs. having things in common?

Q2 Different values of meeting new/other people
- 3 empty signs to be named Contact with diversity
  - Value of friendship knowing somebody group? Different spaces?
  - Value contact with diversity?

Q3 Role interactions for feelings of belongingness in Scotland & identity
- Putting down roots community?
- Understanding Scotland’s society better?
- Integration? Making connections?
- Old – new ID
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Appendix E: Example of open-ended coding used for interview data
Meeting Spaces: Coming Together in Glasgow

Research Project

This project set out to explore the different ways in which people live together in Glasgow, Scotland. For one year, I visited public libraries, cafes and community centres around the West and North of the city, meeting many people actively involved in Glasgow’s neighbourhoods and communities. This research rests on everyone who volunteered to share their experiences and stories with me. Thank you for making this project happen.

With this report, I want to share some themes that run through the data I collected with your help.

Initial findings & reflections

Living in Glasgow both with and in diversity?

- Glaswegian society is diversifying
  Many feel that Glaswegian and Scottish society are becoming more diverse, with specific areas of Glasgow diversifying more than others. Diversity is mainly talked about in terms of visible differences increasing such as seeing more people of different ethnicities, religions and cultures on the streets.

- Largely positive experiences of living in Glasgow
  Many feel that media and much political talk create feelings of uncertainty and fear around issues of immigration & multiculturalism in Scotland. Still, most experience their everyday lives in Glasgow as positive. Many newcomers, long-term residents as well as those born & raised in the city feel comfortable, safe and at home in Glasgow and in Scotland.

- Daily moments of discrimination, racism and aggression do exist
  Many people of non-white and/or non-Scottish heritage feel that they stand out on the streets, that political talk alienates and disconnects them from Scottish society, and that popular media portrays them as too different. It is vital to discuss these experiences especially as Scotland is often displayed as an inclusive, tolerant and accepting society to the outside world.

Everyday social spaces are both highly valuable and political

- Creating ‘liveable lives’
  Indoor public spaces are central to social life in Glasgow. Here, people meet and connect to others around common activities or interests. This helps both newcomers and more established residents to (re)establish and maintain social networks in their (new) environments. Realizing that one can have a
place in the local community and in Glasgow also means that people feel that they can belong in Scotland more widely.

- *The other one becomes a person, you know?*  
  By gathering around a shared activity or passion, people realize both their differences and similarities. This helps to move beyond ethnicity, age, gender or religion as a common identity, towards identifying with others around lifestyle, opinions & experiences. Many feel that these are more important, personal and ‘human’ characteristics.

- *Sending a strong political message*  
  Being together and engaged with others can counteract negative images and stereotyping statements made around diversity & difference by the media and on the streets. By sharing positive moments around common passions, activities and interests, these views can be stripped off some of their power they might have over our thinking and everyday life.

Integration depends on the individual as well as on adequate political support

- *Integration doesn’t just happen to you*  
  Many feel that people themselves have to take the first step in becoming involved in local life if they wish to feel integrated. Many actively seek out social spaces in the city to feel connected to others and communal life, thereby establishing ties with Glasgow and Scottish society as well.

- *Public policy and local government need to value these efforts more*  
  Both national and local government need to better support the wish and efforts made to engage with others and become involved in community life. This support is urgently needed within current political times as many new and existing social projects and initiatives in Glasgow have to face budget cuts and fight for dwindling funds.

What do you think? Do you dis/agree? What remains unclear?

These are initial findings and reflections. I would like to hear your thoughts and questions to improve my analysis and take more views and opinions into account!

For further questions and suggestions, you can always contact me at: h.peterson.1@research.gla.ac.uk

Melike Peterson  
PhD student in Human Geography, University of Glasgow